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Abstract

This study is a discourse-oriented ethnographic investigation of language-in-
education policy in Vanuatu. Following a period of joint Anglo-French colonial
rule, education currently follows a dual-submersion model, in which children are
enrolled in either English-medium or French-medium schools, while the
remaining 106 languages are excluded.

A case study of one English-medium school and one French-medium school
demonstrates that a single language (either English or French) is constructed
as the only appropriate language of each institution, but that this construction is
challenged in two ways. It is, firstly, undermined by the heteroglossic reality of
daily language practices. Teachers and learners make use of multiple linguistic
resources in order to negotiate their school lives, using only just enough English
or French to conform to the monolingual ideal. It is, secondly, contradicted by
the desire for 'bilingualism' in English and French, as the vestiges of Vanuatu's
double colonial heritage have been reimagined in unexpected ways. The dual
legacy has been transformed from being a reminder of an oppressive and
burdensome past to being both a gateway to double opportunity and a marker
of a 'bilingual' national identity that should be celebrated.

The thesis examines the way participants mediate the tension between
competing conceptualisations of 'language' and 'languages' in education. It
considers whether ideological and implementational spaces (Hornberger, 2002)
can be found amongst the contestation for the incorporation of alternative or
additional linguistic resources. It suggests the need to rethink the notion of
media of instruction, and to look for ways to foster the productive use of
repertoires of learning and teaching, drawing on whichever resources
are available to be used. In so doing, it reorients the problem from an approach to
education policy and planning that is driven by language, to an approach to
language policy and planning that is driven by learning.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 Vanuatu in brief

Map 1.1 Map of Melanesia

Vanuatu is a chain of islands in the Melanesian region of the South Pacific. It has a population of approximately 243,000, of which 75% live in rural areas. It has been an independent country since 1980. Prior to this, the islands were ruled jointly (as the New Hebrides) by Britain and France, following the establishment of an Anglo-French condominium in 1906. This arrangement meant that the two powers ruled the whole chain of islands jointly, but separately: there were two systems for policing, justice, education, health, and so on.

A review of titles of published accounts of colonialism and postcolonialism in Vanuatu reveals a consensus that the condominium was inefficient and chaotic: “The New Hebrides: A doubly-oppressed colony” (Edgell & Kalo, 1974); “The end of an episode of schizophrenic colonialism” (Forster, 1980); “Beyond pandemonium” (Lini, 1980); “Tufala Gavman” (two governments) (Bresnihan &
Woodward, 2002); “To kill a bird with two stones” (MacClancy, 2002); and “Bridging mental boundaries in a postcolonial microcosm” (Miles, 1998).

At Independence in 1980, Vanuatu was left with two separate education systems. One had been set up by the British and used English as the medium of instruction; the other had been set up by the French and used French as the medium of instruction. This dual system continues today, with English-medium and French-medium schools in close proximity to one another. Parents often choose to send some children to each stream of the system, in the hope of ‘getting’ both English and French for the family. Outside school, neither English nor French is widely spoken, particularly in rural areas.

The SIL Ethnologue lists 108 living languages. 105 of these are Austronesian languages of the Oceanic subtype, which are referred to throughout this study as the vernaculars. In the most recent census that included language use (1989), 94% of the population over the age of six reported speaking one of these languages (Lynch, 1996). However, no vernacular is spoken by more than 11,500 people, and there are an estimated 66 languages spoken by fewer than 1,000 (P. Lewis, 2009). The other three languages spoken are Bislama, English and French, which share official language status. Bislama is a dialect of the English-based Melanesian Pidgin, and is spoken by approximately 95% of the population, although by only 2% as a first language (ibid., citing 2001 figures). Despite being a joint official language, and also the sole national language, Bislama has no place in the education system, and students are often punished for speaking it.

1.1.2 Research questions and purpose

Using Vanuatu as a case study, this thesis aims to contribute to the search for new ways of developing education policies that are appropriate in postcolonial, multilingual contexts. Building on critiques of existing approaches to education within such contexts, this entails examining the way different languages tend to be valued, as well as deconstructing the way ‘language’ itself has generally
been conceptualised. It requires taking a different approach to the consideration of what is possible, by examining what spaces exist for alternatives.

The study is problem-oriented, as it is motivated by a number of language-related issues within education policymaking in Vanuatu. These will be described in Chapter 2 but, in brief:

- Education is underpinned by a strictly monolingual frame of reference within each school, despite the linguistic diversity amongst its staff and students, and despite the multilingual reality of Vanuatu.
- Bislama and, to a lesser extent, the vernaculars are banned from many schools.
- Students struggle to learn through the medium of instruction, to which they have limited exposure outside school.
- Some students experience these issues through the medium of English, while others do so through the medium of French. Families are often polarised into ‘Anglophones’ and ‘Francophones’.
- There has been constant debate about these issues since Independence, and yet little has changed.

The study was motivated by very broad questions: Does the situation have to stay like this? Is it possible to challenge the monolingual status quo? What might be stopping change? A construct that provides an overarching focus for the research is therefore Hornberger’s (2002, 2005) metaphor of ‘ideological and implementational spaces’ (see 1.1.3.4) for the use of additional or alternative linguistic resources. The intention is to understand the mechanisms that are closing down (or preventing the opening of) spaces for change in Vanuatu, whilst identifying other potential spaces that could be opened up and exploited.

The final research questions were as follows:

1. How is 'language' constructed within education practices and discourses?

2. Can ideological and implementational spaces be identified amongst the education practices and discourses that indicate opportunities for additional or different linguistic resources to be used?
1.1.3 What this study contributes to the field of multilingual education

Heugh (2011, p.105) refers to the “baffling phenomenon” of the continued use of education programmes in postcolonial contexts that “have succeeded only in providing successful formal education for a small percentage of children, [and] yet ... continue to be used as if they could offer lasting educational success for the majority” (p.106). The common factor that Heugh argues against in such programmes is the use of what is essentially a foreign language for the majority of children, and often their teachers.

This situation stems from a number of common perceptions about education in multilingual contexts. Many commentators (Da Pidgin Coup, 1999; Heugh, 2002; Makalela, 2009; Tucker, 1998) supply lists of such perceptions as ‘myths’ that provide a bank of justifications for the maintenance of the status quo. With reference to South Africa, Heugh (2002, p.177) explains how claims can quickly become treated as facts that then become hard to refute:

If any evidence is offered, it is either weak or it applies only to a small sample of students or informants rather than the majority. Despite evidence which is flimsy at best, it finds its way into texts which support the status quo in relation to language use in education. Collectively, because the claims are restated with such frequency, they become mythologised.

Taking the same approach here, I identify ten such claims that have become ‘mythologised’ within Vanuatu’s education debate:

Myth 1: Education operates most effectively through a single medium of teaching and learning.

Myth 2: Any language can be mastered by trying hard enough (and can thus be used successfully as medium of teaching and learning).

Myth 3: Knowledge of certain languages leads automatically to economic opportunity and development.

Myth 4: Certain languages have no instrumental value.

Myth 5: Pidgins and creoles are inferior to other languages.

Myth 6: Corpus planning in a large number of small languages makes multilingual education impractical.

Myth 7: Materials development in multiple languages is too costly and complex.
Myth 8: Teaching or managing a class in which multiple languages are in use is impossible.

Myth 9: Assessment in multiple languages is impractical.

Myth 10: The use/teaching of familiar languages takes up time that could be spent learning additional languages.

These myths can be thought of as a series of recurrent and interconnected arguments that serve to close down space for multilingual education. They are well-documented and can easily be dismissed on linguistic grounds (Heugh, 2002; Siegel, 1999a), and yet they prevail as their logic remains uncontested. This thesis examines the practices and discourses that keep these myths in circulation in Vanuatu, thereby closing down spaces for change. It seeks to examine the foundations on which they are based, and explore potential to open up spaces for additional or alternative linguistic resources.

1.1.3.1 Education within postcolonial, multilingual contexts

Throughout this thesis, I refer to ‘multilingual education’ as an umbrella term for a number of possible ways of incorporating more than one language in education. I do not differentiate between ‘bilingual’ and ‘multilingual’ approaches, although the terms are often used to refer to the use of two, and more than two, languages, respectively (cf. García, Skutnabb-Kangas, & Torres-Guzmán, 2006, p.13). A number of typologies of education models have been suggested (Baker, 2006; Benson, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981). The four models documented in postcolonial contexts are summarised in Table 1.1, along with examples from the South Pacific. The terms ‘L1’ and ‘L2’ are common, albeit contested, terms (Brock-Utne, 2009) that stand proxy for children’s first and subsequent languages.
Table 1.1 Multilingual education models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Medium of instruction</th>
<th>Examples from the South Pacific¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submersion</td>
<td>L2 throughout school</td>
<td>Solomon Islands (English-medium); Vanuatu (English- or French-medium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-exit transitional</td>
<td>L1 for between one and three years, before transition to L2</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea (multiple vernaculars used in pre-school and 2 years of primary school before transition to English); Fiji (Fijian or Fiji Hindi used for 3 years of primary school before transition to English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-exit transitional</td>
<td>L1 for between six and eight years, before transition to L2</td>
<td>Tonga; Samoa (Tongan/Samoan used throughout primary school, before transition to English; both L1 and L2 continue to be studied as subjects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>L1 medium throughout primary school; L1 and L2 dual medium throughout secondary school</td>
<td>Palau (Palauan throughout primary school; Palauan and English throughout secondary school)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submersion, as Benson (2009, p.64) points out, is neither *multilingual*, since it operates through one language only, nor even *an approach* to education, since it appears to be born out of reluctance to engage with questions of language and pedagogy at all. Children are expected to cope with instruction delivered through the medium of an L2, often in poorly-resourced classrooms with teachers who lack adequate command of the language themselves. This type of education has long been criticised, both internationally (see particularly Benson, 2009; García, 2009; Heugh, 2003; Ouane & Glanz, 2011; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981, 2008) and regionally (Early, 1999; Lotherington, 1996, 1998; Mangubhai, 2002; Tamtam, 2008): on pedagogical grounds (since children struggle to learn through an unfamiliar language); on societal grounds (since school becomes separated from community involvement and education tends to be alien to the local culture); on language maintenance grounds (since indigenous languages are denigrated and can thus become endangered); and on human rights grounds (since children are denied the right to use and learn in their own

¹ The Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Papua New Guinea and Fiji are in Melanesia, a region of immense linguistic diversity. Tonga and Samoa are in Polynesia. Palau is in Micronesia.
language, as well as the right to effective education). However, this scenario is familiar throughout the linguistically diverse context of Melanesia.

Transitional models refer to programmes in which a more familiar language (whether or not the language a child actually speaks at home) is used as the medium of instruction for a set period of time, before a transition is made to L2. We can differentiate between early-exit and late-exit transitional programmes, according to the stage at which the transition takes place. There has been a convergence on early-exit transitional programmes throughout both Anglophone and Francophone postcolonial contexts (Alidou, 2009; Heugh, 2011), and these are the most common models followed in multilingual education experiments that have been conducted in a wide range of countries. All attempts to incorporate L1 that have been implemented in post-independence Melanesia also fall into this category, including the Vernacular Language Education policy piloted in Vanuatu since 1999 (Nako, 2004; Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999), which will be discussed in 2.2.2.2.

Papua New Guinea has implemented what is globally considered the most ambitious programme to incorporate L1, through a community-driven approach that had established approximately 386 pre-schools by 1991, using 91 different languages (Troolin, 2013, p.288, citing figures from Yeoman & Obi, 1993), and which was then extended under the subsequent Education Reform to incorporate a significantly larger number of languages in pre-school and early primary education. Although this rapid expansion and centralisation of the initiative was extremely problematic (Litteral, 1999; Siegel, 1997a; Troolin, 2013), early evaluations indicated that children were able to make the subsequent transition to English successfully and appeared better adjusted to school life than those who received education only in English (Klaus, 2003; Siegel, 1997b). Perhaps its greatest impact has been to show governments that simple resources can be developed in a large number of languages, and that perceived complexities and costs of implementation in linguistically diverse contexts should not be used as a justification for maintaining the status quo. Transitional programmes are arguably the most controversial of all approaches. They have been championed for their inclusion of more familiar languages,
thereby attempting to address the problems of submersion education. However, the aim is ultimately to replace these languages with the L2, and they are thus ‘subtractive’ rather than ‘additive’ models (Baker, 2011). In most cases, the transition is made before children have gained sufficient grounding in L1, so such programmes merely “delay the ‘sink or swim’ ritual” of submersion (Chimbutane, 2013, p.316). The question is whether they are a step in the right direction towards an additive approach, or whether they do more harm than good, as Heugh (2002) argues is the case when the transition is made too early. In terms of the efficacy of such programmes, she notes that “there is, by 2010, no internationally-acknowledged second language acquisition expert who suggests that transition to the second language by the end of the third year of primary school will serve most children well” (2011, p.124).

More importantly, the danger is that negative results from early-exit transitional programmes will lead to a return to submersion programmes, rather than an extension of the use of L1. It appears that this may be the case in Papua New Guinea, where the government has recently reinstated English-only education at all levels, in order to “address the concerns of parents, teachers, students, academics and political leaders that vernacular in elementary schools created a poor standard of spoken and written English” (Belden, 2013). For this reason, Heugh (2011, pp.147-8) argues that it is irresponsible for advisors and international agencies such as UNESCO to advocate early-exit programmes. She argues strongly for models of extended L1 use alongside L2, i.e. late-exit transitional and additive bilingual programmes.

Education in multilingual contexts is thus far from multilingual. The models outlined above provide frames for considering current approaches to education, but this thesis will re-examine many of the foundations on which these models are based. It will suggest that there may be more productive ways to contribute to multilingual education debates.

1.1.3.2 Languages jostling for inclusion: Language ideologies

The previous section has presented four models of education in which the choice between languages might be considered a neutral one. However, it is
clear that beneath language policy and planning decisions lies an ideological configuration in which languages are anything but equal. As Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004, pp.1-2) note:

In multilingual settings, language choice and attitudes are inseparable from political arrangements, relations of power, language ideologies, and interlocutors’ views of their own and others’ identities. Ongoing social, economic, and political changes affect these constellations, modifying identity options offered to individuals at a given moment in history and ideologies that legitimize and value particular identities more than others.

As Woolard (1998) notes, there is no unified body of literature that encompasses the field of language ideologies. A commonly cited definition is that of Silverstein (1979, p.193), who describes language ideology as the “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use”. While this definition states that ideologies are explicitly “articulated by users”, others make less strong claims about the users’ ability to do this, such as Kroskrity (2004, p.496), who refers to “incomplete, or ‘partially successful’, attempts to rationalize language usage”, citing Errington’s (2001) definition of “situated, partial, and interested character of conceptions and uses of language”.

In studies of language-in-education policy, the notion of dominant ideology is important. Gal (1993, p.356) uses the term ‘dominant’ “to refer to ideas made official by their use in governing and by the support of the state bureaucracy”. However, Gal (1998, p.321) also notes that “some ideas and practices are ‘dominant’, not simply because they are produced or held by dominant groups, but because their evaluations are recognized and accepted by, indeed partially constitute, the lived reality of a much broader range of groups”. For this reason, the myths introduced in 1.1.3 that serve to close down space for multilingual education in Vanuatu can be considered the products of dominant ideology.

Ideologies are multi-sited. “They include the values, practices and beliefs associated with language use by speakers, and the discourse which constructs values and beliefs at state, institutional, national and global levels” (Blackledge, 2005, p.32). They can be uncovered through analysis of the way people use language, as well as the way they talk about language (Blackledge, 2005;
Woolard, 1998). Three particular issues are relevant to this study: the prioritisation of former colonial languages over others; the effects of the coexistence of more than one former colonial language; and the denigration of pidgins and creoles.

With reference to the first issue, the models summarised in Table 1.1 reveal that, in postcolonial contexts, the former colonial languages are typically prioritised over all others. This stems from hierarchies constructed during colonialism, in which the languages of the coloniser and the colonised were positioned in an asymmetrical relationship. As Stroud (2007, p.44) states, with reference to Mozambique,

This was bolstered by an ideological and religious discourse that mapped ideas of culture and civilized humanity onto essentialist notions of language, race and territoriality, and by principles of governmentality that circumscribed the limits, and linguistic requirements, of citizenship for the native African.

As a result, as Brock-Utne (2010, p.92) argues, “an African child with a perfect command of two very different African languages is not called bilingual. It is only when one language is an ex-colonial language that the concept ‘bilingualism’ or ‘bilingual schooling’ is being used.”

The lack of value accorded to the home languages of the majority of children in postcolonial contexts is clear. Bamgbose (2005, p.255) attributes the problem to the absence of political will to break down these colonial ideologies and see indigenous languages as viable options. This study contributes to this particular discussion from the context of the Pacific, which tends to be underrepresented in global discussions of postcolonial legacies in education.

The second aspect is the way former colonial languages are compared against each other in contexts in which two or more former colonial powers have left their linguistic mark. Although Vanuatu was the only territory to be ruled jointly by Britain and France, certain similarities can be found with each of Cameroon (Ayafor, 2005; Nana, 2010), the Seychelles (Laversuch, 2008; Salabert, 2003) and Mauritius (Rahaj-Carrim, 2007; Sonck, 2005), which have each inherited both English and French as former colonial languages, due either to the joining of former British and French possessions (Cameroon) or to separate periods of
British and French rule (the Seychelles and Mauritius). Language policy decisions in these countries must take into account the existence of two former colonial languages.

However, in such contexts, English and French are no longer solely the former colonial languages. They are languages that are used for a variety of purposes both within the postcolonial country and elsewhere in the world. Thus the relative status accorded to the two languages within a country may be affected by their relative status worldwide, such that English may currently be considered to be the more widely used language of the two (Heller, 1999a; Kembo-Sure, 2009). At the same time, however, the linguistic and cultural space of Francophonie provides a common point of reference for former French or Belgian colonies that provides a shared identity to be upheld (Le Vine, 2004; Salhi, 2002). There are often financial implications of retaining (or severing) ties with the former colonial governments and other Anglophone or Francophone countries, and postcolonial governments understandably prefer to keep as many doors open as possible. Thus, in addition to the prioritisation of former colonial languages over all others, there are a number of contexts in which the issue may be intensified by considerations of which colonial language.

Finally, in addition to the prioritisation of former colonial language(s), certain other languages may be denigrated more explicitly than the rest. Of relevance here is the exclusion of pidgins and creoles from formal education, despite their often widespread functional usage (and sometimes high status) outside this domain. Chapter 2 will demonstrate this paradox with reference to Vanuatu, and provide more specific detail about the example of Bislama. However, in summary, Siegel (2007) lists only three pidgins or creoles throughout the world that are used nationwide as media of instruction in formal education (Seselwa in the Seychelles, Haitian Creole in Haiti, and Papiamentu in the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba – all at the primary level). He refers to a very limited number of other contexts in which educational programmes either accommodate pidgins or creoles for specific purposes such as the study of literature, or include

---

2 There are also obvious parallels with Canada (Heller, 2007a; Tabouret-Keller, 2007), as well as formerly ‘Francophone’ countries such as Rwanda which have increasingly shifted towards the English-speaking world (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010), and other countries that have experienced other forms of ‘dual outside influence’ such as Timor-Leste (Taylor-Leech, 2013).
awareness components in which the languages are examined more explicitly, but reports that widespread attitudes have remained negative towards the use of pidgins and creoles in education. Siegel argues that little research has been done within the field, and that negative attitudes remain largely unchanged by any studies that have been conducted. This study therefore aims to add to the body of research on both the use of and attitudes towards these languages in education.

1.1.3.3 Rethinking the ‘multilingual’ in ‘multilingual education’

A more fundamental issue to be tackled than which language to use is the question of why there is a need to choose a language at all. Education in postcolonial, multilingual contexts has long been criticised for the perceptual barrier created between school and home (Banda, 2010; Brock-Utne, 2009; García, 2009; Higgins, 2009), a barrier that stems, in part, from the fact that a singular language is selected for use. Outside school, it is common for a number of languages to be used, but this multilingual reality is rarely reflected within formal education. Higgins (2009, p.151) refers to “the development of two separate worlds where heterogeneity and homogeneity each govern language without acknowledging the presence of the other world”, and argues that the linguistic heterogeneity of everyday life needs to be acknowledged within formal education too. The various contributors within Prah and Brock-Utne (2009), working with reference to Africa, aim to challenge the monolingual ideology by taking multilingualism as the starting point, or the norm, rather than a problem to be dealt with. In this thesis, it will be shown that Vanuatu’s school language policies do not in any way reflect the way language is actually used, either inside or outside school, and this disjuncture provides the first contradiction to interrogate.

Bilingual models tend to position indigenous languages against languages such as English, with a lack of discussion as to how these languages fit together. The following problems have been identified with reference to Africa:

African languages are promoted as autonomous and bounded systems linked to equally autonomous homogenous communities, regions and, in some cases, far flung villages. Even though there is evidence of multilingual speech patterns all over Africa, the official doctrine is to promote singular languages to the exclusion of other
African languages spoken in the communities or regions. Even though English and other colonial languages are part of the multilingual landscape and have become critical components of the linguistic repertoires of Africans (due, in part, to the advent of information technology), the policies favoured by language education researchers are those that restrict instruction in English to later stages of a child’s education. (Banda, 2009, p.3)

The result is that (usually a single) indigenous language is assigned a certain place in an education system, while (usually a single) former colonial language is assigned another place, leading to a number of separate, monolingual approaches to postcolonial education, as summarised in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2 The monolingual framework underpinning each model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Integration of different ‘languages’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submersion</td>
<td>Monolingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Transition from one monolingualism to another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>One monolingualism added to another</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This monolingual focus stems from the foundations of the field of Language Policy and Planning, which will be discussed in more depth in Chapter 3. In brief, the field has traditionally concerned pragmatic decisions about which language(s) to use for which purpose(s), within specific domains such as education and the media. Language has therefore typically been conceptualised in instrumental terms, so that different languages are compared for their usefulness and efficiency in fulfilling particular roles. Each language has been conceived of as an autonomous system that can be picked up and used for a given purpose (cf. Pennycook, 2010).

In seeking spaces for multilingual education, a strong foundation that needs to be broken down is this attempt to add languages together, whilst still keeping them separate. Following Heugh (2003), Banda (2009, p.1) refers to this conceptualisation of multilingualism as “multiple monolingualisms”, and attributes this to a Western experience of language learning. He notes that language policies based on such an understanding of multilingualism make no sense in contexts where people use a number of languages on a daily basis,
without separating them into these distinct systems. Although García (2009) does not directly address the situation of majority learners within postcolonial contexts, her differentiation (p.120) between monoglossic ideologies and heteroglossic ideologies, according to the way 'language' is understood within education models, follows the same line of argument. She considers both ‘subtractive’ and ‘additive’ models of bilingual education to follow monoglossic frameworks, given that they focus on the way discrete languages are either removed from or added to learners' repertoires. She argues instead for a dynamic theoretical framework of bilingualism, underpinned by a heteroglossic ideology, which “allows the simultaneous coexistence of different languages in communication, accepts translanguaging, and supports the development of multiple linguistic identities to keep a linguistic ecology for efficiency, equity and integration, and responding to both local and global contexts” (García, 2009).

This argument follows a growing number of calls to deconstruct or disinvent (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007) ‘languages’ as separate, discrete systems that can be mastered for particular purposes, and find ways instead to understand multilingualism in terms of social practice (Banda, 2009, 2010; Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Chimbutane, 2011; García et al., 2006; Heller, 2007b; Pennycook, 2010; Prah & Brock-Utne, 2009). Within this paradigm, distinct, named languages are considered to be “ideological constructions” (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011, p.5), and it is through the interrogation of such constructions that the identification of ideological space can begin. As Heller (2007a, p.2) notes, we can think of language as “a set of resources which circulate in unequal ways in social networks and discursive spaces, and whose meaning and value are socially constructed within the constraints of social organizational processes, under specific historical conditions”.

A move has thus been made towards a more fluid conceptualisation of the use of multiple linguistic resources, rather than separate languages, leading to notions of ‘heteroglossia’ (Bailey, 2007; Bakhtin, 1981), ‘translanguaging’ (García, 2009), ‘polylanguaging’ (Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen, & Møller, 2011), and ‘flexible bilingualism’ (Blackledge & Creese, 2010), as more realistic frameworks of language use. The distinctions between these terms are contested (Blackledge, Busch, Van Avermaet, Jørgensen, & Pennycook, 2011),
but common to all are an opposition to monoglossic frames of reference, a focus on fluidity and flexibility, a prioritisation of language use rather than of abstract, idealised language models, and the recognition that ‘a language’ cannot be mastered in its entirety. This move helps us to re-think what is actually meant (or what could be meant) by ‘multilingual education’.

García (2009, p.128) suggests:

The development of bilingualism depends on the degree to which bits and pieces of the children’s languaging practices are extended in the academic context. Heteroglossic bilingual education types support the language interaction of children with different translanguaging practices and build bilingualism accordingly.

She argues for the recognition and extension of learners’ linguistic repertoires, and there are parallels here with the Council of Europe’s (2007, p.8) definition of ‘plurilingualism’ as “the repertoire of varieties of language which many individuals use”. From this perspective, an individual’s plurilingual repertoire is a “group of language varieties ... mastered by the same speaker, to different degrees of proficiency and for different uses” (p.51). The Council of Europe recommends “a holistic and coherent approach” to language education (p.8), in order to “promote an integrated competence and a consciousness of learners’ existing repertoires and of their potential to develop and adapt those repertoires to changing circumstances” (p.41). This vision of language competence tends to be framed in terms of building a repertoire that will lead to economic opportunity within the context of the EU, and it is not clear that the resources of less widely spoken languages hold equal value (cf. Sierens & Van Avermaet, 2013), but the rhetoric with which the argument is made is not dissimilar to that of scholars such as García (2009).

A review of publications since the late 1990s reveals that attempts to reconceptualise bi/multilingual education and bi/multilingualism are not new (e.g. “Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education” (Cenoz & Genesee, 1998); “Rethinking language education from a monolingual to a multilingual perspective” (Tosi & Leung, 1999); “Towards a multilingual culture of education” (Ouane, 2003); “The monolingual bias in bilingualism research” (Auer, 2007); “Clarification, ideological/epistemological underpinnings and implications of some concepts in bilingual education” (Skutnabb-Kangas &
McCarty, 2008); and, most recently, “The multilingual turn” (May, 2013). At the current time, however, the endeavour coincides with a significant period of re-examination of a number of aspects of ‘multilingualism’ itself (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011), and this study attempts to work within this nexus.

In particular, I hope to continue the lines of argument explored above but with specific reference to Melanesia. I draw on research from both the Global North and the South, given that there are concurrent challenges being made to the monolingual bias within multilingual education from scholars working in, from, and with reference to, a number of different contexts. Of particular relevance is the work being done to deconstruct the foundations of postcolonial language-in-education policies, largely emanating from Africa. However, while the principle of a paradigm shift (e.g. Brock-Utne, 2009; Holmarsdottir, 2009; Kimizi, 2009) away from a Western, or Eurocentric, approach is valid in this study, the Pacific island region is different from the continent of Africa. My aim is to draw on the work done in other postcolonial contexts, for which African scholars provide many starting points, but in a way that remains relevant to Vanuatu, and to the Melanesian region more generally. While Africa can provide many useful comparisons, the wholesale importation of ideas developed in this postcolonial context is no better than the retention of colonial ones. Mühlhäusler (1996) is one of the few scholars who has problematised both the construction of ‘languages’ and language-in-education policies in the Pacific region, although his arguments are solely ecological in nature, and he seems to completely ignore pedagogical aspects of education policy.

1.1.3.4 Ideological and implementational spaces
The final notion that this study engages with is Hornberger’s (2002) concept of ‘ideological and implementational spaces’. Hornberger examines the way macro-level multilingual policies can create, but also close down, spaces in which different linguistic resources may be used in ways that were not necessarily intended. Ramanathan (2005, p.98) has referred to these as “spaces of unplanned language planning”.
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While some versions of policy may appear to be closing down ideological spaces, there may be other policy moments going on elsewhere that manage to keep these spaces open (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). Educators may find ways to wedge open spaces in their local contexts that may not be noticeable from other vantage points, but they may equally ignore spaces that could have been productively used. Moreover, the implementation of new policies may actually close down spaces that were previously being used to good effect. As Johnson (2011, p.129) notes, such spaces are only potential opportunities for change. Somebody needs to implement something that takes advantage of this potential space. Hornberger (2002, p.30) states that “there is urgent need for language educators, language planners, and language users to fill those ideological and implementational spaces as richly and fully as possible, before they close in on us again”. She later expands on this to argue that,

It is essential for language educators and language users to fill up implementational spaces with multilingual educational practices, whether with intent to occupy ideological spaces opened up by policies or to prod actively toward more favorable ideological spaces in the face of restrictive policies. Ideological spaces created by language and education policies can be seen as carving out implementational spaces at classroom and community levels, but implementational spaces can also serve as wedges to pry open ideological ones (Hornberger, 2005, p.606).

Given the stalemate that appears to have been reached in Vanuatu with regard to languages in education, this is an appropriate time to examine the ideological and implementational potential for change. This study aims to contribute to the search for appropriate education policies, by focusing on the way language(s) are currently understood within one particularly complex postcolonial context. It therefore contributes to an understanding of how ideological and implementational spaces open and close, with wider implications for language-in-education policymaking in other postcolonial contexts.

1.1.4 Potential contributions in Vanuatu

Poor quality of education in Vanuatu has been raised as a concern in numerous government reports since 1999 (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, 2004, 2006a, 2006b, 2009). National assessments across all school subjects can
provide little meaningful data to support the concerns, given that ‘pass/fail rates’
at each level are determined solely by the number of available school places at
the next level. However, the regional Pacific Islands Literacy and Numeracy
Assessment, administered until the late 1990s, gave cause for concern. In the
1996 tests, 53% of Francophone pupils and 21% of Anglophone pupils in Year
4 were considered ‘at risk’ in literacy (defined as having “acquired no significant
knowledge in the subject”), with very similar results for the two groups in Year 6.
19% of Francophones in Year 4 (rising to 21% in the Year 6 cohort), and 16% of
Anglophones in both age groups were considered ‘at risk’ in numeracy

These regional tests have been replaced by a nationally-designed assessment
since 2004. In the first year of testing, the Vanuatu Standardized Tests of
Achievement (VANSTA) suggested that literacy and numeracy levels were
‘critical’ for 61% and 65%, respectively, of Year 4 pupils across the whole
cohort, although there were no significant differences found between
Anglophone and Francophone pupils. The situation appeared better amongst
the Year 6 pupils, although ‘critical’ levels were still seen for 29% in literacy and
26% in numeracy (Tambe, 2005). Pupils were defined as being “‘critically
disadvantaged’ if their Achievement Levels in both literacy and numeracy were
either Level 1 or Level 0, where achievements at Level 0 refers to those who
have shown no evidence of having achieved any of the skills expected at [the
relevant level], and achievements of Level 1 refer to those who have shown little
evidence of the skills expected” (ibid, p.6). The 2009 VANSTA results defined
59% of Anglophone pupils and 65% of Francophone pupils (across both Year 4
and Year 6) as “critically underachieving” in literacy, with 66% of Anglophones
and 61% of Francophones defined as such in numeracy (Niroa, 2012, p.36).

The Vanuatu model of the USAID-funded Early Grade Reading Assessment
(EGRA) (EdDataII, 2004) was first used in 2010, and demonstrated that only a
quarter of pupils at the end of Year 3 were able to understand the text they were
asked to read (Niroa, 2012, p.37).

Tamtam (2008) draws links between low proficiency in the medium of
instruction and difficulties learning content subjects, using evidence of poor
performance in university entrance assessments amongst ni-Vanuatu students
to support her case. Bibi (2004) draws attention to Vanuatu’s very high rates of school dropouts and repeaters, indicators that are common to submersion programmes worldwide (Ouane & Glanz, 2011). A number of linguists have argued for a move away from submersion education in Vanuatu, based on the pedagogical disadvantages that children in such programmes are considered to face due to the use of an unfamiliar classroom language (Crowley, 2005; Lotherington, 1996; Mangubhai, 2002). The medium of instruction debates that have arisen in the country will be introduced in detail in Chapter 2, where it will be shown that there has been significant concern about, but little change in, policy since Independence.

Relatively little empirical education research has been conducted to date in Vanuatu. One collective effort made to address the lack of research in the Pacific region as a whole has been the work of the PRIDE project (Pacific Regional Initiatives for the Delivery of Basic Education) (Puamau & Teasdale, 2005), in which the aim has been to “develop a set of principles and processes that [is] firmly grounded in Pacific values and epistemologies, yet [is] fully syncretised with useful global approaches” (Puamau, 2005, p.26). Another major initiative, specific to Vanuatu, was the ‘Re-thinking Vanuatu Education Together’ conference of 2002 (Sanga, Niroa, Matai, & Crowl, 2004), which was part of the wider ‘Re-thinking Pacific Education’ initiative. However, despite encouraging statements about ways forward, very little empirical research is being carried out.

A second issue is that any research that has been done has tended to be quantitative. The PRIDE project’s chapter titled ‘The role of data in educational planning’ (Tokai, 2005) refers only to quantitative data. The few chapters of the ‘Re-thinking Vanuatu Education Together’ publication that deal with school-based data contain only quantitative findings. However, in the contribution titled ‘Education statistics’, the author actually creates a case for qualitative methods to be employed. She notes that “current trends in student repeaters are disturbing and require closer scrutiny” (Bibi, 2004, p.288, my emphasis). Another point states, “Indications of an over-supply of teachers demonstrate the complexities of the student/teacher ratio issue. A recommended ratio is a guide
only and often other factors seriously affect the application of policies on student/teacher ratios” (ibid., my emphasis).

There seems to be a need for qualitative data to be collected in order to supplement the statistics for issues such as repeater rates and student/teacher ratios. Information such as low teacher numbers and poor examination results can indicate that problems exist, but reveal little else. Leung (2005, p.241) notes that studies that take into account only macro-level situational variables, such as demographic and linguistic statistics, and outcome variables, such as attainment figures, miss vital elements of what is really going on, since data collected are “abstracted indices” of such variables that are “very distant from classroom activities in which the languages concerned are experienced and used, and through which language learning opportunities occur”. Qualitative studies in non-contrived educational settings are needed, before any meaningful understanding of the situation can be achieved.

The third factor that creates a need for further and different research is the unique Anglo-French dimension to Vanuatu’s education system. There seems a fairly unanimous agreement that the status quo is ineffective, as evidenced by the limited quantitative data, media reports, and community consultations conducted by the Ministry of Education. What is not agreed upon is whether the current dual-medium system needs to be enhanced or whether it needs to be combined into a single system. If the latter is chosen as the ideal solution, then there is a dilemma over which language to use for what purpose, and this choice is invariably affected by the language preferences of those in power at the time. Language is a key component of any such decision making, and research is needed that reflects this. To my knowledge, there has been no school-based study of language policy that has taken into account both streams of the dual-medium education system, and this research therefore aims to address this gap.

The final aspect of the language configuration that merits investigation is the presence of Bislama as a co-official and national language that students are punished for speaking in official institutional settings. Siegel (1996) reports on one of the few studies that have investigated the use of Melanesian Pidgin (of
which Bislama is a variety) in education, presenting the successes of a pre-
school programme in Papua New Guinea. In a 2007 update to his (1999a)
survey of research into pidgins and creoles in education, Siegel states that very
little research has been carried out since that time in the field of pidgins and
creoles in education, and he mentions no studies involving Melanesian Pidgin.
He notes that what little research has been carried out in the general field has
demonstrated positive effects of the inclusion of pidgins and creoles in
education and yet these languages “continue to be excluded from the
classroom and speakers of these varieties continue to be disadvantaged”
(Siegel, 2007, p.76). He calls for applied linguists to further the body of research
in this area.

In summary, there is a complex language configuration within the Vanuatu
education system that presents several interesting issues. A large number of
language-related debates circulate within the domain of education policymaking
but little change is ever implemented. Very little research has investigated
languages within education in Vanuatu or the wider Melanesian region. School-
based, qualitative, exploratory research is needed, in order to investigate what
is going on, as a first step towards an understanding of what is preventing
effective change. In particular, a sociolinguistic approach to research is needed,
in order to foreground the language complexity that is so politically sensitive,
rather than trying to work around it. Drawing on the notion of ideological and
implementational spaces, it is hoped that spaces can be revealed amongst the
complexity in which potential exists for approaches that are more realistic and
relevant in Vanuatu.

1.1.5 Limitations

There has been debate over the extent to which research can actually
contribute to policymaking. Finch (1986) has suggested that inherent
differences between the fields of research and policymaking prevent an easy fit
between the two, including the organisational and cultural factors that guide the
operations of both fields, the different types of people involved in each, and the
perspectives they have on policymaking. Hammersley (1994, p.148) explains
the difficulty of trying to effect change and contribute knowledge at the same time: “It no longer seems possible, if it ever was, simultaneously to pursue the goals of contributing to disciplinary knowledge and serving educational policy making and practice, while at the same time framing research within some all-embracing political philosophy.” Understanding this dilemma, the orientation of this study is exploratory and analytical. Starting from the assumption that some kind of change is necessary, it focuses on the potential for such change, rather than on its enactment. It is therefore not an interventionist study, but an exploration of the conditions in which policy change could become possible.

I am also cautious in the extent to which I can make generalisations about the nature of potential spaces for change that would be applicable elsewhere. Firstly, the unusual colonial period and unrivalled linguistic diversity of Vanuatu mean that the language configuration reported here is particular to this country. Secondly, even within Vanuatu, there is significant variation in the politico-historical experiences and sociolinguistic realities of different areas, with implications for the way language(s) are used and talked about. For example, a comparison between my research sites on the island of Ambae, and the communities in which Miriam Meyerhoff (personal communication, May 2012) is currently working on the neighbouring island of Espiritu Santo reveal significant contextual differences3, and corresponding differences in what it means to be ‘Anglophone’ or ‘Francophone’. These differences within such close geographical proximity are a reminder of how ‘locally’ my observations must be understood.

1.2 Clarification of terms

From this point on, the terms ‘Anglophone’ and ‘Francophone’ are used with reference to the schooling system. For example, students and teachers are referred to as ‘Anglophone’ if they are part of the community of an English-

3 For example, Espiritu Santo experienced intense fighting in the build-up to Independence, with rivalry based predominantly along Anglophone-Francophone lines, while Ambae appears to have had no such history; one of Vanuatu’s two towns and a number of tourist attractions are located on Santo, while Ambae remains entirely rural and attracts very few visitors; approximately 24 distinct languages are listed by the SIL Ethnologue as being spoken on Santo, while only two languages are listed for Ambae.
medium school. Outside school, these terms are not frequently used. Parents often choose to educate some children in English and others in French (Lynch, 1996), so it is rare to be able to label a family or community as being, for example, ‘Francophone’. As Miles (1998, p.121) notes, this form of language identification relates neither to actual language use (outside the institution of education) nor to ethnicity, as is the case in other contexts in which these terms are used. These terms may sometimes be used in popular discourse to refer, for example, to political parties (e.g. the Vanua’aku Pati is traditionally considered ‘Anglophone’ and the Union of Moderate Parties ‘Francophone’, for which there is historical justification, see 2.2.1.4), but these labels do not necessarily reflect the language use of today’s members or supporters of these parties.

Since language-in-education policy is the focus of this study, the two current media of instruction are discussed in depth. For convenience, the term L2 will be used to refer to whichever language is used as the medium of instruction. The term L3 will be used to refer to the other school language, taught as a subject in each school. At Anglophone schools, L2 is English and L3 is French; at Francophone schools, L2 is French and L3 is English. Brock-Utne (2009) criticises the use of ‘second language’ to refer to a language to which children may have very limited exposure outside school, and I agree with her point that ‘foreign language’ is more applicable. However, the advantage of using these terms is that they enable discussion of either or both parts of Vanuatu’s education system without needing to specify whether English or French is being referred to.

As the terms imply, neither of these languages is generally used by the students as a ‘first language’, ‘mother tongue’ or ‘home language’. For the purpose of this study, all languages that could be considered to fit into one or more of these categories (including Bislama) will be referred to as L1. This term is particularly problematic, given that the majority of ni-Vanuatu will have at least two ‘languages’ within this category. However, by using this shorthand, I actually avoid distinguishing between these languages as though they are kept separate in the linguistic repertoire. It is a useful category to encompass all languages apart from the principal languages of education. Thus, children speak one or
more languages at home (L1); at school they are introduced to a new language, which is used as the medium of instruction (L2); later on, they are introduced to a third language, which is learnt as a subject (L3).

1.3 Outline of chapters

Chapter 2 presents the research problem in its context. It tells the story chronologically from my point of view as the researcher. In the first stage, I describe how I became aware of a problem during my experience living, teaching and, later, conducting research in Vanuatu. I highlight a number of issues that arose throughout this period that led me to begin this study in 2009. In the second stage, I contextualise this problem by giving the historico-political background to the education system, as well as details of the wider sociolinguistic context. In the final stage, I turn the problem back into a research problem, by summarising how I approach the different possibilities and directions that could be pursued in investigating this problem.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodological and analytic approach taken. It provides an overview of the Ethnography of Language Policy (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, 2011; Johnson, 2009), which has been chosen as the most appropriate overall framework for the study. Within this overview, both the ‘ethnography’ and the ‘language policy’ of the approach will be discussed, in order to set out how I am using these terms. The use of discourse analysis within this framework will also be discussed, with reference to the Discourse-Historical Approach (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009; Wodak, 2001).

Chapter 4 then introduces the research design of the case study, with the help of contextual background to the two chosen schools and the Ministry of Education. I outline the methods that were used in order to collect data throughout two periods of fieldwork, and the analytic steps taken in dealing with the discourse data. I also discuss my own position within the research.

The first two data chapters examine the way language is used and talked about within, and with reference to, the two schools. The focus of Chapter 5 is the position of the official school language (either English or French) as the emblem
of each school, and thus as the only correct language to be used. The strength of the L2-only ideology is made clear, particularly as students and teachers talk up the extent to which they are punished for failing to use only this language, and an impression is created of a very restrictive top-down policy. However, other elements of the data reveal the challenges that are posed to this position by the heteroglossic reality of school life, and it appears that symbolic uses of the official school language may be enough to maintain its institutional status.

Chapter 6 focuses on the classroom as a key site of school life. This chapter examines the way the official school language is, once again, positioned as the only correct language to use. It is shown that teachers and students work together to make sure that classroom interaction can proceed without obvious interruption to the flow of learning, as the teachers take on the majority of the language work, and students are able to fill in the gaps with content knowledge to keep the lesson going. Any attempts to question this situation are met with a discourse of inadequate language learning, as teachers argue that their students would be able to learn through L2 if only they were better at this language, and students appear to agree. At the same time, specific arguments are put forward against the use of L1, and Bislama in particular. The L2-only ideology remains sufficiently strong in the domain of the classroom to close down spaces for alternative practices.

The second pair of data chapters examines how these practices and discourses fit in with other ways in which these language(s) are understood in the wider contexts in which they are used. Chapter 7 reveals how participants construct language as a gateway to opportunity and success, valuing only English and French as languages of wider communication. Crucially, they construct the notion of English/French ‘bilingualism’ as the most effective route to success, with Anglophones and Francophones alike vocal about the need to learn both school languages. However, something more than a practical need for both English and French is revealed, since anecdotes reveal that only very small amounts of L3 are required, and nobody can explain any benefits that French brings in real terms. This desire for both English and French appears to close down potential spaces that might exist for other languages in education.
Chapter 8 examines this perceived need for both English and French further. It presents data in which language is constructed as a marker of national identity. Within this construction, the two languages are together constructed as integral to Vanuatu’s national identity, based on their role in the country’s history. In constructing a new national identity that embraces, rather than rejects, their colonial history, ni-Vanuatu justify the maintenance of a divisive and inefficient education system that is poorly-aligned to local needs. Space appears to be constructed for all languages within education, but, while only some languages are considered to have instrumental value, it is readily shut down again.

Chapter 9 synthesises the practices and discourses that have been examined, with reference to the concept of ideological and implementational spaces. It discusses the way considerable implementational space appears to be left open for the use of additional or alternative linguistic resources, and suggests that this space is unutilised for two main reasons. Firstly, the immutability of a number of deeply-held beliefs about language(s) and education prevent realistic consideration of change. Secondly, despite a certain amount of implementational tolerance for the use of other linguistic resources, there is insufficient implementational support, stemming from uncontested arguments that change is too costly and complex.

Chapter 10 concludes the thesis by suggesting the need to move towards a more flexible framework in which attention is paid to linguistic repertoires rather than separate languages. It suggests that we should move beyond language-oriented models within which pedagogical considerations need to be accommodated, and think instead of a learning-oriented framework within which teachers and students have greater freedom to negotiate learning by drawing on the multiple resources they have at their disposal.
2 The research problem in its context

2.1 Noticing the problem: Observations from the inside

2.1.1 The problem experienced at one particular school

I was an English teacher at Angolovo College, a secondary boarding school in Vanuatu from 2004 to 2006. The medium of instruction was English, but I was the only member of the community for whom this was the dominant language. It was considered essential for students to develop a sound command of English, and school rules stipulated that this was the only language allowed around the campus, even at weekends.

The following was displayed in 2004:

Re: College Language Policy

This notice serves to remind the community that the use of Bislama is banned from the whole campus. Anyone caught speaking Bislama in any area will be savagely punished.

This is essential because Bislama:

- has minimal vocabulary
- influences spoken and written English
- confuses the structure and word order of English
- disturbs the fluency of English in the college

As previously noted, Bislama is the national language and an official language. It was clearly not welcome in my school, however. The notice was followed up by a campaign to ‘eradicate’ Bislama from the school, justified by the need to improve competence in English. Punishments tended to be manual tasks, such as cutting the grass with bushknives.

Bislama was not the only L1 for most staff and students. School records indicated that 38 vernaculars were spoken by the approximately 300 students.
Although the English-only campaign emphasised the use of English at all times, and thus precluded the use of the vernaculars, these languages were not made such deliberate targets of the school policy as Bislama. This may be due in part to the fact that Bislama was the most common ‘unauthorised’ language used, since it was spoken by all staff and students, but, as the above notice makes clear, this is not the only reason.

As a teacher of English and a native speaker of the language, colleagues considered me the most suitable proponent of the Bislama-eradication campaign. I disagreed. Firstly, my potential association with a harsh policy that punished students for speaking their own languages concerned me; secondly, the bizarre situation in which a school (whose role surely was to prepare students to become citizens) punishes students for speaking the national and official language confused me; thirdly, no teachers actually followed the policy themselves, particularly when talking amongst themselves, but often even when talking to students. On many occasions, punishments seemed to be given when there was a manual task that needed doing, rather than out of any concern for language use. It was particularly ironic for me that staff meetings, during which complaints were frequently made about the use of Bislama around the school, were conducted entirely in Bislama! The policy was unfair, illogical, inconsistently enforced, and not clearly linked to efforts to improve levels of English.

In 2008, I returned to the school to research the way English and Bislama were used in students’ academic interaction (Willans, 2008). Interviews and questionnaire data revealed that both students and teachers felt that Bislama was only used because students were not good enough at English, and all participants expressed approval of the school’s English-only policy. However, audio-recordings of student-student interaction in the classroom indicated that code-switching from English to Bislama rarely occurred for ‘participant-related’ reasons (Auer, 1984), to accommodate the competencies or preferences of different participants; many episodes of code-switching seemed to accomplish subtler functions internal to the discourse itself, i.e. ‘discourse-related’ reasons (ibid.) that were far more complex. It seemed that students were competent users of the resources of both Bislama and English, rather than deficient users.
of English. However, they clearly held negative feelings about a perceived inability to speak the language of instruction, and kept this bilingual pattern of interaction out of the earshot of the teacher (Willans, 2011).

Although the policy was inconsistently enforced, one aspect remained constant. Students and staff, alike, knew they were supposed to speak English only and expressed the desire to do this. They talked about school as an English-only institution, thereby constructing a monolingual zone within their discourse, even though this was not borne out in reality. Within this discursively constructed zone, it was inappropriate to use other languages in the classroom to make learning easier, and punishment seemed acceptable.

2.1.2 The problem doubled

There was another secondary boarding school seven kilometres away, Collège de Faranako, where the medium of instruction was French. The priority here, therefore, was to improve the levels of competence in French, so that students could learn all of their subjects and pass all of their examinations in this language. A researcher told me in 2008 that students at this school were made to wear a sign announcing:

Je ne dois pas parler Bichelamar à l’école

[I must not speak Bislama at school]

Both schools seemed to take a clear stance towards the use of Bislama, and punish students for speaking this language. Lynch (1996) claims that these instances are by no means unusual in the country. Indeed, Smith (2011) provides other recent examples of children being punished for language use at primary schools on a different island of Vanuatu, and see Nick Thieberger’s homepage (Thieberger, no date) for a photo showing a sign worn as punishment for speaking a local vernacular. Whether these rules are enforced consistently is unclear, but there is a common aspiration to conduct education through one language only, either English or French.
Although the idealisation of educational monolingualism in Vanuatu therefore falls in line with the experience of many postcolonial countries, it is marked out by the duplication of this monolingual ideology, leading to what Charpentier (1979, p.136) has termed “back to back monolingualism”. Families often choose to send some children to each stream, thereby polarising their children artificially into ‘Anglophones’ and ‘Francophones’. An episode recorded in my fieldnotes reveals the complex factors that lead to a child being enrolled in one or other stream. Frieda is a Year 8 student at Collège de Faranako:

**Extract 2.1**

Chatted to Frieda’s mother while waiting. Frieda apparently has three sisters who are all at Anglophone schools. Frieda did Class 1 Anglophone and then the teacher said she could either go to Class 2 or repeat Class 1. Frieda complained about the boys in her class and asked to change to the Francophone Class 1 since her aunt was the teacher. She’s been in Francophone ever since although her uncle wants her to move to Anglophone. She was top of the class last year so her mother kept her at Faranako and she isn’t sure yet about Year 9. She wanted to put another of her daughters in Francophone but there was no Class 1 Francophone at the school that year so she went to Anglophone. Nobody else in the family speaks French. (fieldnotes 27/4/11)

In this case, Frieda appears to be doing well, despite being the only child in her family in the Francophone stream. However, the following day, I spoke to the mother of another girl, Salina, currently in Class 4 at a Francophone primary school, whose family members have all attended Anglophone schools:

**Extract 2.2**

She said she and Salina’s father want to move Salina to Anglophone but she doesn’t want to. The only reason she is in the Francophone system is that there was a Francophone kindy close to the village where they were then but the Anglophone one was far away. She saw all the other kids going and wanted to join them even though she was too young. She picked up bits of French so, when it was time for her to start kindy properly and they were already in Santo, they put her in Francophone. She later had problems learning to read (so repeated Class 2, although going to live with her grandmother in Santo in order to do so) and she sounds like she struggles a bit. Salina’s mother says they keep trying to persuade her to change and they use her marks as a threat – if she doesn’t get good marks, they’ll transfer her to Anglophone. (fieldnotes 28/4/11)

A number of issues are compounded here. The most concerning is that Salina might be moved to the Anglophone stream as punishment for poor marks,
which could, firstly, create a negative association with the move and, secondly, cause Salina to struggle further if she has to encounter subjects she already finds difficult in a new language. Another issue is that, when Salina’s parents lost faith in the local school where she had started, there were no other Francophone schools nearby, so she went to live with her grandmother on a different island. There, it seems she receives less support than she might at home with her parents, one of whom is a teacher. Her older brother is currently in Year 11 at a very good Anglophone secondary school, and has always done well. Salina might have had a very different start if she had been able to read and do homework with parents and a brother who all knew the language she was using at school. Although this kind of support may still be uncommon in rural Vanuatu, as parents may not be comfortable using either school language, it was actually available in Salina’s case. Both stories reveal families making choices dictated either by availability of school places in the preferred language, or by ‘guesswork’ as to what is best for their children.

2.2 Contextualising the problem: Background

2.2.1 Historico-political background

2.2.1.1 Pre 1906 (The pre-colonial period)
Vanuatu’s islands have been populated for approximately 3,000 years. Throughout numerous cross-Pacific migrations, settlers from different Austronesian origins came together, resulting in great linguistic and cultural diversity (MacClancy, 2002). Early European arrivals were explorers (de Quiros, in 1606, de Bougainville, in 1768, and Cook, in 1774). Missionaries followed, with the three main groups comprising English-speaking Presbyterians and Anglicans from the 1860s, and French-speaking Catholics from the late 1880s. This century also brought sandalwood traders, labour recruiters, and plantation owners (Van Trease, 1995).

Melanesian Pidgin emerged during this era, originally as a simple pidgin used in sandalwood trade. It developed during the era of labour recruitment, when islanders speaking a wide variety of mutually unintelligible languages worked
together on plantations in Queensland, Fiji and Samoa. The language later evolved into the three dialects spoken today in Vanuatu (Bislama), Papua New Guinea (Tok Pisin) and the Solomon Islands (Pijin). See Charpentier (1979) and Crowley (1990) for a fuller account.

2.2.1.2 1906 – 1980 (The colonial period as The New Hebrides)

Large portions of land were ‘acquired’ by settlers, leading to disputes between the Europeans and the indigenous people, and among the Europeans themselves. As many settlers were British and French, a Franco-British Naval Commission was reluctantly established in 1887. The Condominium of the New Hebrides was then formed in 1906, by which Britain and France assumed joint administrative control, but no sovereignty, over the island group (see MacClancy, 2002; Van Trease, 1995).

As Van Trease (1995) states, the two powers had very different colonial philosophies. Firstly, they had opposing views regarding independence (Lynch, 1996; Van Trease, 1995). The British favoured moving towards independent rule at some point, and aimed to create a pool of educated New Hebrideans who would be able to take over. The French intended to retain the islands, and had no interest in creating an elite. Documents left behind by the French at Independence (Résidence de France aux Nouvelles-Hébrides, 1969, pp.2-3) make this clear:

*Politique Britannique – D’une manière de plus en plus ouverte, la Grande Bretagne cherche à mener ce pays à l’indépendance.*

*Politique Française – Elle est claire. Mes instructions, reçues du Général de Gaulle, étaient : “on reste”.*

[British policy – More and more openly, Great Britain is looking to lead this country to independence.

French policy – This is clear. My instructions received from General de Gaulle, were: “we are staying”.

The second implication of joint rule was the establishment of parallel governmental systems. Separate schools, hospitals, police services, law courts, prisons and even currencies were established by the two powers, administered in either English or French (Miles, 1998; Van Trease, 1995). Premdas and
Steeves (1995, p.222) summarise the situation as a “bifurcated” form of government that “superimposed an artificial cleavage which came to pervade most aspects of ni-Vanuatu life”. Miles (1998, p.37) coins the term ‘condocolonialism’ to refer to this state of affairs in which the two powers acted primarily against one another rather than for the benefit or even relevance of the colonised people, who were “neither repressed by a metropolitan power nor assimilated into a metropolitan model but rather ... induced to join one side against the other”.

2.2.1.3 1980 (Independence)
Vanuatu became independent on 30 July 1980. The transition was turbulent, as islanders who had been educated in the different systems were drawn into the Anglo-French disputes (Miles, 1998). Political parties were inevitably formed along linguistic lines, so that the pro-independence Vanua’aku Pati was made up of those educated in the Anglophone system, while various smaller ‘Francophone’ parties emerged, who had differing attitudes towards the developing political situation, but tended to resist independence (Premdas & Steeves, 1995; Van Trease, 1995). As Van Trease (1995, p.58) notes, “one of the main results of the troubled transition to independence was, therefore, the creation of an artificial unity on both sides of the political arena”.

Language-in-education issues became contentious. The Vanua’aku Pati announced in 1977 that English would become the sole medium of instruction after Independence if the party was elected (Van Trease, 1995, p.54), sparking widespread concerns among those who had already been educated through French. The streets filled for a demonstration in support of ‘Francophonie’ (MacClancy, 2002, p.140). The point made by the public was perhaps eclipsed by that of France, who set the condition that the French language and culture must be preserved, as part of its constitutional negotiations (Van Trease, 1995, p.38).

The Anglo-French division also impacted on the new nation’s identity. Firstly, Bislama was used by political parties as the language of unity and the rejection of colonialism. According to Thomas (1990, p.238), the Vanua’aku Pati encouraged supporters to see Bislama “as unique to their country, embodying
the history of Vanuatu ... not as the language of domination created by Europeans, but as the language of survival and solidarity created by Melanesians”. Bislama was selected as the national language, and as a co-official language alongside English and French, due to its politically neutral role in uniting ‘Anglophone’ and ‘Francophone’ ni-Vanuatu (Lynch, 1996). Bislama is the only dialect of Melanesian Pidgin to be given such status and Vanuatu was the only country in the Pacific Basin to select de jure official and national languages at Independence (Lynch & Fa’afo, 1995, p.30). In addition, Bislama is the sole language in which Vanuatu’s national anthem and motto are written.

Furthermore, while most other independent Pacific nations have retained something similar to their colonial names, it may be significant that the name ‘New Hebrides’ was replaced by ‘Vanuatu’ (with the literal meaning ‘land eternal’ or ‘our land’ in many of the vernaculars). While there is no evidence that these developments resulted directly from the joint rule, it seems reasonable to note that Vanuatu engaged in significant displays of nationalism, and made a marked attempt to leave colonialism behind.

2.2.1.4 1980 – 1991 (The first government)

The Vanua’aku Pati (VP) ruled Vanuatu until 1991. The stable government throughout this period laid deep foundations for the nation. In the same way that this party had to start from what the colonial powers had left behind, future governments would have to build on the institutions and styles of governance established in the 1980-1991 era. The VP was made up of those educated within the Anglophone education system, and was considered to represent ‘Anglophone’ interests. There were no Francophone-educated members of the cabinet, very few Francophone-educated civil servants, and few French-speaking expatriate advisors. The primary opposition throughout this period was the Union of Moderate Parties (UMP), formed from a number of different groups considered to be ‘Francophone’.

The extent to which ‘Francophones’ were deliberately marginalised is debated. Premdas and Steeves (1995, p.221) refer to the VP as “Francophobic”, and state that “[their] regime was more than just jaundiced in favour of Anglophone ni-Vanuatu; it seemed to be systematically set on a course towards Anglicising
preparing its school-leavers for the post-independence workforce, and that France refused to support a proposal in 1983 for French-medium courses to be offered by the University of the South Pacific\(^4\) (ibid., p.55). Tertiary education and training was therefore a more realistic option for Angophone students, and they were thus better prepared to take on positions of responsibility. Intentionally or not, English began to be used more and more in official circles, and those educated in the Angophone system did gain an advantage.

2.2.1.5 1991 – present (A period of political instability)

The elections of 1991 saw the end of this two-party dominance (Steeves, 1992). A gradual breakdown within the VP led to the formation of a number of new parties, and thus a ‘split’ in the original VP vote. Coupled with an increasing but not overwhelming number of UMP votes, no party therefore won an outright majority in the 1991 election. A coalition government was formed between UMP and one of the newer offshoots of VP, the National United Party (NUP). Premdas and Steeves (1995, p.225) heralded this as “a government of Anglo-French accommodation”, with the potential that “old wounds were about to be healed” (ibid., p.222). In practical terms, Francophone-educated personnel became well-represented in the cabinet and the civil service, and French-speaking advisors were increasingly recruited. Inevitably, accusations of marginalisation were raised again, this time by Angophone-educated ni-Vanuatu (Premdas & Steeves, 1995).

The result is that one-party dominance has been replaced by immense uncertainty. Since 1991, coalitions have been formed between increasing numbers of parties, with five coming together in 2000 (Jowitt, 2000), nine during 2005 (Jowitt, 2006), and ten in 2012, following the election of representatives of seventeen parties and four independents. Party goals are unclear, allegiances change with incredible frequency, and coalition restructurings and motions of no confidence have become commonplace. This instability is likely to have had an enormous impact on coherence of policymaking objectives and implementation.

\(^4\)established in 1968 for Angophone students across the region
2.2.2 Vanuatu’s education system

2.2.2.1 From missionary origins to the present day

Missionary education was established during the 19th century, oriented towards reading the Bible and adopting Christian values and behaviour. Much early teaching was done through the vernacular, although this later shifted to English or French, generally depending on whether it was a Protestant or Catholic concern. By 1900, the English-speaking Anglicans and Presbyterians had established a large number of schools throughout the northern islands and the central and southern islands, respectively. The French-speaking Catholics, having arrived slightly later, had established missions on a variety of different islands, seeking areas where Protestant stations did not exist (Van Trease, 1995, pp.3-6).

By 1960, enrolments in English-medium schools were four times higher than in French-medium schools (Miles, 1998, p.46). This was due to a combination of factors: the Protestants had arrived before the Catholics; Australia and New Zealand were close by, providing a ready supply of personnel; the British government gave greater support to the missions than the secular French government; and the Protestant missions in turn gave greater material support to education than the Catholics did. From the 1960s, the colonial governments took increasing control over schools, although continued to leave much of the administration to the missions. The British used a model that retained its missionary character, adapted to the local context (Miles, 1998, p.47), while the French more closely followed the education system used in France (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2010, p.5).

According to Miles (1998, p.45), while the British intended to produce an educated elite, the purpose of education for the French was “to produce as many Francophones as possible, not to cultivate a select group of indigenes who could assure high-level administrative responsibility of their own” (ibid., p.47), since they had no plans to leave. Significant resources were invested in Francophone education, and enrolments steadily rose until the disparity had been significantly reduced by Independence (Van Trease, 1995). However, this situation did not last, and, by 1990, only 38.4% of primary enrolments were at
Francophone schools (Van Trease, 1995, p.56). Figure 2.1 (taken from Miles, 1998, p.49) presents the levels of primary enrolments within the two streams during this period. Although there are dramatic changes around Independence, the proportions of Anglophone and Francophone enrolments are similar at the start and end of the period.

![Figure 2.1 Primary school enrolments 1971-1990](image)

While Francophone-educated ni-Vanuatu have used the post-1980 decline in Francophone enrolments to support claims of unfair treatment by the VP government, there were clearly other factors. Before Independence, French education had been free while the British system had charged fees. When both systems came under the control of one national government, France was only willing to support French-medium education and withdrew much of its funding (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1980, p.5). The VP government therefore decided to charge the same level of fees in both streams (Van Trease, 1995, p.56), which is likely to have affected Francophone enrolments. In addition, many parents, concerned that French would gradually be replaced by English in Vanuatu, transferred their children to the Anglophone system in the early 1980s (ibid.). Finally, to reduce costs, the government closed many of the smaller
primary schools. Since the French had opened many such schools, Francophone schools were often the ones closed (ibid.).

The issue of ‘balance’ between the two streams has continued to be the subject of discussion. The most direct call for language equality, whereby enrolments should be split equally between the two streams, was made in the Ombudsman’s 1996 report on ‘the observance of multilingualism’. Having presented similar figures to those discussed above, this report states:

The seed of rapid decline has therefore been planted and needs to be uprooted immediately if current proportions are to be as least [sic] maintained, particularly if the language equity that the Constitution appears to demand is to be re-established. (Ombudsman of the Republic of Vanuatu, 1996, p.32).

However, almost twenty years after the end of the political era dominated by an ‘Anglophone’ government, the imbalance remains. The disparity between Anglophone and Francophone enrolments has continued to increase since 1990, as shown in Figure 2.2 (based on 1990 data from Miles (1998) and 2000 and 2010 data provided by the Ministry of Education).

![Figure 2.2 Proportions of Anglophone and Francophone enrolments 1990-2010](image-url)
2.2.2.2 The current education system

Table 2.1 gives an overview of the current education system.

Table 2.1 Current education system in Vanuatu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Anglophone</th>
<th>Francophone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Kindy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Year 8 national exam (in English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Year 8 national exam (in French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Year 10 national exam (in English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Year 10 national exam (in French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior secondary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior secondary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pacific Secondary School Certificate (Year 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>National Year 12 exam (French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Form 7 Certificate or USP foundation (Year 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>DAEU (Year 14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last decade and a half have seen a great deal of activity in terms of education policymaking, in attempt to address concerns of inequity between Anglophones and Francophones, lack of access to post-primary education, and poor quality throughout the system (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, 2006b, 2009). Firstly, work has been carried out to unify the curriculum and assessment structure of the two streams. As Table 2.1 shows, education now follows the same programme for the first ten years, but in two languages. With the exception of language subjects, the Anglophone and Francophone exam papers at Years 8 and 10 are direct translations of each other. However, senior secondary level remains entirely separate. The Anglophone senior curriculum comes under the control of the Secretariat of the Pacific Board for Education and Assessment (SPBEA), a regional body that administers curricula and assessment in nine countries. There is no Senior Secondary curriculum for the Francophone system, but each school contributes to the format of a national Francophone exam at the end of Years 12 and 13, following which the top students may take the Diplôme d’Accès aux Etudes Universitaires (DAEU) at
the end of a fourteenth year of school. However, in 2010, a new Vanuatu National Curriculum Statement was published (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2010), setting out a ‘harmonised’ curriculum and assessment structure to be used from pre-school to Year 13 in all schools.

Another recent change has been the extension of basic education, in an attempt to offer eight years of education for all children. This was set out in the Education Master Plan (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999). The first selection exam is now at the end of Year 8 rather than Year 6 (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2010, p.7). The intention is that children spend eight years in ‘Centre Schools’ (comprising six years of primary education and two ‘top-up’ years), before moving to secondary schools. However, the reality depends on resources at existing schools and the ability and willingness of communities to respond to this change, resulting in a wide disparity in the logistical arrangements for Years 7 and 8. The two schools of this study exemplify two of the possible permutations, as will be set out in Chapter 4. Education is currently neither compulsory nor free at any level. A 2010 initiative has been to provide ‘block grants’ to primary schools, removing fees up to Year 6, but parents are frequently still expected to pay ‘non-fee contributions’, as well as financing uniforms, books, and transport. It is also unclear how long the government will be able to pay such grants to schools. From Year 7 onwards, parents must pay very high costs, which often include boarding fees.

A number of education documents of the last decade have also stated the need to increase access to tertiary education (e.g. Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2003, 2006b, 2009). The University of the South Pacific (USP), co-owned by the governments of twelve member countries, has been the most common route for Anglophone students. The majority of courses are run at the main campus in Fiji, but some students can begin their studies by distance at the Vanuatu campus. There are more limited opportunities for Francophones to study at Université de la Nouvelle-Calédonie (New Caledonia). However, all students struggle to finance tertiary studies, and realistically can only complete a degree course in either medium if awarded a scholarship. Other students find places at institutions such as the Vanuatu Institute of Technology and the Vanuatu Institute of Teacher Education, which are both dual-language.
Some recent developments have increased opportunities for Francophone school leavers. Firstly, study skills modules in English are being offered by USP to Francophone students in Years 12, 13 and 14. This gives these students assistance if they choose to switch to English-medium at tertiary level, thus providing access to far more institutions. Secondly, and somewhat controversially (Letters to the Editor, 2009), a great number of Francophone students have recently been offered scholarships to complete foundation level studies at USP’s Vanuatu campus, and then further scholarships for degree courses overseas, while Anglophone students have to pay for their foundation studies and complete a greater number of undergraduate courses before being eligible for a scholarship. Thirdly, there are plans to establish a Francophone institution on Vanuatu’s USP campus (Makin, 2012; Marango, 2012), although it is still unclear what exactly this will offer to whom.

Finally, as the remainder of this section will show, a number of linguistic debates have been circulating for several years, in part driven by the desire to provide better quality and more equitable education, particularly at the early primary level. Lynch (1996) states that language-in-education debates were common throughout the 1980s and 1990s and, he observed in the mid 1990s that there had been “lots of talk but no action; and, at the present time, somewhat less talk (and no action)” (p. 249). In 2009, an Education Language Policy team was appointed, but the policy proposal produced by this team proved highly controversial and unworkable (see Possibility E below), and by 2011, when I conducted my fieldwork, the situation seemed to have returned to one of a lot of talk, although still no action.

The new National Curriculum Statement (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2010, p.49) makes clear its position on the advantages of using familiar languages:

There is considerable research evidence that supports children having a good understanding of their first language to begin with because it assists their intellectual development and learning of other languages. The evidence suggests that if children are prevented from using their first language too soon, it can hinder and slow down their intellectual development and they find it difficult to fully recover from this.
However, the stalemate is made clear within the following provisions in the document:

**Extract 2.3**

Produce a ni-Vanuatu curriculum whatever the language of instruction (French, English, Bislama or a vernacular language). (ibid., p.v)

The languages of instruction may differ from school to school in accordance with the Vanuatu National Education Language Policy but the curriculum standards will be the same for all children and students from Kindergarten to Year 13. (ibid., p.75)

The language of instruction in our schools will either be English or French, which one of these two languages will be determined by the Vanuatu National Education Language Policy. (ibid., p.89)

Attempts to sustain dialogue with the Education Language Policy team failed (personal communication with the technical advisor leading the Curriculum Team, February 2011). The solution reached has been to set out standards that can be achieved through any language, awaiting a decision on what this language will be. While this may well be the only way in which the curriculum work could proceed, it appears to marginalise quite what is at stake in language policymaking (not to mention delay or duplicate the production of teaching materials).

Table 2.2 summarises five models that have been considered in Vanuatu over the past thirty-five years, categorised according to the typology summarised in Table 1.1. It is worth noting at this point that no proposals for change have ever been implemented (i.e. the situation remains as in A).
Table 2.2 Models considered in Vanuatu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Medium of instruction</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Maintaining the status quo (put in place by the colonial powers)</td>
<td>L2 medium throughout education, in either English or French</td>
<td>(Dual) submersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 1977 New Hebrides National Party congress (see Van Trepce, 1998)</td>
<td>L2 medium throughout education, in English only</td>
<td>Submersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 1981 Vanuatu Language Planning Conference, (see Topping, 1982, Thomas, 1990)</td>
<td>Vanuacu/Bislama medium education at least throughout primary school (with English and/or French taught as subjects)</td>
<td>Late-exit transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 1995 Vanuatu Education Master Plan (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1993)</td>
<td>Vanuacu/Bislama medium until Year 2; English or French medium from Year 3 onwards</td>
<td>Early-exit transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 2010 Education Language Policy Team (2010b)</td>
<td>Vanuacu/Bislama medium until Year 2; Progressive transition to L2 medium from Year 3; L3 medium progressively introduced; Equal use of L2 and L3 from Year 7</td>
<td>Double transitional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Maintaining the status quo: Submersion in English or French

L2 is used as the medium of instruction for all subjects, a model that is not considered effective (1.1.3.1). The situation is compounded by the co-existence of two streams. This duplication presents an economic strain on the system, polarises ni-Vanuatu into ‘Anglophones’ and ‘Francophones’ even at the family level, and appears to disadvantage those educated in the Francophone system.

Meanwhile, it is hoped that students will gain competence in both English and French. Guidelines state: “If students leave school without competency in English and French then we have wasted our time” (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1998a, p.43). This is reaffirmed in the National Language Policy, which states that “the principal languages of education should be promoted equally in all classrooms at higher primary, secondary and tertiary levels” (Vanuatu National Language Council, 2006). However, L3 is only introduced at
the start of secondary school, and then allocated just four periods a week of language study, making this goal entirely unrealistic.

B. Submersion in English only

As discussed in 2.2.1.3, the Vanua’aku Pati stated that they would abolish French-medium education, should they be elected. The decision was revoked following street demonstrations and pressure from the Government of France. Since that time, this possibility has never publicly been proposed again.

C. A late-exit transitional programme from L1 to L2(s)

Attitudes towards the use of the vernaculars and Bislama within education were negative under colonial rule. However, opinions appeared to change around Independence, judging by the opinions put forward at the 1981 Vanuatu Language Planning Conference, a 1982 parliamentary debate on languages in education, and a 1984 Pacific Languages Unit report (Thomas, 1990). Topping (1982, p.3) summarises the resolutions passed at the Language Planning Conference:

1. As a general principle, there must be room for and recognition of vernacular, Bislama, and the metropolitan languages in the education system of Vanuatu.

2. a. Vernacular languages must be used as the medium of instruction in primary schools through Classes 1-3.

b. Bislama will be introduced in primary schools beginning Class 4.

c. Bislama should be used as the medium of instruction, Classes 4-6, with French and English introduced as subjects of study.

d. French and/or English will be introduced and used as media of instruction in secondary schools with Bislama continued as a subject of study.

e. Technical schools should continue with Bislama as the medium of instruction through Classes 7 and 8.

f. If these new language requirements necessitate extending the time period for primary school, this is something for the Ministry of Education to study.

However, no resolution was ever put into practice. Current guidelines for secondary school principals, unchanged since 1998, state that “local languages should be used only at the week-ends or out of school hours” and “although Bislama is an official national language, it is not a language of instruction [and]
where possible it should not be used when either English or French is appropriate” (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1998a, p.43). Lynch (1996, p.248) also cites one Ministry of Education directive that teachers using Bislama in school would be guilty of “professional misconduct”. This sentiment is more recently reinforced by the Education Language Policy team (2009, p.5) report, which states that Bislama’s “presence in day-to-day teaching far exceeds legal requirements”, despite there being no law that actually refers to Bislama’s use in schools.

Since the early 1980s, no consideration appears to have been given to either the use or the teaching of Bislama and the vernaculars beyond the earliest grades.

D. An early-exit transitional programme from L1 to L2(s)

In 1999, the government mandated the implementation of a vernacular education curriculum for pre-school and two years of primary school, before a transition to either English or French (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999). This was motivated by debates that had run for over 25 years in Vanuatu (Thomas, 1990), and further afield (e.g. UNESCO, 1953). Justifications for the policy included improved literacy acquisition; a reduced learning burden; a less alien school environment; clearer links between school and home; the maintenance of traditional culture and languages; the potential for closer parent and community involvement; and the increasing recognition of linguistic rights (Thomas, 1990).

Implementation did not begin as anticipated. By the end of the pilot phase, little had been achieved (see Nako, 2004), although the Summer Institute of Linguistics appears to have implemented similar programmes successfully in a few areas (Stahl, 2004). No systematic evaluation of the project has been carried out, so it has not been possible to test the pedagogic validity of Heugh’s (2011) assertion that early-exit transitional programmes are doomed to fail (see 1.1.3.1). However, the absence of any obvious success has not helped demonstrate the potential to use L1 in education.
E. A double transitional programme from L1 to L2 to L3

An Education Language Policy team was appointed in April 2009, to develop a proposal to combine the two streams of the education system into a single ‘plurilingual’ system, in which all children would use the vernacular (and/or Bislama), English and French. The initial report produced by the team (Education Language Policy Team, 2009) presented three different scenarios for public consultation. All three scenarios proposed the use of the vernacular as medium of instruction for at least the first full year of school, before a transition to French, and later to English. The only difference was the timings of the transitions. The rationale was as follows:

It is evident that plurilingualism requires a particular sequence in the introduction of the languages taught; with a wide consensus, all the Ni-Vanuatu people we have met are unanimous to state that: the first learning during kindergarten period enables the child to extend the social scope of the use of his (her) mother tongue and build up cognitive faculties by verbalising in that tongue with the help of the school; then French comes before English as medium of instruction (Education Language Policy Team, 2009, p.6, my emphasis).

No explanation was given as to why languages must be taught in a particular sequence, or why French should be taught before English. It was also not specified how the consensus of the ni-Vanuatu public had been ascertained, since this was prior to the public consultations.

As noted by Early (2009, p.6), the public were presented with a “false choice” between three very similar options. During the consultations, to which approximately 450 stakeholders were invited, groups were asked to discuss which of the options they supported, or to suggest an alternative option if they agreed with none. The team’s unpublished report on the consultations (Education Language Policy Team, 2010a) shows that none of the three was accepted in its original format. From 60 working groups at the 11 consultation meetings, a total of 32 alternative proposals were made.

The final report on these proposals to the Ministry recommended a single system (Table 2.3) in which all subjects would be taught in the vernacular for pre-school and a further two years, before the two ‘international languages’ were gradually introduced. The intention of this proposal was that, by the start
of Secondary education, these two languages would be used equally. However, this report was inconclusive as to whether English would be introduced before French, or vice versa (Education Language Policy Team, 2010b).

Table 2.3 Education Language Policy proposal (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vernacular</th>
<th>Bislama</th>
<th>International language 1</th>
<th>International language 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>Medium for all subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject (30 mins)</td>
<td>Subject (30 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Medium for Sport, Social Science, Agriculture &amp; Religious Ed</td>
<td>Subject (1 hr)</td>
<td>Medium for Maths &amp; Science; Subject (3hrs)</td>
<td>Subject (2 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium for Maths, Science, Agriculture, Sport &amp; Art; Subject (2hrs)</td>
<td>Medium for Social Science, Religious Ed &amp; Technology; Subject (6hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium for Science, Agriculture, Sport &amp; Art; Subject (3hrs)</td>
<td>Medium for Maths, Social Science, Religious Ed &amp; Technology; Subject (6hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 9 &amp; 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium as above; Subject (4 hrs)</td>
<td>Medium as above; Subject (4 hrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report stated in its conclusion that there were three reasons in favour of French first (the dominance of English in the world makes it more likely that French speakers will go on to learn English too; lexical similarities between Bislama and English lead to confusion for children; French is said to be, in some unspecified way, more likely to safeguard the use of the vernaculars); and two reasons in favour of English (English is used more widely and therefore presents greater opportunities; 70% of the current teacher workforce is English-speaking). The closest the report came to suggesting an answer was on p.49 of the 78-page text:

In view of the human resources currently available [the proposal for L2 to be English] seem[s] to be more realistic in the short term since the current staffing levels indicate that for every French-medium teacher there are two English-medium teachers (Education Language Policy Team, 2010b, p.49).

What is obvious from the set of proposals, however, is that this version of a ‘plurilingual’ system is still far removed from the linguistic reality of ni-Vanuatu.
Although it aims to incorporate a number of different languages, thereby ostensibly moving beyond the monolingual ideology that currently characterises the education system, it intends to keep these languages separate by stipulating blocks on the timetable in which each shall be used as medium of instruction. It is a classic case of what Banda (2009) refers to as ‘multiple monolingualisms’ (see 1.1.3). Rather than helping students learn by making use of a number of languages in the classroom, the environment will remain a monolingual one. However, now students will be expected to master two different foreign languages sufficiently to use them both as media of instruction. This report was completed shortly before I began my fieldwork and this debate was therefore very current.

2.2.3 The language configuration outside education

The final contextual dimension concerns the wider sociolinguistic context of Vanuatu. This section provides examples of language use from Port Vila, the capital city, and the rural area of Ambae Island in which the main fieldwork was conducted.

2.2.3.1 Everyday communication

In rural areas, the vernaculars are commonly used. Many people know the languages of surrounding areas in addition to those spoken in their own, while intermarriage has also led some people to learn the language of their in-laws. Bislama is generally used with visitors who do not speak the local language. However, rural islanders may draw on the resources of one or more vernaculars, Bislama and, possibly, English or French. Detailed description is not possible here, but see Meyerhoff (2000) for an overview of language choice on a different island.

In the two principal towns, Bislama dominates in public. However, for many families, a vernacular continues to be spoken at home or when with others from the same island. The family with whom I spent the most time in Port Vila spoke predominantly Bislama at home, since the parents are from different islands. However, amongst relatives from the mother’s side of the family, the language
from that island was more commonly used. The children reported that they spoke their father’s language when visiting his island, although they did not spend much time there.

Neither English nor French is widely used orally by ni-Vanuatu outside school. Bislama takes on many roles that English and French play in many other postcolonial countries. For example, Bislama is the working language of parliament and many government departments, since they bring together people who have been educated in the two different systems. A common assertion is that Francophones are more likely to use French outside school than Anglophones are to use English, although I personally never heard either language used by ni-Vanuatu in the areas surrounding my two case study schools on Ambae. See Meyerhoff (2000, pp.37-8) for a discussion of this issue on the islands of Malo and Santo, where she notes similar assertions made.

During the colonial period, there were a greater number of French-speaking European residents than English-speaking, but this is no longer the case. After much disputed land was returned to indigenous ownership at the time of Independence, many French nationals left (Van Trease, 1995). The 1970 declaration of Vanuatu as a tax haven has also attracted investors, particularly from Australia and New Zealand, and there is now a larger English-speaking expatriate population (ibid.). Although overseas-born residents make up only 1.26% of Vanuatu’s population (2009 census figures), Australia and New Zealand are also the most common source countries of tourists (as shown in Figure 2.3) (Vanuatu National Statistics Office, 2012), increasing the amount of English spoken in the country.
According to recent figures, between 80% and 90% of tourists stay only in Port Vila, the capital city, located on the island of Efate (Verdone & Seidl, 2012). Of the remaining group, the vast majority visit Espiritu Santo and Tanna (ibid.), both of which boast a number of resorts and established tourism sites.

Ambae, the island on which the fieldwork was carried out, has no tourist resorts and only a handful of very basic guesthouses. The official site for the Vanuatu Tourism Office (2011) does not even include Ambae in its list of potential islands to visit. Two volunteers working as tourism advisors on Ambae from 2009 to 2011 (Bennie & Bennie, 2011) recall in their blog that it took four months before they saw a single tourist on the island. During fieldwork from February to May 2011, I kept a record of non-ni-Vanuatu I met who were either visiting or working on that side of Ambae. I met a total of fifteen overseas-born visitors during this time: two locally-contracted Indian teachers, one Japanese volunteer teacher, one Kenyan health volunteer, five US health or education volunteers, four New Zealand business or education volunteers, an Ethiopian advisor to the Public Works Department, and an Australian IT technician. These visitors were all on Ambae for work-related reasons, often with voluntary organisations.
None of these visitors spoke French but, with the exception of the Japanese teacher who preferred to speak Bislama, they all spoke English. Neither of the two French-medium schools in that area of Ambae had hosted any French-speaking volunteers or expatriate teachers in the memories of any of the current teaching staff. It therefore appears that visitor numbers are limited, and that the few foreigners that do visit Ambae are more likely to be English-speaking than French-speaking. It is also relevant to note the wide range of countries from which these English-speaking visitors come, speaking several different varieties of English.

2.2.3.2 The workplace

I had the opportunity to observe the use of language in a variety of workplaces in Port Vila. I spent time at the Ministry of Education, Vanuatu Institution of Teacher Education and University of the South Pacific for purposes to do with my fieldwork; I also spent time at the market and a number of shops, cafés, and services such as Air Vanuatu and the Post Office in Port Vila, as well as stores in the commercial centre on Ambae.

In Port Vila, Bislama was the primary language I heard used in these contexts, with a few exceptions: I would sometimes be addressed in English (but never French) in the marketplace or in shops, although conversations would continue in Bislama as I generally initiated a switch to this language; I heard English and, to a lesser extent, French spoken to tourists, by employees of cafés and other services; I heard French spoken between two employees on two occasions, once between two ni-Vanuatu employees of Air Vanuatu and once between a ni-Vanuatu employee and a French advisor at the Ministry of Education; I heard two fieldworkers at the Pacific Languages Unit speak in their shared vernacular about their work. On Ambae, both the local vernacular and Bislama were commonly used in stores, but I heard no instances of English or French.

Although Bislama is the most common spoken language in the workplace, competence in English or French is often a requirement stipulated in job advertisements. Government positions are advertised in newspapers bilingually, in English and French, and the following includes the typical requirement:
‘English or French is essential. Bislama is desirable’ (see final line of selection criteria):

Extract 2.4

Analysis of all job advertisements contained within a two-month sample of the four newspapers reveals that English skills are more highly sought after than French skills, as shown in Figure 2.4.
Figure 2.4 Language requirements stipulated in job advertisements

Even where the working languages are expected to be both English and French, it appears that the former is more commonly used. However, this trend is resisted by some. The following extract comes from an email sent by MP Moana Carcasses (a Francophone-educated minister) to all government employees in December 2010:

Extract 2.5

In the past until today almost all of the Government internal communication transmitted over email to all Government employees or published on the Official Government web site has always been published in English language.

Let me quote a section 3 subsection (1) *The National language of the Republic of Vanuatu is Bislama. The official languages are Bislama, English and French. The principal languages of Education are English and French.*

You are formally instructed to make sure as of today any internal communication send to the Finance IT section from your various departments for distribution over email service or published on the official Government web site **MUST** be translated in the two languages (English and French). If it is in Bislama there is no need for the other two languages translation.
2.2.3.3 Linguistic landscape

The linguistic landscape around Port Vila and Luganville, the two main towns, reflects an almost exclusive use of the three official languages.

Government-related signage tends to reflect the official trilingualism of Vanuatu:

![Picture 2.1 Ombudsman's office, Port Vila](image1)

![Picture 2.2 National Provident Fund, Port Vila, 1](image2)

![Picture 2.3 National Provident Fund, Port Vila, 2](image3)

![Picture 2.4 Health warnings 1](image4)

![Picture 2.5 Health warnings 2](image5)

Other evidence of ‘official trilingualism’ is seen on health warnings on cigarette packets, ATM machines, and Air Vanuatu notices.
Official trilingualism (or lack of) occasionally makes a news story. The director of the Department of Languages is quoted in the media (Garae, 2010) as instructing “all responsible citizens, company and property owners and institutions to respect the constitution and put up their public notices in all three languages.” His comments are made in reaction to the following sign displayed in Port Vila:
He states that “it is unlawful to put out a public notice in Bislama only or Bislama and English but none of the same in French”, although there is no law that actually requires this on public notices.

Street signs (only found in Port Vila) are bilingual in English and French, with the names often reflecting French historical origins, although with the addition of some more recent influences (‘Switched-on’ is the name of an internet business at the bottom of the second road).

Shop fronts and signs reflect a range of language choices with some, but not all, opting for English-French bilingualism.
Signs oriented to tourists are almost always in English (although note the Bislama spelling of ‘welcome’ on Picture 2.16).

A sample of tourist leaflets collected from three hotel foyers also reflects the proportions of English-speaking and French-speaking visitors to Vanuatu. Of the 41 leaflets collected, 37 are written entirely in English, with a further one in English only except for a French translation of the main tagline ‘Vanuatu in First Class’ [Le Vanuatu en première classe] – see bottom right leaflet of Picture 2.17:
While none of the leaflets from the sample are written in French only, the remaining three are bilingual in English and French:
Picture 2.18 Bilingual tourist leaflets
Advertising around Port Vila often uses Bislama:

Picture 2.19 Digicel advert, Port Vila

[Facebook on your phone, only with Digicel] ('lo' and 'blo' are non-Standard written versions of ‘long’ and ‘blong’, respectively, reflecting common pronunciation; Digicel's main tagline in the bottom corner is in English)

Picture 2.20 Ice cream advert, Port Vila

[Switi: Vanuatu's best ice cream]

Bislama also predominates in health and other public information signs around the towns and the rural areas.

Picture 2.21 HIV awareness board in Luganville

[Welcome to Santo. Enjoy your time, but remember! STIs and HIV/AIDS are here already. Unless you are in one of these boats, you will drown in the sea and the sharks will eat you. Take extra care!]
Less formal, handwritten or typed notices are also likely to be written in Bislama, in urban areas and the commercial centres of rural areas.
2.2.3.4 Religion

Several languages are used in the domain of religion. Sections of the Bible, prayer books and other religious materials are written in many vernaculars as well as Bislama (see Thomas, 1990), and many church services are conducted in these languages. Picture 2.26 to Picture 2.29 illustrate the front covers and contents pages of texts in Bislama and North-East Ambae.

[Bible in Bislama: Good News in Vanuatu today, which is a translation of the entire old and new testaments]
English or French is also widely used, depending on the denomination – principally, English for Anglican, Presbyterian, Apostolic, SDA and Church of Christ denominations, and French for Catholic. This domain challenges the notion of family affiliation with either English or French: it is quite common for some children to be enrolled in each stream of the education system, but it is usual for the whole family to attend the same church, meaning that some family members may use one language in school and another in church.

It is not uncommon for more than one language to be used within the same service. For example, the sermon, prayers and announcements may be conducted predominantly in the vernacular shared by the community, while Bible passages are read in either English or French; in another scenario, the two Bible readings of a service may be delivered in different languages, depending on the copy of the Bible that each reader possesses. Meyerhoff (2000, p.55) notes the convention for language choice in religion on the island of Malo to be influenced by the linguistic repertoire of the congregation, such that Bislama is likely to be used if outsiders to the community are present.
2.2.3.5 Media

On the radio, Bislama dominates, although language distribution depends to a certain extent on individual stations and their DJs. For example, DJs on FM107 and Paradise FM tend to draw on at least two languages throughout their shows, incorporating elements of English or French together with Bislama, fairly fluidly. Radio Vanuatu divides its programmes up more explicitly, so that there is a ‘French hour’ and an ‘English hour’ each day, and the remaining time given to Bislama. DJs on this station tend to display more monolingual usage of each language throughout the different slots. There are regular slots throughout the day on most stations, in which news bulletins are given in either Bislama or English. DJs also often read out individual news stories of interest which have been obtained from international sources, and these tend to be read verbatim in English. Radio Vanuatu also includes a number of interviews in either English or French, about topics such as the laws of Vanuatu. Public information about matters such as disruption to electricity supply, ship departures, examination results, public health advice, and cyclone warnings are given in Bislama. Radio advertisements may be in either English or Bislama, or occasionally in French. Public call-ins (to request songs, give shout-outs to friends, or enter competitions) are made in Bislama.

The government publishes a trilingual weekly newspaper, under the bilingual name The Independent/L’Indépendant. Two other trilingual weekly newspapers, The Vanuatu Times and The ni-Vanuatu have recently been established. The only daily newspaper, the Vanuatu Daily Post, is predominantly English-medium but contains a small number of articles in Bislama.

Figure 2.5 provides an overview of the percentages of articles in each of the three languages within these four newspapers, based on the sample discussed in 2.2.3.2.
Figure 2.5 Distribution of languages in Vanuatu's four newspapers
There is one nationally-owned television channel, Television Blong Vanuatu (TBV). It broadcasts only for a few hours each evening, with a programme comprising a national news bulletin of approximately half an hour, some local music videos, and sometimes other items produced by organisations such as the local theatre group Wan Smolbag Theatre [lit. a pocket theatre] or Alliance Française. The majority of items are in Bislama. Other television channels can be accessed (without subtitles) via satellite from Australia, New Caledonia and China.

2.2.3.6 Popular culture

The majority of music played on the radio is in English (approximately 70%, based on a sample of programmes from Radio Vanuatu, Paradise FM and FM107), with the remaining in French, Bislama or, less frequently, a vernacular or another Pacific language such as Fijian. Live music in a number of bars in the two main towns, and concerts such as the week-long Fest’ Napuan held in Port Vila, combine music sung in Bislama, English, French, vernaculars from Vanuatu, and other languages from the Pacific region, such as Fijian. Vanuatu’s local ‘string band’ music has typically been performed using Bislama lyrics, although an increasing number of groups sing in a vernacular language, particularly when singing about a specific island.

To my knowledge, no full-length film has been produced through the medium of Bislama or any vernacular. International films are shown at a few venues around Port Vila, predominantly in English. Wan Smolbag performs message-based dramas about issues of topical importance, such as prevention of HIV or the importance of clean drinking water. Dramas are staged in Port Vila and throughout the islands, where members also give workshops. Wan Smolbag also broadcasts some productions on television, including a relatively new soap called ‘Love Patrol’, which deals with issues such as domestic violence. This soap is English-medium, and broadcast outside Vanuatu, but the majority of its productions use Bislama.
2.2.3.7 New media

The final domain in which Bislama is becoming increasingly used is that of mobile phone messaging and social media. Mobile phone networks have, until recently, covered only the two urban areas of Port Vila and Luganville, but the past five years have seen coverage extend throughout much of rural Vanuatu. The end of a monopoly held by Telecom Vanuatu Limited in 2008 enabled a second operator, Digicel, to enter the market, thus improving the service delivery throughout the country to 90% coverage (Joshua, 2012). At the time of my fieldwork in 2011, there was coverage of both network providers at the Anglophone school, and at a point approximately 15 minutes' walk from the Francophone school. Although students were not allowed to keep their own mobile phones with them during term time, a phone is now a very common possession for ni-Vanuatu of all ages. From my observations, Bislama appears to be the dominant language that is used in text messages.

Extract 2.6 and Extract 2.7 show two exchanges I had via text message during the fieldwork, which provide examples of the way Bislama is used. K is Anglophone and H is Francophone. Both use similar non-standard Bislama forms, including abbreviations (such as 'lo' for 'long', and 'wntm' for 'wantem') and the substitution of numerals for homophonous syllables (such as 'umi2' for 'yumitu' and '2moro' for 'tumoro'). The content of the two exchanges also gives a flavour of the way transport and communication work for teachers on Ambae.

Extract 2.6 Text message exchange with an Anglophone teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original messages</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K: if go by ship is that ok with you?</td>
<td>K: if you go by ship is that okay with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen wan new ship.</td>
<td>you are going on a new ship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo santo vi to santo i ron 8 hour wat do u think?</td>
<td>it goes to ambae and santo, vi to santo takes 8 hours, what do you think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Yes hem i oreel wetem mi. Bae i sat long wayem del?</td>
<td>F: Yes that's okay with me. It's not that long, will you call me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: IT SHOULD LEAVE 2NITE SO DEPARTURE 2NITE WAS CANCELLED TILL AFTA THE CYCLONE</td>
<td>K: IT SHOULD LEAVE 2NITE SO DEPARTURE 2NITE WAS CANCELLED TILL AFTA THE CYCLONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN AN ANNOUNCEMENT WAS PUT OUT ON THE RADIO THAT THERE IS STILL SPACE SO I THINK WE SHOULD TRY ON TUESDAY</td>
<td>IN AN ANNOUNCEMENT WAS PUT OUT ON THE RADIO THAT THERE IS STILL SPACE SO I THINK WE SHOULD TRY ON TUESDAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: ok street Bae yum1 perm in advance o team yum1 jam to ship nomo? Ticket i</td>
<td>F: ok cool. Do we pay in advance or just when we board the ship? How much is the ticket?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hannes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: mas perm in advance be bae um12 check to tuesday afta um12 perm tket.</td>
<td>K: I have to pay in advance but we'll check on Tuesday and then buy the ticket.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extract 2.7 Text message exchange with a Francophone teacher

| H: Gud naat Fiona. Mi want askm sposs i possible se accoun bl skul i leam witt printer bl skul 2mooro bl — i from? Be  
| F: I asked —— but she says she can’t msk printers. She can only fix things like  
| H: Gud naat Fiona. Look —— has left the school printer at the store for —— to fix. The problem is that power doesn’t go  
| F: I’ve asked —— but she says she can’t msk printers. She can only fix things like  
| H: Good evening Fiona. I want to ask whether it’s possible for the school accountant to come with the school  
| F: I’ve asked —— but she says she can’t msk printers. She can only fix things like  
| H: Gud naat Fiona. Mi want askm sposs i possible se accoun bl skul i leam witt printer bl skul 2mooro bl —— i from? Be  
| F: I asked —— but she says she can’t msk printers. She can only fix things like  
| H: Good evening Fiona. Look —— has left the school printer at the store for —— to fix. The problem is that power doesn’t go  
| F: I’ve asked —— but she says she can’t msk printers. She can only fix things like  

Extract 2.8 shows a sample of messages received from my network provider Digicel. Note the inconsistent orthography of ‘i ko’/‘iko’ and ‘tankio’/‘thank yu’.

Extract 2.8 Text messages received from Digicel (Bislama)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hi: Gud naat Fiona. Mi want askm sposs i possible se accoun bl skul i leam witt printer bl skul 2mooro bl —— i from? Be sposs i putum blo  
| F: I asked —— but she says she can’t msk printers. She can only fix things like  
| H: Good evening Fiona. Look —— has left the school printer at the store for —— to fix. The problem is that power doesn’t go  
| F: I’ve asked —— but she says she can’t msk printers. She can only fix things like  
| H: Gud naat Fiona. Mi want askm sposs i possible se accoun bl skul i leam witt printer bl skul 2mooro bl —— i from? Be sposs i putum blo  
| F: I asked —— but she says she can’t msk printers. She can only fix things like  
| H: Good evening Fiona. Look —— has left the school printer at the store for —— to fix. The problem is that power doesn’t go  
| F: I’ve asked —— but she says she can’t msk printers. She can only fix things like  

The only three messages I received from Digicel in English during the fieldwork are shown in Extract 2.9. The first two messages were received eleven hours apart, shortly after the March 2011 earthquake in Japan triggered a tsunami warning across the Pacific. Although information about the tsunami warning was also broadcast in Bislama on the radio, English was the chosen language in which Digicel sent the advice.
Internet providers currently do not cover such wide areas, and computers are rare commodities in rural parts of Vanuatu, where most communities have either no electricity or only small generators used on occasions. There is Internet coverage in Port Vila and Luganville, although it is still relatively rare to find computers in individual homes. Unsurprisingly, one of the largest groups of Internet users is the university student population, particularly those on scholarships in other countries.

The following is a screenshot taken from Facebook, showing the wall posts of a student in Fiji who is about to return to Vanuatu for the holidays. He and his friends use elements of Bislama and English, using abbreviations and colloquial forms typical of social media conversations.

Extract 2.10 Facebook sample 1 – a ni-Vanuatu student in Fiji

[three more days...

doing to see drinking kava (lit. killing light) in Vila lol

Counting down 4 what?!...

So time to play ..lolzz

safe trip tawi (voc. address form for an in-law) & c u nxt yr.. happy holidays...:-)

Bro.......show off (lit. you’re flash)

hehehe jealous nways safe trip........]
Regenvanu, from parliament, combining excerpts of other media extracts written in English with comments that are predominantly in Bislama.

Extract 2.11 Facebook sample 2 – a political party
The following posts were taken from a requests page on Vanuatu FM107’s website (23/3/2012). The radio station can be listened to online, and is therefore popular among ni-Vanuatu students based overseas in Fiji and New Caledonia, who often make requests for songs to be dedicated to their families back home. Again, a number of non-standard Bislama and English forms are used.

**Extract 2.12 Posts from online request page**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original post</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Bula dj, shout out li ko lo ol boys blo um!</em></td>
<td><em>Greetings (Fijian)</em> dj, this shout out goes to our boys who are playing now in New Zealand, shout out also to the family in ---- and last but not the least, ---- in ----. Thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hi dj, mi wam tekem wan special request blong mi i ko lang ol family blo mi long Port Vila and Santo. Special request blong mi i stap ko lang ol family blong mi lang ----. Ol family blong mi especially baby blong mi ---- and olgeta sister blong hem long house and long santo ol family ----. Mi missim yufala everi wan back long vanuatu. thanks God bless...</em></td>
<td><em>Hi dj, I want to make my special request to my family in Port Vila and Santo. My special request goes to my family in ----. My family especially my baby ---- and all his sisters at home in Santo the ---- family... I miss you all back in vanuatu thanks God bless...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hi DJ, mi jes wantem requestm wan song i ko lo sister blo mi nait we smok i sta kamoa lo hed blem nala mo tu i ko lo ol families bak to vita ta</em></td>
<td><em>Hi DJ, I just want to request a song for my sister now who is angry/stressed (lit. smoke is coming out of her head) and also for my family back in vila ta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hi dj...gud afterun lo vanuatu, me lae wem 2mas ol song blo 107, taem me smp lizen lem me i m osem me smp lo vanuatu nmo,.. i'm 107 e mekem me smp fl at home osem nmo,...me jes wantem mekem sout act blo me i ko lo okta ya=uncle ---- -- wa m smp lo fij, ol group blo ----, ol family ---- lo ifra, olx student blo ---- we oll smp study lo usp</em></td>
<td><em>Hi dj... good afternoon to vanuatu, I really love all the songs on 107, when I listen to them I feel like I'm just in vanuatu, I'm 107 makes me feel at home all the time... I just want to give my shout out to the following: uncle ---- who is in fiji, the group from ----, the family in ----, ex students from ---- who are studying at usp</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hi DJ, Mi wantem mekem wan special request i ko lo ol family blo mi lo santo lo ---- mo ol family ---- lo port vila lo ---- ;; mo no fogetem ol ifrens blo mi lo pies ia lo ncorema....hope c oll no nk m taks leg blo faol..... like to wish them a happy sunday n happy week</em></td>
<td><em>Hi DJ, I want to make a special request for my family in santo at ---- and the ---- family in port vila at ---- ;; and not forgetting my friends here in noumea... hope that they're not wandering around too much (lit. making too many chicken legs)..... like to wish them a happy Sunday in happy week</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hi dj mi 1tm mkm 1 special request go lo ol ex 13 lettre blo ---- 2011 mi wishm ol happy sunday mo next ol boys lo fij---- hope se ol no sleep 2mas 4m 2mas kava last naet,</em></td>
<td><em>Hi DJ I want to make a special request for all ex Year 13 literature (French) students from ---- 2011 I wish them a happy Sunday and next the boys in fiji (----) hope they're not feeling the effects of too much kava last night</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.3.8 Summary

This overview of the language configuration outside education has been included in order to show the roles of different languages across a number of domains. There is a disjuncture between what goes on in school and outside, as only one language is welcomed within the school gates, and multilingualism is the norm beyond them. Within each school, one of the two former colonial languages is the only language considered appropriate, but this is clearly not the way language is used elsewhere. The resources of a number of different languages are made use of together across the different domains.

In particular, the section has shown the variety of contexts in which Bislama is used. Its role as the sole national language is reflected in its wide usage in both rural and urban areas, although English and French are also reflected in the linguistic landscape of the latter. In ‘formal’ non-school domains, such as parliamentary debate and religion, pragmatic decisions often result in the use of Bislama as the primary language. These decisions appear to defy or resist ideologies that position Bislama as a language incapable of fulfilling a diverse range of functions. This again challenges the grounds on which Bislama is marginalised from formal education.

2.3 Turning the problem into a research problem: Looking back into the system from the outside

I began the current study with the following sense of the situation:

Secondary boarding schools in Vanuatu are multilingual sites, as they are attended by students and staff speaking a variety of languages.

Bislama is banned (inconsistently) from many school campuses in order to promote the use of the medium of instruction.

The medium of instruction for all subjects and assessments is either English or French, and adequate levels of competence in this language are considered essential.
Some schools therefore promote English to the exclusion of all other languages, while others promote French to the exclusion of all others.

Families often become divided between those who learn English and those who learn French. There are often practical implications of these divisions, due to limited availability of school places in both streams in all areas.

The study has emerged from observation of this complexity, and therefore takes an exploratory approach, with a primary consideration for working out ‘what is going on’. It foregrounds the schools, their students and teachers – the ‘users’ of language in education – as well as taking an interest in the more ‘official’ discourses of policymaking.

The situation described in this chapter is that each school presents itself as a monolingual part of a dual education system, in an officially trilingual state, situated within a highly multilingual reality. Within each stream, students are expected to learn solely through the medium of a language that they have limited exposure to outside school, and they are often punished (albeit inconsistently) for the use of more familiar languages. Bislama is particularly controversial, despite its high constitutional status and widespread usage outside school. At the family level, children are often divided into ‘Anglophones’ and ‘Francophones’, sometimes due to deliberate parental choice, but sometimes due to factors beyond their control. Language-in-education policymaking in Vanuatu is thus similar to situations elsewhere, but faces the additional complexity of a double colonial legacy.

At the policymaking level, a number of reforms have been made to the education system as a whole, including an extension of the number of years of ‘basic education’ offered and a new national curriculum statement, but any such changes appear to have sidestepped questions of language. Proposals that have been put forward for changes to language-in-education policy have led to widespread debate, but the status quo that was inherited from the colonial period remains. Political instability over the past twenty years has the potential for, at best, directionless within the Ministry of Education, or, at worst, the politicising of language-in-education issues for some other purpose.
This study searches for ideological and implementational spaces for change within this domain. The debates about language that have circulated in Vanuatu since Independence create potential for many such spaces to exist. In particular, the consultations and briefings carried out during 2009-2011 by both the Education Language Policy team and the National Curriculum team appear to have opened up certain spaces for the consideration of different possibilities. Indeed, if the key ingredients for the existence of such spaces are debate, controversy and inconsistency in discussions leading up to, and the texts resulting from, policy decisions (as Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, p.515, suggest), Vanuatu’s language-in-education policy domain should be bubbling with ideological and implementational potential! This study examines the extent to which potential for realistic change can be identified.
3  Methodological and analytic approach

3.1  Ethnography of Language Policy

Martin-Jones (2011, p.5) notes that “ethnography has come to occupy the centre ground in research on language education policy in multilingual settings”. An ethnographic approach is considered appropriate for this study, given that the research is problem-driven, and motivated by considerations of the potential for change. In advocating the use of ethnography as a lens into the phenomenon of policy, McCarty (2011a, p.4) reshapes this broad starting point into other questions, such as: What does language education policy ‘look like’ in social practice? Who does it, with what purposes, to and for whom, and with what consequences?

The approach taken here is that of Ethnography of Language Policy, which owes its origins as a distinct approach to the work of Nancy Hornberger and David Cassels Johnson (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, 2011; Johnson, 2009). The approach thus has foundations in two areas – the anthropological tradition of Ethnography and the field of Language Policy and Planning (LPP). The following two sections of this chapter will examine these two foundations.

3.1.1  The ‘ethnography’ in Ethnography of Language Policy

The Ethnography of Language Policy builds on the anthropological foundations of ethnography. “At its core, an ethnographic analysis is a cultural analysis – a peeling back of tissues of meaning to answer the question, ‘what is going on here?’” (Wolcott, 2008, pp.73-74). The stated goal of Ethnography of Language Policy is thus to “reveal agentive spaces in which local actors implement, interpret, and perhaps resist policy initiatives in varying and unique ways” (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, p.509). It “is not so much about uncovering how macro-level LPP acts on people at the micro-level, or even about conveying on-the-ground information back to policy-makers, but rather it is about how people themselves actively create, contest, and mediate LPP at multiple levels – micro, meso, and macro” (Hornberger & Johnson, 2011 p.285).
Canagarajah (2006) suggests that ethnography can enable LPP work to take note of subtle ways in which power differences, language attitudes, classroom practices, renegotiation of policies, and so on, actually happen in specific contexts, and thus calls for scholars in this field “to listen to what ethnography reveals about life at the grass-roots level – the indistinct voices and acts of individuals in whose name policies are formulated” (p.154). McCarty (2011a, p.17) notes that this perspective provides “a view into LPP processes in fine detail – up close and in practice – and the marbling of those processes as they merge and diverge, constantly configuring and being (re)configured within a larger sociocultural landscape, which they in turn (re)shape”.

3.1.1.1 Minimal requirements to count as ethnography

Many authors have attempted to set out minimal requirements that must be met in order for a study to be considered ethnographic (e.g. Hammersley, 1998; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Rampton, 2006; Walford, 2003; Wolcott, 2002). Four common elements that are included in such lists are that studies are natural, rather than set up by the researcher; they require a direct and close relationship between the researcher and participants, privileging the views of the latter; there is a focus on the particular or local, rather than the general; and the process of theory building is cyclical, so that hypotheses are continually reformulated and open to the emergence of new data.

These four elements have been considered integral aspects of this study. The only other feature that will be discussed here is longevity, since this seems to be a criterion that sets apart some types of ethnographic study from others. I initially considered a period of only one school term (three and a half months) sufficient for the fieldwork, since I was already relatively familiar with the context. Having lived on the island on which the schools are located for three years, I already had an understanding of Melanesian culture, spoke Bislama well, and was known to many of the participants. I also had a good background to the education system of Vanuatu, although I was far more familiar with the Anglophone stream than the Francophone stream. My knowledge of both the context and the education system enabled a more compressed design (Jeffrey
& Troman, 2004; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999), since data collection could begin from certain ‘known’ aspects. One school term was also considered to be an appropriate “cycle of activity” (Wolcott, 1995, p.69) for a study set in an educational context, given that its structure is understood by students, teachers, policymakers and researchers alike. However, as will be explained in 4.2, the timeframe was not long enough to complete all the anticipated data collection, and the research design was therefore modified to include a second period of fieldwork.

3.1.1.2 An inductive approach to description, analysis and interpretation

Hammersley (1998, p.8) stipulates the importance of discovery in ethnographic research, with a focus on inductive approaches, rather than the testing of hypotheses. In this view, ethnographers should start out with as few assumptions as possible. However, it is also clear that we do not enter the field without any assumptions or knowledge whatsoever, and that we begin with an idea as to what we may find, as well as an awareness of what other people have found in other contexts. “Ethnographic work is dialogic between existing explanations and judgments … and ongoing data collection and analysis” (Heath, Street, & Mills, 2008, p.57).

For Wolcott (2009), the process is built up through the conceptually distinct elements of description, analysis and interpretation. The first of these “provides the foundation upon which qualitative inquiry rests” (p.27). In particular, “thick description” (Geertz, 1973) enables the researcher to describe phenomena as they occur within their specific contexts, encompassing as much of the detail and complexity as possible. Wolcott (2009) then defines analysis as “the examination of data using systematic and standardized measures and procedures” (p.29), and interpretation as “a human activity that includes intuition, past experience, emotion”, involving “the reflection, the pondering, of data in terms of what people make of them” (p.30). He stresses the ‘human’ of the latter stage, making clear that different people will draw different interpretations from the same data that has been analysed in the same way. Although conceptually distinct, these three elements do not take place in separate phases. Analysis does not wait until description has finished, and
choices of what to describe are contingent on interpretations of previous data and the wider situation. However, this chapter and the next set out the way the phenomenon of language policy was broadly investigated, through description of the way language was used, taught, learnt, regulated and talked about at two schools; analysis of these practices and discourses through the Discourse-Historical Approach; and my interpretation of what such analysis reveals about potential spaces for change.

Such an inductive approach can also provide a different way of understanding a problem that may appear to be straightforward. For example, as noted in 2.2.2.2, Vanuatu’s Education Language Policy team currently recommends a complete overhaul of the education system, presenting a choice between three almost identical proposals, implying that they already know broadly what the solution should be. An ethnographic approach allows a more in-depth description of how languages are actually being used and talked about in schools and how policy is being negotiated, thereby allowing these assumptions to be examined and challenged. It enables us to “look beyond what we are told” (Greathouse, 2001, p.102).

3.1.1.3 Reflexivity

Indeed, ethnographic approaches should challenge the assumptions on which the research was originally conceived, enabling changes of direction throughout. Reflexivity is a key component of the approach, so that the researcher constantly revisits prior interpretations of the situation, and builds new understandings into the account of what is happening. Reflexivity goes beyond reflection, requiring a complete “turning-back of experience of the individual upon himself” (Mead, 1962, in Babcock, 1980, p.2), being able to “regard oneself as an other and to be aware of oneself as his own instrument of observation” (Babcock, 1980, p.3).

Throughout the study, I have kept memos in which I have recorded the steps I have taken, changes of direction I have made, questions I have asked myself, and reflections I have made on my role within the research. I have tried to draw on these memos throughout the discussion of my data, attempting to show the processes through which I have arrived at my analysis and interpretation of
what I present. I also summarise a number of issues concerning my own position within the research in 4.4.

3.1.2 The ‘language policy’ in Ethnography of Language Policy

3.1.2.1 Foundations in the field of Language Policy and Planning

Hornberger and Johnson (2007) present Ethnography of Language Policy as an approach that can capture the intricacies of language policy that other models cannot adequately address. Rational models encompass early language planning frameworks (e.g. Haugen, 1966) that were characterized by goals of problem-solving, particularly in response to complex language issues arising from the emergence of new nations. Within these frameworks, language diversity was generally understood to be problematic, while homogeneity was considered beneficial (Ricento, 2000). These assumptions were based on ideologies about languages as monolithic systems, about monolingualism as necessary for national unity, efficiency, and development, and about the equal availability to all of linguistic resources (Ricento, 2006, p.14). Later LPP research has criticised such rational models for ignoring issues of power and inequality, highlighting the fact that ‘policy’ can never be ideologically neutral (McCarty, 2011a; Tollefson, 2006).

The resultant critical models thus “view policies as ideological constructs that both reflect and (re)produce the distribution of power within the larger society” (McCarty, 2011a, p.6). Critical scholars have attempted to reveal the hegemonic views about language implicit in rational frameworks, in order to find ways of achieving social change and to deconstruct dominant ideologies such as that monolingualism is the norm. These issues are particularly relevant in the investigation of postcolonial education policies in multilingual contexts. Critical LPP “acknowledges that policies often create and sustain various forms of social inequality, and that policy-makers usually promote the interests of dominant social groups” (Tollefson, 2006, p.42). It follows critical theory in investigating “the processes by which social inequality is produced and sustained, and the struggle to reduce inequality to bring about greater forms of
social justice” (Tollefson, 2006, p.44); it attempts “to uncover systems of exploitation, particularly those hidden by ideology, and to find ways to overcome that exploitation” (Tollefson, 2006, p.44).

As Canagarajah (2006, p.154), working within this paradigm, makes clear, “considerations of language allegiance, linguistic identity, and linguistic attitudes are not necessarily rational, pragmatic, or objective. They are ideological”. LPP models thus cannot be based on the assumption that policies are implemented on the basis of rational needs and objectives. Indeed, a clear finding of my study will be shown to be that a traditional, rational approach to LPP fails to capture several different aspects of what people in Vanuatu want, with regard to language policy.

Hornberger and Johnson (2007, p.510) note that, despite the positive steps that have been made through these types of research, they still fail to account adequately for how “microlevel interaction” fits in with other aspects investigated. Human agency still tends to be sidelined from the more critical approaches, so that those outside the traditionally powerful policy maker roles (teachers, students, parents, for example) are characterised as helpless. The danger is now that “an (over)emphasis on the hegemonic power of policies obfuscates the potentially agentive role of local educators as they interpret and implement the policies” (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, p.510).

A move has been made towards policy research that focuses on this agency of actors who do not hold traditional policymaker roles. Hornberger (1988) conducted one of the earliest ethnographic studies of language policy, focusing on bilingual education and language maintenance in Peru from the perspective of the local community and its classrooms, rather than the national government. Another seminal study is Canagarajah’s (1993) critical ethnography of compulsory English teaching in Sri Lanka, that focused on the student point of view rather than the programmes themselves. Martin-Jones (2011, p.4) documents the research of the Bilingualism Research Group working in the 1990s at Lancaster University, who took similar classroom-based approaches to language and education policy in various contexts (e.g. Arthur, 1996 in Botswana; Martin, 1996 in Brunei Darussalam; Ndayipfukamiye, 1996 in
During the same period, Hornberger (1995, p.245) called for "sociolinguistically-informed approaches to ethnographic research" that prioritised school-based investigation.

More recent studies that follow similar lines include those of Heugh (2003), who examines the way inequality is mediated through multilingual policies in South Africa; Blommaert (2005b), who examines the use of Swahili as medium of instruction in Tanzania from an ethnographic exploration of language use; Chimbutane (2009, 2011), who examines the implementation of bilingual education in Mozambique; Blackledge and Creese (2010), who examine multilingual practices in complementary schools in four UK cities, and the contributions to a special issue on ethnographic and discourse-analytic perspectives on multilingual classroom research, edited by Saxena and Martin-Jones (2013).

However, it appears that a perceived choice between constraining power at the top and reactionary power at the bottom is still pervasive within the field. Hornberger and Johnson (2011, p.279) note that current work is still characterized by these dichotomies and the tensions they imply. The Ethnography of Language Policy is one such attempt to resolve these tensions more explicitly, by setting out a goal of "marrying a critical approach with a focus on LPP agency, and by recognizing the power of both societal and local policy texts, discourses, and discoursers" (Hornberger & Johnson, 2011, pp.279-280).

It does maintain critical orientations, but aims to move beyond binaries of structure and agency, and between critical focuses on power and action-oriented focuses on practitioner roles. 'Power' is therefore considered not only with reference to those in traditionally ‘powerful’ roles, i.e. policymakers. The ethnographic focus enables flexibility to look at and "slice through" the different layers of policy (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, p.510).

3.1.2.2 Towards a definition of policy

Current understandings of policy within education tend to draw on the work of Stephen Ball and others from the 1990s. Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992) describe three distinct, although interrelated, stages of a policy cycle, rather than considering a policy to be a static set of directives to be implemented. These
stages are the *context of influence* which gives rise to any particular policy, through collaboration and/or dispute between different parties; the *context of policy text production*, during which the original intentions and interests are transformed in some way in order to present the policy that they represent in a meaningful way to the recipients; and the *context of practice*, which is the site of application of the policy, the situation in which it is expected to take effect. Throughout these stages, the policy is constantly renegotiated and transformed. Ball (1994, p.10) draws attention to the fact that policy is “both text and action, words and deeds, it is what is enacted as well as what is intended”. This work has been expanded more recently within a framework of policy enactment, described as the “creative processes of interpretation and translation, that is, the recontextualisation – through reading, writing and talking – of the abstractions of policy ideas into contextualised practices” (Braun, Ball, Maguire, & Hoskins, 2011, p.586).

Despite this elaboration in terms of the complexity of what policy actually is, it appears that the policy process is still often conceptualised as linear. As Johnson (2009, p.142, following Levinson et al 2007) notes, there remains a conceptual distinction between the formation and the implementation of policy, and he argues instead for policy to be considered a “dynamic process”, to recognise that policies are “socially constructed and dynamically negotiated on a moment-by-moment basis” (García & Menken, 2010, p.257).

Similarly, in the introduction to a special issue on the media, multilingualism and language policing, Blommaert et al. (2009) reveal that this binary view has by no means been broken down, and problematise the practices that are hard to account for within traditional dichotomies of ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’. They argue for a more dynamic and unstable view of policy (Androutsopoulos, 2009; Blommaert et al., 2009; Kelly-Holmes, Moriarty, & Pietikäinen, 2009). They consider it more productive to consider language policy to be “continually evolving, emergent and influenced by norms of specific communities and cultures” (Leppänen & Piirainen-Marsh, 2009, p.261). Drawing on Foucault’s understanding of power and control, they reconceptualise policy as a form of ‘policing’, defined as “the rational production of order” (Blommaert, 2009, p.245), and as “the orderly management, negotiation and (re)construction of
norms for language choice and use” (Leppänen & Piirainen-Marsh, 2009, p.262). These definitions stress that policing practices are “rational” or “orderly”, but that the agency is shifted from macro-level institutions to the coexistence of “multiple policing agents” (Androutsopoulos, 2009, p.288), who “never operate alone, but always have to work in a polycentric environment in which different norms need to be negotiated and balanced against each other” (Blommaert et al., 2009, p.206). According to this view, actors at different levels operate in “complex webs of language policing activities” (Blommaert, 2009, p.244), which take place and are contested through discursive action (Leppänen & Piirainen-Marsh, 2009).

The studies within a recent volume on ethnographic approaches to language policy (McCarty, 2011b) draw on a sociocultural approach, which takes a similar starting definition of language policy as “processual, dynamic, and in motion” ... “best understood as a verb” (McCarty, 2011a, p.2, following Heath and Street, 2008, on culture). In summarising the contributions of the volume from this perspective, Hornberger and Johnson (2011, p.284) define language policy as “language-regulating modes of human interaction, negotiation, and production”. They elaborate:

A sociocultural approach to language policy focuses on how people make policy in everyday social practice, thus emphasizing local agency to potentially challenge hegemonic discourses which privilege some languages and speech communities while marginalizing others. A sociocultural approach to language policy redefines notions of ‘bottom’ and ‘top’, since individual agents are allowed to ‘make’ or ‘enact’ policy through everyday interaction (Hornberger & Johnson, 2011, p.281).

In this study, I draw on this sociocultural approach in order to focus on what goes on at several points within policymaking. I focus predominantly, but not entirely, on school-based language practices in an attempt to understand what ‘language’ and ‘languages’ mean to teachers and students within the context of education. I also include the more traditional ‘policymaker’ voices through the analysis of written policy texts and interviews with employees at the Ministry of Education. It is therefore important to make clear that ethnography is not something to be done solely ‘at the bottom’, despite it having been championed as a way to take account of how things play out ‘on the ground’. If we are to take seriously the notion of multiple agents, we must not swing so far in the
other direction that we assume a complete lack of influence of those in
traditional positions of ‘policy power’. I consider Ethnography of Language
Policy to be the best way to understand language practices and discourses
throughout the broad domain of education, whilst still keeping in mind policy
structures, such as school rules, professional guidelines and teacher-student
relationships, within which participants are generally very aware of their places.

3.1.2.3 What is not policy? Policy and policies

Hornberger and Johnson note that, while a sociocultural approach solves some
problems, it creates a new one: by saying that policy happens at every level
(instead of only at the top), then, they ask:

What isn’t language policy? How does this conceptualization of policy distinguish
itself from other sociolinguistic terms already in existence, such as ‘discourse’ and
‘norms of interaction’? Certainly language policies can appropriate and/or resist
dominant discourses, and can influence or be influenced by norms of interaction, but
are discourses and norms of interaction, in and of themselves, language policies?
(2011, p.285)

For me, discourses and norms of interaction are not policies, but phenomena
through which policy is produced and sustained. In this study, I take policy (as
an abstract noun) to mean the ‘rational production of order’ that Blommaert
refers to as ‘policing’ (see above), which may well materialise as policies (a
concrete noun). These policies can be written down in documents, sent to
schools, debated in meetings, implemented and evaluated, and so on. Thus a
(concrete, particular) language policy that states which languages are to be
taught as subjects in a particular school is a specific instance of (abstract,
general) language policy. A number of personnel at the Ministry of Education
commented to me during my fieldwork that the Education Language Policy team
have never come up with an actual language policy (specific), but I would say
that they have certainly been engaging with the phenomenon of language policy
(in its general sense) during meetings and consultations that have cost
considerable time and money. I thus consider policy to be the constantly
evolving process, created and sustained through discourse and practices, from
which specific policies can be formulated, debated, implemented, and so on.
In this study, I therefore look for instances of language policy that can shed light on the issues outlined in Chapter 2. I began the research aware of some examples of specific language policies that would certainly be relevant, such as the school rules explicitly banning Bislama, mentioned in 2.1. However, there was no single language policy that I set out to investigate, as has been the case in some studies that utilise the Ethnography of Language Policy (such as Johnson (2007), who examined the implementation of the US No Child Left Behind Act of 2002). Indeed, as noted in 1.1.3 and 2.1, my research was motivated to a certain extent by the volume of debate about language in Vanuatu that never seemed to provide any action – this observation might be rephrased here as policy without any policies.

However, the situation is slightly more complicated than a total absence of policies. In fact, while chatting to someone at the Ministry of Education, I was startled when he opened a filing cabinet drawer to reveal an array of documents that indicated an incredible flurry of policymaking: The Education Master Plan, The national EFA plan, The Education Sector Strategy, The Education Road Map, and so on (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, 2004, 2006b, 2009). Closer inspection revealed many references to language throughout these documents, and certain concrete instances that could be considered to be language policies. Extract 3.1, from the Vanuatu Education Sector Strategy (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2006b, p.20), is one such example:

Extract 3.1

Policy: Bi-lingual Schools

Confirm language of instruction in the formal education sector to include:

- Use of vernacular as language of instruction in pre-school and first two years of basic education to develop literacy and conceptual skills and cultural identity in mother tongue.
- Phased introduction of either French or English from Year 3 as the language of instruction.
- Phased introduction of the second global language (English or French) as a language of instruction from Year 7.
- Bi-lingual instruction from Year 9.
Encourage merger of Anglophone and Francophone schools to form bi-lingual schools. No new single language schools to be approved.

Support introduction of other languages as subjects.

The overall policy to create bilingual schools subsumes a number of sub-policies relating to language(s) of instruction, physical merging of Anglophone and Francophone schools, and the teaching of languages as subjects.

In a post-fieldwork memo, I noted:

**Extract 3.2**

*With soft copies of these (apparently publicly-available) documents on my USB stick, I suddenly had a wealth of data that I didn’t know what to do with. In one sense, these texts were nothing to do with my study, since they didn’t appear to have much effect on anything outside their filing cabinet, and certainly hadn’t made it as far as the schools where I was conducting my case study (an impression that was confirmed when I arrived at the schools, and the only post-1998 document in evidence was the newly published 2010 National Curriculum Statement). In another sense, however, this data told me a lot about one aspect of ‘policy’, providing a window into the discourses circulating within one domain of policymaking. From a policy vs. practice perspective, it could be said that a lot of time was being wasted ‘up the top end’ of policymaking, given that the Ministry appeared to be putting a lot of effort into producing paperwork that was irrelevant to schools; at the same time, it provoked questions about where the ‘top’ really is, as the documents reveal the pervasiveness of the ‘expert’ discourse of supranational bodies such as the World Bank. The Ministry of Education can be seen to be answerable to bodies far further ‘up’ the metaphorical policy ladder, with clear financial implications; as well as to the Government of Vanuatu, who needs to be able to repackage this ‘expert’ discourse in ways that appear to the voting public that they are in control and moving in the right direction for the country; while trying to do what is actually best for students and teachers at the schools. Financial and political pressures inevitably clash with pedagogical priorities.*

As I make clear here, this series of policy documents are both nothing and everything to do with my concern with language policy in education. External agencies appear to be imposing some form of top-down policymaking, but there is also a gap between the concerns of the Ministry of Education and those of the schools themselves. I cannot ignore the existence of top-down macro policy documents, and yet I cannot be sure that they have any influence at all on what goes on elsewhere. It is therefore very hard to draw boundaries around ‘policy’ to find a starting point or end point, or to predict the influence of one element on another.
3.1.2.4 Onions, webs, and networks

Ricento and Hornberger (1996) introduced the metaphor of the ‘onion’ to conceptualise “a multilayered construct, wherein essential LPP components – agents, levels, and processes of LPP – permeate and interact with each other in multiple and complex ways as they enact various types, approaches, and goals of LPP” (p.419). They describe an outer layer composed of legislative or other formal policymaking bodies, and various institutional and interpersonal layers within the ‘onion’. This conceptualisation encompasses what is going on in classrooms and schools, rather than assuming that what is handed down from ‘above’ is accepted unquestioningly. It enables the focus to shift inwards from the ‘outer layer’.

This has been a powerful way of conceptualising the interrelatedness of different layers and levels of policymaking, and it is useful in understanding the complexity involved. However, I feel that reference to an onion’s layers does not do enough to move beyond a top-down/bottom-up view of policymaking, given that one layer can only be located on top of (or beneath) another layer, albeit in close connection. Secondly, however carefully the analyst peels back the layers of the onion, a centre will inevitably be reached, leaving one element at the core. Despite its usefulness in understanding how complex the connections are between this core and other layers, the metaphor prioritises what lies at the ‘heart’ of the onion. Finally, it suggests an outer layer that can be imagined to contain everything within “the LPP whole” (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996, p.402), which is too neat to capture the complexity that it aims to describe. It makes it difficult to see connections between, for example, very similar policymaking processes going on in different countries, influenced by the same supranational body.

A more realistic model of LPP needs to, firstly, take into account the multidirectionality of the connections between different elements (rather than layers, which can only pile on top of one another) and, secondly, have the ability to prioritise a number of these different elements at any given time, rather than maintaining the binary opposition between top-down and bottom-up that still preoccupies the LPP field. In this way, potential for change can be examined at
a number of different points, rather than as a form of (singular and unidirectional) ‘bottom up’ process that can only ever be positioned in opposition to a more powerful ‘top’.

The quotation at the end of 3.1.2.3 from Blommaert et al. (2009) refers to the way policing works within “complex webs”. Others have used the same metaphor, although each in slightly different ways. So, while Mora (2002) describes how Latino students are “caught” by the web of California’s Proposition 227 that “by its very complexity and multifaceted nature ... is much harder to combat than a single initiative or policy that affects the academic achievement and access to sound programs for Latino students” (p. 41), Winton (2011, drawing on Joshee and Johnson 2005) considers a “policy web” to be a conceptual tool that enables her to map out the influences of local, state/provincial, national, and international actors on local safe school policies in the USA and Canada. She concludes that, “while influenced by international beliefs about unsafe schools and youth violence, affected by local social, economic, and historical contexts, and constrained by state/provincial and federal policies, local school districts are nevertheless able to exercise some agency” (Winton, 2011, p.247). In this account, she notes the variety of different potential influences on what schools do (rather than a single ‘top’ that holds all the power), and allows for agency in a number of different school districts. It becomes clear that a web can be viewed in many different ways (depending, to continue the metaphors, on whether you are the spider that created it or an insect caught up in it, or an observer who may see it either as a thing of beauty or a sign of poor cleaning).

Winton’s use of a ‘web’ as a conceptual tool is helpful in that it enables description of what goes on at different points, without neglecting to show how these fit into the whole of which they are part. It allows the multidirectionality that is missing from a policy ‘onion’. For me, a visual shortcoming of making use of this metaphor, however, is that a web still converges on a central point and has fixed edges, thus making it hard to link new insights into the model.

Vidovich (2007) employs the model of a policy ‘network’, which shares many similarities with this ‘web’. Vidovich bases this model on Bowe et al.’s (1992)
policy cycle, discussed in 3.1.2.2. However, she, firstly, expands the boundaries of the cycle to incorporate elements beyond a nation’s borders, i.e. international and supranational influences. Secondly, she re-emphasises the state-centredness that many post-modern models reject, although stressing that this does not mean ‘state-controlled’. She argues that governments do play key roles in policymaking that should not be removed from models, although this emphasis does not preclude focusing on agents elsewhere. Finally, Vidovich stresses “the two-way interrelationships between the different levels and contexts of the policy process by examining the dynamics of how these contexts continually relate to each other” (ibid., p.290). Rather than envisaging a distinct ‘context of influence’ (cf. Bowe et al., 1992) in which LPP plays out, there is constant interplay and blurriness between this context and those that Bowe et al. position before (or above) it. As Vidovich (ibid., p. 291) argues, for example, “the localized context of individual institutions can directly influence the nature of practices/effects at that site, rather than operating through the official policy text”.

For Vidovich (ibid., p.292):

The intention of this framework is to begin to depict the messiness of the policy process (a post-modern perspective), but not to be so overwhelmed by the messiness that the policy process is rendered beyond systematic analysis. The ‘bigger picture’ (modernist perspective) should not be lost.

Although Vidovich, herself, critiques the use of ‘policy network’ models, and notes several weaknesses (namely, that a more critical orientation is needed; that governments should be seen as something more than just one actor among many; and that networks must be seen to be unstable and changeable, see p.294), the model provides a more useful conceptual tool for my purposes than either an ‘onion’ or a ‘web’. It enables description of several different points within the network, allowing a number of points to be prioritised simultaneously, or to varying degrees at different times. I can thus describe what goes on in a particular classroom or within a school community, without this approach being considered the panacea to the whole policymaking problem, as can sometimes appear to be the case with many models of ‘bottom-up’ LPP. I can relate what I see in the schools to what is going on outside, whether in the villages, at the
Ministry of Education, or at an international conference. My study is obviously able to describe only very small parts of this network, and does prioritise two particular school communities, but I attempt to keep a more holistic overview in mind.

Useful elements I take from these metaphors are therefore the interrelatedness of different “agents, levels and processes” (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996); the variety of different influences that come from many origins (Winton, 2011); and the multidirectionality of the connections between these different contexts, levels and influences (Vidovich, 2007). Adding the metaphor of ‘ideological and implementational spaces’ introduced in 1.1.3.4, I will examine the potential ‘spaces’ that can be identified within the ‘network’ of policymaking in Vanuatu.

3.2 Discourse analysis within this framework

Within the Ethnography of Language Policy, I incorporate a discourse analytic focus. A key way in which I examine potential spaces for change is through the analysis of the discourse of various actors within the network of language-in-education policy in Vanuatu. This section will give an overview of the way I use the terms ‘discourse’ and ‘text’, and an introduction to the Discourse-Historical Approach used here.

3.2.1 Discourse(s) and texts

Language policy has been defined in 3.1.2.3 as a constantly evolving process that is created and sustained through practices and discourse. This perspective is underpinned by the view of discourse as social practice (Blommaert, 2005a; Chouliaaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 1995). Discourse is considered to be constitutive rather than purely representational or reflective of reality, thereby “construct[ing] a version of social reality” (Wetherell, 2001, p.17). Policy is thus created through practices and discourse, rather than simply being talked about, enforced, and displayed on walls. It must also be remembered that, in being present in the schools and showing an interest in policy(ies) and language(s), I also contributed to this process. Some issues may have been talked about in
different ways from usual, and practices may have been altered that, in themselves, became part of the policy enactment.

In its most general usage, discourse is taken to refer to “language-in-action” (Blommaert, 2005a, p.2) or to “language use in speech and writing” (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p.258). However, from a social practice perspective, it becomes hard to separate the linguistic from the non-linguistic elements of social action. It becomes important to consider “the many material resources beyond speech and writing which societies have shaped and which cultures provide as means for making” (Kress, 2011, p.208). It is thus quite common to extend the definition to encompass “all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural, and historical patterns and developments of use” (Blommaert, 2005a, p.3). While agreeing that non-linguistic resources may be deployed to convey as much as, if not more, information than linguistic resources alone, for the purpose of this thesis, I do prioritise the linguistic. I am interested in the way language policy comes into being, particularly through the historical and social use of language, but in conjunction with its non-linguistic accompaniments. I therefore define discourse as ‘language – and other semiotic resources – in use’.

In the same way that I distinguish between ‘policy’ and ‘policies’, I use the term ‘discourse’ in two ways, to make a distinction between the general and the specific. When I refer to, for example, ‘my participants’ discourse’ or ‘discourse within the domain of language-in-education policymaking’, I refer in a fairly general way to the language – and other semiotic resources – in use of my participants, or to that of others within the broad domain. Following Fairclough (2003), this sense of discourse is an abstract one. In contrast, when I refer to ‘a discourse of economic opportunity’ or ‘two conflicting discourses’, I refer to specific arrangements or configurations of the more general ‘language-in-use’ version of discourse. These discourses relate to specific topics such as economic opportunity or human rights.

I consider texts to be concrete, observable instances of discourse (in its general sense), which may or may not be captured through actions such as audio-recording, photocopying, or photographing. I do not differentiate between
written or spoken texts, so examine interview data, policy documents, handwritten signs, and so on. Following the points just raised, a text comprises more than the words that are used, i.e. it is more than the talking and writing itself. Aspects such as the size of a sign, the proximity of a teacher to a group of students, or the volume at which a rebuke is made contribute to the shaping of each text, and must thus be taken into account alongside the linguistic aspects.

The means through which texts are produced must also be taken into account. As Gumperz and Hymes (1972) made clear, language is inseparable from the social action in which it is used, and the relationship between them is dynamic. Patterns of interaction produce social structures or norms that then guide what is and is not possible in subsequent talk or interaction, and it therefore makes no sense to analyse the words used in any interaction as though they are anything but a part of that interaction. Teachers and students in a classroom activity are thus doing more than using a language such as English; they are working within structures that dictate who gets to speak when and about what. If I want to examine how language is being used in a classroom, I need to take into account that these patterns are in place, and that all classroom participants are aware of them. They may not conform to these situated norms and practices, but it is helpful to keep them as a reference point when analysing and interpreting what participants do. Similarly, knowing something of the process through which a written text is produced helps to make sense of it. So, for example, to understand the language provisions that were included in Vanuatu’s constitution, I found it useful to read the minutes of the meetings in which it was drafted in 1979.

3.2.2 The Discourse Historical Approach (DHA)

Implicit in my definitions of discourse as social practice and of policy as a phenomenon produced through practices and discourse (serving to create, sustain, reproduce and reflect forms of power and inequality) is an understanding of the importance of history. Policy is a phenomenon that comes into being through complex processes, and even an apparently radical policy does not suddenly appear from nowhere. Thus, school rules about Bislama both have a history, in the sense that their origins can be traced to earlier attitudes
towards the language, and have been historically produced, in the sense that they have been formed out of and by that history.

The particular approach taken within this study is therefore the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009; Wodak, 2001). Blommaert (2005a, p.37) criticises “the absence of a sense of history” in most approaches to critical discourse analysis and states that “an expression of interest in historical backgrounds or intertextuality [will not] serve as a substitute for a genuine historical analysis of the ways in which power regimes come into place”. DHA prioritises historical context within its analysis and interpretation, although Wodak and Meyer (2009, p.30) state that “there is no clear procedure for this task”. In analysing each text, I therefore try to keep in mind all of the aspects discussed above that have shaped that text as a product of historical and social action. For example, a comparison of the treatment of English and French within the rules at two schools initially suggested that, while the Anglophone school promoted both languages equally, the Francophone school prioritised French, perhaps due to a contemporary need to protect and bolster the status of this language in Vanuatu. However, by considering the differences in the original purpose of the Anglican and Catholic missions on which these two schools were founded, it is possible to understand the discrepancy in terms of a fundamental difference in what is meant by ‘school’ (see 5.2.2.2).

The DHA is situated within the broader approach of Critical Discourse Analysis. It is therefore located within the field of critical social research, concerned with understanding possibilities for social change. This objective fits well with my focus on ideological and implementational spaces that hold potential for policy change. Combining Critical Discourse Analysis and Ethnography of Language Policy enables discourse and power to be examined within the multiple layers and contexts of language policy (Johnson, 2009, p.151). Attention can thus be paid to counter-discourses as well as to the macro discourses that might be assumed to be the most powerful, following the principle that “local educators are not helplessly caught in the ebb and flow of shifting ideologies in language policies – they help develop, maintain, and change that flow” (Johnson, 2011, p.128).
The approach has tended to be driven by political critique. It was developed for the analysis of anti-Semitic images in Austrian public discourse in the late 1980s, and has since been used to analyse other aspects of political discourse in various European contexts (as summarised in Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p.95), and elsewhere (e.g. Lawton, 2008, who analyses English-only discourse in the US; Ricento, 2003, who analyses the construction of ‘Americanism’). I extend the focus on the ‘political’ to refer not only to what goes on in the formal or official ‘domain of politics’ but also to “dynamics that operate in the everyday, the domestic, and the mundane” (Besnier, 2009, p.7). I analyse the discourse of teachers and students whose role is not, on the face of it, a ‘political’ one, as well as what might be considered more typical ‘policy discourse’, i.e. that which shows up in policy documents and interviews with personnel at the Ministry of Education.

The key principles underlying the approach of DHA are as follows (summarised from Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p.95):

1. The approach is problem-oriented;
2. It is interdisciplinary, and combines a variety of theories and methods in order to understand the problem under investigation;
3. It incorporates fieldwork and ethnography where necessary, and requires moving recursively between theory and empirical data;
4. Numerous genres and public spaces are investigated, as well as the links between them; historical context is taken into account;
5. Categories and tools must be elaborated for each analysis according to the specific problem;
6. ‘Grand theories’ may serve as a foundation, but ‘middle-range theories’ frequently supply a better theoretical basis in the specific analyses;
7. The application of findings is important.

The specific ‘categories and tools’ (cf. point 5) used in this study will be set out in 4.3, once the research design has been introduced.
4 Research design

4.1 An ethnographic case study as an approach

The initial research design comprised data collection at two schools on Ambae Island (Angolovo College and Collège de Faranako\(^5\)) over the period of one term, supplemented by one background interview at the national Ministry of Education (see Map 4.1).

Map 4.1 Location of the research sites

However, the design changed in three ways. Firstly, I was given greater access at the Ministry than I had anticipated, so managed to collect quite a large data set at that source (see 3.1.2.3); secondly, I had insufficient time at the schools to carry out the final interview component as planned (see 4.2.1.1), and

\(^5\) Following academic convention, these are pseudonyms. For reader convenience, they are derived from ‘Anglophone’ and ‘Francophone’, respectively, modified to fit local pronunciation norms. However, with full agreement from participants, I have not disguised the locations of the schools (see 4.4.7).
therefore built in a second fieldwork period; finally, I had the opportunity, during this second visit, to follow up the themes that had emerged from the first period of fieldwork in interviews with participants both at the schools and at the Ministry, as a way of tying together what was happening at the schools with what the Ministry priorities were. Participants’ talk about language and languages revealed unexpected insights into the potential for multilingual education that I wanted to explore in greater detail, thus shifting much of the emphasis towards this interview data in the final analysis.

The final research design therefore comprised two fieldwork trips. The first was conducted from February to May 2011, during which I spent three weeks in Port Vila and three months (one term) at the schools on Ambae. The second trip took place in October and November 2011, during which I spent one week in Port Vila and two weeks on Ambae.

4.1.1 The research sites

Ambae has a population of approximately 9,000, traditionally speaking two distinct languages – North-East Ambae and West Ambae. The island’s interior is covered by dense forest, rising steeply to a volcano, thus keeping the two parts of the island separate. The two schools are located on the north-eastern tip, approximately seven kilometres apart on the single road that runs around the northern and eastern coasts. The airfield on this part of Ambae is serviced by flights from Port Vila and the surrounding islands several days a week, and ships call with similar frequency. The north-eastern part of the island also holds the headquarters for the provincial government, including the Provincial Education Office, with administrative control of the three islands of Penama Province (Pentecost, Ambae, Maewo). There is also a hospital, and a commercial centre with seven small stores and a combined post office and bank.

Like most secondary schools in Vanuatu, both are boarding schools, which presents three implications for the study. Firstly, students and staff come from islands all over Vanuatu, resulting in significant linguistic diversity; secondly, observation took place throughout the week and around the whole campus, rather than only in classroom hours and settings; thirdly the whole community of
each school was of interest to the study, including teachers’ families. This is therefore an ethnographic investigation of language use within two school communities, rather than a classroom-based study.

Given that 79% of secondary schools are located in rural areas (Ministry of Education statistics), I deliberately chose two rural schools for my case study. Students living in Vanuatu’s two towns are likely to be exposed to very different language patterns than those in the rural areas, so I wanted to focus on something closer to (if not ‘typical’ of) the experience of the majority. Ambae itself was, primarily, a convenient rural choice, given that I have previously lived and taught on the island. However, the particular location of the schools is appealing because they are neither too close to the two towns (in contrast to schools such as Collège de Montmartre and Matevulu College that are classified by the Ministry of Education as ‘rural’, but known to be well resourced due to their proximity to Port Vila and Luganville, respectively), nor too remote and therefore unusually isolated (such as Arep in the Banks Islands, serviced far less frequently by flights and ships).

**4.1.1.1 Angolovo College**

Angolovo College is an Anglophone secondary boarding school, part-maintained by the Anglican Church. It was established in 1902 as an Anglican mission school, initially located on a different island. It houses 304 students from Years 9 to 13 (aged approximately 14 to 19). There are new intakes of students into Years 11 and 13, and current students need to be reselected in order to continue at these levels.

73% of the students come from the three islands of Penama Province but with few schools in the country offering senior secondary education (particularly up to Year 13), the remaining students come from approximately 22 other islands. Questionnaire data suggests that 44 vernaculars are spoken. There are 25 teachers, ten teaching junior students (Years 9 and 10), and 15 teaching senior students. These teachers also come predominantly from Penama, although, at senior level (offering more specialised subjects), four teachers have been recruited from the Solomon Islands, including a couple originally from India, and
another is from a different province of Vanuatu. There is also a Peace Corps volunteer teaching Computer Studies.

From 2004 to 2006, I was an English teacher at Angolovo College. I also conducted research at the school in 2002, 2006 and 2008. I was therefore known to the majority of the teachers, and they had some idea about what I meant when I asked if I could come back and do research. I was introduced to the students and any new teachers as an ex-teacher, thereby providing me with a certain ‘way in’ to my research (see 4.4.5 for discussion of the implications of this).

4.1.1.2 Collège de Faranako

Collège de Faranako is a Francophone secondary boarding school, part-maintained by La Direction d’Enseignement Catholique, the Catholic Education Board. The school was established in 1964 as a Catholic mission primary school, to which a secondary school was added in 1995. It houses 89 students from Years 7 to 10 (aged approximately 12 to 16), while the primary school on the same site caters for Kindergarten and Classes 1 to 6. Since the policy changes to Basic Education (see 2.2.2.2), students progress automatically from the primary school to the secondary school, and then sit a national exam at the end of Year 8 in order to be reselected to Year 9. There is also a new intake at this point into Year 9. Due to administrative problems and disputes with the local community, provision for Years 11 and 12 was withdrawn in 2008. As a result, after the national Year 10 exam, successful students can only continue to Year 11 on a different island, since there is no Francophone provision at this level on Ambae.

97.6% of the students come from the three islands of Penama Province and there is therefore a less diverse mix of languages than at Angolovo College. Questionnaire data suggests that seven vernaculars are spoken. There are seven teachers at the school, only two of whom come from Penama. After the problems of 2008, the school was reopened with a new principal and several new teachers from different islands, possibly to avoid further problems with the local community.
I had previously visited Collège de Faranako, but I did not know any of the staff or students personally. However, they knew of me from staff at Angolovo College and I was welcomed as somebody who had spent quite a long time on Ambae.

4.1.1.3 The Vanuatu Ministry of Education
The Ministry of Education is located in Port Vila, the capital city. It is a national structure that administers all schools within both language streams, although many schools are still part-maintained by religious bodies. The Ministry is part of the wider national governmental structure, and must align its strategies with those of the government. For example, the Priorities Action Agenda of 2006 (Government of the Republic of Vanuatu, 2006) sets out national concerns that individual ministries must respond to. The Ministry of Education must then develop internal strategies specific to its sector, such as the Vanuatu Education Sector Strategy (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2006b). Vanuatu has also signed a number of international agreements, such as commitment to the Education For All goals (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2004) and education policy is thus also influenced by supranational policy. Due to the constant changes in government described in 2.2.1.5, this policymaking process is very unstable, and three different Ministers of Education were in post throughout my fieldwork.

As an ex-teacher in Vanuatu, I am a former employee of the Ministry of Education, and I was known to some personnel. I was introduced to others as an ex-teacher from Angolovo College.

4.2 Methods used

4.2.1 Fieldwork 1

4.2.1.1 Observation, informal discussions and fieldnotes
In the literature, observation is often seen as the “hallmark of ‘classical’ ethnographic methodology” (Harklau, 2005, p.180), since it is through observing what goes on that a researcher attempts to understand a phenomenon in its natural setting. Research was carried out at both schools throughout the whole
term, rather than observing one during the first half, and the other during the second half. I divided my time fairly equally between the two schools, staying for approximately one week at a time at each school. I slept in a teacher’s house at Angolovo and at the end of a dormitory at Faranako, and spent no nights away from the schools. I therefore lived as a member of each school community throughout the term, dealing with water shortages, generator breakdowns, and transport and communication difficulties with everybody else. I followed the schools’ daily routines from early morning to late at night, and was thus fully immersed in the practices of interest.

To begin with, I spent as much time as possible in classrooms. As well as giving me a starting point for my observations, this enabled students to get used to me in a defined ‘observer’ role, rather than just hanging around. During the first few weeks, I attended at least one lesson with each class in each school, so that I could explain what I was doing. I later focused my attention on Year 10, since both schools had students of this level. There is a national curriculum up to this level, so I observed similar topics taught at the two schools. I observed content lessons taught through the medium of instruction of the school; and language lessons, for both L2 and L3. From the third week onwards, I audio-recorded these lessons.

Outside the classroom, I attended church services, staff meetings, and a number of ‘one-off’ events, such as the celebration of La Journée de la Francophonie at Collège de Faranako. I also observed activities such as sports practices, mealtimes, evening study sessions, and work parties (sessions of manual work, in which students collect firewood for the kitchen, cut grass, sweep the classrooms and so on). I took photographs of written texts around the school campus, which ranged from official notices on the noticeboards to graffiti on desks and walls, and collected copies of other relevant texts.

The extent to which I participated in events could, according to Schensul et al. (1999, p.92), be conceptualised along a continuum ranging from simply being present to being actively involved in the activity. As Heath and Street (2008, p.31) note, “only rarely can we shed features of ourselves to be a ‘real’ participant”. However, being a member of a community does not have to mean
doing every activity, and it would in fact be unusual for a single member to participate in all activities that are collectively identified as being done in that community. Some activities are typically gender-specific, or carried out by people who hold certain roles or status, while others are whole-community activities in which different members may play different parts. As a female researcher, I gained unexpected insights from mothers about their concerns for their children’s education (see 2.1.2), but only rarely joined groups of male teachers drinking kava in the evenings, which a male researcher would find easier to do.

The Melanesian predilection for ‘storying’ presents ample opportunity for an ethnographer to do the very activity that is key to the research – hanging around and chatting. I spent hours at a time in the shade of various trees, either while waiting for something to happen, or simply stopping for a chat on the way somewhere else. In this environment, I began to ask questions, prod for thoughts about language(s), and simply listen to the sort of topics that were discussed. I became engaged in many very interesting conversations about language and education, and began to formulate ideas about what was important to these participants.

My initial research design had included a series of more structured, audio-recorded group interviews in the last few weeks of the term, focused on themes that appeared to be important. However, I did not reach a point during the three months at which I felt I knew the key themes that I wanted to address in such a way, as I felt that each new conversation was still showing me fresh insights at the very end of term. I also felt that it would seem artificial within the timeframe to suddenly sit the same people down that I’d been chatting to every day and ask them to talk about exactly the same things but with a microphone. As a result, I held only informal conversations during the first fieldwork period, seizing opportunities as they arose and relying on fieldnotes, usually written straight after the event. The follow-up interviews were eventually carried out during the second fieldwork period.

Finally, some discussion of the fieldnotes themselves is important. Rather than being simply a post-hoc account of what I did, my fieldnotes are a part of the
ethnographic product, becoming a platform for post-observation narrative and analysis of the data. Geertz (1973, p.19) describes the way an ethnographer “turns [something] from a passing event, which exists only in its own moment of occurrence, into an account, which exists in its inscription and can be reconsulted”. Fieldnotes are a record of moment-by-moment description and interpretation of different events, rather than a coherent account of the overall situation told with the benefit of hindsight. Choosing what to include required me to react both to what I had already observed and to what happened at the time. Such notes were written as soon as possible after an event, if not during the event itself. There were therefore practical difficulties involved in either writing whilst present in a situation, or being able to walk away and write up what had been observed.

A further pragmatic decision had to be made regarding language, since my fieldnotes were written in English, but described events involving interactions using elements of English, French, Bislama and vernaculars. I attempted to use a combination of short direct quotations in other languages and clear annotations about which languages were being used, although there were certain problems with this. In particular, I noted (fieldnotes 24/3/11) that, when I was surrounded by conversations predominantly in Bislama, for example when working at the end of the dormitory at Collège de Faranako, my attention would only be attracted when someone used French or English. In the case of the former, it was often too late to write down exactly what had been said, while I was more able to include a direct phrase in English in my notes. I wrote that I was concerned that I might skew my impression of how much English was used at Faranako, compared to French.

Emerson et al. (1995) describe the process of writing fieldnotes as moving from initial jottings, to writing these up, to processing the information, and finally to writing the ethnography. My notebooks contain a combination of little thoughts, quite detailed summaries, and more rigorous ‘observation notes’ taken, for example, during a lesson. I used different colours to separate original notes and later annotations of these notes, as well as to begin to identify certain things of interest. I also wrote summaries every seven to ten days. Finally, I started writing post-fieldwork memos on return to the UK, in which I continued to
document and develop my emerging thoughts and ideas in a similar way to that of my fieldnotes. The process was ongoing throughout, between, and after the two periods of fieldwork, and these notes, summaries and memos have very much formed the basis of the analysis and interpretation.

I have had to be selective in deciding which, and how much, ethnographic data to include in the written thesis. In some chapters, my own descriptions of the language use I observed have been employed predominantly to provide a stark contrast to my participants’ accounts of such language use, with interesting insights emerging from the discrepancy between these different versions. However, while interview data from the second fieldwork period may appear to have been prioritised in certain chapters, the three and a half months spent living in the two school communities during the first period certainly provide far more than a backdrop to this interview data. I have attempted to show throughout the thesis how linguistic practices that include the display of official notices and symbols, the scribbles of graffiti high up on dormitory walls, the interaction patterns used within classroom activities, and the interruption of school routine in order to ‘do Francophonie’ for the day interact with (and juxtapose) the discourses that are in circulation about these very same practices.

4.2.1.2 Questionnaires

I used a written questionnaire to investigate students’ ideas about language. This enabled me to elicit ideas from a wider number of student participants and in a less intimidating way than was possible through face-to-face discussions, which were easier to initiate with other adults. A preliminary English version of the questionnaire was piloted in advance via email with some ex-students, before being translated into French, and the French version checked via back translation. See appendix VII for the final questionnaires. The questionnaires were administered to each class of students at the end of a lesson or during a homework session. 211 out of 304 students at Angolovo College and 85 out of 89 students at Collège de Faranako completed the questionnaire.
4.2.1.3 Assessment of student language competence

A recurring comment I heard early on in the fieldwork was that Francophones learn English far more readily than Anglophones learn French. This came up so many times at both schools and with participants from outside the school communities that I wanted to get a sense of how true this was amongst my participants. With the help of the language teachers, I therefore devised some writing and speaking tests for the Year 10 students at both schools that enabled me to consider this issue.

The writing task contained two questions, one written in each language. Students were asked to write at least one paragraph for each question, answering in the language in which the question was written. The speaking task required students to speak without preparation for as long as they could, based on simple vocabulary items written on prompt cards that they selected at random. The first set of vocabulary items were written in the students’ L2, requiring them to speak in this language, before the task was repeated in L3.

One French teacher and I worked together to assess both speaking and writing at both schools. In order to compare two groups of students’ use of two different languages, we developed a simple set of descriptors based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), assigning levels from A1 to C2, (subdivided into sub-levels to suit our purposes). I do not claim any validity or reliability in terms of the instruments or the descriptors, but our procedure enabled us to talk about the students’ ability to write and speak at length about familiar topics in the two languages.

4.2.1.4 Collection of other background data

Finally, a collection of background data was collected, guided by a pragmatic principle of gathering as much as I could carry that might turn out to be relevant, without having the intention of analysing everything in depth. This became a set of data to dip into for triangulation purposes, as a way of contextualising what participants said. It included policy documents, historical papers, newspaper articles, job advertisements, religious texts, statistics from various sources, and photos of the area outside the schools. In some way, this data enabled a form of ‘validity check’ on participants’ explanations of language use. For example,
assertions that job advertisements ask for candidates to have competence in particular languages can be contextualised with a sample of such advertisements printed in the press; comments about the number of English-speaking and French-speaking tourists can be compared with visitor arrival statistics. Although no attempt is made to build in a positivist notion of validity, where impressions of language use (including my own) seem to differ from other measures or depictions of language use, an interesting issue arises of how my participants and I have come to have these impressions.

4.2.2 Fieldwork 2

I returned to the UK at the end of May 2011 with a large amount of data about the way language was used, learnt, taught, regulated and talked about at the two schools; with a series of fieldnotes and memos from which I could begin to identify themes of interest; and with a collection of official policy documents that appeared to contain some examples of the way language issues might intersect with other education policymaking concerns. As well as feeling some need to ‘tie together’ data gathered from the schools and from the Ministry, without creating a dichotomy between official policy and school practice, I was particularly interested in gauging participants’ reactions to the themes that I felt were of interest.

Language(s) appeared to be talked about in a number of different ways, by different people at different times, but also by the same people at almost the same time. I decided to conduct follow-up interviews with a variety of different participants (Anglophones and Francophones, students and teachers, school-based and Ministry-based employees), in which I could explore some of these different ways of talking about language(s) with reference to the key themes I had identified during Fieldwork 1. The interviews therefore enabled me to test out some of my ideas about which ideas were indeed relevant to participants, and sought to engage participants at all ‘data sources’ with topics that may have been raised by those at other ‘sources’ during Fieldwork 1.

4.2.2.1 Group interviews

Group interviews were carried out with two groups of teachers at Angolovo and one group at Faranako, and with one group of students at each school. A group
format was chosen in the hope that discussion of different viewpoints might occur. Attempts to interview students individually during previous research at Angolovo College (Willans, 2008) had produced stilted responses, so I was also hoping to engender a more relaxed atmosphere.

A question list (see appendix VIII) was given at the start of the interview and, having had time to read through the questions and check any unclear meaning, participants were asked to discuss their ideas together in whichever languages they wished. I sat just slightly to one side of the group throughout the main part of the discussion, joining in only if participants asked me to, or if I felt I needed to address any operational issues, such as asking participants to speak louder or to give reasons for their answers. Once the groups had covered the questions, I took a more active role, following up certain parts with further questions.

4.2.2.2 One-to-one interviews

I carried out one-to-one interviews with the two principals, the Director of Policy and Planning, the Director of Education Services, the Director of Basic Education, and the former Minister of Education (who had been Minister during some of the earlier period of fieldwork). These interviews were structured by the same question topics as for the group interviews, although the order in which these topics were covered was more flexible.

4.2.2.3 Design of interview questions

Following Krzyżanowski (2008), I drew up a list of ‘specific areas of inquiry’ to guide all interviews, which derived directly from the themes of interest from the first period of fieldwork:

1. The school language (in which the focus is on L2, rather than English and/or French in particular)
2. English and French (in which the focus is on the notion of “bilingualism”, a term frequently used in policy documents and recorded several times in my fieldnotes from Fieldwork 1)
3. English or French (in which the focus is on any difference between English and French, and/or between Anglophones and Francophones)
4. An appropriate education system for Vanuatu (in which the focus is on any links between language and other issues)

I then set out ‘area-specific questions’ (Krzyżanowski, 2008) and prompts that were used to engage the different participants in discussion about these areas. The questions put to each group of interviewees were phrased slightly differently (i.e. to be relevant to Anglophones or Francophones, to teachers or students, and so on), but all questions addressed the same topics (see Appendix VIII).

Rather than treating interviews as opportunities to gather objective information about a situation, I take the view that they are discursive events. Following Gubrium and Holstein (2001, p.14), an interview is seen as “an occasion for purposefully animated participants to construct versions of reality interactionally rather than merely purvey data”. The policy and language issues we talked about were thus constructed through our discourse. I was very much a part of this co-construction. Interviewees were not talking about topics that were necessarily important to them, and thus my questions forced certain issues into the discussion that would not have arisen during ‘normal’ conversation between the same participants. For example, an adult Anglophone who does not use French at all, but who tells me in an interview that French is essential for every ni-Vanuatu (as was frequently the case) may thus have constructed this need based on their awareness that I know it is an official language, or that I am also doing research at a Francophone school. I therefore try to remain reflexive about what I was told, based on the questions I asked, the relationship I held with each interviewee, prior conversations we had held, and other data I had collected.

4.3 Analytic procedure

4.3.1 Development of categories and tools

Within the overarching framework of DHA, a useful approach followed to ‘get into’ the data was that of Krzyżanowski (2008), who deals with analysis at two different textual levels:
(1) the general level of the key topics of discourse stratifying its contents and
(2) the in-depth level, which focuses on discourse elements such as rhetoric, different argumentation patterns and other means of linguistic realization supporting the key arguments (p.169).

The first level deals with the substantive content of the discourse, the things that were spoken and written about. Following the first period of fieldwork, I used NVivo software to code the range of topics within fieldnotes, policy documents and questionnaire answers. I used an open coding system, enabling the establishment of recurring themes, which then fed into the design of the interview guides. Following the second period of fieldwork, I used the same categories to code the interview data, although these were expanded and reshaped as necessary.

The second level of analysis deals principally with discourse strategies (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009) – the ways and means through which these things were spoken and written about (see Table 4.1). However, it was pointed out in 3.2.2 that the DHA requires categories and tools to be developed according to the nature of the specific problem under investigation. In this study, categories are needed that go beyond the linguistic aspects of discourse. As well as the words used within written and spoken texts, my ethnographic descriptions of the way language was being used, taught, learnt, regulated and talked about led me to focus on a range of ways in which the texts themselves were shaped. In keeping with the principles of DHA set out in 3.2.2, I therefore drew to varying extents on a range of other frameworks to make sense of the data.

My fieldnotes show that I was implicitly drawing on such additional frameworks during the data collection itself. For example, I wrote several comments during classroom observations about chorus answers, sequences of teacher-student-teacher turns, and teachers doing most of the ‘language work’ of lessons. I was clearly examining classroom interaction patterns in terms of what Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) introduced as the Initiation-Response-Feedback framework. At other times, I simply described something in my fieldnotes, without knowing whether it would be relevant, but then later analysed this piece of data using a framework that I had since identified as useful.
Various analytic frameworks thus shaped the description of my data in a fairly eclectic way. Following the fieldwork, it was helpful initially to draw on a single framework, which is why I followed the two-level approach taken within the DHA, and focused on discourse topics and strategies. This close attention to what was said, and how it was said, enabled me to approach the phenomenon of language policy according to four conceptualisations of language:

1. a symbol of appropriate behaviour within a school
2. a tool for learning within the classroom
3. a gateway to opportunities beyond school
4. a marker of national identity

These became the four thematic strands of the thesis. However, within each strand, I fleshed out the analysis using other frameworks. In the remaining two sections here, I therefore first discuss the framework of discourse strategies, which provides a robust set of questions to ask in the analysis of what is said and written within a specific text; I then set out a similar set of questions used in order to examine the way in which the texts themselves were shaped. In the actual analysis, I did not distinguish so crudely between the words themselves and everything else, but it seems logical to set out the primary framework used by DHA first, followed by my extension of this framework.

4.3.2 Discourse strategies

The five discourse strategies (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009) are nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivization, and intensification/mitigation. An overview of these strategies, the guiding questions posed by Reisigl and Wodak, and the linguistic devices through which they may be realised is presented in Table 4.1. The table also provides some examples from the data of this study, although this summary is not exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse strategies</th>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
<th>Linguistic devices, with examples from my analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Reisigl &amp; Wodak (2009, p.93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination strategies</td>
<td>How are referents named and referred to linguistically?</td>
<td>Naming of precepts and propositions, e.g. medium of instruction, second language, foreign language, official language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional anthroponyms, e.g. teachers, students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnolinguistic anthroponyms, e.g. Anglophones, Francophones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Synecdoche, e.g. Government, Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deictics, e.g. I, we (inclusive/exclusive variants in Bislama), you, they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Semantic role, e.g. agent, experiencer of language difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Suppression: no nomination within the text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predication strategies</td>
<td>What characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to the referents?</td>
<td>Metaphors of teaching, e.g. transferring knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metalinguistic metaphors, e.g. tool for learning, door to opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit predicative adjectives, e.g. hard-working, strong, weak, smart (students), easy, hard,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors, languages, and other processes or phenomena</td>
<td>complicated, useful, living, chaotic, (un)sophisticated (languages)</td>
<td>Explicit comparisons between contexts, social actors, and languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Argumentation strategies (Persuading addressees of the truth and normative rightness of claims) | What arguments are employed? (see Table 4.3 for a full list of the specific topoi used here) | Claims that teachers can or should use and allow L1 in the classroom (based on the rationale that students struggle with L2, and following the topos of *successful learning*)

Claims that L2 should be used as much as possible, and L1 should be used as little as possible (based on the rationale that L2 is the medium of instruction, and following the topos of *successful learning*, in conjunction with the topoi of *target language* and *interference*)

Claims that Francophones can pick up English (L3) very easily (based on the rationale that Bislama and English share lexical similarities, and following the topos of *positive transfer*)

Claims that Bislama should not be used in the classroom (based on the rationale that it has an underdeveloped vocabulary and is rapidly changing, and following the topos of *linguistic adequacy*)

Claims that both English and French are important to learn (based on the rationale that these languages are needed for jobs, scholarships, mobility and wider communication, and following the topos of *international languages*, and its extension to the topos of *double opportunity*)

Claims that English/French 'bilingualism' should be encouraged (based on the rationale that the duplication and need for translation arising from the current dual-medium system are inefficient and costly, and at the same time that there are unequal opportunities for Francophones, and following the topos of *efficiency and equality*)
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Claims that both English and French are an essential part of being ni-Vanuatu (based on the rationale that they are no longer colonial languages, that these languages have been spoken for a long time in the land, that they unite all ni-Vanuatu, and that Vanuatu is the only country in the Pacific to use both languages, and following the topoi of *postcolonial national identity, traditional national identity, united national identity* and *unique national identity*).

Claims that both English and French must be retained in Vanuatu (based on the rationale that French is less commonly used, and following the topos of *heritage*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspectivization strategies (Positioning speakers’ or writers’ points of view and expressing involvement or distance)</th>
<th>From what perspective are these nominations, attributions and arguments expressed?</th>
<th>Overt use of personal opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to (shared) professional experience as a teacher or student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anecdote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported speech or indirect reference to others’ claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissal of an utterance made by an interlocutor, or of a topic under discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensification/Mitigation strategies (Modifying the illocutionary force of utterances in respect of their epistemic or deontic status)</th>
<th>Are the respective utterances articulated overtly; are they intensified or mitigated?</th>
<th>Deontic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concession clauses to mitigate strength of statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hyperbole or repetition to intensify strength of statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epistemic:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hedging language or concession clauses to mitigate certainty about a statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This framework enabled me to approach my data with a sense of the type of phenomena I might find, such as certain ways in which speakers may intensify or mitigate the force with which they make a claim. However, I did not examine the occurrence of each and every potential discourse strategy within the data, focusing only on those that gave insights into ideological and implementational spaces for policy change.

4.3.3 Extending the framework beyond discourse strategies

Although the DHA has generally prioritised analysis of the words themselves, the problem-oriented nature of the approach, along with its commitment to historical analysis, means that the lens must be widened to take into account other aspects of the social action through which texts and discourses come into being. Much CDA work has also shifted its attention “beyond language, taking on board that discourses are often multimodally realized” (Van Leeuwen, 2006, p.292) so, although the majority of DHA studies have not paid explicit attention to the non-linguistic aspects of discourse, this element is not incompatible. My analytic procedure thus also included asking questions about how texts were shaped.

Table 4.2 sets out what I refer to here as ‘text-shaping moves’, along with the questions I paid attention to, and some examples of the devices through which these moves were realised.
Table 4.2 Text-shaping moves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text-shaping moves</th>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
<th>Devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction moves</td>
<td>How is the text (co-)produced within social interaction?</td>
<td>Taking or relinquishing ‘the floor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Setting out expectations for who can speak to whom (e.g. asking students to work in groups, or maintaining whole class interaction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance strategies through which interaction could be minimised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code moves</td>
<td>What codes can be identified within a text? How many are used? How do these codes pattern together?</td>
<td>The presence of one or more languages within a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear separation between codes, or the fluid use of features from different codes, within a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralinguistic moves</td>
<td>What non-linguistic features accompany the linguistic features within the production of a spoken text?</td>
<td>Hesitation, changes of volume, or the use of gestures within the production of a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual moves</td>
<td>What non-linguistic features accompany the linguistic features within a written text?</td>
<td>Shape, colour, size, layout of texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locational moves</td>
<td>Where do activities, rules, norms apply or take place? Where are texts and social actors located?</td>
<td>The physical location of school rules and notices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spaces within schools to which the rules apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity of the teacher within a group activity in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal moves</td>
<td>When do activities, rules, norms apply or take place? What time constraints are posed?</td>
<td>Frequency of public reminders about the use of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Times of day to which the rules apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These text-shaping moves helped me to examine a number of other aspects that work alongside (or in apparent contradiction to) the strictly linguistic elements of the discourse. Paying attention to these non-verbal aspects, as Blommaert (2012, p.7) notes, “compel[s] us towards historicizing sociolinguistic analysis”, given that any discourse is a social activity (and any physical space is
a social space) that has come into being through a history of semiotic activity. Paying attention to interaction, code, paralinguistic, visual, locational and temporal moves provides additional categories through which I can begin to understand how the object of study – here, language policy – is “the outcome of historical processes of becoming” (Blommaert, 2012, p.16). Attention to such aspects thus provides one procedure through which the sense of history (Blommaert, 2005a) can be incorporated within DHA.

4.3.4 Making connections within and beyond the data

Having identified what was said and how it was said, the next step was to draw connections between the topics, strategies and moves, in order to “locate varying contexts and areas in which different issues become prominent and different experiences are gathered (at the ‘real-life level’)” (Krzyżanowski, 2008 p.175). I needed to build up an understanding of how the very small observations I had made fed into and were bound up in the policy network, as an attempt to interpret the claims made about language(s) with reference to the complex phenomenon of policy.

One aspect of this work was to draw connections between the different parts of the data set itself. Again, NVivo was helpful in keeping track of the way similar topics were dealt with in data associated with different participants (e.g. teachers and students), in different groups (e.g. Anglophones and Francophones), at different locations (e.g. at the Ministry of Education and on Ambae), and in different types of text (e.g. policy documents and interviews). This also enabled me to see connections between different discourse topics. For example, I could see that the discourse topic of ‘learning both English and French’ was linked both to ‘economic opportunities’ and to ‘feelings of pride and regret’, and I began to see patterns across the interview data in the way arguments invoking the latter would often be reformulated in terms of the former. As well as helping me organise the ‘overall story’ into the four thematic strands identified above, such connections gave me insights into potential spaces for change (as well as the lack thereof).

A more important aspect of this work was to draw connections with topics and discourses beyond my immediate data set, in order to identify where some of
these ideas and arguments were coming from. This interest stems from awareness I built up through my fieldnotes that all participants were doing and saying what seemed perfectly rational, which seemed to go against my reasons for starting out on the research in the first place. I wrote the following memo shortly after returning from the second period of fieldwork (20/12/11):

**Extract 4.1**

*It has really struck me how much sense everyone has made in every interview – students, teachers, principals and MoE officials all seem to be saying something that sounds rational, well thought out, relevant etc. I also saw fantastic teaching from all teachers, apart from possibly in language subjects.*

*So why do I have a picture of utter chaos and why is it so easy to ridicule what's going on?*

- What seems strange to outsiders has come to be normal? e.g. Sending some children to each school for the collective good of the family.
- Everybody talking sense but different sense at different times? Particularly at the Ministry, individuals seem to draw on own personal thinking and personal experience. There is no commitment to a party line, despite the fact that many employees have been there for a very long time.

In this memo, I suggest two possible explanations to account for why I started out looking at contestation, but found that everybody seemed to be doing something rational. The first is that my ability to consider the ‘big picture’ (as I did when I started the research) provides a different version of events to what I see when I come back into the everyday realities of school and look at much smaller parts of the whole. This links to Bourdieu’s (1990) ‘logic of practice’, in which he notes the need to separate the analyst’s and the practitioner’s views of practice, given the totality implied by the work of the former. Individual teachers, policymakers, and so on, will never address the ‘whole’ within a single instance, even if they do address each part of the whole at different points in time. In order to avoid the analytic totality that I have access to, I need to keep remembering the operation of individual parts. (I also note that my outsider perspective complicates my view. See 4.4.1).

The second explanation I give is that my participants make sense of different aspects of what we talked about in different ways, without there necessarily being a conflict of interests. Recent work on identity would argue that “people
do orient towards entirely different logics in different segments of life” (Blommaert & Varis, 2011, p.2). As Blommaert and Varis note:

An individual life-project so becomes a dynamic (i.e. perpetually adjustable) complex of micro-hegemonies within which subjects situate their practices and behavior. Such complexes – we can call them a ‘repertoire’ – are not chaotic, and people often are not at all ‘confused’ or ‘ambivalent’ about their choices, nor appear to be ‘caught between’ different cultures or ‘contradict themselves’ when speaking about different topics. The complex of micro-hegemonies just provides a different type of order, a complex order composed of different niches of ordered behavior and discourses about behavior. (p.3)

I therefore try to put aside my original perceptions of ‘chaos’ and look, instead, at what is logical. I examine participants’ arguments with the assumption that they base these on what they consider to be rational in that instance. I can later look at points of conflict that may occur between the different ‘logics’, but I try to postpone this interest in contradiction. Consideration of each of intertextuality, interdiscursivity, recontextualisation and topoi enables me to do this. Each of these elements will be introduced briefly here.

Intertextuality can be defined as the links between different texts, which may include reference within one text to the topic of another, or elements within one text that purport to report on what was said in another (Wodak, 2008, p.3). For example, Vanuatu education strategies make reference to earlier texts, such as the constitution or education acts, but also to contemporary texts such as those of supranational agencies. Texts may include direct quotations from other sources, citations of evidence such as from international research, and reference to summits at which policy was discussed.

Interdiscursivity can be defined as the links between discourses (Blommaert, 2005a), or “the presence or trace of one discourse within another” (C. Lewis & Ketter, 2011, p.129, drawing on Fairclough, 1992). For example, the current widespread global discourse of ‘Education for All’ (UNESCO, 1990, 2000) reveals the presence of a discourse of human rights that is prevalent in a number of other contemporary discourses, as well a discourse of education for economic development, associated with early language planning attempts. Identifying such traces gives me an indication of the wider discourses to which
participants have been exposed, and thus insights into how their viewpoints may be being shaped as one aspect of the production and reproduction of language policy.

A process that helps ground and make sense of the identification of these intertextual and interdiscursive links is recontextualisation. This is defined by Fairclough (2003, p.222, drawing on Bernstein, 1990) as “a matter of how elements of one social practice are appropriated by, relocated in the context of, another”. Wodak (2008, p.3) considers this a form of intertextuality, as it is the “transfer of main arguments from one text into the next ... restating it in a new context”. The key variable is the new context in which the argument is relocated, “thus adding new metapragmatic frames to the text” (Blommaert, 2005a, p.254). Blackledge (2005, pp.12-13) demonstrates the potential effects of this process, examining the way discourse can gain power and legitimacy as arguments are transformed in increasingly authoritative settings along chains of discourse until they become non-negotiable. Thus, looking out for similar chains of discourse enables me to look at how directives about language in Vanuatu’s schools have been recontextualised from official Ministry of Education guidelines to school rules to everyday policing practices.

Topoi are means of argumentation that often take prominence in DHA analyses. They can be defined as “generally used and generally accepted arguments, also called commonplaces” (Wodak & Krzyżanowski, 2008, p.208). Their three key features are that they are the “conclusion rules” that are used to explain or justify arguments made; that they draw on “common sense reasoning”; and that they have “occurred elsewhere” (Blackledge, 2005, p.67-8). This usage follows the work of Wodak and others (e.g. Wodak & Meyer, 2001, following Kienpointner, 1992). The identification of such common sense argumentation enables me to consider how my participants seemed to put forward coherent arguments that either drew explicitly on what had been said in other contexts, or that were familiar to me from elsewhere.

The process by which I have identified topoi is inductive, based on justifications given for arguments within the data. I examine claims that appear to be logically connected back to some evidence or rationale, and consider whether the
A conclusion rule that makes this connection is recognisable as having occurred elsewhere, as represented in Figure 4.1.

![Diagram of different topoi]

Teachers referred frequently to students struggling to learn through L2, which is labelled as the evidence or rationale in Figure 4.1. However, a number of different claims were made by participants in reaction to this same concern, three of which are included in the diagram. The first claim, that L1 should be used alongside L2, was used by teachers in arguing that they had to do whatever they could to ensure that the students could understand. They appeared to draw on the common sense reasoning that it was their duty, as teachers, to ensure that learning took place, and this is a conclusion rule recognisable from specific contexts such as teacher training or development, as well as general contexts such as media or public discourse about the duty of teachers and schools. However, this logic is in a certain amount of tension with the second and third claims, that L2 should be used as much as possible, and that L1 should be used as little as possible, in attempt to improve students’
These claims resonate with longstanding issues within the field of Second Language Acquisition about exposure to the target language, and interference, or negative transfer (Sharwood Smith, 1994). The teachers may or may not be aware of these as SLA perspectives, but they appear to be making reasoned arguments that draw on the same principles.

The identification of topoi enables me to focus on what ‘conclusion rules’ are employed by the different participants, and where else these arguments have been made, in order to see the extent to which arguments (or conflicts between different arguments) may be closing down ideological and implementational spaces for alternative practices. Table 4.3 lists the different topoi that are identified within the data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim or argument made in the data</th>
<th>Rationale given for this argument</th>
<th>Topos that links the argument to the rationale</th>
<th>Other contexts in which this topos can be identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only L2 (and/or) L3 should be used in the classroom.</td>
<td>L2 (and/or L3) is the language in which books and exams are written.</td>
<td><em>Successful learning:</em> If learning and teaching are the expected activities in a context (e.g. a school), then learning and teaching must actually be taking place.</td>
<td>Used with reference to any kind of teaching context (typical of the discourse of teacher education texts, policy texts, professional discourse within school contexts, and public discourse about education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is sometimes necessary to use L1 in the classroom in order to ensure understanding.</td>
<td>Students often struggle to learn through L2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It doesn’t matter which language is used as long as learning is successful.</td>
<td>Language is just a tool through which knowledge can be transmitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Topos</td>
<td>Other contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 should be used at all times in school.</td>
<td>Students need to be able to understand and express themselves in L2 (particularly since this is the medium of instruction).</td>
<td><strong>Target language:</strong> If a high level of competence is needed in a language, it is important to use this language as much as possible.</td>
<td>Language teaching contexts (particularly those influenced by the principles of Communicative Language Teaching) Language teaching contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 should not be used at all in school.</td>
<td>Students need to speak the 'correct' version of L2.</td>
<td><strong>Interference:</strong> If a new language needs to be learnt, the use of other languages will impede this process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bislama should not be used at all in (particularly Anglophone) schools.</td>
<td>Bislama and English share many lexical similarities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Typical of discourses specifically about pidgins and creoles, in which “L1” has lexical similarities to “L2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francophones can pick up English very easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discourses about certain languages being easier to learn than others, based on similarities with L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Topos</td>
<td>Other contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bislama cannot be used for teaching.</td>
<td>Bislama has a limited range of lexical items.</td>
<td><em>Linguistic adequacy</em>: A language must have a sufficiently developed and stable lexical range before it can be used for teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Discourses about stigmatised linguistic varieties, such as pidgins, creoles and minority dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bislama does not have direct lexical equivalents of all English (and French) words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The lexical stock of Bislama is constantly changing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vanuatu government should create more opportunities for Francophones.</td>
<td>Francophones currently have fewer opportunities than Anglophones to find jobs or scholarships, and there is no regional Francophone curriculum for senior secondary students.</td>
<td><em>Equality</em>: A service that is provided for citizens must be available equally to all citizens.</td>
<td>Discourses of democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of the South Pacific and South Pacific Board of Education &amp; Assessment should cater for Francophones as well as Anglophones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Topos</td>
<td>Other contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages such as English and French should be learnt.</td>
<td>Languages such as English and French are needed for jobs, scholarships, mobility and wider communication.</td>
<td><em>International languages</em>: If certain languages are considered to open up opportunities that cannot be accessed without knowledge of these languages, they should be learnt.</td>
<td>Instrumental discourses of language learning for greater economic opportunities and mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and French are important to learn.</td>
<td>English is used for some jobs, scholarships, mobility and communication opportunities, while French is used for others.</td>
<td><em>Double opportunity</em>: if one element provides opportunities, then two such elements must provide twice these opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/French ‘bilingualism’ should be encouraged to avoid the need for translation and duplication.</td>
<td>The current dual-medium system is inefficient and costly, due to duplications in training, materials and personnel, the complexities of teacher postings, and the need for translation.</td>
<td><em>Efficiency</em>: If actions reduce cost and inefficiency, these measures should be taken.</td>
<td>Typical of discourse in management and economics (prevalent in Structural Adjustment programmes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Topos</td>
<td>Other contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional languages and cultures must be preserved.</td>
<td>Traditional languages and cultures have existed in the islands that are now Vanuatu since they were first populated.</td>
<td><em>Heritage</em>: If something has historical value, then it must be retained.</td>
<td>Discourses of endangered cultures and languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and French must be preserved.</td>
<td>English and French have a long history in Vanuatu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking both English and French is a part of a ni-Vanuatu identity.</td>
<td>English and French are no longer colonial languages.</td>
<td><em>Postcolonial national identity</em>: If a nation exists, it must be different from any previous (colonial) condition in which it was not recognised as a nation.</td>
<td>Discourses typical of emerging new nations, or nations that need to re-establish the values and attributes considered important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanuatu is the only country in the Pacific to use both English and French.</td>
<td><em>Unique national identity</em>: If a nation exists, it must be different from other nations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English and French have been spoken for a long time in the land.</td>
<td><em>Traditional national identity</em>: If a nation exists, it must have historical foundations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English and French unite all ni-Vanuatu.</td>
<td><em>United national identity</em>: If a nation exists, its people must be united as a common people of that nation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 My position in the research and in the thesis

I have already outlined the extent to which I was known to participants, both on Ambae and at the Ministry of Education. It is likely that they will have held perceptions about who I was and what I represented, which may have affected the way they reacted towards me, answered my questions, and so on. Most obviously, I am white, and therefore stand out as a foreigner, albeit one who has spent a lot of time on Ambae. I am also English-speaking, British, Anglican, and a former teacher of English at Angolovo College, all of which might have marked me out as being associated with one ‘side’ of the research problem. I cannot change this, and can only attempt to be reflexive about any issues arising from who I am. At the same time, I consider any reactions to these factors to be revealing of the extent to which they were important. Below I discuss the extent to which each factor appeared significant.

4.4.1 My foreigner problem?

There were certainly times when students, in particular, drew attention to my foreignness. For example, one evening at Collège de Faranako, I was drawing water from the school well when a girl left the classroom in which she was supposed to be doing her homework, because she wanted to check that I had been able to get enough water. She was being helpful, but managed to make it clear that she didn’t think I could manage by myself, thereby highlighting my outsider-ness. In terms of my work, however, it is hard to separate being a foreigner from being a researcher, since the latter is not a role that the school participants were particularly familiar with. Research in Melanesia has a far longer association with Western than local interests, as summarised by Tonkinson (2011). The combination of what I looked like and what I was doing doubly marked me out as an outsider.

There has long been a question of whether an ‘outsider’ to a context can gain understanding of the culture under study. One way to deal with this issue is with the logic that “an inside view is not the only view and that there is no single inside view, anymore than there can be a single outside one” (Wolcott, 1995, p.131). The researcher’s version of what is happening does not represent some kind of ‘reality’; it can only be considered one of many possible interpretations.
Indeed, my prior experience in my context gives me a slightly different ‘view’ from one I might have had if beginning fieldwork in a new place.

Canagarajah (2006) also notes a problem created by the traditional ethnographic attempt to prioritise the ‘insider view’ as the correct way of understanding. He gives an example of local preferences that might exist for discarding traditional languages in favour of those associated with economic mobility and asks, “should the ethnographer simply validate these views in the interest of articulating the native perspective?” (p.163). A similar issue in my study is the denigration of Bislama as a language, which is a position that I do not want to validate. Canagarajah’s solution is for researchers to “move beyond passively listening to the local informant [to] conduct a reflexive rethinking of their own and the informant’s positions”, enabling both parties “to interrogate conflicting viewpoints on language relationships from a macro-social perspective” (p.164). I consider that recognising the negative perceptions of the language held by ‘insiders’, without necessarily validating them, is a necessary step in working out whether or to what extent Bislama might play a part in education.

4.4.2 My Anglophone problem?

Two concerns here were whether I would be perceived as ‘on the English side’ (i.e. potentially anti French), and whether I would have sufficient competence in French, which is for me a foreign language.

Although concerned initially about being identified as English-speaking, I felt that my position as a researcher in this particular study actually created a different role for me than I had expected. I was an Anglophone who was interested in French or, for some people, an Anglophone who spoke French. For example, the principal of Collège de Faranako complimented me on the French I had used in letters I had written prior to the fieldwork and when introducing myself to the students, saying explicitly “blong wan Anglophone i yusum French” [for an Anglophone to use French] (fieldnotes 2/3/11; 17/3/11). Similarly, the French teacher at Angolovo asked me to teach a Year 11 French class. She wanted to use me as an example of an Anglophone who speaks French, to encourage her students that it was possible (5/5/11). Despite me
having to do very little to actually prove this competence in French, I was constantly told that it was surprising or good that someone like me ‘knew’ French.

Regardless of the way I was perceived, my actual language competence did have some effect on the way I conducted the research. I am a native speaker of English, I am a near-fluent speaker of Bislama, and I am an intermediate-level speaker of French. Although I have studied Pacific Linguistics, and therefore have a good understanding of the structure and typology of the vernaculars of Vanuatu, I do not speak either of the languages of Ambae. I felt confident introducing my research and explaining questionnaires to students in the medium of instruction at each school, but I was concerned that my French would not be sufficient for talking about a range of less predictable topics outside the classroom. I worried that my competence might affect participants’ language choice in reaction, and I did not want Francophones to switch from French to Bislama for my benefit.

However, as will be outlined in Chapter 5, Bislama dominated spoken interaction at both schools, apart from in the classroom and in official situations. It therefore seemed appropriate that I used Bislama for much of the time at both schools, and I conducted all interviews in this language. I also found few difficulties in understanding the French of the Francophone teachers when observing lessons. In fact, Extract 4.2 from my fieldnotes demonstrates an advantage I felt I gained by having a less than perfect knowledge of French:

**Extract 4.2**

10.55: I’ve been in class since about 8.00 listening to French and trying to write notes. I’ve learnt about force and pressure, grammatical agreement of French subjects and verbs, the Holy Trinity, and breeds of cattle. I’m zoning out, possibly after not enough sleep. Tells me what it’s like to be a student as the French is easy to understand if I force myself to focus but it’s v. easy to let it wash over me. (17/3/11)

I realised that I was gaining an understanding of what is like to learn through an L2, which I hadn’t fully appreciated whilst teaching at Angolovo College. I was an adult who already knew much of what students were learning for the first time, and I had a vested interest in concentrating as hard as I could for the
purpose of my research. Even in this situation, and even when there were few occasions on which I felt I lacked vocabulary, I still found it incredibly tiring to focus on understanding what the teachers were saying for such a long period of time and about so many different subjects in succession.

4.4.3 My British problem?

Strangers would often assume I was from Australia or New Zealand. The only reaction to finding out that I was British was usually that I had come from further away than expected. Throughout my fieldnotes, I recorded only three instances in which Britishness was explicitly mentioned. The first occurred near Collège de Faranako:

Extract 4.3

En route to the store, an olfala sitting outside his house called out to me and wanted to know whether I spoke English or French, and then where I was from. He told me all about meeting the Queen in 1974 and shaking hands with her on the 200 year anniversary of Captain Cook’s arrival. (23/3/11)

In the second, an Anglophone teacher revealed his opinion that British standards of education had been high, although he had actually been born after Independence:

Extract 4.4

Mr Anton said today that he was proud to have been educated at the former British primary school at Sarakata and then Malapoa (originally called British Secondary School), making specific ref to British education. (23/3/11)

In the third reference, from an episode in an interview, another Anglophone teacher explains that she thinks English is more widely spoken than French, since there were more areas colonised by the British. On this occasion, she reveals a negative association with Britain, and draws attention to the fact that this is where I am from:

Extract 4.5

Like we know English through (.). like (.). <turns to me> no offence (.). British colonising Vanuatu.

From these examples, it can be seen that my Britishness triggered a number of different reactions. Unlike my interest in French, discussed in 4.4.2, there was
no consistent theme that emerged here, and I did not feel that any particular issue was caused within my research.

4.4.4 My Anglican problem?
Religion appeared to raise no issue at all. Angolovo College is an Anglican school, while Collège de Faranako is Catholic. However, 44% of students at the former were a denomination other than Anglican, while 47% of those at the latter were a denomination other than Catholic (all were listed as belonging to some Christian denomination). I attended Church services at both schools and, while non-attendance might have marked me out in some way, I do not believe that the specific denomination created any issue. Indeed, the Catholic priest responsible for the community in which Collège de Faranako is situated was always one of the more eager community members to *storian* with me about language and education issues, and he was keen to point out that English and French were not tied to being Anglican and Catholic. He insisted that he was a ‘bilingual’ Catholic (by which he means knowing both English and French), rather than ‘Francophone’ (fieldnotes 17/3/11).

4.4.5 My (English) teacher problem?
A benefit of my previous role as a teacher was that my interest in education made sense to participants. It was easier to explain that I was asking about language(s) because of the relevance for education policy, rather than simply out of curiosity. My background also meant that I was very familiar with both one of the schools and the (Anglophone stream of the) education system, thus making me more of an ‘insider’ than I might otherwise have been.

The fact I had previously taught English, in particular, might have positioned me ‘in favour of’ this language, potentially influencing participants’ voicing of opinions about language. Whilst collecting the data, I did not feel any sense of this from any of my participants, and this has been something I have been more aware of whilst writing the thesis. For example, when writing about the two school languages together, I have decided to be consistent in writing ‘English and French’ rather than ‘French and English’. I am aware that my interpretations may be read as those of an ‘Anglophone’. However, as the research has
progressed, it has become less about English versus French, and more about their co-existence.

4.4.6 Making use of the ‘problems’

As Hymes (1996, p.13) notes, “since partiality cannot be avoided, the only solution is to face up to it, to compensate for it as much as possible, to allow for it in interpretation”. The impact of the researcher on what is observed is not necessarily disadvantageous, however. As Emerson et al. (1995, p.3) state, “relationships between the field researcher and people in the setting do not so much disrupt or alter ongoing patterns of social interaction as reveal the terms and bases on which people form social ties in the first place”. Through understanding the way participants react to my presence – as a foreigner, as a teacher, as an Anglophone, and so on – I can begin to uncover several aspects of the way language(s) are conceptualised. For example, the following incident was recorded in my fieldnotes:

**Extract 4.6**

*Heard one student outside a classroom at break time call out “stop speaking in Bislama” [in English] at another student inside the class. This is the first time I’ve heard any such directive from either a student or a teacher. He was definitely speaking in a jokey way and I assume it was purely for my benefit as I walked past. (11/3/11)*

I am in no doubt that this student was reacting to my proximity, rather than doing what he would have done ‘naturally’. However, this tells me something about the way students believe they are expected to behave, and about the way adults or teachers may influence students’ language use, as much as it interrupts the activity. It gives me an insight into the regulation of language at Angolovo College.

It is rarely possible to be so sure of the extent to which my presence affected an interaction. However, since I have previously taught at one of the schools, I had some knowledge of the dynamics of an ‘unresearched’ situation. I also sometimes asked participants whether something I had observed had seemed usual. For example, when language policy was an item on the agenda at an Angolovo College staff meeting, I asked whether my presence had influenced this. The principal laughed and said that my research had made him think about
language while he had been writing the agenda, but that he would normally include the item anyway at the start of the year. From my previous experience, I believe this is true.

A further consideration in this particular case study is the effect created by me physically moving between the Anglophone and Francophone schools. This became advantageous since it provided a topic of discussion through which participants talked about the dual-language system, their opinions of members of the other school community, and their attitudes towards the two European languages. This provided more natural starting points for discussions than decontextualised questions about English and French. However, if I had been carrying out fieldwork at one site only, it is possible that the other school or L3 would not have been mentioned at all in informal conversations, and opinions would only have been elicited through direct questioning.

4.4.7 Ethics

I have tried hard throughout to ensure that my participants have understood exactly what participation involves for them, both at the time, and after the event. There are a number of issues that arose.

The first was ensuring that participants who gave consent to use their data appreciated how far it would ‘travel’, via international conferences and, particularly, through publications accessible on the Internet. When I explained to school participants that people at both the Vanuatu Ministry of Education and the University of the South Pacific had read a paper that I had published from my previous school research in Vanuatu, without me sending it to them, they were very surprised. I believe they had understood my request to carry out research to mean that I would use their data in order to complete my PhD, but had not understood the nature of the academic community in which I would also participate. In particular, I felt they had thought I would take their data ‘back to England’, at which point it was far enough away that it didn’t matter. Having realised this, I spent a lot of time explaining exactly what I meant by asking to
take a photograph or write down participants’ opinions and words. See Appendix IV for a copy of the information posters I made use of to do this.

A second issue relating to consent was fulfilling university requirements to obtain signed consent forms, while ensuring that I really was being given consent. On quite a few occasions, potential participants would tell me in advance that they were willing to take part, but then would fail to turn up at the appointed time. Regardless of whether I thought they had forgotten or been held up for some reason, I made a point of never trying to find them or asking them later why they had not come. I decided that their physical presence was a far more reliable method of judging willingness to participate than the signing of a form. For this reason, I made sure that we dealt with formalities regarding consent at least the day before any interview or classroom observation.

The final issue has been my inability to hide the identity of the two case study schools. There are only 57 Anglophone secondary schools and 27 Francophone secondary schools in the whole country, and the only way to ensure anonymity would be to give no contextual detail at all about the schools or their locations. As soon as I give information about the age range of pupils, the number of vernaculars spoken on the island, and the religious affiliation of each school, their identity is immediately obvious. The people from whom it might be considered most necessary to protect schools’ identities are those at the Ministry of Education. However, given that I am known to many employees there, and it is well known which school I used to teach at, my own name on the thesis is just as likely to reveal the identities of the schools.

For this reason, and with full permission from the principal and teachers of the two schools, I have chosen to be explicit about the location of the two schools, so that I am able to give this type of contextual information which is so relevant to the way language(s) are talked about. The individual identities of all students are anonymised (where individual interviewees are referred to, names beginning with ‘A’ and ‘F’ have been chosen for students at Angolovo and Faranako, respectively. The names of teachers are never used (pseudonyms beginning with either ‘A’ or ‘F’, and prefixed by Mr, Mrs, Miss, Mme or Mlle have
been used⁶, but there are some occasions on which I have referred to, for example, ‘the French teacher’ or ‘a teacher at the Anglophone school who was educated in the Francophone system’, thus making it possible to trace their identities. For the same reason, holders of unique positions such as the principal of each school, as well as holders of specific posts at the Ministry of Education, can easily be identified. However, despite these concerns, I am confident that the data I present is not of a sensitive nature, and does not implicate any participants, professionally or otherwise.

4.4.8 Representations of different ‘languages’

Interview transcripts can be found in Appendices XI-XXI. As the principal language used for all interviews was Bislama, albeit incorporating elements of English and/or French, two versions of each transcript are given: the first is a representation of the original words that were spoken (labelled with uppercase Roman numerals), while the second is an English translation (labelled with the corresponding lowercase numerals). Thus, the reference (XI:170-5/xi:159-63) after an extract in the main body indicates that the extract comes from lines 170-5 in the original version of the Angolovo Student interview (Appendix XI), and that its translation can be found in lines 159-63 of Appendix xi.

The transcripts are understood to be representations that are neither natural nor objective (Roberts, 1997), so I try to make explicit the decisions I have taken in their composition. A particular issue I have faced is deciding whether to represent a phrase, word or morpheme as ‘Bislama’ or ‘English’, given the lexical similarities between the languages. Blackledge and Creese’s (2010) solution is to use the same font for the transcription of resources from all languages, thereby avoiding such boundaries. However, the practical task remains of choosing which orthography to use, since different orthographic systems are used in Standard Bislama and Standard English. Attempts to establish consistent ‘rules’ to determine when I will write one phrase as Bislama and another as English appear to resist the very essence that ‘flexible

⁶ It is common practice for teachers to be referred to by their title and first name, e.g. Miss Agnes, Mr Felix.
bilingualism’ encompasses. I discuss some of the choices available and their implications in a conference paper (Willans, 2012), included in Appendix XXII.
5 Language as the emblem of a school

5.1 Introduction

This chapter considers how language contributes to the construction of appropriate school behaviour, enabling students and teachers to act as members of that school. It examines the way one language is constructed as appropriate at each school – English at Angolovo College and French at Collège de Faranako – through the existence of publicly displayed school rules, a range of practices that demonstrate the idealisation of L2 only, and the construction of a far more draconian version of rules and punishment than is really the case. However, it will be suggested that, despite this construction of a strictly-enforced policy, brief displays of L2 appear to suffice in enacting institutionally appropriate behaviour without interrupting the heteroglossic flow of daily life.

5.2 Policy on the noticeboards

5.2.1 The existence of school language rules

Both schools include a section on language in their school rules, integrated with other aspects of behaviour. These rules were displayed on the school noticeboards. The relevant extract from each set is highlighted in Extract 5.1 and Extract 5.2.

---

7 The words themselves will be discussed in detail in 5.2.2, at which point a translation of Extract 5.2 will be given.
Extract 5.1 from Angolovo College rules

2 LANGUAGE
   a) Foul languages are not allowed in the College at any time.
   b) English and French and any other approved languages are the only approved languages are the only languages allowed to be used during school terms, in the College compound.
   c) Vernacular languages or Bislama may be used during the holidays, cultural activities, when authorized by the College for special purposes and when conversing with outsiders.
   d) Bislama is not allowed at all times, except when conversing with outsiders and during concerts only.

3 FIGHTING OR BULLYING OTHERS IN THE COLLEGE
   a) Fighting or bullying other students and use of inappropriate gesture to others in the College is not allowed. Anyone who fails to comply with this rule will be dealt with seriously.
   b) Paragraph 3.1.(above) also applies to threats – that is any intentional attempt to hurt another student, whether it be by foul language as in paragraph 2.1 or physically using dangerous items.
   c) No student shall threatened, insult, abuse or injure any member of the College Community or visitors to the College.
   d) Students are not allowed to involve outsiders in matters that will put student's security at

Extract 5.2 from Collège de Faranako rules

4.6 L'étude supplémentaire pendant le week-end et pendant l'heure de la sieste est autorisée.

5. La langue de communication
   5.1 Pendant les journées de classe, les élèves s'expriment en français de 8h30 à 12h30, de 13h15 à 15h30 ainsi que pendant les heures d'étude.
   5.2 Pendant les heures non-mentionnées ci-dessus et pendant les week-ends les élèves peuvent se communiquer dans les autres langues de leurs choix.
   5.3 La communication entre les élèves et les professeurs ne se feront uniquement qu'en français sauf à la réclame d'un professeur.
   5.4 Pendant les périodes d'études, dans des situations difficiles, la communication peut se faire en bilingue.

6. La formation spirituelle
   6.1 Tout élève est obligé de participer à la prière.
   6.2 La visite à l'église est liée à chaque.
   6.3 Les prières personnelles sont encouragées.

7. Les scolarités
   7.1 Elles varient d'une année à l'autre suivant la situation de l'établissement en fonction de ses besoins.
   7.2 La scolarité ne comprend les autres frais.
   7.3 Tout élève doit se présenter avec ses droits de scolarités le jour où il arrive à l'établissement.
   7.4 Les frais de scolarités peuvent se régler de différentes manières.

8. La formation humaine
Les responsables d'internat s'assurent que les élèves apprennent à être autonomes. Il doivent pouvoir:
Since language is listed as one aspect of appropriate behaviour, it becomes part of the construction of what it means to be a member of a school. The rules exist as official texts, which are displayed on school noticeboards. Through their physical placing in prominent spaces, as well as the words they contain, language becomes a public symbol of appropriate behaviour, alongside other institutional symbols such as school uniforms and the mottos and crests displayed on school entrance boards, official notices, and letterheads (Picture 5.1 and Picture 5.2).

5.2.2 From the Ministry to the noticeboards

The school rules derive from Ministry of Education guidelines (1998a, 1998b). I am interested in the way each school constructs certain languages as appropriate for use, so begin by comparing the school rules with these guidelines, in order to examine the choices each school has made. I therefore examine the way different elements of the Ministry’s guidelines have been recontextualised within the school rules.

I find it helpful to separate three key components: reference to the languages themselves (with a particular focus on the nomination strategies used); the nature of the directives that state how these languages should be used (paying particular attention to intensification and mitigation of such directives, as well as explicit argumentation strategies); and the domains in which these directives are intended to apply (i.e. focusing on locational moves). Table 5.1 gives both language versions of the Ministry guidelines, while Table 5.2 and Table 5.3 give the school rules. These tables are organised according to these three components.
### Table 5.1 Ministry of Education guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Teachers and students must use</td>
<td>the medium of instruction of the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les élèves et enseignants doivent suivre les instructions de l’école [Pupils and teachers must follow the school rules]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 All information and notices must be in</td>
<td>the language of instruction of the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toutes notes et informations seront communiquées (orales et/ou par écrit) dans [All notices and information must be communicated (orally and/or in writing) in]</td>
<td>la langue d’enseignement [the language of instruction]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 A number of differences between the two versions of the Ministry guidelines suggest a translation from the English version to the French version. For example, it is more likely that ‘medium of instruction’ from the English version has been mistranslated as ‘les instructions de l’école’ (school directives) than the other way round, given that the guideline appears under the sub-heading of ‘Language’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Directive)</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>(Directive)</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>should be used interchangeably where possible, in order to create competency in both languages</td>
<td>dans les échanges inter-élèves [in inter-pupil interaction]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afin de mieux maîtriser chaque langue, encourager [In order to improve each language, encourage]</td>
<td>les langues d'enseignement [the languages of instruction]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>must be encouraged, taught, and learnt</th>
<th>in English-speaking schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>must be encouraged, taught, and learnt</td>
<td>in French-speaking schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Le français [French]</th>
<th>sera enseigné et utilisé [must be taught and used]</th>
<th>dans les écoles de langue anglaise [in English-medium schools]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L'anglais [English]</td>
<td>il en sera de même [should be the same]</td>
<td>dans les écoles de langue française [in French-medium schools]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Directive)</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>(Directive)</td>
<td>Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Local languages</td>
<td>should be used only</td>
<td>at the week-ends or out of schools hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | Les dialectes ainsi que le Bislama  
[Dialects and Bislama] | seront seulement autorisés  
[are only authorised] | en fin de semaine  
[at weekends] |
| 6          | (Bislama) | Although Bislama is an official, national language, it is not a language of instruction. Where possible it should not be used, However, punishment is probably inappropriate, in view of human rights views on indigenous languages | when either English or French is appropriate |
| 6          | (Le Bislama) | Bien que le Bislama soit une langue national officielle, elle n’est pas une langue d’enseignement ; elle ne doit pas être utilisée dans des écoles afin d’éviter l’appauvrissement de la langue d’enseignement.  
[Although Bislama is an official national language, it is not a language of instruction; it should not be used in schools in order to prevent negative effects on (lit. the impoverishment of) the language of instruction.]  
Toutefois, il faut éviter de punir les élèves qui enfreignent cette règle, mais plutôt leur expliquer le bien-être de cette interdiction.  
[However, pupils who break this rule should not be punished, rather the purpose of this ban should be explained to them.] |
Table 5.2 Angolovo College language rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Domain(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Foul languages</td>
<td>are not allowed</td>
<td>in the College at any time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b English and French and or any other approved languages</td>
<td>are the only approved languages are the only languages allowed to be used</td>
<td>during school terms, in the College compound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Vernacular languages or Bislama</td>
<td>may be used</td>
<td>during the holidays, cultural activities, when authorized by the College for special purpose and when conversing with outsiders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Bislama</td>
<td>is not allowed</td>
<td>at all times, except when conversing with outsiders and during concerts only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Collège de Faranako language rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>Domain(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 les élèves s’expriment en [students should speak in] français [French]</td>
<td>Pendant les journées de classe … de 6h30 à 12h20, de 13h15 à 15h30 ainsi que pendant les heures d’étude. [During school days ... from 6.30 to 12.20, from 13.15 to 15.30, and during study periods.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 les élèves peuvent se communiquer dans [students can communicate in] les autres langues de leurs choix. [other languages of their choice.]</td>
<td>Pendant les horaires non-mentionné ci-dessus et pendant les week-ends [Outside the hours mentioned above and during weekends]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 La communication … ne se feront uniquement qu’en [Communication ... should be only in] français [French]</td>
<td>entre les élèves et les professeurs … sauf à la résidence d’un professeur. [between students and teachers ... except for at a teacher’s house.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 la communication peut se faire en [communication can be in] bichlamar [Bislama]</td>
<td>Pendant les périodes d’études, dans des situations difficiles, [During study, when in a difficult situation.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition of the rule prohibiting foul language at Angolovo College is not directly relevant to the research, but it raises two points of interest. Firstly, it appears that Bislama and ‘foul languages’ are treated with the same lack of tolerance. Secondly, the fact that it has been included in one school’s rules, but not the other’s, reveals that schools have the freedom to decide on their own language policy, rather than simply reproducing government guidelines, thereby revealing a certain amount of space to shape policy locally.
5.2.2.1 The construction of certain languages as (in)appropriate

The first aspect of interest is the way that L2 is dealt with. The Ministry guidelines refer to “the medium of instruction of the school”, “the language of instruction of the school”, “la langue d’enseignement” (language of instruction) and “les langues d’enseignement” (languages of instruction) thereby directing attention to the academic function of certain languages. The English version emphasises that each school will have a particular L2, while the French version does not, treating both L2 and L3 as languages of instruction. The directives are given that all information and notices must be in this language (both versions), that L2 must be used by teachers and students (English version), and that the languages of instruction must be encouraged (French version).

The Angolovo rules make no mention of the academic function of any language, and they do not treat L2 (English) any differently from L3 (French). The Faranako rules, however, make L2 (French) prominent. They stipulate explicit academic contexts in which French must be used, referring to classroom hours and study periods (Rule 1), and teacher-student communication (Rule 3). They thus narrow the meaning of and intensify the force of the Ministry guidelines that state only that information must be communicated in this language (Guideline 2) and that the languages of instruction should be encouraged (Guideline 3). The importance of L2 in particular is thus intensified in the Faranako rules but downplayed in the Angolovo rules.

The second aspect of interest concerns the way L2 and L3 are referred to together. The English version of Ministry Guideline 3 names the two languages “English and French”, while the French version labels these as “les langues d’enseignement” (the languages of instruction) and “chaque langue” (each language), which, although referring to two languages, does not emphasise L3 so clearly. Guideline 4 does name both languages in both versions, stating that competency in both is the intention. However, there are slight differences in the extent to which these languages are promoted. In the English version, Guideline 3 states that they should be used “interchangeably”, although this is mitigated by the use of “where possible”, and Guideline 4 directs Anglophone schools to encourage, teach and learn both languages. In the French version, Guideline 3
is applied to “les échanges inter-élèves” (inter-pupil interaction - possibly due to mistranslation of ‘interchangeably’), and Guideline 4 directs Francophone schools to teach and use them. The expectation to actually use both languages is thus intensified in the French version.

The Angolovo rules never mention English without French. They label the two languages equally as the default “approved languages” (rule b), although do not actually state that both must be used. They thereby neither emphasise L2 nor actually promote the use of L3 as much as the Ministry does. However, Angolovo further specifies the context to which these rules apply as “during school terms, in the College compound”, which can be contrasted with the specific academic contexts in which Faranako rules apply. The Faranako rules omit all reference to L3, thus erasing English altogether. Thus neither school emphasises L3 to the extent that the Ministry guidelines suggest they should, and Faranako omits all reference to this language.

Finally, the directives relating to L1 are also recontextualised in various ways, although there are again differences between the two versions of the Ministry guidelines. The vernaculars are referred to as “local languages” in the English version of Guideline 5, and “les dialectes” (dialects) in the French version. Both terms serve to position these languages as less important than French and English. The strength of the directive is mitigated in the English version by the use of “should be used”, as opposed to “authorisés” (authorised), and by the inclusion of “out of school hours” in addition to the weekends. The French version of this guideline treats Bislama in the same manner as these languages, while the English version does not mention Bislama until the following guideline.

At the start of both versions of Guideline 6, Bislama is described as an “official, national language”, but this is immediately followed by the qualification that it is not a language of instruction, thus overriding the relevance of its high status. The second element of this guideline states that Bislama should not be used, but this is mitigated in the English version by “where possible” and by the vague qualification of “when either English or French is appropriate”. In the French version, there is no such mitigation in the phrasing, although the guideline is justified by concerns that Bislama will influence L2 (the topos of interference).
The final part of Guideline 6 reveals a conflict between different ideologies about punishment. In the English version, it is discouraged, but the phrases “however” and “probably” serve to mitigate this, suggesting the ingrained acceptability of such punishment. This version also employs a linguistic human rights argument but, crucially, only with reference to the indigenous languages. The implication is that punishing students for speaking languages other than English or French would be acceptable, but the problem is that this prevents them from speaking these indigenous languages (invoking an ideology of language maintenance, rather than an anti-punishment stance). The French version is more direct, stating without mitigation that students should not be punished, suggesting that it is better to explain the rule, rather than punish its infringement. The overall message from the Ministry is that L1 is not appropriate in schools, but neither a total ban nor punishment is advocated. This is significant when examining the way rules are discussed at the two schools (see 5.3.2.4).

L1 is dealt with rather differently in the two sets of school rules, although both devote a significant amount of attention to it. At Angolovo, Rule b appears to grant space to L1, through the addition of “or any other approved languages”, but, in Rules c and d, the specific situations in which these languages (“vernacular languages or Bislama”) may be spoken are set out. The strength of the statements about L1 is intensified by the repetition of very similar points, and by the use of “only” and “at all times”. L1 is not banned completely, and there seem to be a number of occasions on which these languages may be spoken, but the level of detail devoted to them makes clear that they are not intended to be used. The treatment of L1 is thus similar to that in the Ministry guidelines.

At Faranako, the stance towards L1 appears more lenient, as a number of exceptions are specified. The strength of Rule 3, for example, is mitigated by “sauf à la résidence d’un professeur” (except at a teacher’s house), revealing that teacher-student interaction is only considered bound by the rules in the ‘school’ domain, from which staff houses are excluded. The prepositional phrase in Rule 2, “pendant les horaires non-mentionné ci-dessus et pendant les week-ends” (outside the hours mentioned above and during weekends), and a
number of verbs in the positive form also shift the focus to what is allowed, rather than what is not allowed, while the inclusion of “de leurs choix” (of their choice), in Rule 2, indicates that students have control over which languages to use. Similarly, although Rule 1 states that Bislama is not officially sanctioned in study periods, Rule 4 notes that this language can be used to resolve difficulties. Space therefore exists for L1, although the way this tolerance is presented as a form of mitigation of rules about French reveals, again, that L1 is not considered ideal.

5.2.2.2 The demarcation of domains in which such usage is appropriate

It could be possible to read into the difference between the two sets of school rules that Faranako promotes only French, since it needs to construct itself as a “monolingual francophone space” (Heller, 1999a, p.338), given the dominance of English outside school. Following this hypothesis, the school cannot undermine its existence as a Francophone institution, while Angolovo is able to promote French alongside English without jeopardising its Anglophone credentials.

However, the locational and temporal moves become relevant, as we see that all eight rules stipulate specific spaces and times that different languages may be spoken. At Angolovo, the rules apply to the whole college compound and the entirety of the school term. A distinction is drawn between the term and the holidays, and between school members and outsiders, with only a few school activities given as exceptions. In contrast, the Faranako rules distinguish between academic and non-academic domains, between study times and free time, and between teacher-student interaction and (by implication) interaction in which teachers are not present. The schools appear to set the boundaries in different ways – with Angolovo counting the compound as ‘the school’, and Faranako counting only academic aspects.

These differences may stem from fundamental differences in the original ethos of each mission school from which the institutions have evolved, rather than from contemporary concerns for the protection of Francophonie. Anglican schools were founded on the principles of learning to live and work in boarding schools, at which academic work was just one part. At Angolovo, there is still a
farm, and manual work sessions each afternoon are an integral part of the programme (for practical reasons, since they keep the college going, but students were frequently told that this work was an important part of their life training). The college motto of ‘Educating the whole person’ symbolises these foundations, and is given a high profile. For example, Picture 5.3 shows the motto written at the front of the school chapel, beneath illustrations that depict wisdom, strength, spirituality, and joy.

Picture 5.4 is a reminder notice from April 2011 that demonstrates the integration of different elements of ‘school life’, as problems with electricity are included alongside reminders for uniform, punctuality, and, of particular relevance here, language use. (This particular reminder will be discussed in 5.3.1.1.). Picture 5.5 and Picture 5.6 are posters displayed around the college during 2011 that give a sense of the moral guidance that is an important part of ‘education’ at Angolovo.¹⁰

---

¹⁰ These posters demonstrate that the English used does not necessarily follows the norms of what might be labelled ‘Standard English’ although the code chosen is undoubtedly ‘English’. 
Picture 5.3 Decoration behind the altar of Angolovo College chapel

Picture 5.4 Reminder notice displayed at Angolovo College

Picture 5.5 ‘Things to guide us’ poster displayed at Angolovo College

Picture 5.6 ‘Road to success in life’ poster displayed at Angolovo College
At Faranako, I was less aware of this ‘whole school’ culture. 27% of the pupils lived in nearby villages (while all pupils were boarding pupils at Angolovo), and all students had guardians with whom they were expected to stay every other weekend when the campus closed. The students attended the local church that was looked after by the community priest, rather than having their own chapel and their own priest as a member of staff (as Angolovo did). Manual work took place only first thing in the morning, to clean the immediate area around the dormitories and classrooms. Other work generally only occurred when a task needed doing (such as collecting firewood), and lasted until the task was completed, rather than being scheduled for a set period each day, as was the case at Angolovo. In summary, boarding life appeared to be a pragmatic solution to enable students from different islands to attend secondary school. The central focus was academic, while other activities ensured that religious attendance could be continued, that the kitchen was stocked with firewood, and so on.

These differences can also be seen through the layout of the school buildings. Map 5.1 shows the Angolovo campus to be contained within a single plot of land, on which classrooms, dormitories, staff houses, the school chapel, gardens and the farm are all integrated within the boundary. Map 5.2 shows Collège de Faranako to be situated on a separate plot of land to the primary school and the church (although these are all leased to the Catholic Church by the same landowner). There are only two staff houses, while others walk to school from their villages, or are accommodated in makeshift rooms at the end of dormitories. The gardens are a short distance away.

Angolovo appears to consider ‘the school’ to apply to all aspects of boarding school life, while Faranako counts only academic activities. Within these two versions of ‘the school’, only certain language(s) are considered appropriate, but this does not necessarily point to different values attributed to ‘English’ and ‘French’ at the two schools. Given that Faranako’s rules relate to a concept of education that is solely academic, Rules 1 and 3 make logical reference to French, since this is the medium of instruction. English may be excluded
because it has little to do with Faranako's conceptualisation of education, rather than because it is placed in opposition to French.

Map 5.1 Angolovo College campus

Map 5.2 Collège de Faranako campus
5.3 Policy off the noticeboard:

5.3.1 Displays of using L2

It is clear that L2 (and potentially L3) is constructed as the only appropriate language. However, although the existence of a public, written text can be counted as a display of policy, I never saw anybody reading anything on these noticeboards. More importantly, the ‘policy’ that happened away from the noticeboards bore little resemblance to the ‘policy text’ that was fixed to them. However, teachers and students could still be said to use language as a symbol of institutional appropriateness, judging by the way it was used and talked about. There are distinct differences between the two schools in this regard, so they will be dealt with separately.

5.3.1.1 Constant policy noise at Angolovo College

Language policy was frequently mentioned at Angolovo, and my fieldnotes recorded frequent talk of ‘policy’, ‘rules’, ‘procedures’, ‘punishment’ and ‘discipline’. Based on previous experience, this was not unusual. Whether or not my research triggered additional attention, I would argue that such attention demonstrated the desire to show me the importance of policy.

The first announcement I heard about language policy was during an orientation afternoon concerning the school rules. Staff circulated around the classrooms, each responsible for setting out a section of the school rules. I sat in one classroom throughout the afternoon, after which I wrote the following:

Extract 5.3

Having listened to an afternoon of ‘rules’ and ‘policies’, I am left with a real sense of the need to make ‘policy’ visible, without worrying about whether it is actually followed. Firstly, the language rules were read out verbatim from the school rules, before Mrs Angela summarised that “English and French are the only languages we should be using”, and yet, of the 17 staff members who took part in the afternoon, 7 addressed the students entirely in Bislama, and 1 other in a mixture of English and Bislama. Secondly, the rule about no graffiti was read out, while there was a girl in the front row who had been writing on the desk throughout the whole session, clearly in view of the four teachers in the room. Thirdly, Mr Axley read out a rule that all teachers should be addressed by their title and surname, rather than title and forename, but he then promptly finished his section by saying ‘and now I will hand over to Miss Alice’, thereby ignoring exactly that rule. I got the feeling teachers were
reading out the rules because they were on the paper in front of them, rather than because anybody had any intention of following them. A common pattern was for staff to read or explain the rules, and to finish each point with 'Is that clear?/Hem i klia?', to which the students would reply ‘Yes’ in chorus. (fieldnotes 7/3/11)

This provided an early insight into the conflict between the words themselves and other text-shaping moves. The code in which the rules were read out was often Bislama, despite the rules stating that it shouldn’t be used.

Another mismatch throughout the fieldwork was in the treatment of French. I heard 11 announcements in assembly that Bislama must not be used, and that English was the only language allowed in school, but French was never mentioned. After one such announcement, the following was displayed on the school noticeboard (reproduced from Picture 5.4):

**Extract 5.4**

*Reminder for uniform tidiness, punctuality & language use (English).* (8/4/11)

Appropriate ‘language use’ is predicated here only as English, despite the equal treatment of English and French in the school rules. When I asked the principal about whether other languages, such as Bislama or French, should play a greater role in school, he said:

**Extract 5.5**

AP: Um long saed long Bislama o vernacular? Ating i gat taem blong hem? Er especially taem yumi communicate wetem ol peren/s? O yumi communicate wetem ol outsiders we oli kam? O yumi go aot? Long Lolowai o ol surrounding vilen? Ating taem blong hem blong yumi toktok lanwis\(^{31}\). O Bislama. But (.). **within the college** (.). personally mi ting se hem i supposed to be lanwis of medium we i stap. We medium of instruction hem i should be Ingis.

[AP: Um in terms of Bislama or vernacular? I think there is time for it? Er especially when we communicate with parents? Or we communicate with outsiders who come? Or we go out? To Lolowai or surrounding villages? I think that’s the time to speak lanwis. Or Bislama. But (.). **within the college** (.). personally I think that it’s supposed to be the language of instruction here. The **language of instruction** should be English.]

\(^{31}\) The term 'lanwis' (language) is used to refer to the vernacular. It is rare for speakers to use any specific language name for the language they speak at home.
And French. But French olses i no gat noes nomo long hem.

<both laugh>


AP: E::r (2) once in a while. Sometimes i jes slip my mind (.) taem blong emphasis/em French. But er most of the time mi emphasise long Inglis. (1) Ating hem i supposed to be (.) both sides. (XVI:63-76)

And French. But French is like there’s no noise from it.

<both laugh>

F: I see that the school rules say French. Like French or English. But when you go to chapel do you ever announce that you must speak English or French? Or every time is it just English. (1) Do you ever emphasise French? Or

AP: E::r (2) once in a while. Sometimes it just slips my mind (.) to emphasise French. But er most of the time I emphasise English. (1) I think it’s supposed to be (.) both sides.] (xvi:65-77)

At the beginning of the extract, the principal’s account conforms to the domains set out in the school rules. However, although he adds French as a language of instruction along with English, the preceding pause suggests that this is something of an afterthought. He immediately clarifies that French is never used. We had previously been talking about classroom language use, so it is likely that this had led the principal to focus on English when I began to ask about language outside the classroom. However, had the principal wanted to present the school as a place in which English and French are spoken equally, he had plenty of opportunity to do so during the interview. Despite the equal promotion of English and French in the official school rules, these languages clearly do not share this status off the noticeboard.

The principal does, however, reveal the importance of applying the school rules to the whole domain of ‘the school’, reflecting the locational and temporal moves used in the official rules:

Extract 5.6

AP: Aot saed ia nao olsem (.) supposed to be wan praktikel ples we pipol oli practise/im Inglis?

F: M-m.

[AP: Outside now that’s (.) supposed to be a practical place where people practise English?

F: M-m.
**AP:** But hem i no olsem? And these people. Communication between teacher student and student student (.) teacher to teacher hem i (. ) jes nao hem i come to be more in Bislama than in English.

**F:** M-m. Be yu wu wis se yu save gobak long?

**AP:** Mi wis tumas sapos we i save gobak long Inglis? So that at least pipol oli save express/em olgeta. O oli save andastanem? O sapos oli ridim wan buk o wanem but at least oli andastan. But sapos oli continue blong olsem samtaem oli save rid? Be (.) blong toktok blong express/em olgeta nao hem i (. ) i nogat.

**F:** So long wis blong yu hem i (. ) Monday to Friday? Or Monday to Sunday? Or

**AP:** Just Monday to [Sunday.]

**F:** [Everywhere?] (.) Dormitory? Chapel?

**AP:** Everywhere. (XVI:34-48)

**AP:** But it’s not like that? And these people. Communication between teacher student and student student (.) teacher to teacher it’s (.) it’s now just come to be more in Bislama than in English.

**F:** M-m. But you wish you could go back to?

**AP:** I really wish that it could go back to English? So that at least people can express themselves. Or they can understand? Or if they read a book or whatever but at least they understand. But if they continue to like sometimes they can read? But (.) to speak or express themselves now it (.) they can’t.

**F:** So your wish is (.) Monday to Friday? Or Monday to Sunday? Or

**AP:** Just Monday to [Sunday.]

**F:** [Everywhere?] (.) Dormitory? Chapel?

**AP:** Everywhere. (xvi:36-50)

The principal makes use of the topos of target language to argue for the exclusive use of English at all times, throughout the campus. His claim is based on the rationale that students will then be able to understand and express themselves in this language, thus drawing on the conclusion rule that exclusive use of English will enable greater competence in this language. Given that students only need to understand and express themselves in French during French lessons, the argument is not applied to this language (see XVI:318-23/xvi:319-24). The school rules are again undermined in the enactment of day-to-day policy.

Language policy was an agenda item during a staff meeting (15/3/11) and, once again, it was about English rather than English and French. Extract 5.7 is a
reconstructed dialogue based on fieldnotes. The discussion was held in English. Teachers are referred to in the extract by their official role or teaching subject:

Extract 5.7

Deputy: The next item on the agenda is language. Too many people are using own language. We must prepare students for further education.

Principal: Yes I think there is too much lanwis and Bislama. Students even feel free to use Bislama in class. Even teachers are talking in Bislama when teaching which encourages students. We must use English as much as possible and if a concept is hard, use simple English. We must come up with a solution. Other students from other colleges are asking if this is normal.

Economics: We should leave it to the English teachers as they are the experts and they can tell us what to do. They have methods for this.

Geography: That’s true but we can play our own part. We should speak to each other in English and if a student comes to ask a question in lanwis or Bislama we just speak back to them in English.

English (1): I agree with [Geography].

English (2): We have been talking about this for so many years but nothing works out. The information is here and we all know it so please can we make an effort to be a role model. I appeal to every teacher to try their best. Inside and outside class and only use Bislama outside the compound.

Deputy: We can’t make a sudden change but we must encourage the students.

Chaplain: What about a time or area for English. Like from 7.30 in the morning to 4.30 we speak English. Then you can speak Bislama in other areas or times. In the dormitories only English or Bislama should be used because others don’t speak lanwis. I want to comment too that there are too many staff using lanwis which makes others feel left out.

Deputy: We must speak English in the staffroom as a starting point. We start gradually. In classes we should speak English only. Does everyone agree?

[Maths to me, in Bislama: Since 2004 we have been discussing this <laughs>]

Principal: The school rule we set out is that Bislama is only to be used with visitors to the college so we shouldn’t change it. First we speak English to each other as much as possible. Then to students to help them as much as possible. It is up to us now. There is a problem especially with Pentecost always using lanwis. There are some other
things we can try like debates in English to help students. An announcement will be made tomorrow about it.

History: I suggest that Fiona\textsuperscript{12} should talk to all the students in assembly about the importance of English because it is her language. That is really going to help.

In this extract, the principal attempts to enforce the rules on the basis that they are the rules. He first mentions that “other students from other colleges are asking if this is normal”, showing the need to project the right image for the school. He later states that the rule shouldn’t be changed, in reaction to other teachers’ attempts to renegotiate the places and times in which it is reasonable to enforce the use of English. The second English teacher makes a similar point that the rule is perfectly clear, so it is now a matter of teachers setting an example. The majority of other contributions relate to practical suggestions about achieving the policy, indicating agreement that it should be achieved.

Despite this constant attention paid to the rules, it was unusual to hear anyone actually reprimanded for using a language other than English. I noted only four such instances throughout the term, as presented in the fieldnotes excerpts below.

**Extract 5.8**

*Heard one student outside a classroom at break time call out “stop speaking in Bislama” [in English] at another student inside the class. This is the first time I’ve heard any such directive from either a student or a teacher. He was definitely speaking in a jokey way and I assume it was purely for my benefit as I walked past.* (11/3/11)

**Extract 5.9**

*This morning when I was inside my house, I heard ‘Speak in English’ as some boys went past – this directive was at a higher volume than everything else that was being said, whether specifically for my benefit or to be heard by other people I don’t know.* (19/3/11)

**Extract 5.10**

*Today I was talking to Mr Ala in the school office. Speaking Bislama together. A student came into the office and addressed Mr Ala in Bislama, at which point he*

\textsuperscript{12}No teachers responded to the History teacher’s comment, and I wasn’t called upon. The discussion moved on at this point.
rebuked her, saying ‘Speak in English. What do you want?’ Following the exchange, he turned back to me and reverted to Bislama, while the student was still in the room. (13/4/11)

Extract 5.11

Saturday evening ‘outreach’ programme – groups of students were assigned a staff family to visit for prayers. The Year 10 students who visited the house where I happened to be showed a confidence that I hadn’t seen before in the classroom, as they took turns to lead prayers or singing, and to discuss the message from the Bible reading. It was all in Bislama except for the reading and the singing which was mainly English. At the end, Mr Andrew thanked the students for coming and said that, next time, they should try do it in English, so that families think they are actually learning something in school. He then backtracked a bit and said they hadn’t done anything wrong but they should try to practise doing it in English. Given that the message extrapolated from the Bible reading had focused on the need for families to spend evenings together, rather than all the ‘papas’ drinking kava, it may be that he (the only adult male present) was reacting to what can only have been targeted at him, using language as an easy thing to criticise. It may be that my presence sparked his criticism, although the use of Bislama from students in his house had never previously provoked comment on any of my other visits. Whatever the cause, it seemed to override the use of whichever language was considered most appropriate for getting the Bible message across to families whose members may not speak English well. (16/4/11)

As noted above, my presence might account for some of the displays of policy, but if this were the case, I would actually expect there to be more such incidents. There were plenty of opportunities for teachers (and students) to reprimand students, if they wanted to show me that they were following the policy, but this rarely happened.

The policy displays seemed to be more about constructing an image of appropriate behaviour than actually regulating that behaviour. Paralinguistic moves (such as raised volume), locational moves (such as commenting on language in my presence), and interaction and code moves (such as commenting on code choice in response to the different participants involved) all contribute to this image of what policy should be, as much as the explicit metalinguistic discourse. I refer to this as ‘constant policy noise’, in which students and teachers demonstrate their awareness of how to behave in a linguistically appropriate way, while not necessarily following these norms.
5.3.1.2 A one-day-display of French at Collège de Faranako

Unlike at Angolovo, Collège de Faranako appeared unconcerned by language. There were no announcements, reminders, or notices about it. Students were never reprimanded for speaking a language other than French. The principal appeared to support a French-only policy, but acknowledged that this was not implemented:

Extract 5.12

\[FP: \text{Taem we pikinini i go long wan} \]
\[\text{Franis skul o wan (.) ca- wan wanem ia.} \]
\[\text{Wan college blong hemia i sud} \]
\[\text{maintain/em lanwis blong hem blong} \]
\[\text{teaching ia nao. Be mifala ol tija tu sam} \]
\[\text{long ol weakness blong mifala tu.} \]
\[\text{Hemia nao taem mifala i toktok Bislama} \]
\[\text{long olgeta? Then pikinini hem i karem.} \]
\[\text{So mifala i no fosem olgeta blong oli} \]
\[\text{mekem wanem. Lanwis maternelle i} \]
\[\text{kam. Olsem lanwis blong ol tradition} \]
\[\text{ia? I go miksimap wetem Franis ia.} \]
\[\text{Yu harem taem oli toktok long yu?} \]
\[\text{Yu harem i (.) yu harem yu kolkol} \]
\[\text{long hem. Expression blong lanwis i} \]
\[\text{nogud. Oli askem yu nomo se blong oli} \]
\[\text{mekem wan samting yu no andastan se} \]
\[\text{be (.) samting we yumi stap lanem long} \]
\[\text{skul be hem i no go insaed long hed} \]
\[\text{blong hem. (XVII:77-86)} \]

\[\text{[FP: When a child goes to a French school or a (.) sch- a what’s that. A} \]
\[\text{school for that it should maintain its} \]
\[\text{language of teaching now. But us} \]
\[\text{teachers too some of the weaknesses} \]
\[\text{are with us too. That’s it when we} \]
\[\text{speak Bislama to them? Then the} \]
\[\text{children adopt this. So we don’t force} \]
\[\text{them in what to do. The mother} \]
\[\text{tongue comes. Like the traditional} \]
\[\text{language? It goes and mixes up with} \]
\[\text{French. You hear when they talk to} \]
\[\text{you? You feel (.) you find it} \]
\[\text{unpleasant. The expression of the} \]
\[\text{language is poor. They just ask you if} \]
\[\text{they can do something and you don’t} \]
\[\text{understand but (.) it’s something that} \]
\[\text{we are learning in school but it doesn’t} \]
\[\text{go inside their heads.]} \]
\[\text{(xvii:73-81)} \]

Although the principal begins by stating that a school should maintain its language of teaching, thereby making the link between language policy and academic concerns, he links this to standards of French rather than to learning. He draws on ideologies of linguistic purism and maintenance of a standard language, rather than focusing on the use of French for academic purposes, as might be expected from the school rules’ attention to academic contexts.

When I ask whether he wishes he could reintroduce a French-only rule (Extract 5.13), he shows further divergence from the official rules, by arguing that students should make the effort to speak both French and English in order to
enhance their future prospects (see Chapter 7 for more detailed treatment of this argument):

Extract 5.13

F: So do you wish you could put back a French-only rule outside the classroom?

FP: Us here? We introduced the rule that when the children come inside the school area? They should speak French or English. Because now we are like one- the only country in the Pacific that’s (. ) bilingual. The only country in the Pacific. Out of us in the Pacific that’s it. So (. ) I think that when like (. ) If a child makes an effort to (. ) he want to get things in his future. I think that he should take an interest himself.] (xvii:82-7)

Despite the erasure of English from Faranako’s school rules, it does feature in some of the talk about policy. The principal introduces this language into the discussion without prompting from me (and see XVII:483-87/xvii:467-70). There is also a conspicuous presence of English in some places that might be considered the most opportune sites for symbolic displays of Francophonie, as shown in Picture 5.7 and Picture 5.8.

![Picture 5.7 Bilingual sign at the entrance to Collège de Faranako](image)
Picture 5.8 Memorial stone at Collège de Faranako

(Note the use of English on the official plaque (inset), but the scratching of the school motto in French in the concrete)

When I ask the principal about the place of L1 in the school, he reveals a certain pragmatism, drawing on the topos of successful learning. He claims that it is necessary to use Bislama in certain circumstances, based on the rationale that French is a hard language and that it is therefore acceptable to switch to Bislama to achieve understanding:

Extract 5.14

FP: I gat (.) i gat sam sabjek we yu nidim (.) from explanation hem i had lelebet long French. Olesem mi talem hem i wan lanwis we hem i had lelebet long ol pikinini? So i gat sam (.) sam sabjek we i allow/em blong smol taem blong oli eksplenem long (.) se eria hem i talem olsem. Okei pikinini i andastan. Se ah okei long French oli talem olsem. So i gat sabjek we (.) Bislama hem i go insaed smol.
(XVII:127-31)

[FP: There are (.) there are some subjects that you need it (.) because explanation is quite hard in French. Like I said it’s a language that is quite hard for the children? So there are some (.) some subjects where it’s allowed for a small time for them to explain in (.) that this area they say it like this. Okay the children understand. That ah okay in French they say it like this. So there are some subjects that (.) Bislama goes inside a little.] (xvii:120-25)

Despite a greater tolerance for the use of L1 than expressed by the Angolovo principal, he also reveals that this is not an ideal strategy. It is clear from Extract 5.14 that French is the expected language. He makes similar points throughout
the interview, although he also seems uncomfortable about inconsistencies within the way policy is enacted:

Extract 5.15


FP: Like to find a good solution? We should put it like to say (.) one thing only. We say that the children speak French? It’s French. It’s not another language. So then like we should all work together with it to make it so that we achieve what we want at the end of the day. But when just the principal is trying to do it they don’t do it but how can we do it? It’s hard. (xvii:113-7

Despite his acceptance of L1, he feels that, if there is a French-only rule, it needs to be enforced. Tolerance of languages is not the same as support for their use, and it remains clear that L1 is not considered appropriate.

However, there was less of a focus on French than might have been expected from the rules. The only exception was on La Journée de la Francophonie, the annual celebration held by member countries of Francophonie. On this day, French suddenly became very visible.

As I listened to the teachers drawing up a programme for the celebrations, I wrote:

Extract 5.16

They’ve decided that there should be a guest speaker, that the students should march, that they should sing, and that there should be competitions. They’re now spending ages trying to decide what the students should chant while marching, and trying to think of songs that would be suitable. They keep starting to sing but not being able to remember enough of the words. I get the feeling that these teachers (all relatively new in the profession) know what is expected of such a day, but they don’t actually know the right kind of songs etc. (23/3/11)
I wrote the following notes in my corner of the dormitory, throughout the evening before the celebrations and the following morning:

Extract 5.17

(24/3/11) 6.30pm: Heard a few quiet conversations about Journée de la Francophonie. One girl was explaining about the day last year, saying that they had to speak French only from the moment they woke up and no Bislama.

7.45pm: Girls colouring in their Francophonie flags. Talk flying around of people getting up in the night to practise singing, and then some others talking about getting up early to prepare tara. Heard singing later and it seemed to be Yr10 girls practising. The Yr7 girls complained that their teacher hadn't told them anything. Heard again that everyone had to speak French all day tomorrow from early morning. Discussion of which colours to put where on flag and how to hold it. Definite excitement about tomorrow but I wonder how much is due to Francophonie and how much is just the celebration/distraction.

(25/3/11) 6.30am: The girls have been awake for an hour (some longer) and have been talking since at least 5.45. I haven't heard a word of French, either as a joke or serious (not even a Bonjour).

6.45am: The girls are back from breakfast. Suddenly lots of admonishments amongst themselves to speak French (announcement made during breakfast??)

Examples:\[13:\]

Luisa: Mali i go we?

Where’s Mali?

Charlotte: **Parlez en français.**

Speak in French.

Luisa: Eh Charlotte!

Danielle: **Parlez en français.**

Speak in French.

Sassi: Hu i talem?

Who said so?

Karine: <Jokey tone> **On ne doit pas parler en Bichelamar.**

We mustn’t speak Bislama.

---

\[13:\] In these examples, elements in French are written in bold font, for emphasis.
<All laugh>

((4))

<Mali started speaking in lanwis>

<Conversation in Bislama outside the dormitory>

Charlotte: <shouting out the window from inside> Parlez en français.

Speak in French.

<Conversation continued. Charlotte walked outside >

Charlotte: Parlez en français.

Speak in French.

Sassi: Sore.

Sorry.

A lot of lanwis being spoken. So far, ‘Parlez en français’ has only been said in reaction to Bislama. A few attempts to start sentences in French and a lot of laughing.

7.05am: One example of lanwis spoken, interrupted by ‘Eh parlez en français; pas en langue’¹⁴. (Eh speak in French; not in lanwis.)

7.15am: By now, most conversation has gone back to Bislama with very few admonishments. Girls getting ready for class. Complaining about one of the teachers and discussing whether to take their flags.

During this period, the girls revealed an awareness that they were supposed to speak French, via repetitions of formulaic admonishments in this language. This was clearly not ‘normal’ practice, given the metalinguistic commentary.

Year 10 started the morning in the classroom. The teacher read out some information about Francophonie, asked students to devise some riddles, and then gave them time to finish colouring their flags. This was the first classroom moment when I witnessed students free to talk, rather than working silently at individual desks (see Chapter 6). This also led to the only time I witnessed a

¹⁴ Both ‘langue’ and ‘langage’ appear to be used to refer to the vernacular by French-speaking ni-Vanuatu
teacher reminding students to speak in French throughout the fieldwork, with the single command of *En français s’il vous plaît* (In French please).

The programme entailed a march around the field with chanting of *Vive la Francophonie* (Long live Francophonie), a speech from the priest on the significance of Francophonie, a quiz based on information displayed the previous day, a song that had been practised during the week, a series of riddles, a football tournament between five teams (each allocated one colour from the Francophonie logo), a special meal, and a film in the evening. Picture 5.9 to Picture 5.15 provide illustrations of some of these events. Displays of the importance of French, once again, drew on a range of non-linguistic aspects alongside the use of the language itself.
Preparing to march

Picture 5.9

Students march around the field chanting

Picture 5.10

Picture 5.13 Francophonie flag made by each student

Picture 5.14 Information that had been displayed prior to the quiz

Picture 5.11 Students sing ‘Levons nos mains’

Picture 5.12 Groups compete in a quiz.
(The boy in the foreground has drawn the flag and ‘Francophonie’ on his shirt)

Picture 5.15 ‘What is Francophonie?’ poster
During the evening, I asked some girls why they were not watching the film, and was told that it was boring. I discovered a few students watching *Hotel Rwanda*. I asked a teacher why that particular film was being shown and she replied that it was the only French language film that any of the teachers owned, and that they had thought it important to show a French film that evening. It was clear that students didn’t enjoy the film, and it was hardly an entertaining choice for 11-16 year olds\(^\text{15}\), but the need to ‘do’ Francophonie became clear again.

Throughout this one day, the displays of French enabled Faranako to reaffirm its existence as a Francophone institution, before going back to business as usual for the remainder of the term. It was a one-day-display of French and, even then, not a strictly-regulated one, in terms of the actual use of language. More effort was deployed in replicating other semiotic resources associated with Francophonie, including songs, marching, and the colours of the flag. Most noticeable for me was the break in the usual running of the school that had to happen in order to ‘do’ Francophonie that day.

### 5.3.1.3 Business as usual

The remainder of this chapter will focus on the way language policy was enacted in much the same way at both schools, once the ‘policy noise’ was tuned out. Despite constructions of what should be happening, there was very little attempt at either school to enforce this. Students and teachers used several different languages on a daily basis. Judicious displays of L2 appeared sufficient to enable students and staff to conform to the school norms of linguistic appropriateness, without interrupting the flow of daily life.

Interaction outside class drew on the resources of multiple languages. Bislama dominated, but students from the same island or area tended to form close groups, providing opportunities to use the vernacular. Teacher-teacher interaction and student-student interaction rarely made use of L2 to the extent that a stretch of speech would be identifiable as this language to a monolingual speaker of either English or French, but elements of this language were certainly incorporated. Teacher-student interaction, particularly for ‘on the

\(^{15}\text{The film documents the events from the 1994 genocide in Rwanda and contains graphic scenes of violence. It also doesn’t present the French government in a good light, and it is hard to see the film as a positive image of Francophonie.}\)
record' school business, was more likely to be dominated by L2, although it was also common for conversations to proceed in L1. These languages were not kept separate, as speakers drew fluidly on elements of both L1 and L2. I couldn’t follow conversations conducted predominantly in the speakers’ vernacular, but I would still hear features that I would identify as either Bislama, English, or French. At other times, brief elements of a vernacular would be incorporated in conversations that I could otherwise follow relatively easily.

Extract 5.18 and Extract 5.19 show two examples, from interview data, of the way teachers drew on the different resources available. Elements are marked in different font type to show which ‘language’ they would be considered to be features of, if attempting to identify the origin of each element, as follows: Bislama (regular), English (bold), French (italics), Bislama or English (underlined). See the relevant appendices for translations.

Extract 5.18

Mr Aru: From sapos yumi talem se (.) yumi tokbaot gogo (.) yu finis i stap? Then yumi traem blong (.) switch straightaway bae i no save wok aot nomo because ol human resources ia oli nogat. I no gat insaed long system we i stap. So yumi nid blong se tekem at least (.) faef ten yia/s (.) then yumi prepare/em olgeta tija? From bae yumi nid blong trenem olgeta praemeri skul tija ol French tija nomo. And then ol secondary school tija? Bae hemia nao Inglis wetem French antap. So that olgeta i do/im wok ia daon ia long behalf blong yumi evriwan antap. (XIII:693-99/xiii:639-45)

Extract 5.19


16 Given that I was a co-participant, and only rarely spoke French to participants, it is unsurprising that very few features are identified as French.
17 There are a number of phrases that could be considered Bislama calques from English, such as ‘yumi nid blong trenem’ (from ‘we need to train them’). These combine many features that could be considered either English or Bislama, but the phrases might be considered illustrative of an ‘Anglicised Bislama’.
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Mr Aru and the Francophone principal discuss similar topics. They both use numerals and several school-related lexical items that could be considered either Bislama or English. They both use the phrase ‘human resources’, for which there is no Standard Bislama item. The Francophone principal uses the French phrase ‘ressources humaines’, although preceded by the Bislama plural modifier ‘ol’, while Mr Aru uses the English phrase human resources. Both use a compound verb composed of the English/French stem ‘prepare’/’prépare’ and the Bislama transitive suffix ‘-em’. Finally, both speakers use conjunctions that would be considered either English (e.g. ‘then’, ‘so that’) or French (e.g. ‘soit ... soit’).

Extract 5.20 and Extract 5.21 show examples from two students, marked in the same way.

Extract 5.20

Arthur: <reads> “Is it good that you have the chance to know both English and French?” Mi long tingting blong mi mi ting se i gud blong yumi lanem both English and French. From tudei long kaontri blong yumi? Whole/fala kaontri we i go i gat fulap wok i stap long hem? Many people oli yusum both English and French. So mi mi ting se hem i gud blong yumi lanem both English and French long skul. Blong hem i save helpem mi (. ) helpem yumi that (. ) sapos yumi go long other places be (. ) yumi save Inglis and French sapos wan person hem i toktok long yumi. (XI:84-90/xi:78-83)

Extract 5.21

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que tu trouves que c’est facile ou difficile d’utiliser le français pour apprendre toutes les matières.” (2) Long tingting blong mi? Se (. ) from mi skul kam praemeri mo long secondary i facile blong (. ) isi blong toktok long French. (2) Long evri matière. (XII:1-4/xii:1-4)

In these two extracts, the students are discussing questions that are written on the interview guide in either English or French. They read the questions verbatim, before discussing them. The majority of the discussion could be identified as Bislama, although Arthur uses the phrase ‘both English and French’ several times, presumably influenced by the phrasing of the question in English. Similarly, Fylene uses the words ‘facile’ and ‘matière’, and these can be identified in the question she has just read out in French. Both students integrate L2 elements within what would primarily be considered Bislama.
This type of attempt to identify the ‘language’ to which each element ‘belongs’ is clumsy and artificial, in that it does not capture the fluid way with which teachers and students draw on the different resources available to them. My purpose in doing so is to simply demonstrate that the talk is anything but monolingual.

My impression was that it was possible for students to get by with limited use of L2, and thereby navigate the school policy with relative ease. When addressing teachers, they showed awareness of a variety of norms – a teacher from the same home island was more likely to accept the use of the vernacular than a teacher from elsewhere; a student was more likely to use L2 when asking a teacher for help with school work in a clearly marked ‘school’ space, such as the office, than when chatting outside the store; and so on. When addressed in L2 by teachers, students drew on a range of strategies. One-word answers or raising the eyebrows to indicate an affirmative answer would usually suffice, and it was common for one student to act as spokesperson for the group if a longer exchange ensued. If students were talking to each other in L1, they might lower their voices or stop talking if a teacher came past. These interaction practices made it very clear what the policy was expected to be, without anybody needing to draw attention to it. L1 was kept sufficiently under the radar, and just enough L2 was used to construct the appearance of conforming to institutional norms.

There was no evidence that anybody had much knowledge of L3, or any reason to speak it. Through my language tests, I found very few students able to produce more than a few words (see Figure 6.3 to Figure 6.6 in the next chapter), and I heard neither talk about using L3 nor actual use of features that I would identify as L3 at either school, from either students or teachers. Most interviewees admitted speaking very little L3, and there was a lot of laughter about it (XI:69-82/xi:64-76; XII:76-90/xii:75-86; XIII:220-228, 238-49, 264-9/xiii:197-204, 213-25, 238-40; XIV:378-92/xiv:355-67; XV:162-9/xv:150-56; XVI:78-81/xvi:79-82; XVII:171-78/xvii:164-71). My presence as an English speaker at Faranako was not considered an opportunity to practise this language and, in fact, three staff members told me that they were relieved to discover that I spoke Bislama (despite assertions during the interview from one teacher that she took every opportunity to practise speaking it, XV:210-
If my presence at either school triggered some additional ‘displays’ of L2, it did not appear to have a similar effect on the use of L3.

The final examples of language practices come from written texts around the schools. Four photos of graffiti demonstrate that language is used in unofficial spaces in similar ways inside and outside the school boundaries. The examples in Picture 5.16 and Picture 5.17 come from a Faranako classroom. The examples in Picture 5.18 and Picture 5.19 were scratched into the cement of the public road, when it was reconstructed with a semi-permanent surface for the first time in 2012.

A: ‘No gat taem’
B: ‘Weed of wisdom’
A ‘slogan genre’ of English dominates in the pictures from both inside and outside Faranako, although some features of Bislama appear in Picture 5.16 (A), such as “no gat taem” (there’s no time), a slogan popularised locally by a sticker on a truck that drives regularly to this school. There are recurring references to cannabis in the form of slogans, images, and an intertextual reference to the song ‘Ganjer Farmer’. The slogan ‘weed of wisdom’ is found in both Picture 5.16 (B) and Picture 5.18. The music references are also consistent throughout. The absence of French is notable, particularly from the two Faranako examples.

Picture 5.20 to Picture 5.22 present examples of information displayed prominently in more public spaces. The first shows a clearly demarcated ‘official zone’ of the Angolovo staffroom, where English announces the ‘Staffroom information corner’. Just above this, and on the right-hand side of the board, there are posters in Bislama explaining about the H1N1 vaccination and savings products (see Picture 2.22 and Picture 2.23) amongst more typical school notices in English. Picture 5.21 was taken outside the Angolovo College store. Elements of both Bislama and English can be identified. Picture 5.22 shows a poster produced by the Ministry of Education, which was displayed at Faranako. It provides information in Bislama about the abolishment of school fees.
These examples flout the Ministry’s guidelines to display information in the medium of instruction of the school, which is particularly paradoxical in the case of Picture 5.22. Bislama is the chosen language through which much of the information is presented. In each case, this ensures that the health, financial, commercial or political message reaches diverse communities most effectively.
In Picture 5.22, the language choice also serves to present a Ministry initiative as relevant to all ni-Vanuatu, rather than separating Anglophones and Francophones. The instrumental goals behind each text appear to override the need to reaffirm the status of certain languages within the school context. Once again, L2 is used as the official language of information up to a point, but other languages still permeate these spaces.

5.3.2 The idealisation of L2 only

The constant tension between the formal school rules and the heteroglossic reality was highlighted through conversations, interviews and questionnaires. I was told that L2 was the only language used, when it clearly wasn’t. I was told that students were punished for breaking these rules, when they clearly weren’t (see 5.3.2.4). I was told how much people enjoyed speaking L3, when they never seemed to do this. I was told that Bislama had no place, and yet this was the language which participants would have identified themselves as speaking most of the time.

5.3.2.1 The construction of an ideal school

Teachers revealed a great deal of pragmatism, recognising that it was unrealistic to expect students to speak L2 only. However, this pragmatism was in constant tension with the belief that students had insufficient competence in this language to cope with academic demands, and teachers generally wished that it was possible to enforce an L2 only policy:

Extract 5.22

Mr Ala: Oli sud jenisim polisi ia. Speak English and French at all times. From tufala lanwis ia nao oli stap talem long skul. (XIV:234-5)

[Mr Ala: They should change the policy. Speak English and French at all times. Because these are the two languages they say are for school.] (xiv:217-8)

I had many conversations with teachers at both schools who lamented the low levels of L2, compared their students unfavourably to those they had taught elsewhere or in previous years, and lamented that usage and standards of L2 had declined since they had been students themselves. Through such comments, the teachers constructed a description for me of an ideal school,
considered either lost to the past or only achievable elsewhere, with which they explained what I should be observing around me (cf. Besnier, 2009, p.73 on a discourse of nostalgia).

The teachers justified this discourse on the grounds that L2 was the medium of instruction and students needed greater competence in it. Drawing on the topos of target language, they explained that L2 should be the only language spoken. L3 had no place in such arguments, since it was not the medium of instruction, and was therefore not a ‘target language’. Meanwhile, the use of L1 was considered a direct impediment to raising standards in L2, given the logic expressed through the topoi of target language and interference (see 6.3.2).

5.3.2.2 Awareness of the rules

In a written questionnaire (see Appendix VII), students were asked through three open questions what the school language rules were, what happened if they broke these rules, and what they thought of these rules. Of 211 questionnaires returned at Angolovo, the answers were discounted from nine, as these included rules that were not language-related. 202 students (96%) were therefore able to write down what they thought the language rules were.

Of 85 questionnaires returned at Faranako, 19 were discounted. I found that several students seemed confused by the questions, appearing less aware of any language rules than at Angolovo. However, 64 students (75%) wrote some form of language rule, while two students stated that there were no such rules. Although students initially struggled to answer these questions, and despite the apparent lack of visibility of language policy at Faranako, a significant number of students did still write an answer that suggested these rules existed. Students appeared to be aware of what such rules were likely to be, whether or not they thought they applied.

Figure 5.1 summarises the responses. Many students' responses fit into more than one category, although the first two categories are mutually exclusive.
The first two pairs of bars show that 96% at Angolovo and 77% at Faranako said that a rule existed requiring the use of L2 and/or L3 only. Approximately 40% of students at both schools mentioned not being able to use L1. The vast majority said that, if they broke these rules, they would be punished.

### 5.3.2.3 Justifications for the rules

When asked what they thought about these rules, 97.1% of Angolovo students and 88.3% of Faranako students stated that they were in favour of them (0.5% at Angolovo and 3.5% at Faranako were against them, while the remainder gave no evaluation). Figure 5.2 summarises the different justifications given for this support. Some students provided several justifications.
6.6% of Angolovo students and 51.8% of Faranako students stated explicit support for the language rules, without giving any reason. A further group explained only that it was important to have rules or that it was important to act like a school:

Extract 5.23

My opinion about these rules are: Rules can protect me and show me the right ways to follow in my daily lifes. Rules are sometime can learn about your wrong and good behaviours in school.¹⁸ (Year 10)

I think whatever that the rules talks about I’ll try my best to follow because its part of my learning in here. (Year 10)

Quand tu es ici, on peut suivre bien ces que le principale ou le règles qui dit. J’aime ces règles parce qu’elle apprend moi a faire de chose qui est bone et de chose qui n’est pas bone. [When you are here, you can follow carefully what the principal or the rules say. I like these rules because it teaches me to do what is right and what is not right.] (Year 9)

¹⁸There are a number of features of non-Standard English and non-Standard French in the questionnaire answers. I have chosen not to comment on these, and focus only on the content of these answers. My Standard English translations of the French originals therefore misrepresent the sense of the original, but it seems problematic to try to capture the ‘non-standardness’ in translation.
Ces règles sont tres important pour garde a l’école pour ne pas faire au mal. [These rules are very important to follow at school in order not to do wrong.] (Year 10)

To my own opinion about these language rules it is good and may be I think teachers and also staffs and every staffs living in this college should speak the two language to show that it is a school, where everyone learn and speak this language, not only making students and teachers speak this language by everyone living in this college boundary. (Year 12)

Il est bien parce que nous somme dans le école Francophon nous doit parle en Français seulement. [It is good because we are in a Francophone school we must speak only in French.] (Year 9)

At both schools, students gave the impression that they knew how language(s) should be used. They contributed to a discourse of institutional appropriateness in their agreement with these rules, often without presenting any justification other than that the rules were there to be followed.

Other students, however, did put forward justifications for needing to speak certain languages, as shown in Figure 5.2. This was particularly the case at Angolovo, although it must be remembered that the students at this school included Senior students who were more aware of the need to prepare for their futures. These reasons included the needs to succeed in school (as will be discussed further in Chapter 6), to prepare for future opportunities including further studies and employment (as will be discussed further in Chapter 8), and to improve levels of language competence.

5.3.2.4 The construction of punishment for breaking the rules

The two principals express similar views regarding punishment:

Extract 5.24

F: Afta sapos oli brekem rul ia bae oli panis ia? Yu harem se hem i pat blong hemia? [F: And then if they break this rule will they be punished? Do you think this is part of it?]
AP: Hem i no really ating bae **panis** hem i no really bae i make sense? I mean blong panisim man from lanwis. Ating (.) hem i base tumas wetem ol staf blong lid by example (.) so once hem i start/em off (.) bae yumi panisim pikinini from lanwis? Most of the time bae hem i no wok. ... From i mas uh trenem o tijim ol tija fastaem? Olgeta oli mas fluent bifo yumi kambak long (.) adrese姆 um i issue blong lanwis blong pikinini. Bae yumi stat wetem ol tija. (XVI:51-60)

AP: It's not really maybe **punishment** doesn't really make sense? I mean to punish someone for language. I think (.) it's really based on staff leading by example (.) so once it starts off (.) if we punish the children for language? Most of the time it won't work. ... Because we have to train the teachers first? They must be fluent before we come back to (.) address the uh issue of the children’s language. We must start with the teachers.] (xvi:53-62)

**Extract 5.25**


[FP: When we try to have it and we punish them? But the children don't understand. It means that you don’t do it like that. Okay something else is like? Me I am the head of the school but it needs the cooperation of teachers. I tell them that (.) the children are under all of us. You see something that’s wrong? You correct it. But no they don't do it. So I'll talk and talk but I keep talking? But someone else is causing a problem on the other side. So I can’t control them. That’s now the main (.) one of our weaknesses as teachers. The supporting of the running of the school which is to (.) we suggest an idea for us to work towards but it doesn’t work. That’s why the children’s weaknesses they'll come and they’ll question. Yes they’ll question us. We must question ourselves first. Before we criticise the children. Whether we show a good example to them or not. But what can we say.] (xvii:93-104)
Both principals state that they do not punish students for language use. Both make clear, however, that a language rule *should* be enforced, and blame the teachers for failing to do so. They state that they *would* enforce the rule if this were possible. Although the Angolovo principal seems to suggest that it is wrong to punish someone, he goes on to say that this is because it won’t work, rather than because he disagrees with punishment itself. Meanwhile, the Faranako principal states that it is not possible to maintain a French-only rule since the students then don’t understand. Neither feels able to enforce a strict language policy, despite wishing this were possible.

However,

Figure 5.1 showed that the majority of students wrote that they were punished for breaking the language rules. Students gave quite detailed accounts in their questionnaires of the type of punishments that were given. These accounts are very similar across the answers given by students from different classes, as shown in the following examples:

*Extract 5.26*

If I break these rules I will be in 2 hour detention. If I do it again I will be in school suspended. If I do it again I will be suspended and withdraw out from school. (Year 10)

If someone break this rules by speaking Bislama or Island language she/he will be doing detentions. If she or he keep doing it he will be suspended. (Year 11)

If we break these rules will be put down for detention because its our school rule that we have to speak English at all time. (Year 12)

“If a student break the rules he should be warn by a teacher and promise to speak english at all times. However, if he breaks it again he/she should have a punishment, detention, in-school suspension and withdraw from school. The student have these different forms of punishment.” (Year 13)

*On va faire punir pour que nous désobeissions à ces règles.* [They will punish us because we have disobeyed the rules.] (Year 7)

*Si tu ne suivre pas ces règles Monsieur le principale va te envoyé dehors.* [If you don’t follow these rules the principal will send you out.] (Year 8)
‘What will happen is we will be sent to the office or if not we have a punishment to weed the sensitive grass.’ (Year 8)

‘If you disobey these rules the teacher will put you out.’ (Year 9)

‘If not we will be punished, we will weed the grass.’ (Year 10)

However, I saw no evidence of any punishment being given at either school for language use during the term. Punishments such as detention (including cutting grass and ‘sensitive grass’), suspension and withdrawal were certainly given for infringements of other rules, such as smoking and missing classes, but not for language use. The principals, boarding masters and teachers agreed that punishments were not given for language, and this was supported by the detention records kept at Angolovo. Teachers at Faranako told me about other schools which did punish students for using languages other than French, appearing to be in favour of these systems, but said that their own students weren’t good enough at French to force them to speak this language all the time.

Students appeared to recontextualise their awareness of punishment for other offences to construct a sense of punishment for language use too. Whether or not they genuinely believed that they would be punished for speaking L1, they wrote that they would be. Given that the questionnaires were completed individually, the similarities across answers within and between each school can only be accounted for by some shared sense that this is what the rules must be. There appears to be a relatively widespread discourse of institutional appropriateness that students reiterate (and generally supported) in their answers. As the Ministry guidelines are recontextualised, first as school rules, and then as day-to-day policy, discourses become increasingly less accommodating towards L1. Either the directive from the Ministry not to punish students is being ignored by schools, and the students are giving accurate accounts of something I failed to notice throughout the fieldwork, or the students

---

19 ‘sensitive’, the common name for nil gras/sensitive grass
are drawing on their conceptualisations of what they consider to be institutionally appropriate in order to construct accounts of punishments that don’t exist.

The discursive construction of punishment conforms to a certain extent to a Foucauldian (1977) sense of discipline. Students appear to base their answers on the knowledge that they could be constantly observed and disciplined, and should be following the rules. They do not speak L2 only, as a result of this imagined surveillance. However, they do moderate their language use as a result of the awareness of the rules, by addressing teachers in L2 when they are expected to do so, and by often lowering their volume or switching to L2 when a teacher passes. The effects of surveillance are therefore quite visible.

5.4 Summary

The data in this chapter reveals the way language is talked about as a symbol of a school, thereby taking on an emblematic function. Language has become a marker of belonging to a school in the same way that wearing a school uniform has. Angolovo students should wear blue uniforms and speak English, while Faranako students wear blue and brown uniforms and speak French. Failure to conform to these norms makes a student less of a member of the institutional community to which he or she is supposed to belong.

As a result, special status is given to whichever language has been selected to represent each school. English was used by the Anglican founders of Angolovo, while French was used by the Catholic founders of Faranako, and these languages thus symbolise the missionary origins of the schools. These are also the languages of the colonial powers that formalised education into the system(s) Vanuatu retains today, and they are thus symbolic of what is meant by formal education. Finally, the two languages have been enshrined as ‘the principal languages of education’ in the national constitution, adding legal weight to their status.

For a number of reasons, English and French have thus long been considered to be the appropriate languages of education, demonstrating the complex
historical production of what are now taken for granted as school rules (cf. 3.2.2). Behaving well entails using one or both of these languages, but no others. Participants refer constantly to a sense of what should be done and the way it’s always been, with few justifications given, thus eliminating the potential to interrogate or redefine the parameters of institutional norms. Where language is constructed as an institutional emblem, English and French become untouchable through a form of de facto policy (Shohamy, 2006b) that is hard to challenge without appearing to lose something important. There is a sense of duty attached to maintaining the status quo, which makes attempts to seek spaces for alternative practices appear seditious. This sense of duty merely compounds what Salhi (2002, p.326) refers to as “the delicate power of inertia and the persistence of things already in existence”, such that the exclusive use of L2 has become part of “the historical body” of students and teachers (Esch, 2012, p.312, following Nihida, 1958). It is hard to imagine change and nobody seems interested in doing so.

However, plenty of space is actually left open for other linguistic resources. Official policy is not as draconian as participants suggest, and school rules are rarely enforced. Students and teachers do make use of resources of languages other than English or French in order to negotiate the day-to-day business of school life, demonstrating that the linguistic heterogeneity of the outside world is certainly not left behind at the school gates (cf. 1.1.3.3). The displays of language policy that have been described in 5.3.1 reveal that small amounts of L2 (and potentially L3) are sufficient for participants to avoid overtly flouting the rules, and thus maintain their identities as members of their school communities. However, it is also clear that this space is only being used ‘off the record’ (cf. Arthur, 1996). It happens out of earshot, or when tacit permission has been negotiated to use other languages. So space exists in which students and teachers can get by, but it is hard to argue that this space is actively being made use of.
6 Language as a tool for learning

6.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the way L2 is constructed as the only appropriate medium of instruction at each school. Within a classroom culture in which language is talked about as the tool through which knowledge can be transmitted from teachers to students, the logical argument constructed is that students need to master this language in order to learn. However, teachers recognise the difficulty imposed by L2, and they take on much of the language work themselves, thereby enabling lessons to proceed without obvious breakdowns. Although it is acknowledged that the use of L1 might help students understand, this is considered a fallback strategy rather than a positive resource. A number of arguments about the nature of Bislama, in particular, serve to maintain L2 as the only appropriate language, at least for the ‘on the record’ interaction. The tension is constantly revealed by the need to use sufficient amounts of L2 to conform to the institutional norms (as described in the previous chapter), while ensuring that effective learning and understanding takes place.

6.2 Language as part of the classroom culture(s)

Figure 6.1 and Figure 6.2 present sketches of a Year 10 classroom at each school, in which ‘B’, ‘G’ and ‘T’ represent boys, girls and the teacher, respectively. Students in the Angolovo classroom sat in groups of four, and there was a lot of interaction between them (sometimes as part of a task in which students were directed to collaborate, and at other times during either a whole-class activity or when students were meant to be working individually). Students in the Faranako classroom sat at individual desks, organised into straight rows. Students sometimes whispered to each other, for example to ask to borrow a pen, but this type of interaction was generally kept ‘under the radar’. 
This pattern extended to other classrooms. Angolovo lessons almost always involved elements of student-student interaction, while Faranako lessons did not. It is therefore possible that there is something ‘Anglophone’ about the classroom culture at Angolovo, and something ‘Francophone’ about that at Faranako, but, within a case study of this nature, this is not possible to ascertain. What is of more interest here is that, despite the surface-level differences between the opportunities for interaction within the two classrooms, language appeared to be used in similar ways.

Extract 6.1 and Extract 6.2 present what might be described as typical whole-class interaction patterns that I observed in the Year 10 classrooms.

---

20 However, reading Nana’s (2010) description of Anglophone and Francophone classrooms in Cameroon, I was interested to see parallels with Vanuatu. For example, Nana’s descriptions of the way Francophone Cameroonian teachers maintained very organised blackboards, and were concerned with styles of handwriting (in contrast to the less rigid approach of the Anglophone teachers) was very similar to what I had observed on Ambae. The Faranako teachers always divided their blackboards using a ruler, and made use of red chalk to emphasise important words. If they dictated notes, they would pause and tell students to change to their red pens in order to emphasise a particular phrase, as well as instructing students on the punctuation they should use. Angolovo College teachers simply dictated notes, without giving information about format or punctuation, and their blackboard use appeared less structured or uniform.
Extract 6.1 Angolovo Yr 10 Agriculture

**T:** What is rumination. ((2)) What is rumination?

**S1:** Chewing [food for once]

**Ss:** [Chewing food] twice

**T:** Again?

**S1:** Animals that chew the food once.

**Ss:** Twice ((laughter))

**T:** Rumination? ((3)) What are ruminant animals?

**Ss:** Animals that chew the food twice.

**T:** Ruminant animals are animals that chew the food?

**Ss:** Twice.

**T:** Twice. Okay? Examples of ruminant animals are?

**Ss:** Cattles.

**T:** Cattle?

**Ss:** Goats.

**T:** Goats and?

**Ss:** Sheep.

**T:** Sheep. Okay? So? Cattle is one of the ruminant animals? And? ((2)) When its stomach is full of ((1)) grass this animal will find a shade somewhere and start to?

**Ss:** Chew the cud.

**T:** Okay. Chew the cud again. Which is known as?

**Ss:** Rumination.

**T:** Rumination.
Pour calculer la croissance de la population. ((1)) Pour faire le calcul sur la croissance de la population? Il s’agit plutôt ici? De deux facteurs. Donc le premier facteur était plutôt? ((3)) C’est quoi.

((2))

S1 : [xx]

T : Oui ?

S1 : Croisement [xx]

T : La croisement naturelle. Et nous avons le deuxième facteur qui est le?

Ss : Migration


((4))

S : [xx]

T : Quoi ? ((2)) C’est quoi le uh la croisement naturelle ? C’est quoi exactement ? Ce que c'est la croisement naturelle. ((2)) Il s’agit de quoi.

Ss : Naissances.

T : Il s’agit plutôt de changement eu à ?

Ss : Naissances.

T : Le chiffre du plutôt au naissances et au ?

Ss : Décès.

T : Au décès.

[\text{T} : \text{To calculate population growth. (1)) To do the calculation of the growth of the population? Here it involves? Two factors. So the first factor was what? (3)) What is it.

((2))

S1 : [xx]

T : Yes?

S1 : Crossing\textsuperscript{21} [xx]

T : Natural crossing. And we have the second factor which is the?

Ss: Migration


((4))

S : [xx]

T : What? ((2)) What is it uh natural crossing? What is it exactly? What is natural crossing. ((2)) It involves what.

Ss: Births.

T : It involves changes in?

Ss: Births.

T : The number of births and of?

Ss: Deaths.

T : Of deaths.]

\textsuperscript{21} The term ‘croisement’ means ‘crossing’. However, the student suggests this as the term for ‘growth’ (instead of ‘croissance’), and the teacher continues to use this term for the remainder of the episode.
In each case, the teacher does most of the work. In Extract 6.1, the teacher rephrases his question several times, before being provided with a definition for rumination. Several students answer together, appearing to make use of fixed phrases (‘chewing food’ and ‘animals that chew the food’), although there is confusion about how many times the food is chewed. When the teacher asks for examples of ruminate animals, several students answer together, providing the three examples in the same order. The teacher then tries to link these examples back to rumination, but the students (again, in chorus) complete his sentence with the synonymous phrase ‘chew the cud’, with no students calling out ‘ruminate’. It seems that the students make use of phrases and lists of examples in the order in which this information had previously been presented to them, an impression that was later confirmed by notes I saw in students’ exercise books.

In Extract 6.2, the teacher begins with an open question, but rephrases this to ask for the two factors needed to calculate population growth. A student provides a suggestion (not fully audible to the recording device), which the teacher accepts as the first factor. In so doing, she appears to accept the student’s use of ‘croisement’ (crossing) in place of ‘croissance’ (growth), and continues to use this for the remainder of the episode. Having elicited the second factor of migration, she asks for the definition of natural growth. Again, she makes several attempts to elicit this information, before reformulating her question into a version that enables a group of students to provide the single word ‘naissances’ (births) and, from there, she is able to elicit the term ‘décès’ (deaths).

In both cases, the students appear to understand the content required. They supply the correct information (despite initial confusion in Extract 6.1 over the number of times the food is chewed), and they seem able to draw on previous learning to do this. They use enough L2 to conform to expectations, but rely heavily on one-word answers and formulaic responses in chorus. In both extracts, the teacher’s prosodic cues of rising intonation orchestrate the interaction, indicating to students when they are to contribute, and restricting student participation to pre-determined answers. I witnessed a number of similar episodes, through which I built up the impression of a classroom culture
in which teachers took care of all procedural, or language work, while the
students simply filled in the content, through carefully controlled Initiation-
Response-Feedback structures (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, 1992), thereby
maintaining the construction of the monolingual classroom norm (Heller, 1995).
Students seemed capable of fulfilling their role, and it cannot be said that the
use of L2 was stopping any form of learning from taking place. I noticed few
obvious breakdowns in communication, where the lesson had to stop or
completely change direction, but teachers constantly had to rephrase and
simplify their questions and instructions. The patterns mirrored those described
in other contexts, such as Brunei and Botswana:

The IRF pattern has a potential benefit in that it ‘essentially strips the work of turn
taking and utterance design’ away from the learners (van Lier, 1996, pp.151-152). It
does so by providing relatively undemanding ‘display slots’ for learners to fill. Thus
the lesson proceeds smoothly through a collaboratively constructed flow of
discourse which is, however, essentially a teacher monologue (Stubbs, 1983).
(Arthur & Martin, 2006, p.182)

The situation is also resonant with Chick’s (1996; Hornberger & Chick, 2001)
descriptions of ‘safe-talk’, in which teachers and students appear to work
together to maintain the appearance of successful learning, using chorus
responses as a social, rather than academic, strategy to maintain this
classroom ritual. As Pérez-Milans (2011) notes, the term ‘safe-talk’ has often
been erroneously applied to any instances of chorus interaction (see also
Weber, 2008), neglecting the focus on the social function intended by Chick.
However, a comparison of Chick’s classroom data (1996, pp.26-7) and Extract
6.1 and Extract 6.2 reveals very similar interaction patterns in which students
provide only low value information, merely repeating information from their
notes, thus suggesting that the lessons I observed were structured to enable
students to “participate in ways that reduce the possibility of the loss of face
associated with providing incorrect responses to teacher elicitations, or not
being able to provide responses at all” (ibid., p.29).

I witnessed only three occasions on which L1 was either used by the teacher in
the classroom, or explicitly sanctioned for the students to use: on the first, the
Angolovo Social Science teacher used the Bislama term ‘had wok’ (hard work)
to clarify the concept of the ‘burden’ for the working population caused by
dependents; while dealing with the same topic, the Faranako Social Science teacher explained that the French phrase ‘les petits’ (grandchildren) meant ‘smol bubu’ in Bislama, and later switched to Bislama briefly to explain that ‘sapos population i hae bae i no gat naf wok’ (if the population is high, there won’t be enough work); finally, while trying to elicit examples of plants that reproduced through various methods of seed dispersal, the Faranako Biology teacher told Year 7 students that they could use Bislama or the vernacular to provide examples. All other teacher-student interaction that I observed was carried out in L2.

Classrooms at both schools were arranged in rows, along the side of which was a covered walkway from which it was easy to hear at least the teacher talking through the open windows (see Picture 6.1, foreground, and Picture 6.2). I therefore had further access to incidental examples of classroom interaction every time I walked from one end of the block to the other, and I heard nothing that suggested that the lessons I observed proceeded in any unusual way. (The walkway also enabled surveillance of lessons by principals and other staff, thus making it unlikely that a teacher would make use of L1 if this was not considered institutionally acceptable. cf. Chapter 5.)

At Angolovo, groupwork was built into the lessons and, at this point, the resources of both L1 and L2 were frequently used. Student talk was generally low volume, and the approach of a teacher often triggered either a switch to L2
or silence. While groupwork was going on, teachers would frequently comment to me on the fact that so much Bislama was being used. They revealed discomfort about the use of L1 (perhaps heightened by my presence), but also suggested that enforcing L2 only would prevent students being able to complete tasks. Faranako lessons provided no opportunities for groupwork, so inter-student talk was confined to whispered exchanges while the teacher’s back was turned which, again, was generally dominated by L1.

In summary, teaching was going ahead in L2, as expected by the institutional norms. Whole-class interaction was led by teachers, with students required to do little more than provide single words in L2, thereby enabling activities to proceed without obvious breakdowns. When students were expected to take on more language work, the use of L1 and L2 together was considered acceptable, albeit by teachers turning a blind eye rather than explicitly authorising such language use.

6.2.1 A transmission model of teaching

During interviews, teachers described the struggle of transferring knowledge to students through the expected language. For example, when asked about which languages are appropriate to use in the classroom, Miss Adina states,

Extract 6.3

Miss Adina: hem i matter of (.) yumi pasem knowledge. ... it doesn’t matter if I use any language in passing on the knowledge. ... both English and Bislama mi save yusum blong mi save pasem knowledge since language is any language (1) yusum blong communicate/em information. (XIII:13-29)

[Miss Adina: it’s a matter of (.) us transferring the knowledge. ... it doesn’t matter if I use any language in passing on the knowledge. ... I can use both English and Bislama to transfer knowledge since language is any language (1) used to communicate information.] (xiii:11-26)

Here, she uses the metaphor of teaching as the transmission of knowledge, which corresponded to my observations of a teacher-led approach in the classroom. She later argues:
Extract 6.4

Mi no wantem save se hem i kasem long which <laughs> which uh (.) which lanwis? Mi wantem save nomo se styuden karem save we blong i gat wan fiujia. (XIV:605-7)

[I don’t care which <laughs> which uh (.) language they learn in? All I care about is that the students get the knowledge for them to have a future.] (iii:557-9)

In these explanations, Miss Adina emphasises the importance of learning. She argues that the priority is getting knowledge to students, and that language is just the means through which this is done (cf. XVIII:38-42, 124-8/xviii:39-42, 123-7 on language as a ‘tool’; XXI:19-29, 37-44, 141-9/xxi:19-29, 35-43, 137-45 on language as a ‘vehicle for knowledge’; see also XIII:595-615, 788-805, 813-14, 820/xiii:548-65, 730-46, 754-5, 761; XIV:785-7/xiv:738-9; XIX: 548-52/xix:537-41). Miss Adina concludes in both extracts, through the topos of successful learning, that it doesn’t matter which language is used. She keeps the focus on learning, rather than on any particular language, stating explicitly that any language (or a combination of them) can be used.

In the Francophone teachers’ interview, Mr Fred draws on the same metaphor:

Extract 6.5

Mr Fred: Wan impoten samting? Yu yu wantem se pikinini i save. ... So yu traem bes blong yu blong pik- i go insaed long (.) bren blong hem. So yu stap lukaotem ol wei/s blong yu mekem se nem blong samting ia i mas go long bren blong hem. Be sapos yu talem long Français? And then pikinini hem i se (.) no nem ia? Mi no (.) taem yu talem long Bislama be taem Bislama i no gat? Bae yu talem long lanwis nao. (XV:133-40)

[Mr Fred: Something important? You want the children to understand. ... So you try your best so that child- so that it goes into (.) their brains. So you keep looking for ways to make the names of things go into their brains. But if you say it in French? And then the children say (.) no that name? I don’t (.) when you say it in Bislama but when Bislama doesn’t work? Then you say it in lanwis now.] (xv:122-8)

He, again, argues that other languages can be used to ‘get things into the students’ brains’, thereby drawing on the topos of successful learning. However, by listing French, Bislama, and lanwis in turn, Mr Fred makes clear, firstly, how separate he considers these three languages to be as alternative media of
instruction and, secondly, the hierarchy in which these languages are positioned. Languages other than French are only considered appropriate when problems arise. Although Mr Fred appears to keep learning at the centre of his argument, the ideological tension surrounding the language(s) through which this should happen is clear.

Mlle Felicia draws on the same metaphor to describe the use of L2 to explain, pass, or give something to the students (the Bislama transitive suffix –Vm makes the metaphor of transmission particularly salient, as four transitive verbs are used in quick succession):

Extract 6.6

Mlle Felicia: Lanwis hem i is- hem i stret. Yumi yusum blong yumi save talen wan (.) pasem wan (.) olsem givim wan samting uh? Be hem i lelebet difficile tu (.) olsem difficult tu olsem long level blong ol tu from (.) hem i wan lanwis tu olsem hem i jes lanem. (XV:29-32)

[Mlle Felicia: The language is eas- it's fine. We use it so that we can say a (.) transfer a (.) like give something uh? But it’s a bit difficult too (.) like difficult too like at their level too because (.) it’s a language too that they are just learning.] (xv:26-9)

On this occasion, Mlle Felicia says it is not the language itself that is problematic, but that the students have not learnt it sufficiently yet. She reveals an understanding of language as a system that can be taught, learnt and mastered, in order to be used as an effective tool. Rather than considering using alternative languages to ensure that learning takes place, Mlle Felicia focuses on whether the students have sufficiently mastered the expected language.

Students also refer to the teachers ‘giving’ them work and subjects, appearing to distance themselves from the question of whether this is problematic for them. In Extract 6.7, Frinston explains that he sees no problem using French, because he is used to it; in Extract 6.8, Feven does not question the use of L2 (and L3) in school, arguing that they need to know these languages in order to learn (cf. XII:46-59/xii:45-58):
Similarly, the following discussion between two Anglophone students over which language(s) should be used in the classroom reveals conceptualisations of language as a way of getting the information that “subjects use” and that are “inside the book”. Both students prioritise learning, and argue that they need to know certain languages to acquire knowledge and information, but they disagree on the languages through which this can or should be accessed.

**Extract 6.7**

*Frinston:* Taem mi skul long praemeri i kam. ... Finis? Mekem ol matière we ol tija i stap givim (.) i isi nomo. (XII:14-16)

*Frinston:* Because I’ve learnt it since primary. ... Already? It means that the subjects which the teachers give us (.) are easy.] (xii:14-17)

**Extract 6.8**

*Feven:* Ol tija oli givim ol wok long yumi oli eksplenem long Inglis mo French i gud blong yumi lanem Inglis mo French. (XII:52-3)

*Feven:* When the teachers give us work they explain in English and French so it’s good that we learn English and French.] (xii:51-2)

*Arthur:* Long tingting blong mi mi ting se ating bae (.) yumi save yusum (.) Inglis nomo? Mo French. (1) Inglis mo French. From (1) tudei ol tu- ol sabjek blong yumi we yumi stap yusum long skul? Tugeta oli yusum Inglis wetem French. From tufala sabjek ia nomo? Uh tufala lanwis ia nomo? Be yumi stap lanem blong yumi save andastanem ol wod/s we olsem oli had insaed long ol buk (.) textbook o ol buk we bae yumi stadi long hem. From sapos yumi lanem ol narañala lanwis? Naoia bae i mekem i difficult blong yumi nao. Blong yumi andastanem ol (.) ol er (.) wod/s insaed long buk o (.) ol texts we bae yumi ridim. Mi mi ting se bae yumi save yusum tufala lanwis ia nomo.

*Arthur:* In my opinion I think that maybe (.) we should use (.) just English? And French. (1) English and French. Because (1) today to- our subjects that we use in school? Together they use English and French. Because just these two subjects? Uh just these two languages? But we learn them so that we can understand the words that are hard inside the books (.) textbooks or books that we study with. Because if we learn other languages? That will make it difficult for us now. For us to understand the (.) the er (.) words inside the books or (.) the texts that we’ll read. I think that we should only use these two languages.

(2)
Andrina: I think we should use three. That is English French and Bislama. Because if they like the teachers go and speak English? And then like they don't understand? Then they explain again in Bislama. Because uh some students like they haven't learnt English well like us? Or French? So they should use Bislama to explain to them. They will understand properly.

(7)

Arthur: I think that we should just use two because if they start and come up from when they are tiny and come up with these two Englishes? Then it won't be hard at all and the teachers won't need to explain again in Bislama. Because they already know English from when they're small onwards and French. So it will be easy for them. They can understand what their teachers are doing. But if they add Bislama in again? That will just make it difficult now because one wants to speak English? Or French? One wants to speak Bislama? So that the two languages er the three languages can't go ahead at all.] (xi:203-225)

Arthur claims that English and French should be used, based on the rationale that these are the two languages in which books are written (cf. XI:259-63/xi:244-8). Andrina, however, argues that Bislama should be used alongside these languages, since this may help many students to understand the explanations better. The same conclusion rule, the topos of successful learning, appears to be connecting both students’ claims to the evidence they draw on, but they reach different conclusions. Unable to dispute Andrina’s logic, Arthur therefore draws on a different rationale in his second turn to restate his claim, suggesting that students won’t have trouble using English and French if they
have used these languages since they were small, but too many languages would be confusing.

To link this justification to his argument for two languages only, Arthur appears to be drawing on the topoi of target language and interference. However, it is significant that he considers the addition of Bislama to the other two languages confusing, but he sees no difficulty with the use of both English and French. Although he does not use any overt predication strategies that label Bislama as different from the other languages, he does nothing to explain his reasoning that three languages are confusing, while two languages are not.

Through a combination of the metaphor of teaching as the transmission of knowledge, and the topos of successful learning, teachers and students describe the way they use language as best they can to transfer and receive information. Teachers describe themselves as professionals doing their utmost to do their jobs, while students base their arguments on considerations of which languages will enable them to access the knowledge they require. There is a constant tension between using the expected medium of instruction and getting knowledge across effectively.

6.2.2 Teachers and learners – Us and them

The way teachers and students talk about themselves and each other also shows how language is understood. Wodak (2001, p.73) describes categories of ‘us’ and ‘them’ as “the basic fundaments of discourses of identity and difference”. In studies such as Blackledge (2005) and Lawton (2010), these categories are taken to be markers of difference that index discrimination and intolerance. In my data, there is no sense of intolerance between different groups within the classroom, but teachers do construct their students as ‘the other’ through their use of oppositional pronouns.

It may be typical of institutional discourse for teachers to position themselves apart from their students. Although unremarkable, it has implications for the way language is conceptualised as a tool that students must master. Rather than
talking about language as a component of shared classroom practice, teachers construct it as an object with which a group other than themselves has difficulty.

Mlle Felicia states,

Extract 6.10

*Mlle Felicia:* I oraet osem *yu toktok oli* andastanem *yu*. Bae *yu toktok oli* andastanem be wan samting nomo? *Olgeta oli* no manage blong bae *oli*:: traem blong toktok long oisem (.). ansarem bak *yu* bakegen long French. (XV:17-20)

[Mlle Felicia: It’s alright like you talk and they understand you. You talk and they understand but just one thing? They don’t manage to:: try to speak to like (. ) answer you back again in French.] (xv:16-19)

The constant switching from the second person singular pronoun, which refers to the teachers22, to the third person plural pronoun, which refers to the students, constructs two different groups. This pattern is repeated throughout the interview. The inclusive first person plural pronoun *yumi* is also used frequently in all teacher interviews (with reference to the interlocutors, i.e. the fellow teacher interviewees, but never appearing to include the students they talk about), while the exclusive pronoun *mifala* (excluding the fellow teacher interviewees) is never used to refer to a teacher and their students together. Teachers do not speak from the perspective of a member of a group with their students. Rather, they speak from a shared teacher experience about their students, in which they describe their attempts to mediate the language difficulties faced23.

Miss Agnes reports that she used to struggle with the language herself, but, while she is conscious that her students still struggle, she now feels more confident in her own ability:

22 The point was made during a group teacher interview, in which teachers directly addressed each other, as well as me. I consider the second person pronoun to be used here to refer to ‘the teacher in general’, so that a contrast is constructed between ‘teachers’ and ‘them’, rather than strictly between ‘us’ and ‘them’.

23 My questions will have contributed to this dichotomy – I asked whether teachers found it easy or difficult to use L2, before asking whether they thought students found it easy or difficult – but throughout fairly extended turns, no participants broke down this dichotomy by referring to anything shared about the difficulties.
Miss Agnes: Fastæm we olsem blong mi tijim Inglis? Hem i mi faenem i had lelebet blong mi tijim. ... Afta taem se i kam go olsem naoia seken yia? Mi mi filim se naoia olsem se (. ) mi save yusum (. ) i stret nomo long klas wetem ol styuden. Be samtaem bae ol styuden bae oli nid blong mi ripitim bakegen mi wan? Samtaem i no klia tumas long olgeta so bae mi mas ripitim (. ) er (. ) instruction blong mi bakegen blong mekem i mo klia long olgeta. (XIII:31-9)

[Miss Agnes: When I was first teaching English? I found it a bit difficult to teach. ... Then now time goes on now to the second year? I feel that now like (. ) I can use it (. ) it’s fine in the class with the students. But sometimes the students will need me to repeat myself again? Sometimes it’s not very clear to them so I’ll have to repeat (. ) er (. ) my instructions again to make it clearer for them.] (xiii:28-35)

Miss Agnes refers to her own difficulties separately from those of her students, and does not acknowledge the difficulties posed for everyone by the use of L2. Now that she feels she has mastered it, the problem appears to rest entirely with students. Language is thus constructed as a system that can (and must) be acquired in order to be utilised effectively (cf. XIX:33-5, 39-46, 600-9/xix:33-6, 38-45, 585-93), rather than something inseparable from either its users or learning.

Excerpts from the student interviews reveal a similar separation between ‘them’ (the teachers) and ‘us’ or ‘me’ (the students), realised either through pronouns or explicit use of the professional anthroponyms. The following comments by two Anglophone students include a contrast between third person and first person (inclusive) plural, and third person and first person singular, respectively:

Extract 6.12

Andrina: Sapos ol tija oli talem long yumi (. ) yumi save ansarem olgeta. (XI:28-9)

[Andrina: If the teachers explain to us (. ) we can answer them.] (xi:26)

Extract 6.13

Aston: Taem tija i eksplen long Inglis? Most bae mi andastan. Be sapos we (. ) hem i (. ) continue blong (. ) eksplen long French nomo? Ating bae mi no (. ) bae mi no save andastanem nomo. (XI:4-6)

[Aston: When the teacher explains in English? I can understand most of it. But if (. ) he (. ) continues to (. ) explain in French? I don’t think I (. ) I will be able to understand.] (xi:4-6)
Again, it is unsurprising that students talk about their teachers as belonging to a different category, given their positions of authority. However, conforming to the roles of ‘student’ and ‘teacher’ does not prevent talk about what they all do together in the classroom. However, students refer only to work that the teachers ‘give’ and ‘explain’, positioning themselves on the receiving end of a unidirectional process mediated through a language.

Perhaps the clearest indication of teachers, students and language being considered separately can be seen in the following comment by a Francophone student:

**Extract 6.14**

*Feven: Mi long tingting blong mi se bae yumi yusum French taem yumi skul long praemer i kam antap. Kasem long Klas 6. Afta yumi (.) blong go long secondary long Yia 7 go long ... French mo Inglis. Ol tija oli kam givim Inglis blong yumi bae yumi stap yusum.*

(XII:369-74)

[Feven: In my opinion we should use French when we’re in primary school upwards. Until Class 6. Then when we (.) go to secondary in Year 7 we should go to ... French and English. **The teachers will come and give English to us and then we'll use it.**] (xii:357-61)

Feven suggests that teachers can arrive at the start of a new year and ‘give’ them a new language that they can then use from that point forward. Each language is treated as a potential medium of instruction, and new ones can be added at any time. Language is thus constructed as a tool through which successful learning can and should take place.

These interview extracts present a classroom culture in which teachers and students occupy different roles as transmitters and recipients of knowledge. The discourse is in line with my own impressions based on classroom observation, discussed in 6.2. While teachers find their role difficult, due to the students’ inability to ‘receive’ the knowledge in the way that they want to ‘transmit’ it (due to low competence in the language used as the ‘tool’ of ‘transmission’), students are unlikely to be able to comment on L2 itself as a problem within this classroom culture. It is hard for them to critique the use of the only medium they
have ever known in school\textsuperscript{24}. It is hard to envisage either teachers or students challenging the status quo and seeking alternatives, since no clear problem is acknowledged.

6.3 Sufficient linguistic competence for learning

Within the classroom culture described, students are expected to have sufficient competence in L2 to learn all subjects through it. I saw no document in Vanuatu that makes any specific mention of any normative indicator of such competence. The assumption appears to be that students selected for Year 9 will have performed sufficiently well in the Year 8 national examination, including in L2, to proceed with their studies. My personal experiences as an L2 user of French in the Faranako classrooms would challenge this, as I found I struggled to concentrate on so many different subjects in succession (see Extract 4.2), despite having no problem with the requirements of the Year 8 French L2 examination. I judged my own competence in French to be sufficient for my purposes as an observer in the classroom, but not to engage actively within the lesson.

My observations suggested that students were in a similar or weaker position. They appeared to understand much of what the teachers were saying, but they had either limited opportunity or ability to participate much themselves. The broad tests I carried out of students’ ability to speak and write in L2 and L3 suggested a lack of confidence, at least, in using either language. Figure 6.3 to Figure 6.6 summarise my judgement of L2 and L3 ability at both schools. As noted in 4.2.1.3, I use subdivisions of the CEFR levels to do this, although I do not suggest that these judgements are either valid or reliable, with reference to others’ usage of the framework.

\textsuperscript{24}It should also be remembered that the students who I am interviewing have managed to cope with learning through an L2 sufficiently well to make it as far as Year 10, while those that struggle more have already dropped out of the system.
Figure 6.3 Speaking (Angolovo)
Average L2 (English) = B1/B1+; Average L3 (French) = A1-

Figure 6.4 Writing (Angolovo)
Average L2 (English) = A2/A2+; Average L3 (French) = Pre/A1-

Figure 6.5 Speaking (Faranako)
Average L2 (French) = A2-/A2; Average L3 (English) = A1+/A2-

Figure 6.6 Writing (Faranako)
Average L2 (French) = A2; Average L3 (English) = A1/A1+
According to the Council of Europe (2001), ‘independent users’ of a language are those considered to be at B1 or B2 levels. The Francophone assessor and I considered the majority of Angolovo students to be able to speak at some length in English, and assigned an average level of B1/B1+. Few were judged to fall below A2 for either speaking or writing. However, we considered the vast majority ‘pre-level’ in French, unable to produce anything at all in this language. At Faranako, the students’ levels in the two languages were closer together, averaging A1 or A2 in both French and English. Although the assessment did lend weight to the common perception that Francophones speak L3 better than Anglophones, it appeared that this particular group of Francophone students could only be considered ‘basic users’ (averaging A2) (ibid.) of the language they were expected to use as the medium of instruction.

6.3.1 Students as helpless experiencers of language difficulties

Teachers seem aware that their students struggle in L2. In the following four extracts, teachers describe similar accounts of unsuccessful attempts to explain in L2:

Extract 6.15

Mr Felix: Samtaem mi toktok Franis mi luk ol pikininini oli (.) <laughs> sam oli stap ae i bigbigwan. (XV:7-8)

Mr Felix: Sometimes I speak French I see the children (.) <laughs> some just sit there wide-eyed.] (xv:7-8)

Extract 6.16

Mr Fred: Mi toktok Français gogo bae (. ) yu luk se (.) i go fas? Naoia bae mi kambak long Bislama nao. (XV:12-13)

Mr Fred: I go ahead in French (. ) you’ll see that (. ) it doesn’t work? I’ll come back to Bislama now.] (xv:12-13)

Extract 6.17

Mrs Anne: Nomata yu eksplenem wan samting we yu ting se yu eksplenem hem i very klia long ol styuden long Inglis? But still bae oli no save er andastanem nomo. So:: fulap taem mi stap tempted se mi (.) turnaround mi jes traem blong eksplenem long (. ) Bislama long olgeta ating bae oli save andastanem mo. (XIV:28-31)

Mrs Anne: Even if you explain something that you think you’ve explained very clearly to the students in English? But still they just won’t be able to er understand. So:: I’m often tempted to (. ) turnaround I just try to explain in (. ) Bislama to them maybe they will understand more.] (xiv:26-9)
Miss Adina: Mi no yusum Inglis approach evri taem sometimes mi mas kamdaon long level blong olgeta (.)
ekspelenem slowly or putum long simple terms. Sometimes? I can go as far as explaining it in Bislama.
(XIII:16-18)

[Miss Adina: I don’t use the English approach all the time sometimes I have to come down to their level (.)
explain it slowly or put it in simple terms. Sometimes? I can go as far as explaining it in Bislama.] (xiii:14-16)

Again, these teachers draw on the topos of successful learning to justify switching to Bislama when students cannot understand. The phrases “come back”, “turnaround” and “come down” present the languages as unequal options, as Bislama is only used when the expected medium fails. Teachers thus describe L2 as a problem that students cannot deal with (cf. XIII:93-100/xiii:85-92; XIV:348-51/xiv:328-31; XVII:127-31, 142-55, 159-61/xvii:120-5, 135-8, 144-8).

In some extracts, students are positioned in an adjunct clause, helpless experiencers of L2, which is assigned the role of grammatical subject:

Extract 6.19

Mr Felix: Franis hem i had lelebet long olgeta. (XV:9)

[Mr Felix: French is a bit hard for them.] (xv:8-9)

Extract 6.20

Mr Andrew: A lot of er words we mifala i yusum blong tijim long Science oli very difficult for (. ) wan yang learner. (XIV:10-11)

[Mr Andrew: A lot of er the words that we use to teach Science are very difficult for (. ) a young learner.] (xiv:10-11)

In other extracts, a third person singular pronoun subject – ‘hem i lelebet difficile’ (see Extract 6.6), ‘i no klia tumas long olgeta’ (Extract 6.11), ‘i go fas’ (Extract 6.16) – represents something like ‘explanation through L2’, while the students are, again, less prominent. The inadequacy thus remains depersonalised.
Finally, where students are positioned as the subject, the lexis of difficulty and fear removes some of their agency, depicting them as helpless:

**Extract 6.21**

*Mr Andrew: Oli faenem lelebet difficulty wetem (.) lanwis.* (XIV:8-9)  
*[Mr Andrew: They find a slight difficulty with (.) language.] (xiv:8-9)*

**Extract 6.22**

*Mlle Felicia: Oli stap hesitate oli fraet o oli olsem wanem. Timides blong ansarem yu.* (XV:25-6)  
*[Mlle Felicia: They hesitate or they’re afraid or they’re kind of. Timid to answer you.] (xv:23-4)*

Students are therefore described as passive experiencers of problems caused by L2, constructing language as the cause or agent of these problems. Language is considered external to its users, either a tool or a barrier to successful teaching (cf. XV:45-8, 75-9/xv:40-3, 68-72; XVII:18-20/xvii:16-8).

Teachers blame any difficulties on the fact their students haven’t acquired L2 to a sufficient standard. By doing so, they appear content with the use of L2 as medium of instruction. The Francophone teachers, for example, contrast the difficulties faced by Faranako students with the ease with which urban students use French. In each case, a well-known school in the capital city is named, and compared to their own situation. The teachers construct the problem as resting with their particular students who have not mastered L2, in comparison to other (better) students:

**Extract 6.23**

*Mr Felix: Mi stap long Montmartre fastaem? Ol styuden oli luk se (.) hem i (.) isi. Be long ples ia samtaem mi toktok Franis mi luk ol pikinini oli (.) <laughs> sam oli stap ae i bigbigwan. Mi (.) mi ting se Franis hem i had lelebet long olgeta long (.) long long aelan.*  
*[Mr Felix: I was at Montmartre first? The students seemed like (.) it was (.) easy. But here sometimes I speak French I see the children (.) <laughs> some just sit there wide-eyed. I think French is a bit hard for them on (.) on the islands.]*

(2)
Mr Fred: Hem i (.) hem i tru hem i tru. Mi mi stap long Lycée? Long Lycée yu toktok Français hem i (1) i oraet. Be taem mi kambak long aelan? Mi toktok Français gogo bae (. ) yu luk se (. ) i go fas? Naoia bae mi kambak long Bislama nao. Mi toktok Bislama ia. (5)

Mlle Felicia: Mi go mekem (. ) wanem ia praktikel blong mi long Montmartre? Mi luk se lanwis ia hem i: (. ) yu toktok oli ansarem yu hariap nomo. ... Be long ples ia oli tekem (. ) olsem oli stap hesitate. (XV:6-25)

Mr Fred: It's (. ) It's true it's true. I was at Lycée? At Lycée you speak French it's (1) it's alright. But now I've come back to the island? I go ahead in French (. ) you'll see that (. ) it doesn't work? I'll come back to Bislama now. I speak Bislama. (5)

Mlle Felicia: ... I did my (. ) what's that my practical at Montmartre? I saw that language wa::s (. ) you spoke and they just answered you straightaway. ... But here they make it (. ) like they hesitate.] (XV:6-23)

Anglophone teachers also compare situations in which L2 works with those in which it is easier to use L1:

Extract 6.24

Mr Aru: I gat few styuden/s nomo we bae oli traem blong (. ) yu givim ol explanation long Inglis we olgeta i grab/em (. ) er straightaway. Fulap blong olgeta bae yu introduce-m bae yu riptim sem information o sapos no? Olsem long level blong pikinini olsem Bislama yumi yusum hem i much more klia long olgeta? (XIII:42-46)

[Mr Aru: There are only a few students who will try to (. ) you give the explanations in English and they grab it (. ) er straightaway. Many of them you'll introduce it and you'll have to repeat the same information or if not? Like at their level it's much clearer for them when we use Bislama?] (XIII:38-42)

In both interviews, teachers appear to separate students into those who cope and those who don’t, and situations where L2 works from those where it doesn’t. They therefore continue to draw on the topos of successful learning to justify their use of L1. They make it clear that they only have to do this because most of these particular students do not have sufficient competence to cope as expected. The implication is that language is there to be learnt and, once mastered, it can be used for learning (as the medium through which knowledge can be transmitted).
Interestingly, students seem unwilling or unable to talk about any difficulties they personally face with L2. Although my observations, language assessment and teachers' accounts all indicate that they struggle, neither group of student interviewees talks about such a problem from their own experience. The Francophone students all state that they have no difficulties using French, since they have learnt it since they were small (XII:1-16/xii:1-17). They also say they like the language (XII:18-29/xii:19-29), and at no point report any problems. In contrast, the Anglophone group mention difficulties (XI:8-12/xi:8-11), but these students tend to distance themselves personally from this difficulty by referring to others.

For example, when asked whether they are good at English, and whether they wish they spoke it better, Arthur appears to begin to answer this about himself, but then shifts to explaining how students in general can improve their English, a move that the others follow:

**Extract 6.25**

Arthur: *Mi mi ting se mi mi gud blong Inglis from (. ) long Inglis? Sapos yu speak long hem? Bae (. ) mo yu save gud bae evri samting long buk we (. ) long defren kaen sabjek (. ) we hem i had? Hem i (. ) yu save andastanem nomo bae yu save gud Inglis.*

(Artur: I think that I am good at English because (. ) in English? If you speak it? Then (. ) and you know it well then everything in the books from (. ) the different subjects (. ) that is hard? It (. ) you can understand it if you know English well.

Amboline: *Okei yu (. ) yu save toktok gud Inglis sapos we yu stap practise/im toktok long hem evri taem ... (XI:16-22)*

(Amboline: Okay you (. ) you can speak good English if you practise speaking it all the time ...)

This distancing was also seen in Extract 6.9, in which Andrina used the third person to refer to problems faced by other students. She explicitly contrasted these ‘other students’ with the interview group. At the end of this extract, Arthur also made use of Andrina’s categorisation of ‘others’ who do not understand, and presented solutions to the problem of inadequacy for these ‘others’, rather than continuing to speak with reference to himself and his co-interviewees.

While teachers attribute the problem to students, students either shift the issue
to others or deny its existence. No participant group appears able or willing to refer to language as anything that concerns them personally.

It should be remembered that questions of language competence and confidence were discussed right at the beginning of the interviews, and the dynamics in the student groups, in particular, were very stilted at this point (see XI/xi and XII/xii for long pauses and whispers during the early stages of both interviews, and my comment to the Francophone group in XII:61ff./xii:60ff.). Students may have felt they had to present themselves as conforming to official policy, or they may have felt unable or unwilling to critique the status quo. However, whether they genuinely did not feel they had a problem, or whether they did not want to talk about a problem, the outcome is the same. Language was considered something that they had little control over, which they either did or did not face a problem with. L2 was accepted as the medium of instruction, and they therefore needed sufficient competence in it.

6.3.2 The need to practise L2

Whether or not other languages were tolerated, both Anglophone and Francophone teachers made clear that monolingual use of L2 was the expectation. The topos of target language was utilised in similar ways by both groups to argue that exclusive use of L2 would improve competence.

In the following excerpt, Mr Felix states clearly that only French should be used:

Extract 6.26

*Mr Felix: Sapos yumi tij long Franis?
Then yumi mas traem blong emphasise se (1) yumi toktok er Franis nomo blong helpem pikinini blong hem i improve/m (. ) Franis blong hem. (XV:119-21)*

*[Mr Felix: If we teach in French? Then we must try our best to emphasise that (. ) we speak er only French to help the children to improve (. ) their French.] (xv:109-11)*

Mr Felix’s claim is justified by the rationale that French is the medium of instruction. He therefore draws on the logic of the topos of target language. The Anglophone principal comments on the use of “too much” Bislama to make the similar point that this affects students’ ability to express themselves in English:
Extract 6.27

AP: From er (.) tija hem i tend to speak long ol styuden long (.) Bislama? (.) and er communication most of the time hem i stap long (.) Bislama? ... So mekem styuden hem i no save (.) um express/em hem (.) confidently and (.) flow hem i expression blong hem i flow? Taem hem i traem blong kambak long Inglis. From ating i jes tumas Bislama insaeed long (.) klasrum. (XVI:10-16)

[AP: Because er (.) the teachers tend to speak to the students in (.) Bislama? (.) and er communication most of the time is in (.) Bislama? ... So it means students are unable to (.) um express themselves (.) confidently and (.) flow how their expression should flow? When they try to come back to English. Because I think it’s just too much Bislama inside the (.) classroom.] (xvi:11-17)


Extract 6.28

Miss Adina: Taem yumi yusum tumas Bislama? Yusum tumas lanwis. Ossem mi samtaem mi stap mekem? Afta bae mi faenem se in the end bae olgeta nomo oli suffer/em consequences because they are writing their exams in English. ... Nao yumi stap competent long nara lanwis nao. So mi samtaem bae mi go be bae mi mas gat wan limit we you stop here. Yu no eksplenem <laughs> tumas samting long Bislama. With lanwis. (1) Own mother tongue. (XIII:54-68)

[Miss Adina: when we use too much Bislama? Use too much lanwis. Like I sometimes do? Then I'll find in the end that they will just suffer the consequences because they are writing their exams in English. ... Now we become competent in another language now. So sometimes I’ll go but I must have a limit where you stop here. You don’t explain <laughs> too many things in Bislama. And lanwis. (1) Own mother tongue.] (xiii:48-61)

There is a consistent concern with what happens when communication must go back to the target language of L2, with references to “too much” L1 placed in contrast to what “should” happen. The predication strategies used to describe the means taken to ensure understanding reveal a sense of unease with the use of L1. A tension becomes clear between the use of L2, in order to conform to expected usage in the classroom as well as requirements in the exam, and
the incorporation of other languages that are used to help students understand. The topos of *successful learning* clearly does not always lead to the conclusion that any language can be used. This is an issue that has been discussed elsewhere with regard to the use of pidgins and creoles in education (see Siegel, 1999a, in particular, on the time-on-task argument), as well as in foreign language teaching more generally.

Within this argument, an inconsistency is revealed in a comparison of the way academic and non-academic contexts are talked about. It becomes clear that the classroom is considered to be a special ‘academic’ domain at both schools (cf. 5.2.2.2) in which the norms are particularly fixed. Teachers depict an ideal situation in which only L2 would be used, but also explain that L1 is tolerated outside the classroom for pragmatic reasons:

**Extract 6.29**


[Mr Felix: I was at Montmartre? I spoke French with all my students? Outside. Then? I sent them? Whatever? I said everything in French. I came and tried it here. I say something? The student just stands there? He asks me what I’ve said. So (.) so that (.) I don’t take too much time trying to make him understand what I want to tell him outside? I tell him straight in Bislama you go do this?] (xv:62-7)

**Extract 6.30**


[Mr Fred: At each child’s home? Papa and mama they speak language. ... They don’t speak French. (1) So when they send him to go get something? They don’t tell him in French? So here? When he comes back here? *When he comes outside from class? He thinks about his home. So for you (.) to say something in French? Then the child doesn’t get it.] (xv:90-95)
Mrs Anne: To students olsem mi traem bes blong mi. From mi save se hem i wan requirement blong skul blong yumi toktok Inglis long olgeta at all times even (.) insaed long klasrum o aot saed. So (.) olsem. Mi olsem mi traem long taem blong skul olsem mi hardly toktok Bislama o eni ting long ol styuden and (.) be wanem mi faenem se (.) taem sapos yumi wokbaot tugeta wetem ol styuden bae yumi go olsem yumi wokbaot go long stadium or yumi go eni wea. Sapos we mi ting se mi communicate wetem olgeta long Inglis? Bae dis taem bae i katemaot conversation long olgeta nao. Bae mi mi toktok. Sapos mi toktok long olgeta? Oli yes no oli givim wan smol ansa nomo finis? Oli stop nao. Bae mifala i communication i no save go so. Mifala i jes wokbaot olsem (.) kwet nomo i go. Be sapos mi jenis ia mi kam Bislama nao conversation i (.) i stat nao i go on. (XIV:201-11)

Teachers reveal their awareness that insisting on L2 causes communication breakdowns, and yet they are only willing to modify the institutional norms and use L1 outside the classroom. It could be argued that many non-academic communication breakdowns at school are less problematic than those that occur during the formal teaching context, given the difference in what is at stake. However, an awareness that communication proceeds more meaningfully when L2 monolingualism is not imposed rarely permeates into discourses about the classroom. Students are expected to have high enough L2 competence to learn exclusively through this medium, and thus L1 remains, at best, the fallback strategy for situations in which students’ competence is inadequate. The fact that L1 is not considered to be suitable in the classroom and yet seems to be tacitly accepted in other areas of the campus reveals the
academic hegemony of L2, but presents an inconsistency in logic that might provide potential space to be interrogated.

Another inconsistency is the lack of concern for L3 as a target language, as highlighted in 5.3.2. The argument that a language should be used at all times in order to develop competence in this language would suggest that L3 should be used as much as possible, at least within L3 subject periods. However, in all L3 lessons that I observed in Year 10 classrooms, explanations and grammar notes were given entirely through L2. The teachers themselves appeared to make their own decisions about which language to use, and I did observe an Anglophone French teacher at a neighbouring school using French (L3) as the medium. A discussion with one of the teacher trainers at the Vanuatu Institute of Teacher Education (20/5/11), at which all the teachers I observed had been trained, confirmed that the issue of whether to teach L3 through the medium of L2 or L3 was not really discussed. The trainer did not seem to see the significance of my questions. The teaching of L3 thus presents an interesting conflict between whether it is the school language (L2) or the target language (in this case, L3) that should be used as much as possible. Again, there may be space within the conflicting logics that can be interrogated.

Finally, it was clear that, although there was a desire for L2 to be spoken at all times around the campus, this came up against an equally strong desire for a particular standard or ‘correct’ version of this language. Several teachers commented on the fact that concerns about making mistakes in the language may have impeded students’ willingness to speak L2 (XIII:276-342/xiii:250-314; XIV:60-1, 81-7/xiv:56-7, 75-80). A number of other references were made to a good or pure L2 (XI:21-4/xi:20-22; XVII:81-4/xvii:77-9). The Director of Basic Education was the most vocal about this, stating:
6.4 L1 as unfit for purpose

Argumentation about L2 is usually as much about not speaking L1 as it is about improving L2. Other, specifically metalinguistic, topoi are employed in arguments that construct L1 (and Bislama, in particular) as inappropriate.

6.4.1 A lack of vocabulary

The first argument made against Bislama is that it has insufficient vocabulary for use in education, an argument that has long been used in pidgin and creole debates (see Siegel, 2007). Extracts from Anglophone teacher interviews illustrate this in different ways. In the first, Mr Aru argues that Bislama has more limited vocabulary than English:

Extract 6.33

Mr Aru: Long Bislama ia? Yumi no really save yusum because yu faenemaot se most long olgeta vocabularies ia? Yumi no save (.) yumi no save. Yumi tend to yusum wan wod for two three four five different things. So taem we yumi yusum olem ia? Yumi practise/im wan (.) pikanini se ... taem we oli gobak long Inglis? Then olgeta bae oli adoptem Bislama system ia bae i go long Inglis. Then hem i really had blong olgeta i (.) express/em olgeta long Inglis. (XIII:150-6)

[Mr Aru: In Bislama? We can’t really use it because you find out that most of its vocabulary? We can’t (.) we can’t. We tend to use one word for two three four five different things. So when we use it? We practise a (.) children ... when they go back to English? Then they will adopt this Bislama system into English. Then it’s really hard for them to express themselves in English.] (xiii:137-41)
Mr Aru claims that Bislama cannot be used for teaching, on the grounds that each word has several different meanings. He compares the inventories of Bislama and English, suggesting that there are insufficient separate lexical items in Bislama to deal with concepts that need to be discussed in English. The logical connection between the argument and its rationale can only be that a language must have a sufficient lexical range before it can be used to teach (the topos of linguistic adequacy, cf. XIII:4-10/xiii:3-8). (He also draws on the topos of interference which will be discussed in 6.4.3). Miss Adina attempts to incorporate Mr Aru’s argument in her following turn, but reveals a tension between this and the topos of successful learning:

**Extract 6.34**

_**Miss Adina:** Sapos oli save andastanem samting better in Bislama? There is no harm in expl- (. ) be problem ia nomo from sam long ol samting long Bislama? Oli minim olsem Mr Aru i talem? Tu tri samting at once. So mi ting se sapos olsem (. ) sapos oli save andastanem samting long Bislama? (1) Why not tijim olgeta long Bislama. From se purpose hem i them grasping the knowledge. (XIII:170-75)_[**Miss Adina:** If they can understand better in Bislama? There is no harm in expl- (. ) but the problem then is that some things in Bislama? They mean like Mr Aru said? Two or three things at once. So I think that if like (. ) if they can understand in Bislama? (1) Why not teach them in Bislama. Because the purpose is them grasping the knowledge.] (xiii:154-8)

Miss Adina therefore appears to agree with Mr Aru’s point, but the episode reveals a tension between these beliefs about Bislama as a language and her determination to argue that learning is paramount. This indicates a conflict between ensuring that learning takes place (which may enable resources to be drawn from several languages) and selecting one discrete language that is considered adequate for this purpose.

Perhaps realising that Miss Adina has not used his point in the way he had intended, Mr Aru reinforces his argument. He begins by explicitly shifting attention away from learning, and back to the language. This time, he compares Bislama to the vernacular spoken by both him and Miss Adina, making clear that he uses the topos of linguistic adequacy with specific reference to Bislama:
Extract 6.35

Mr Aru: Yes bae yumi gobak long (.)
long lanwis ia. Yu putum wan eksampol
long ples ia osem Ambaean lanwis.
Um mi really agri wetem hemia osem
bae yumi save yusum lanwis blong tijim
long skul/s. ... Because er (.) sapos
yumi compare/em olgeta lanwis (.)
lanwis I mean mother tongue Ambaean
lanwis wetem Bislama? Er Ambaean
lanwis hem i mo rich. Bitim er Bislama.
Hem i mo rich long in terms of
vocabulary. And then olgeta (.) ol uh
oda blong olgeta sentens we yumi
raetem olgeta (.) i gud. (XIII:180-9)

[Mr Aru: Yes let's go back to (.) to the
language. You put one example here of
Ambaean language. Um I really agree
with this like we can use this language
to teach in schools. ... Because er (.) if
we compare the languages (.) language
I mean mother tongue Ambaean
language with Bislama? Er the
Ambaean language is richer. Than
Bislama. It's richer in terms of
vocabulary. And then the (.) the uh
order of sentences that we write (.) is
good.] (xiii:163-70)

It becomes clear that Mr Aru is not simply arguing for the official L2 policy. He
reveals beliefs specific to Bislama, claiming that the Ambaean language has a
rich enough vocabulary to be used. In a different interview, Mr Andrew reveals
similar beliefs:

Extract 6.36

Mr Andrew: Yes long wan lanwis polisi
summit we i bin take place long
Saratamata? Olsem (.) gavman hem i
reorganise/em lanwis/es blong yumi
tijim long skul/s nao. Wan nao hem i (.)
wanem ia vernacular o wanem ia? Ol
local lanwis/es ia? Then Inglis mo
French. Be (.) Bislama oli
discourage/im. So hemia nao wan long
(.) from why? Olsem we mi bin talem
finis. I no gat vocabulary blong hem (.) i
no gat vocabulary. Hem i too difficult. ...
Ating wan risej hem i find out se:: hem i
proper blong jam long vernacular into
English and French rather than jumping
from vernacular into Bislama and then
into that. Hem i Bislama nao hem i
kosem a lot of mess. (XIV:352-68)

[Mr Andrew: Yes at a language policy
summit which took place at
Saratamata? As (.) the government is
reorganising the languages that we
teach in schools at the moment. One is
(.) what's that vernacular or whatever?
The local languages? Then English and
French. But (.) they discourage
Bislama. So that's one of (.) why? As I
have already said. It has no vocabulary
(.) it has no vocabulary. It's too difficult.
... I think a research found thaat it's
proper to jump from vernacular into
English and French rather than jumping
from vernacular into Bislama and then
into that. It's Bislama that causes a lot
of mess.] (xiv:332-46)
Mr Andrew states twice that Bislama has no vocabulary, before concluding that it is too difficult (although it is unclear whether it is the further development of vocabulary that would be too difficult, or teaching using current resources of Bislama). He notes that Bislama “causes a lot of mess”, contrasting this “mess” with the “proper” alternative of not using Bislama. He attributes these ideas to the language policy meeting organised by the government, and then refers to the findings of “a research”, although he mitigates this with the use of “I think”, and explains no further. He therefore seems to draw on external authority to lend weight to his claims. (See also XIV:619-42/xiv:582-605, in which Mr Andrew reproduces very similar arguments that he was told at the same meeting.)

Mrs Anne and Mme Adrienne also draw on the topos of linguistic adequacy by suggesting that Bislama is incapable of explaining concepts needed:

Extract 6.37

Mrs Anne: “Yu yusum wan simple wod we (.) olsem consequences for example. Olsem wan wod ia we mi ting se oli sud save be (.) hemia bae oli no save wanem. Bae oli askem se hemia hem i minim wanem oli no save se hem i minim wanem. So mi no save. Hemia bae mi (.) olsem (.) go long (.) go long wanem kaen problem nao. <laughs>

Mme Adrienne: Be yu lukum hemia hem i tru. From naoia yu tekem consequences ia? For example olsem wan wod? Bae yu traem eksplenem long Bislama bae yu talem olsem wanem. Bae ol pikinini bae oli jes konfius mo. Consequence bae yu talem olsem wanem long Bislama. Yumi ting se Inglis hem i we oli sud harem save be yet nogat. Taem we bae yu mekem i go long Bislama? Hemia bae i worse.”

[Mrs Anne: You use one simple word that (.) like consequences for example. Like this word which I think they should know but (.) they won't know what it is. They will ask what does it mean they don't know what it means. So I don't know. So it (.) like (.) goes to (.) goes to what kind of problem now. <laughs>

Mme Adrienne: But you see this it's true. Because now if you take consequences? For example as a word? If you try and explain it in Bislama how will you explain it. The children will just be more confused. How can you explain consequence in Bislama. We think that they should understand English but yet they can't. When you do it in Bislama? That will be worse.]

The central claim here is that using Bislama makes explanations more confusing, since an English word such as ‘consequence’ has no direct
equivalent in Bislama. The topos of *linguistic adequacy* again provides the logical conclusion rule here. There appears to be the perception that L2 has a set of necessary vocabulary that Bislama lacks direct translations for, thus making it impossible to explain concepts in Bislama. The view that Bislama has an insufficiently developed vocabulary is put forward with relative consistency throughout the data, revealing a fairly deep-rooted belief. Although a few interviewees recognise the advantages of using a widely-spoken language such as Bislama, they are quick to dismiss this potential with comments on the inherent capabilities of the language (e.g. XIX:315-33/xix:307-25; XX:94-6/xx:93-5).

### 6.4.2 Bislama as a made up language

Another common claim that draws on the topos of *linguistic adequacy* is that Bislama is unsystematic or ‘made up’. However, the justifications given for this claim are inconsistent with participants’ descriptions of other languages that they do consider adequate. This can be exemplified with four extracts about Bislama, which will then be contrasted with three extracts about English and French.

**Extract 6.38**

*Mr Andrew: Sapos yu luk vocabulary blong Bislama? Hem i (.) no match/em Inglis vocab mo French vocab. From oli jes get it from the blue and put it into the language.*


*[Mr Andrew: If you look at the vocabulary of Bislama? It (.) it doesn’t match English vocab and French vocab. Because they just get it from the blue and put it into the language.*

*Mk Ala: I:: agree with Mr Andrew too about this. Our Bislama is not a good Bislama. It’s (.) it’s just a made up language. You’ll hear this year people speak in one way? They use certain words. Next year you’ll hear the what the terms or whatever? They’re different now. They’re made up somewhere and people just use them. Meaning it’s no good.] (xiv:296-303)
Extract 6.39

Mr Aru: Sapos we yumi lisin long yumi? Bae most long olgeta toktok we yumi tokba- yumi toktok long Bislama hem i repetition and fulap long ol samting we (. ) we hem i no mekem eni ting nomo. ... Naia yumi stap speak/im uh Bislama? Naia ol broken wan nomo. I no wan gudwan nating? Yestedei i gat wan expression blong one particular thing tudei bae hem i defren. Tumora yumi tok defren lanwis nao. Even though hem i stil Bislama but then yumi yusum ol defren wod/s altogether than yumi yusum ol same wod/s. (XIII:824-35)

[Mr Aru: if we listen to ourselves? Most of what we say when we discu- we say in Bislama it’s repetition and a lot of it (. ) just doesn’t mean anything. ... We’re speaking Bislama now? It’s just a broken version. It’s not a good one at all? Yesterday there was an expression for a particular thing today it’ll be different. Tomorrow we’ll speak a different language. Even though it’s still Bislama but then we use different words altogether rather than using the same words.] (xiii:764-74)

Extract 6.40


[FP: Bislama is a (. ) just a language of communication. It doesn’t have a way of writing. When we write it we write according to our own idea of the grammar. We just write our vocabulary. Whatever you. You want to know whatever you write it. But it doesn’t have a proper vocabulary for us to talk about or for us to look at. No. These words you write them however you like. Bislama is a language for communication.] (xvii:198-203)

Extract 6.41

DBE: At the moment tudei mifala i tok Bislama? We speak bad Bislama. It’s not really Bislama. From Bislama ia hem i ol Inglis wod nomo. Most the time? Oli no minim eni ting long mifala <laughs>. So i gud blong come up wetem (. ) real Bislama. (XIX:330-3)

[DBE: At the moment today we speak Bislama? We speak bad Bislama. It’s not really Bislama. Because this Bislama is just English words. Most of the time? They don’t mean anything to us <laughs>. So it’s good to come up with (. ) real Bislama.] (xix:322-5)
The common theme is that Bislama is constantly changing, with vocabulary that is unsystematic, and a lack of grammatical structure. The language is described as coming “from the blue”, “made up”, no good (Extract 6.38), repetitious, meaningless, “broken” (Extract 6.39), suitable only for (oral) communication (Extract 6.40), “bad”, meaningless, and just English words (Extract 6.41). The language is characterised as being unstable, with Mr Aru and Mr Ala both making use of contrasting adverbs “this year ... next year” (Extract 6.38) and “yesterday ... today ... tomorrow” (Extract 6.39) to argue that language change appears random. The fact that Bislama is constantly developing is used as the evidence to justify the claim that it is unsuitable for education. It is considered to have no norms that guide the way it is used.

The argumentation is inconsistent, however, if these descriptions are compared with those of English and French. In Extract 6.42 and Extract 6.43, Mme Adrienne comments on her competence in English and French while, in Extract 6.44, Mr Felix considers his competence in French.

**Extract 6.42**

*Mme Adrienne: Mi ting se mi yusum Inglis (. ) evri dei. ... Mi no gat problem wetem. Wan man we hem i save better Inglis osem Fiona bae i correct/em. Se whether Inglis blong mi i nogud be (. ) blong talem se are you confident? Mi save talem se yes. (XIV:157-61)*

[Mme Adrienne: I think that I use English (. ) every day. ... I don’t have a problem with it. Someone who knows better English like Fiona can correct me. Say whether my English is poor but (. ) in saying are you confident? I can say yes.] (xiv:145-9)
Mme Adrienne: I can say that I know French because I am in this environment of ours. But (.) I have a question. I have a question whether if I go to an environment where they speak French now? Will I keep up with them? Because actually French is a kind of language which is alive. They change the expressions like we said about Bislama today. But (.) if they say something I'll still understand. But to (.) speak to them? I (.) I wish I could go into I would always like to improve it. But at the moment I speak it's alright. Like we're here if someone comes some time and he speaks? I'll understand. I'll answer him. But maybe somewhere outside? It's already changed. So for the question yes. I wish that I spoke better that I was in an environment where they speak it so that I could (.) update my expressions or my words.] (xiv:371-81)

Mr. Felix: Yes I wish that I spoke better like (.) to speak with students that's I can speak French like that. Or I can speak with one of my colleagues. Like I speak French. But if I spoke with (.) a real French man? My vocabulary would (.) that's it now we wouldn't have any new ones. If I could speak like a French man (.) I'd like that.] (xv:53-7)

Mme Adrienne says she speaks English and French with confidence, but is unsure how her version of these languages would measure against some kind of native-speaker norms that she has no access to, or whether she would have...
sufficient competence to cope in other environments where the language was spoken (cf. XIII:72-81/xiii:63-73). Mr Felix also refers to the norms of French as though they are ‘out there’ somewhere, set by “real” Frenchmen and more up-to-date than his own version.

Mme Adrienne describes French as a language “which is alive”, and Mr Felix notes that he might not have “new” enough vocabulary, both suggesting that they might find they spoke a different version from other French speakers. Mme Adrienne acknowledges that they had also described Bislama as a living and constantly-changing language, thus highlighting awareness of the conflict I am referring to. However, in the descriptions of French, this living quality is depicted as correct and acceptable, and speakers measure their own competence against native speaker benchmarks. Native speakers of Bislama are not given this same authority.

The same predication strategies are used with reference to Bislama, French and English. The languages are constantly changing, rather than stable. However, there is a sense of a correct, up-to-date version of English and French that is owned by native speakers, outside the environment in which the interviewees actually use the languages. There is no such environment in which Bislama norms are considered to exist, and change is described in negative terms. No logical distinction is made to explain why L2 can be living while Bislama cannot. It therefore appears very easy to challenge some of the logic on which the topos of linguistic adequacy is used. However, the negative beliefs about Bislama’s lack of norms appear deeply held.

6.4.3 Similarities between Bislama and English

A further reason put forward against the use of Bislama at Angolovo is that it has a negative influence on the learning of English. In the following extract, the Anglophone teachers discuss why older people tend to speak better English than the younger generation:
Mr Andrew: Mi ting se wan long olgeta influences ia we hem i create/em hemia hem i long that period of time? Bislama hem i no wan common lanwis for every citizen long Vanuatu. Like er (. ) sapos yu stap long Ambae? Bae yumi speak Ambaean lanwis nomo. So taem yumi jiam aot long Ambaean lanwis (. ) sel blong Ambaean lanwis? Yumi jiam i go direct long Inglis o French. Be (. ) Bislama nao hem i wan long olgeta er (. ) lanwis (. ) nasonal lanwis we hem i miksim tumas mekem se hem i isi for young people from (. ) young population blong Vanuatu i toktok long hem. Therefore hem i had blong yumi jiam i go long Inglis vocab o French vocab. ...

Mr Ala: Hem i contribute long olsem (. ) long understanding long Inglis blong yumi. Yu save from. Olsem uh. Mi stap long Ranwadi i gat wan pikinini we hem i kam in long Yia 7? Uh olsem skul rul i talem se speak English at all times. Then hem i traem blong speak Inglis be hao i putum olsem ol man oli talem se hem i talem wan toktok hem i giaman. Afta nara wan i talem se eh boe ia i talem long hem se i wantem talem long Inglis se (. ) hem i sud talem se no he is lying. Afta hem i talem se no he is giaman/ing. Olsem hem i yusum Bislama? I putum i-n-g long en. <laughs> (XIV:305-31)

[Mr Andrew: I think one of the influences that causes this is that in that period of time? Bislama was not a common language for every citizen in Vanuatu. Like er (. ) if you were on Ambae? You would only speak the Ambaean language. So when we jumped out from the Ambaean language (. ) shell of the Ambaean language? We jumped directly into English or French. But (. ) Bislama is now one of the (. ) languages (. ) national language which is very widespread so it is easy for young people from (. ) the young population of Vanuatu to speak it. Therefore it’s hard for us to jump into English vocab or French vocab. ...]

Mr Ala: It contributes to (. ) to our understanding of English. You know because. Like uh. I was at Ranwadi there was a child who came in in Year 7? Uh like the school rule said speak English at all times. Then he was trying to speak English but the way he put it was people said that he said something and he lied. And then another one said eh that boy he told him he wanted to say in English that (. ) he should say no he is lying. Then he said no he is giaman/ing. Like he used Bislama? He put i-n-g on the end. <Laughs>]
(xiv:287-311)

The claim is made that Bislama contributes to difficulties using English. Two pieces of evidence are used to justify this. Mr Andrew notes that older people speak better English than younger people, and explains that these older people spoke only the vernacular before learning English, in contrast to the current situation in which Bislama is widely spoken. Mr Ala uses an anecdote from a previous school in which a boy added an English suffix onto the Bislama verb giaman (to lie) as evidence that people accidentally mix the languages together.
The use of terms such as “influences” (cf. XIV:333-4/xiv:313-4 on “spoiling”) indicates the topos of *interference*.

Siegel (1997b, 1999b) notes the widespread usage of this argument in Vanuatu, citing the views of language planners (in Thomas, 1990) and Charpentier (1997) with regard to Bislama’s influence on English. The logic driving this argument is that the lexical similarity between Bislama and English makes it hard for learners to separate the languages, causing confusion and impeding their development of English. However, once again, the rationale on which this argument is based is inconsistent in the data, presenting an opportunity to challenge its logic.

Firstly, the teachers in Extract 6.45 do not make explicit reference to the lexical similarity between Bislama and English (although see XIV:623-42/xiv:586-605), and there is nothing in Mr Ala’s anecdote that explains why Bislama presents any greater issue than any other language would in the learning of English. It is not clear that they are basing their claims on any linguistic reasoning about the influence of Bislama in particular on English. Secondly, only Anglophones are considered to be affected by this interference. In answer to another teacher’s question as to why Francophones appear to learn English better than Anglophones do, Mr Ala states that this is because they learn English when they are more mature, whereas Anglophones learn it young and “mix” it with Bislama:

**Extract 6.46**

*Mr Ala:* Mi mi ting se long olsem (.) from wanem ol French oli lanem (.) oli speak gud Inglis mo bitim yumi? From oli lanem long ej we olsem oli mature. Oli lanem Inglis. Then oli lanem wan gud Inglis oli speak wan gud Inglis. Yumi from yumi statem long kindy i kam antap ia? Olsem yumi miksim Bislama wetem Inglis (.) yumi miksim gogo taem yumi kam antap ia? (XIV:567-71)  

*[Mr Ala: I think that for (.) why Francophones learn (.) they speak better English than us? Because they learn it at an age when they are mature. They learn English. They they learn a good English they speak a good English. Us because we start in kindy and come up? Like we mix Bislama and English (.) we mix it the whole time that we're growing up?]* (xiv:532-6)
Here, Mr Ala suggests an age limit for the topos of interference, although he does not explain why (older) Francophones learning English do not also confuse the language with Bislama, despite the fact that they also speak it. Once again, the teachers do not appear to be clear about why Bislama might influence English, since Francophones are considered to be able to learn English without such interference.

Thirdly, examination of argumentation put forward by Francophone teachers presents an apparent conflict with the notion that Bislama causes problems for the learning of English:

Extract 6.47

'Mr Fred: Inglis hem i isi. From wanem? From Bislama hem i stap finis.
Mr Felix: Bislama olsem ol (. ) hem i wan dervié blong Inglis=
Mr Fred: =Yes.
Mlle Felicia: Yes.
Mr Fred: Yu (. ) yusum ol wod/s long Bislama? Hem i blong Inglis nomo. Be (. ) French? Hem i lelebet (. ) bae yumi talem se i had blong (. ) blong ol man uh?
Mlle Felicia: French i expensive tumas (XV:224-32)

[Mr Fred: English is easy. Why? Because Bislama is here already.
Mr Felix: Bislama like the (. ) it’s a derivate of English=
Mr Fred: =Yes.
Mlle Felicia: Yes.
Mr Fred: You (. ) use the words in Bislama? They’re just from English. But (. ) French? That’s a bit (. ) we could say that it’s hard for (. ) for people uh?
Mlle Felicia: French is really expensive] (xv:208-15)

Later in the interview, Mr Fred explicitly contrasts the L3 abilities of Anglophones and Francophones, having previously been a French (L3) teacher at Angolovo College:
These teachers do explicitly discuss the lexical similarities between Bislama and English. However, unlike the Anglophone teachers, they consider these similarities to make it easier to learn English, apparently drawing on the topos of positive transfer, rather than interference (cf. XIX:97-9/xix:93-5). Comparing the predication strategies used throughout the interviews with reference to each of L3 English and L3 French, with English referred to as ‘easy’ but French as ‘hard’ or ‘expensive’, demonstrates that ni-Vanuatu are considered to simply
pick up English because of its similarities with Bislama, while French is difficult to learn.

This was one of the most recurrent theme across all interviews (XI:353-9/xi:337-44; XII:192-234/xii:187-227; XIII:212-4, 641-3, 659-60/xiii:190-2, 590-1, 605-7; XIV:538-48/xiv:504-14; XV:224-42, 444-62/xv:208-24, 417-32; XVII :6-12, 125/xvii: 5-10, 121; XIX:106-10/xix:102-6; XXI:236-45/xxi:230-8). The argument makes sense, based on the lexical similarity between English and Bislama, which is likely to help one language appear more familiar to someone who already speaks the other. However, the comment that English is easy for Francophones is not supported by my observations of English (L3) lessons at Faranako, which were carried out in French (L2) and in which neither students nor teachers revealed confidence in using L3. Mlle Felicia had previously told me that she couldn’t teach English through the medium of English because students didn’t understand when she did, but she gave no indication of this during the interview. Although my language assessment also showed that the Francophone students had higher L3 levels than the Anglophone students, neither group would be considered highly confident in English (whether learnt as an L2 or L3), which does not support the assertion that Bislama speakers can simply pick up English.

A number of issues are raised by these conflicting accounts. On the one hand, if Anglophone teachers are concerned about the negative influence of Bislama on English, but do not articulate this concern with reference to lexical similarities, they appear unable to tackle what they consider to be the problem, through some form of awareness approach (Siegel, 1999b, 2006b) (given that their students do speak Bislama, and they can’t simply hope that the language will go away). On the other hand, if Francophone teachers think that English is so similar to Bislama that students can learn this language automatically, there will be negative implications for the way the teaching of this L3 is carried out. Meanwhile, if there is any merit in the argument that French is more difficult to acquire than English, it seems strange that this issue is erased from discussions of medium of instruction. Children labelled as ‘Francophones’ are only exposed to French at school, so the assumption that children can cope with this language as L2, but not as L3, is questionable.
The data is thus inconsistent in the way Bislama is considered to influence English. For Anglophones, Bislama is considered a problem, following the topos of interference. For Francophones, Bislama is considered to make English easy to learn, following the topos of positive transfer. Neither observation, however, is clearly supported by other evidence, and the two arguments appear to present conflicting logic.

6.5 Summary

The data in this chapter reveals the way language is talked about as a tool for learning. As was the case in Chapter 5, the use of certain language(s) enables participants to be ‘good’ teachers and learners, conforming to institutional expectations. However, within this particular data, this is justified by an instrumental need to ensure that learning is successful. Teachers and students describe the way a certain level of L2 competence is required for learning, since this is the language through which knowledge is expected to be transmitted. Classroom observation data supports interviewees’ accounts of teacher-led interaction in which students participate in limited ways, demonstrating that, while a submersion model of education may prohibit languages other than L2, it does not necessarily promote much use of this language from the majority of classroom participants. However, it appears that participants have found a way to ‘get by’ in the classroom, neither facing obvious breakdowns in communication nor directly challenging institutional norms by openly using other languages (cf. Heller, 1995).

L3 has limited instrumental function within each school, which goes some way to explaining the ambiguity of its institutional status discussed in the previous chapter. Participants display neither competence in, nor motivation to use, this language. However, L1 is more problematic. A number of reasons are given for its exclusion, argued through the topoi of the target language, interference, and language adequacy, demonstrating the prevalence of a number of ideas, by no means unique to Vanuatu, about language learning (Cook, 2001; Macaro, 2001), monolingual ideologies of education (Banda, 2010; Brock-Utne, 2009; García, 2009; Gogolin, 1997), and negative attitudes towards certain languages.
that are not considered suitable for formal education (Makalela, 2009; Probyn, 2009; Rajah-Carrim, 2007; Siegel, 2007).

However, each of these topoi has been shown to be used inconsistently within the data. Meanwhile, the recurring use of the topos of successful learning presents a challenge to this argumentation, and participants do appear to recognise the instrumental value of L1. The result is a pragmatic compromise in which L1 is kept under the radar, leaving L2 as the “on-stage” classroom language (Arthur, 1996). To avoid potential difficulties, teachers take on much of the language work, leaving students to join in by supplying very limited chunks of L2, often in chorus with their classmates (cf. Arthur & Martin, 2006; Chick, 1996). Throughout, the impression is given of L2 being the only language used in the classroom, thus enabling all participants to be ‘good’ teachers and students, despite many participants using very little of this language. In the same way that Blommaert and Varis (2011) refer to “enoughness” as a benchmark for being accepted as authentic members of identity categories, it appears that ni-Vanuatu students only need to display enough L2 to act appropriately. This amount may not be enough to ensure that effective learning takes place, but it enables everybody to know and feel that education is proceeding as it should. Coupled with the emblematic function of L2 (and L3), discussed in Chapter 5, this ‘safe’ classroom interaction has become so ingrained that few participants are willing to acknowledge any problem at all.

The overall impression presented by the data in this chapter is thus of an absence of ideological space for change. If a problem is not acknowledged, there is a lack of opportunity to discuss language(s) openly. Once again, however, a certain amount of implementational space does appear to be left open. Teachers appear to draw on their own philosophies regarding the use of different languages within teaching, rather than being constrained by an official position that they have internalised through teacher training or guidelines. Indeed, the training programmes at the Vanuatu Institute of Teacher Education appear to pay little attention to language issues. Meanwhile, the pragmatic patterns of classroom interaction that have become normalised in each school enable students to use just enough L2 to survive in the classroom while the
teachers do most of the talking, leaving space open for alternative language practices, albeit in covert ways.
7 Language as a door to opportunity

7.1 Introduction

Since language use within schools has appeared less contentious than expected, it seems necessary to revisit the original rationale for the study. At the school level, it appears that it doesn’t matter that some schools use English while others use French; there is sufficient L2 competence to ensure some form of learning, albeit with teachers bearing the brunt of the language work; and students seem free to draw on the resources of a number of languages outside the classroom. There has been nothing particularly ‘Anglophone’ or ‘Francophone’ about the way language is dealt with. The question is therefore why and by whom is language being constructed as a problem? The second pair of data chapters thus examine the way language is talked about with reference to the world beyond school.

This chapter discusses the way language is talked about as a gateway to further opportunities, examining the extent to which different languages are considered to provide such opportunities, and whether being ‘Anglophone’ or ‘Francophone’ affects one’s chances. The data suggests that any disparity in opportunities between these pseudo-ethnolinguistic groups is reconstructed as the need for ‘bilingualism’ in English and French, through arguments of the ‘double opportunity’ presented by two ‘international languages’.

7.2 Language within a context of (in)equality

Chapter 2 provided data that suggested greater opportunities for speakers of English than French. It was shown that more job advertisements required competence in English than French, that more scholarships were available at Anglophone tertiary institutions than Francophone ones, and that the tourism industry was dominated by English-speaking visitors. This section examines the extent to which reference is made to these unequal opportunities within the discourse of official education policymakers (7.2.1), teachers (7.2.2), and students (7.2.3).
7.2.1 A dominant discourse of Francophone disadvantage

Official education policy texts make frequent reference to the need for equity between Anglophones and Francophones. The following extracts from the period 1999 to 2010 are typical:

Extract 7.1

We will continue to search for ways to ensure that the best of the young people completing secondary education will have access to higher education, **regardless of the main language in which they have done their previous studies**. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, p.2)

Extract 7.2

Ensure equitable distribution of resources (finance, human resources, educational and non-educational resources) to schools of the same level and type, **whatever the medium of instruction**. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2002, p.4)

Extract 7.3

Improve quality and accessibility for tertiary studies in both the francophone and anglophone schools. (Government of the Republic of Vanuatu, 2006, p.30)

Extract 7.4

It is important that any national assessment system ensures that both Francophone and Anglophone students are given equal opportunity to achieve success, and to progress to further schooling or into further education and training. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2009, p.14)

Extract 7.5

The VNCS emphasizes harmonisation of the curriculum for all students **irrespective of their language background**. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2010, p.2)

Language is positioned as unimportant. For example, language is mentioned in an adjunct phrase within Extract 7.1, Extract 7.2 and Extract 7.5, signalling that it is not the focus of the policy goal, and yet this reference to language has still been included. Likewise, the reference to “both” Francophones and Anglophones in Extract 7.3 and Extract 7.4 reveals that it is considered necessary to mention the two streams explicitly. In each extract, the focus is on achieving an objective such as quality or access to higher education, but the addition of the metalinguistic phrase shows the inseparability of language from the issue. It can be inferred that there is currently a lack of equity between Anglophones and Francophones.
Similarly, the beginning of Extract 7.6 gives the impression that the teaching of L3 will enhance the prospects of both Anglophones and Francophones, since further opportunities will be available to students from both streams:

Extract 7.6

In particular, if the teaching of the second international language is improved dramatically, students will be able to seek admission to both Anglophone and Francophone universities. Thus young people who have been taught in the Francophone system but who have also mastered English can seek admittance to the University of the South Pacific and other Anglophone universities. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, p.9)

However, it is telling that the example in the second sentence (introduced by the logical connector “thus”) demonstrates that the addition of English will help Francophones, while Anglophones are not mentioned. The consequence of greater access for all is actually greater access for Francophones (or a decrease in their lack of access). Background knowledge helps us understand that this point is not about helping all students, since learning French is unlikely to lead Anglophones to choose to go to one of the few French-medium institutions. It is about redressing the balance between opportunities for Anglophones and Francophones.

Other references make this point more explicitly. The Education Sector Strategy, for example, asserts that the dual system of education is “inequitable” (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2006b, p.16), although it does not clarify how this is the case. In its section on ‘Bi-lingualism, equity and special needs’ (the heading, itself, indicating the connection between language and equity), it then states the need to re-develop national assessments “to ensure equity for English and French speakers” (p.23), thus making clear that this is not currently the case. The Education Roadmap from three years later, goes further:

Extract 7.7

Facilitation of access to university for Francophone students on the same basis as Anglophone students, and removal of unnecessary barriers that make it more difficult for Francophone students to gain entry to a university. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2009, p.18)

This extract suggests that something other than numerical dominance of English-medium institutions was considered to be at play. The “unnecessary
barriers” that could be “removed” shift the focus to deliberate measures that prevent Francophones accessing further education.

A key interest therefore became the extent to which the different school participants were aware of (or talked about) a disparity in opportunities and, particularly, how they made sense of any disparity. Do Francophones feel disadvantaged? Do they talk about the need to learn English? Do Anglophones dismiss French as an unnecessary language for them?

7.2.2 A teacher discourse of disparity but not disadvantage

Teachers at both schools seemed aware that Anglophones were more frequently awarded scholarships:

Extract 7.8

Mr Aru: Olgeta we oli go aot especially long skolasip ofis/es ia? Bae most long olgeta ol Anglophone. Er Francophone bae sam (.) I mean sam long olgeta Francophone oli go as far as (.) oli (.) oli (.) oli stap long ol skul/s long Vanuatu oli go long French skul. Then oli go blong entrance blong yunivesiti? Olgeta oli switch nao. From Francophone i go long Inglis. ...

Miss Adina: ... Olsem Mr Aru i talem? Mi ting se ol Anglophones oli gat mo janis/es blong go overseas. Olsem at the moment.

Miss Agnes: Yes ating long kwestin ia? Hemia i tru ol Anglophone nao oli gat mo janis blong stadi oversea. And (.) mi mi luk se from ating ol Anglophone oli gat ol olsem (.) fulap ples/es blong go.

Mr Aru: M-m.

Miss Agnes: While er Francophone olgeta oli gat wan nomo. (XIII:389-420) [Mr Aru: Those who go out especially through the scholarship office? Most of them are Anglophone. Er some Francophones will (.) I mean some Francophones go as far as (.) they (.) they (.) when they are at school in Vanuatu they go to French school. They they go to university entrance? They switch now. From Francophone to English. ...]

Miss Adina: ... As Mr Aru says? I think that Anglophones have more chances to go overseas. Like at the moment. ...

Miss Agnes: Yes I think for this question? It’s true that Anglophones they have more chances to study overseas. And (.) I think it’s because the Anglophones have like (.) many places to go.

Mr Aru: M-m.

Miss Agnes: While er Francophones they have just one.] (xiii:358-88)
Both groups recognise a disparity, and agree that this is due to the number of institutions of each language. They are aware that New Caledonia is the only realistic option for Francophones (see also XVI:212-66/xvi:214-66; XVII:433-43/xvii:418-28). They build on each other’s answers, showing their agreement. Mr Aru mentions that Francophones sometimes switch stream in order to obtain tertiary opportunities, and this was commonly mentioned throughout the fieldwork, suggesting the lack of instrumental value of French. There is a slight difference in the perspectivization strategies used, as the Anglophone teachers refer to both Anglophones and Francophones in the third person, thereby distancing themselves from any advantage they may have, while the Francophone teachers refer to Anglophones in the third person and Francophones in the first person, thereby placing themselves in the category of concern. However, neither group frames their answers within a discourse of
Francophone discrimination. They appear simply to describe and accept the situation they see.

In Extract 7.10 and Extract 7.11, Mr Andrew and Mr Fred argue that the disparities in opportunity (Mr Andrew with reference to jobs; Mr Fred to scholarships) are due to personal choice:

**Extract 7.10**

Mr Andrew: *Straight after Independence long eighties and nineties? Ating (.) er individual ni-Van hem i (.) laek blong save both Inglis mo French. But as taem hem i go on? Near to the two thousand ia? Mi ting se (.) Vanuatu hem i become mo dominant wetem Inglis. So (.) hem i (.) mi no save risen why? But that’s why lanwis polisi ia oli traem blong emphasise/em mo blong French se blong evri sitisen i mas save French. But again? Hemia hem i minim se gavman hem i mas do/im pat blong hem blong lukluk long ensure that intres ia blong lanem French hem i continue blong flow. (XIV:447-54)

**Extract 7.11**


[Mr Andrew: *Straight after Independence in the eighties and nineties? I think (.) er individual ni-Vans (.) wanted to know both English and French. But as time has gone on? Near to the two thousands? I think that (.) Vanuatu has become more dominated by English. So (.) it’s (.) I don’t know the reason why? But that’s why the language policy is trying to emphasise French that every citizen must know French. But again? That means that the government must do its part to look to ensure that the interest to learn French continues to flow..] (xiv:418-25)

[Mr Fred: *What ni-Vanuatu really like is (.) English. (.) They really like English. Um (.) I don’t know why. ... That’s why it seems that (.) many Anglophones go out to go to (.) other countries. Many. But in terms of Francophones? Just a few. But why just a few? Because there is just a small number of (.) Francophones. Just a small number. But if we say again that the two are the same? The government must find a way for it to be easy with (.) the two must be the same. But now? Now not yet? It’s like that now. We see that Anglophones have good (.) access for them to go to (.) different countries. But those Angl- er (.) Francophones they just have Caledonia.] (xv:335-45)
Both teachers link an apparent preference for English to the disparity in opportunities, and then to the need for the government to respond, through a series of logical connectors (‘And then’, ‘So’, ‘That’s why’, and so on). Both imply that the government has control over the provision of these opportunities, and are thus to blame for the scarcity of jobs and universities requiring competence in French (cf. XVII:447-57/xvii:432-41; XX:366-78/xx:366-78). However, both also state that they don’t know why English has become more dominant, which mitigates their apportioning of the blame. Although they think the government should do something in response to the disparity, they do not seem to think any disadvantage is deliberate.

Finally, Extract 7.12 and Extract 7.13 provide the responses given in two of the teacher groups, when asked whether English or French was more widely spoken, nationally and globally.

**Extract 7.12**

*Mr Aru: For example long aelan. (1)*
Ambae. Between population long ples ia directly bae yumi talem nomo se i gat more English speakers than ol French speakers. Be sapos yumi extend mo long provins? Ating bae yumi stil maintain/em hemia (. ) more English speakers than French speakers. And sapos yumi go as far as Vanuatu? Ating bae yumi stil maintain/em hemia. Bae yumi stil maintain/em hemia. From raet nao olsem se sapos yumi lukum ol hao edyukesen system blong yumi i go? Yumi sort of gat wan percentage like er (. ) siksti foti? Or seventi teti. Siksti hem i blong ol Anglophone? And then foti hem i blong ol Francophone. Be throughout long wol ia? Mi no really sua but sapos we yumi tekem category blong Vanuatu ia? Um sem taem we yumi stap tokbaot ol Inglis speakers long wol ia? Mi ting se (. ) ating bae (. ) mebi sapos we tufala i equal or smol percentage defrens nomo. Olsem mi stil fil se (. ) ol English speakers long wol oli more than ol Francophone.
Miss Adina: I think so too. Because considering us? Like we know English through (.). Like (.). <turns to me> no offence (.). British colonising Vanuatu. So in history? The English? Er (.). British? They colonised most parts of the world. So it means that (.). there must be more English speakers than French.

(4)

Miss Agnes: [Yes i tru]


Mlle Felicia: [Presbyterian]

Mr Felix: [Ol narafala jioj] oli kam. Presbyterian? (.). [Anglican]?

Mr Fred: [Anglican]

Mr Felix: Ol SDA olgeta oli kam wetem Inglis. So i mekem se (.). hemia nao Inglis i bigwan. Franis i smol. ... long wol. Ating hem i Inglis.

Mr Fred: Hem i Inglis.

[Mr Felix: Uh many people speak (.). English in Vanuatu. (3) Yes? Many people speak English? It just follows the missionaries from the past. Okay. The churches which spread the two languages. The Catholic Church? It came with French? And then?

Mlle Felicia: [Presbyterian]

Mr Felix: [Other churches] came. Presbyterian? (.). [Anglican?]

Mr Fred: [Anglican.]

Mr Felix: SDA all of those came with English. So it means that (.). now English is big. French is small. ... in the world. I think it's English.

Mr Fred: It's English.
Mlle Felicia: Yes. Olsem mi mi talem long fas ples finis. Inglis hem i the most popular language olsem long wol uh? Fulap. Fulap kaontri long wol oli yusum (. ) lanwis ia olsem se hem i wan ofisol lanwis. Blong ol.

Mr Fred: M-m. Bae yumi talem se long (. ) olsem klosap long Pasifik ia? Sapos yumi kaontem long (. ) karem long Pasifik nomo? Long Pasifik nomo hem i Inglis hem i bigwan.

Mlle Felicia: Yes ating (. ) yes hemia i tru. (XV:469-96)

Mlle Felicia: Yes. Like I said already. English is the most popular language like in the world uh? Many. Many countries in the world use (. ) these languages like as an official language. Of theirs.

Mr Fred: M-m. We can say that in (. ) like nearby in the Pacific? If we count in (. ) take it just in the Pacific? Just in the Pacific it’s English that’s the biggest.

Mlle Felicia: Yes I think (. ) yes that’s true.] (xv:439-64)

In Extract 7.12 and Extract 7.13, both groups, again, recognise a numerical imbalance between Anglophones and Francophones, but they rationalise this with reference to school statistics or historical processes. Mr Aru calculates the different numbers of schools within each stream to explain why he thinks there are more English speakers. Miss Adina justifies her answer about the global disparity with reference to the different colonial powers, and the Francophone teachers explain that the difference within Vanuatu is due to the different denominations of missionaries. Both groups refer to the different languages that these newcomers “came with”, making clear the exogenous nature of English and French, and presenting a matter-of-fact account of their introduction.

Adult participants seem aware that English is more widely spoken throughout the world and, particularly, Vanuatu (XVI:290-96/xvi:289-96; XVII:473-79/xvii:455-63). However, they seem to be making reasoned judgements to explain this, rather than the situation being self-evident. There is no clear sense of a dominant ‘global English’ ideology underlying their answers that makes Francophone disadvantage inevitable.
7.2.3 A lack of student discourse about disadvantage

Both student interview groups seemed unsure how to answer the question of whether Anglophones or Francophones had better opportunities for further study. The only Anglophone student who attempted to answer said:

Extract 7.14

Aston: Mi mi ting se (.) both Anglophones and Francophones oli gat better janis blong go aot overseas (.) blong stadi. From tudei i no (.) ol man nomo we oli stadi Inglis oli go aot. Ol man tu oli stadi French? Olgeta tu oli go aot blong (.) stadi oversea. (XI:110-3)

[Aston: I think that (.) both Anglophones and Francophones have a better chance to go overseas (.) to study. Because today it’s not (.) just people who study English who go out. People who study French too? They also go out to (.) study overseas.] (xi:103-6)

The only Francophone student who contributed said:

Extract 7.15

Frazer: Long mi mi luk se uh (5) ol hem ol Inglis skul nomo (.) oli go (.) oli go aot saed long kaontri blong yumi blong oli lanem ol sam samting (XII:149-50)

[Frazer: To me it seems that uh (5) it’s only English schools (.) who go (.) who go outside our country to learn things.] (xii:144-5)

Aston and Frazer seem to understand the question, and explain that they think Anglophones have greater opportunities, although Frazer states that Francophones also now have chances to go overseas. Other students either made comments about the general benefit of going overseas to study or kept quiet. They seemed uncertain either about the opportunities available, or about the point of the question itself, which suggests that they were at least not aware of a clear disparity. This reticence was in contrast to their animated engagement about many school-based topics. They seemed uncertain about the situation beyond school, and were not willing to guess.

The next question asked students to discuss whether Anglophones or Francophones had better chances of finding employment. Two Anglophone students opted to discuss this:
Both students seem to understand what is being asked. They argue that opportunities are available for both Anglophones and Francophones, using the terms ‘also’, ‘different kinds of people’, and ‘both’. Aston explains that the constitutional requirement to use both languages makes it advantageous to speak both. This particular student, again, displays the most knowledge of the situation beyond school (although the term ‘national languages’ is incorrect for English and French).

The Francophone students initially seemed unclear about what the question meant. I explained in Bislama and, after a further pause, told them that it was fine for them to say that they didn’t know. After another pause of 14 seconds, Frazer finally said:
Frazer is, again, the only student who seems to have an opinion, and he, again, suggests that Anglophones have greater opportunities. Fylene gives tentative support for this opinion but I felt that the other students either were unaware of the situation with regard to employment opportunities, or could not grasp what the question might be asking about, thus indicating that they were not aware of any real issue.

I attempted to follow up Frazer’s comment that Anglophones had greater opportunities, by asking whether they considered this a problem. I reminded them that they were Francophone students, so we were talking about a situation that affected their own futures. There was a 19 second pause before Frazer, again, attempted to answer:

Extract 7.18

Frazer: Mi luk se (7) ol Inglis ia? Ol olgeta we oli skul Inglis nao olsem oli (.). oli save (1) oli save kasem wok blong olgeta. Bitim ol (.). olsem ol French skul. Olsem long tingting blong mi mi luk se i olsem nao.

(17) <whispers>

Frinston: Ating

Fylene: Ating i sem mak olsem Frazer i talem. (XII:172-7)

[17] <whispers>

Friston: Maybe

Fylene: It’s maybe like Frazer says.]

(xii:166-71)
Frazer: Oli save kasem wok blong olgeta hariap. Eksampol French skul from (. ) sam (. ) i no gat (1) fulap man we oli toktok French mekem se i no gat fulap wok. Oli no save (. ) continue. (XII:289-96)

Frazer: They can find work easily. For example French schools (. ) some (. ) there aren't (1) many people who speak French so there isn't much work. They can't ( . ) continue.] (xii:220-7)

His answer doesn’t really address the issue, and the others still seem uncertain. I again felt a lack of engagement in what I was asking about, and the discussion moved on.

Later questions in the interview asked students to consider whether French or English was more widely spoken in Vanuatu. The Francophone discussion revealed that they were unsure. Frazer, again, seemed the most able to give an opinion, and Feven then agreed with him, although she had previously said she didn’t know:

**Extract 7.19**

_Fylene: Long tingting blong mi mi no save._

(4)

_Feven: <whispers> Mi no save._

_Frazer: Mi? Mi luk se (.) mi tu mi no save be (2) mi luk se (1) Inglis ia nao olsem. I fulap. I fulap. Fulap man i toktok er (. ) Inglis._

(2)

_Fristinston: Ating blong mi bae mi no save talem._

<all laugh>

_Feven: Mi tu (.) mi luk se ol man oli toktok Inglis. (XII:243-51) _

_Fven: <whispers> I don’t know._

(4)

_Frazer: <whispers> I don’t know._

_Frazer: Me? I think that (. ) me too I don’t know but (2) I think that (1) It's English now like. There are many. Many people speak er (. ) English._

(2)

_Fristinston: For me I don’t think I can say._

<all laugh>

_Feven: Me too (.) I think that people speak English.] (xii:236-44)

They made similar comments with reference to the global use of these languages:
Extract 7.20

Frazer: Mi long tingting blong mi mi luk se (.) mi luk se mi no save. [Frazer: In my opinion I think that (.) I don’t think I know.

Feven: Mi tu mi no save. Feven: Me too I don’t know.

(15)

Frinston: Long tingting blong mi mi ting (1) fulap (1) oli toktok French? Samfala oli toktok Inglis. [Frinston: In my opinion I think (1) many (1) speak French? Some speak English.

(15)

Frazer: Yes. Mi mi luk se (2) long (1) most ia nao se (.) ol lanwis nao oli toktok plante long hem. (XII:258-65) Frazer: Yes. I think that (2) in (.) most now (.) they speak a lot in these languages.] (xii:251-6)

The Anglophone students also seemed unsure about the situation within Vanuatu. Arthur suggested:

Extract 7.21

Arthur: Long tingting blong mi mi ting se (1) mo Inglis nao oli speak (.) long Vanuatu. From tudei bae yu go bae yu luk (.) fulap (.) insaed long ofis (.) ol olfala jobs blong yumi (.) insaed long Vanuatu (.) mi mi ting se Inglis nao fulap (.) sapos yu go insaed long wan ofis/es bae yu (.) ol (.) sam wok we i stap insaed fulap oli yusum ol Inglis wod/s nomo. Be French hem i no tumas insaed long Vanuatu. (XI:146-51) [Arthur: In my opinion I think that (1) more English is spoken (.) in Vanuatu. Because today if you go you will see (.) many (.) inside the offices (.) all our jobs (.) in Vanuatu (.) I think that there is a lot of English (.) if you go into an office you will (.) the (.) some work in there many just use English words. But there is not much French in Vanuatu.] (xi:138-42)

However, no other students joined in and, after 18 seconds of silence, a different student initiated discussion of the global situation:
Andrina: I think that (.) everybody? Like in the world they speak English and French to communicate with others? To (.) to (.) do like (.) work to (.) develop their countries.

(4)

Arthur: In my opinion I think that (.) the world? Many people speak English. Because (.) many (.) many jobs and occupations that come into the country for us and people who go outside of the country? They go and study in English. But they don’t study in French much because (.) many people around the world (.) like they don’t speak (.) er French well. But they just speak English. (1) So in my opinion I think that (.) throughout the world? Many people speak English.

(4)

Amboline: Me too I think that (.) in the world like many countries speak English because (.) French there are many just a few countries that speak French but (.) whereas many speak English.

(4)

Andrina: I think that er (.) some (.) some too just speak French. (1) Like in (.) like when people from other countries come (.) for example like some white people come to our place on Maewo? They just speak French so like (.) some teachers who (.) the French teachers go to (.) like speak to them? So that (.) to explain things for them to understand.] (xi:146-64)
The Anglophone students do appear able to at least consider the question, although they give different opinions. Arthur and Amboline suggest the dominance of English, although the latter in particular seems to be counting the number of countries in which she thinks each language is spoken, rather than considering English to be spoken widely in all countries. Andrina begins by answering in terms of the prevalence of both English and French, rather than choosing between them, but, in her second turn, she argues that there are some countries that speak French only, thereby following Amboline’s attempt to enumerate the speakers of each language in terms of countries. This territorialisation of language will be returned to in 7.3.1.

The student groups did not seem to be drawing on any discourse of the dominance of English. Although a few suggested that there might be more English speakers, they were uncertain, and it was clear that others thought there were large groups of French speakers who did not speak English. While one Francophone student suggested that Anglophones might have greater opportunities for employment and tertiary studies, two Anglophone students seemed to think that they held no such advantage, and the remaining interviewees seemed unsure.

During 2011, there was a new student in Year 11 at Angolovo College, Simon, who had completed Year 10 at Collège de Faranako. He was therefore well-known at both schools. He told me that he had decided to switch because he was interested in learning English too. I asked several students why they thought he might have switched, and some suggested that it might have been because of lower fees\(^\text{25}\), but no student suggested a motivation of greater opportunities through English. I frequently asked if participants could recall any students ever having switched from the Anglophone to the Francophone stream (cf. XVI:124-48/xvi:125-50; XI:326-62/xi:309-47). Each time, they spent a long time thinking about the question, suggesting that they thought it possible, but could not produce an example. They never suggested that English might lead to greater opportunities.

---

\(^{25}\) In fact, fees at Angolovo were higher than at the Francophone school for which Simon had originally been selected.
I considered it likely that these students who spent most of their time in a rural part of Vanuatu hadn’t been exposed to discourses that might be circulating in the media or in the kind of public discourse that adults might be exposed to. At the same time it was clear that there was no dominant institutional discourse within each school that led students either to value English as a global language above French, or to value ‘their’ L2 above L3. Neither group of students felt that they were particularly advantaged or disadvantaged by the L2 that had been chosen for them, and they did not see any differences between English and French in terms of the opportunities each presented.

7.3 Construction of language as a door to opportunity

Despite statistical indications of unequal opportunities and an official discourse of disadvantage, 7.2 has shown that participants at the two schools did not express this discourse. French appears to be ‘holding its own’ against English, even where participants are aware of the greater number of opportunities for speakers of the latter. This section will therefore examine the way both English and French are considered to provide access to further opportunities, in a discourse that treats both languages equally.

7.3.1 International languages as gateways to the outside world

The topos of international languages is used to argue that knowledge of certain languages, considered to be ‘international’, provides access to things that cannot be accessed without such languages. The Director of Basic Education makes this argument (and see also XX:75-6, 369-70/xx:74-5, 368-9):
DEBE: The use of these two languages is very small. At home. Maybe one percent or two percent out of the population. Then hemi stap putum yumi long wan kwestin se be why yumi go skul long Inglis mo French. From yumi nidim blong go long ol aot saed uh? Long Vanuatu. (XIX:69-72) ... Mifala i maintain/em long edyukesen system ia long konstityusen. Blong oli stap olsem language of instruction long tingting se (.) the only two Vanuatu language we i save karem yu i go aot saed. Because ol narawan oli no save go aot saed. So mekem se mifala i maintain/em hemia. (XIX:353-56)

A number of questionnaire respondents drew on the same logic in explaining why English and French were useful. The following examples make reference to the students’ particular L2:

Extract 7.24

I want to know how to speak English so that I could go to a big country such as Australia. Then I can speak with any men that speak to me. (Year 10)

If I have a bright future I’m not going to write in island language, I’m going to write in English and also to speak to tourists. (Year 11)

For modern life, it’s english language broadly speaking (Year 12)

With good english you can travel around the world for working purposes, businesses and so on (Year 13)

Je cominique avec le monde je ne parle pas au Bislamar et ma longue. [I communicate with the world I don’t speak Bislama and my language.] (Year 9)

Si tu as partir dans les grands pays tu as conne parle en frances. [If you went to big countries you knew how to speak French.] (Year 10)

La langue francaise et il plus importante a comprendre. Parce que c’est un langues du monde entier. [The French language is important to understand. Becuase it is a language of the whole world.] (Year 8)
Angolovo students asserted that knowledge of English could provide opportunities to visit other countries and interact with other people, while Faranako students made similar comments with respect to French. Many students also repeated these arguments with regard to their L3:

Extract 7.25

*It will help you if you travel to different types of countries.* (Year 10)

*You can speak to French people and you may be able to travel oversea if you speak French.* (Year 11)

*Quand je sort de Vanuatu je peu parle on Anglais.* [When I go out from Vanuatu I can speak in English.] (Year 7)

*Quand un blanc arrive dans ton village, tu peut parle avec lui ou discute avec lui.* [When a foreigner arrives in your village, you can speak to them or discuss with them.] (Year 9)

Both English and French were classified as ‘international languages’, and there was a sense that either or both could provide these opportunities.

In 7.2.3, it was shown that the question of the most widespread international language appeared to be answered by counting how many countries used each one. A number of questionnaire responses made similar reference to specific places in which either English or French is spoken:

Extract 7.26

*You can speak with an English man who come from Australia, New Zealand, England etc.* (Year 11)

*Can be use when travelling to places where they speak english eg. USA, Australia, NZ, Europe.* (Year 13)

*Beaucoup des pays qui parle en français.* [Lots of countries speak French.] (Year 9)

*Si plus tard tu gagne tes étude, quand un jour tu allait sur des îles qui parler en Français tu peux parler.* [If you later complete your studies, when one day you go to islands that speak French you can speak it.] (Year 10)

The Faranako Principal also makes clear that Vanuatu needs to have some French speakers, because Anglophones cannot travel to countries such as France, unless they take someone with them to translate. English is not considered an option in a Francophone country:
These extracts reveal a territorial conceptualisation in which languages belong to, or are used in, different areas. Reference is made to countries that use English and countries that use French. Where English is considered to be the more useful of the two, this is only because more people from those countries visit Vanuatu, or there are more countries that use English. There is no sense of English being useful for the purpose of interacting with people who may not speak it regularly ‘in their own country’, such as German tourists visiting Vanuatu. In other words, I heard no reference to a discourse of English as a lingua franca that is useful in an increasing number of contexts.

For similar reasons, Asian languages are considered new languages that are useful for the purpose of trade with this region, in which English and French are not considered to be spoken. Both the Education Language Policy proposals and the new National Curriculum Statement list Chinese and Japanese as additional languages to be offered at Senior Secondary level. Mr Andrew, who had attended the language policy consultations relayed this information during an interview:

Extract 7.28

Mr Andrew: And ating wan long olgeta emphasis tu i stap naioia? Hem i blong introduce/em uh (.) Asian lanwis as well insaed long skul's because maket blong wol this time hem i Asian maket so (.) ating long (. ) few years' time? Bambae nara foreign lanwis tu bae hem i likely to be introduced. Hem i Asian lanwis. (XIV:368-72)  

[Mr Andrew: And maybe one of the influences there is now too? It’s to introduce uh (.) Asian languages as well in schools because the world market at this time is an Asian market so (. ) maybe in (. ) a few years’ time? Other foreign languages are also likely to be introduced. That's Asian languages.] (xiv:346-9)
Within this relatively consistent discourse that associated ‘international languages’ with personal and national opportunities, both English and French (as well as certain other foreign languages) appeared to be valued (cf. XVIII:138-43/xviii:137-41). Since some learnt English and others learnt French, all students were considered to have access to these opportunities.

7.3.2 Two languages = double the opportunity

The argument that an international language can open up new opportunities is taken further in Vanuatu. A very strong theme in the data is an attempt to ensure access to both English and French, in order to get the benefits associated with both.

When I asked the Director of Basic Education whether it was necessary to have both ‘international languages’, he said:

Extract 7.29

DBE: Wan i naf. Be taem yu gat tufala tugeta hem i wan advantage. (XIX:359) [DBE: One is enough. But when you have both together it’s an advantage.] (xix:351)

He claims that greater opportunities can be obtained through both languages than through one alone (cf. XX:379-81/xx:378-80). This suggests the use of a topos of double opportunity in which the logical conclusion drawn is that, if one language provides opportunities, then two such languages must provide twice these opportunities. School participants make similar references to the benefits of knowing both:

Extract 7.30

Frazer: Mi mi luk se (.) i gud blong yumi karem tufala tugeta. (3) From er (.) olsem tugeta lanwis ia (.) yumi stap toktok long hem. Olsem evri man i stap toktok long evri dei. Olsem yu save go aot long kaontri yu save toktok French o Inglis. Mekem se (.) mi luk se i gud blong yumi lanem tufala (.) lanwis tugeta. Tugeta lanwis. (XII:312-5) [Frazer: I think that (.) it would be good if we brought the two together. (3) Because er (.) like both these languages (.) we speak them. Like everybody speaks them every day. Like you can go out of the country and speak French or English. So (.) I think that it’s good to learn both (.) language together. Both languages.] (xii:303-6)
I think French is also important because not only English speakers travel to Vanuatu but also French speaker. So this is important in working places and also tourism. (Year 13 Anglophone student questionnaire)

Mr Fred: Mebi hem i communication. Communication. From samtaem? Sapos mi mi toktok Inglis nomo? And then French man i toktok wetem mi? Naoia bae mi fas nao? And then sapos hemia we i toktok French nomo? Sapos er wan Inglis man i toktok wetem hem? Bae i fas nao. (XV:320-23)

(Mr Fred: Maybe it’s communication. Communication. Because sometimes? If I only speak English? And then a French man speaks to me? I’ll struggle now? And then suppose someone who only speaks French? If er an English man speaks to him? There’ll be a problem.] (xv:297-300)

These participants do not appear to feel that either language is necessarily the most useful, and they express a need to know both in order to communicate with others (cf. XI:84-101, 265-75/xi:78-93, 250-60; XII:92-112, 136-42/xii:88-109, 132-7; XIII:465-6/xiii:428-31; XV:303-4/xv:282-3; XVII:260-3, 287-97/xvii:249-53, 275-84). They continue to draw on a territorial conceptualisation of language, and consider it advantageous to be able to deal with those from English-speaking or French-speaking backgrounds. Faranako participants tended to refer to the individual advantages of speaking both languages, as well as related benefits for the country, while Angolovo participants referred mainly to the benefits gained by Vanuatu as a whole by retaining both languages. In other words, Angolovo participants saw the value for the country of having access to Francophone interests, but didn’t necessarily argue that they needed to know French themselves (cf. XIV:476-80/xiv:446-50; XVI:169-80, 283-7/xvi:169-79, 283-7).

At the family level, it is common to enrol some children in the Anglophone system, and others in the Francophone system. This practice of ensuring that the family ‘has’ both languages, is supported by the Francophone principal:
The topos of double opportunity was also applied with reference to Vanuatu as a whole. For example, I asked the former Minister of Education whether Vanuatu was advantaged over neighbouring countries that do not use French:

**Extract 7.34**

**FME:** Economic development yumi nid blong holom taet tufala lanwis from taem yu tekem long regionally nomo? Long region blong Pasifik New Caledonia hem i wan territory we hem i economically hem i strong. Tahiti (.) we i stap. (1) Mi luk se hem i impoten blong maintain/em. Even though economically (.) in terms of trade in terms of exchange hem i impoten blong maintain/em tufala lanwis.

**F:** So yu luk se yumi gat advantage bitim say PNG Solomon we oli gat wan lanwis nomo. Wan international language.

**FME:** For economic development we need to hold tight to both languages because when you look at the region? In the Pacific region New Caledonia is a territory that is economically strong. Tahiti (.) is there. (1) I think it is important to maintain them. Even though economically (.) in terms of trade in terms of exchange it is important to maintain two languages.

**F:** So you think we have an advantage over say PNG or the Solomons who only have one language. One international language.
FME: Ating se hem i wan asset blong (.) um yu gat wan sitisen o wan person we hem i save yusum both lanwis? Taem yu mekem comparaison wetem sam kaontri we oli olsem Vanuatu. Olsem uh Mauritius o Canada o ol international organisation. Vanuatu i no kasem level yet we ol kaontri oli stap long hem but hem i save go from hemia sapos asset ia i stap. Hem i quality blong wan man i save yusum lanwis monitor/em tu lanwis. Two international language. (XXI:163-75)

FME: I think it’s an asset to (.) um you have a citizen or a person who can use both languages? When you compare with some countries that are like Vanuatu. Like uh Mauritius or Canada or international organisations. Vanuatu hasn’t reached that level yet that these countries are at but it can aim for that if it keeps this asset. It is the quality of an individual to be able to use language to control two languages. Two international languages.] (xxi:158-70)

FME does not explain directly how Vanuatu is advantaged over the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea, referring instead to other countries that officially use both English and French and that are economically stronger than Vanuatu. He explains that having two languages is an “asset” and implies a link between this asset and the economic development of officially bilingual countries such as Canada.

This phrase “asset” was recorded in the minutes of the constitutional committee meeting of 23 July 1979, reporting the ideas of an external advisor:

Extract 7.35

Zorgbibe “appreciated that having two official languages could be costly, but he also pointed out that this could be an asset within the context of the Pacific.”

Discussions before Vanuatu had even gained the status of an independent country therefore already invoked this logic.

The topos of double opportunity was therefore frequently used, and participants were quick to state that both languages were of value. Indeed, the lengthy discussions during interviews over the best way to provide education through the media of both English and French for all (XI:363-574/xi:348-557; XII:300-425/xii:291-410; XIII:555-784/xiii:511-726; XIV:646-784/xiv:609-737; XV:503-712/xv:470-671) revealed a strong commitment to a major education reform to enable this. However, when pushed for explanations, there were several examples in which participants revealed that they were not really sure what the
actual benefits were. The following extracts present two such examples from the principals:

Extract 7.36

AP: Er benefit? Ating benefit we gavman hem i traem blong (.) mekem hemia nao olsem (1) um (1) wetem situation blong yumi? Long long Vanuatu i gat (.) i gat ol um (1) yumi gat communication olsem close relations wetem ol Francophone (.) kaontri/s. So:: sometimes ol taem we i gat ol dialogue between ol kaontri/s ia long saed blong (.) bisnis ol samting olsem? And u::m ating oli faenem se bae i mo isi sapos we:: yumi gat ol Francophone speaker (.) oli save toktok wetem ol Francophone blong communication hem i isi. (XVI:204-10)

[AP: Er benefit? I think the benefit the government is trying to (.) reach now is like (1) um (1) with our situation? In Vanuatu there are (.) there are um (.) we have communication like close relations with Francophone (.) countries. So:: sometimes when they have dialogue between these countries in terms of (.) business or something else? And u::m I think they find that it’s easier i::f we have Francophone speakers (.) they can speak with the Francophones to make communication easy.] (xvi:204-9)

Extract 7.37

F: Be from wanem? Wanem nao benefit blong hemia? Olsem blong karem tufala wantaem.

FP: Hemia nao tu mi no save ansarem yu stre nomo from (.) gavman ating i gat wan tingting blong mekem se tufala pikinini olsem (.) pikinini we i lanem tufala lanwis bambae i faenem isi samting. Long laef blong hem. (XVII:232-6)

[F: But why? What is the benefit of this? Like of having both together at the same time.

FP: That’s it I can’t really give you a straight answer because (.) I think the government has the idea to make both children like (.) if children learn both languages they will find things easy. In their lives.] (xvii:223-7)

It often appeared from the interview data that English brought benefits to Francophones that were not necessarily paralleled by the addition of French for Anglophones (cf. XVI:193-200/xvi:193-200). However, I was rarely told that English was better than French; it was just another language to add. In Extract 7.38, the Faranako principal does not draw on a discourse of disadvantage, but he refers to English as a language that will bring something useful:
FP: So now children who school French up to Year 14? But they are selected to go to other Anglophone institutions. So they want to achieve something in their lives? So I think that the English they learn helps them a lot.

The lexis he uses makes clear that English will add something, although he does not say that this is more useful than French. The former Minister of Education uses similar lexis to refer to the introduction of a series of English language modules for Francophone senior secondary students, accredited by the University of the South Pacific, thus providing a route into English-medium further education:

FME: There is an extra fee to pay but (2) many parents at the beginning they didn't understand? They complained. I said it's another door. The children if you see the children who live here? The university we have in Port Vila it's (.) er (.) the University of the South Pacific which is Anglophone so (.) for you to have access? You must do English.

The predication strategies used here reveal that English is associated with opportunity. Metaphors of ‘getting something in their lives’ and providing ‘another door’ are linked explicitly to the acquisition of English. I asked whether there was an equivalent ‘other door’ for Anglophones or whether this was unnecessary, and was told:

FME: They are okay because they have many opportunities.

Although English is described as a second option, rather than the only option that counts, these comments support the assertions from policy texts referred to
in 7.2.1 that Francophones need English in order to access opportunities, while Anglophones are already well catered for.

7.3.3 Instrumentalisation of the need for both English and French

Unsurprisingly, when I pushed for justifications for the need for both languages, participants would often provide one. This section examines the way I consider participants to have instrumentalised this need, constructing accounts that were justified in terms of the utility of these languages. In Extract 7.41, a Francophone teacher states that English can help him communicate both with tourists and with expatriate advisors at the Ministry of Education:

Extract 7.41


[Mr Felix: One is for tourists? And sometimes if (.) you need something you often go to advisors? Australia sends them here? These people don’t learn Bislama before they come. So sometimes we go? You have to speak English to them. (. ) That’s one (.) if I speak English I think I wi::il if I talk to them? I go and say something. If there is an advisor from Australia at the Ministry of Education and I go to see him? If I speak good English maybe he’ll understand my concern. But if I don’t speak English that’s it now.<laughs>] (xv:162-8)

The two situations described are both valid contexts in which English might help. Yet, when considering how frequently Mr Felix encounters a tourist on Ambae (cf. 2.2.3.1), or how often he personally goes to the capital city to negotiate something with an advisor, this argument seems based on an imagined need for both languages. While there are indeed a great number of tourists and expatriate advisors in Vanuatu, Mr Felix projects this knowledge onto his own potential experience, discursively constructing the need for English in a way that seems unlikely to be borne out in practice (cf. XVI:91-2/xvi:92-3).

Extract 7.42 contains two interesting examples of the way two Angolovo teachers construct the need for L3. Features of French are transcribed in bold:
Mr Ala: Mi mi ting se osem i gud blong yumi save both (. ) mi tingbaot wan (. ) mi stap long Santo i gat wan woman i kam long Caledonia. I kam kasem long epot? Hem i no save Inglis? I no save Bislama. So (. ) hemia? Olfala Ezekiel i stap long epot. So hem i traem bes blong speak Ingr- er Franis long hem. So mi tingbaot wan toktok we i talem i putum hanbag blong hem i go insaed finis i talem se (. ) c'est tout? Afta woman i se oui. Ale hemia nao i osem se woman ia i harem se (. ) olsem mi andastanem smol pat ia mi harem se olfala Ezekiel i win long smol pat ia nao blong talem c'est tout. <laughs> (3) So hem i helpem hem smol ples ia i helpem hem blong er=

Mme Adrienne: =Blong communicate.

Mr Ala: Yeah blong communicate. Olsem hem i impoten blong yumi communicate uh?

Mrs Angela: No be (. ) Mr Ala i stap talem osem mi stap tingting bakegen osem bae yumi long Vanuatu? I no se blong yumi waepemaot be i gud blong yumi encourage/im from (. ) bae yumi lukluk nao osem ol turis. Yumi tokbaot tourism uh. Hem i wan bigfa- wan biggest um risos revenue blong yumi long Vanuatu. Be olsem sapos yumi karem turis i kam long ol eria/s? Afta i no gat wan i save toktok French bae (. ) hao. Olsem i gud blong sam at least i save? Olsem mi mi stap talem ating Fiona i save <laughs> se mi mi talem se wan pikinini blong mi mas skul French. Sapos yumi gat wan visita we i kam long haos we i toktok French? At least mi gat somebody we i andastanem. No gud we bae i kam olsem bae yumi c'est tout finis taem i kam bakegen? Bae yu no save nao se nekis wan waner. <all laugh> Olsem mi stap lukluk se i gud. I no osem se i nogud. Hem i gud blong save both uh? So yumi talem. Turis oli kam? (1) Fulap turis i kam long Vanuatu.

(IV:513-36)

[Mr Ala: I think it’s good for us to know both (. ) I remember once (. ) I was in Santo there was a woman from Caledonia. She came to the airport? She didn’t speak English? She didn’t speak Bislama. So (. ) then? Old Ezekiel was at the airport. So he tried his best to speak Eng- er French to her. So I remember one phrase when she had put her bag in and he asked (. ) c’est tout? Then the woman said oui. Okay then it was like the woman felt that (. ) like I understood that small event I felt that old Ezekiel did well there by saying c’est tout. <laughs> (3) So it helped him a little there it helped him to er=

Mme Adrienne: =To communicate.

Mr Ala: Yeah to communicate. Like it’s important to communicate uh?

Mrs Angela: No but (. ) as Mr Ala was saying that I was thinking again about us in Vanuatu? We shouldn’t wipe it out but we should encourage it because (. ) you look at the tourists. We talk about tourism uh. It’s a big- one of our biggest sources of revenue in Vanuatu. But like if we bring tourists to different areas? And there’s nobody who speaks French then (. ) how. Like it’s good that at least some can? Like I keep saying I think Fiona knows <laughs> that I’ve said that one my children must school French. Suppose we have a visitor who comes to the house who speaks French? At least I’ll have somebody who understands. It’s no use them coming like we’ve already said c’est tout and then they come back again? You won’t know what to say next. <all laugh> Like I think it’s good. It’s not that it’s bad. It’s good to know both uh? So we say. Tourists come? (1) Many tourists come to Vanuatu.] (xiv:482-502)
At the beginning of the extract, Mr Ala justifies the need to know both languages, using an anecdote in which an employee at the international airport had used a very small amount of French with a French-speaking passenger to ask “C’est tout?” (Is that everything?). This is similar to Mr Felix’s construction of instances in which he will speak English to justify the importance of learning the language. In the second part of the extract, Mrs Angela says that this is why she wants to enrol her third child in the Francophone school system (Mrs Angela, her husband and their older two children have all been educated through English). She asks what would happen if a French-speaking tourist came to her house and there was nobody who could speak French. She refers directly to Mr Ala’s story by saying that they can’t simply say “C’est tout”. Again, it is highly unlikely that the majority of ni-Vanuatu will encounter foreign visitors in their home areas, let alone have cause to invite them to their houses, so it seems that a situation is being constructed to justify educating one member of the family in a different language to the others.

A final extract that constructed this need for L3 was produced by Mrs Anne:

Mrs Anne: Mi stap wis ia sapos we <laughs> mi olsem mi bin tekem French mo mi tekem seriously mebi. From mi lukum long (.) tudei laek yu go anywhere? French mo Inglis nao hem i surround long ol eria/s o:: iven raon long ples ia yu luk? ... Mi stap regret long (.) sapos mi bin lanem <laughs> taem mi stap long skul be. Mi wis se mi bin lanem mo. Mebi tekem more seriously. (XIV:386-92)

Mrs Anne’s main point is that she regrets not having learnt French well, which could be justified in a number of ways. However, she chooses to argue that French and English “surround us everywhere ... even around here”, thus suggesting some form of instrumental need to know both. This argument is not borne out by my own observations at Angolovo College, the nearby commercial and provincial centres, and the various villages I spent time in. I saw no French in the linguistic landscape of these areas, and almost no English. I heard neither
language being spoken outside the school compounds (cf. XVIII:185-91/xviii:181-6).

7.3.4 Increased efficiency through the use of English and French

A final instrumental argument is put forward for the use of both English and French. The topos of efficiency is used to argue that teaching everybody both languages will avoid the need for translation and duplication. The Education Master Plan states:

Extract 7.44

We share a vision of a bilingual society where all secondary-school graduates will be bilingual and where the need for translation would have decreased dramatically because virtually everyone will be able to understand everyone else, whichever language is being used. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, p.19)

The claim made is that a “bilingual society” is desirable, with the rationale that there will be less requirement for translation. The logic is that, if a measure will reduce inefficiency, then this measure should be taken. During interviews, the former Minister of Education and the Director of Basic Education reveal the same concern, twelve years after the publication of this document:

Extract 7.45

FME: Well wis blong gavman hem i blong traem blong mekem se at least ol man we oli wok long public administration ... Oli must be bilingual. I no nid blong gat wan translator blong (.) translate wan. Yu yusum wan man blong wan wok nomo. I no nid blong yusum tumas translesen. (XXI:179-83)

[Ch: Well the government’s wish is to try and make it so that at least people working in public administration ... They must be bilingual. There is no need to have a translator to (.) translate. You use only one man for one job. There is not need to use too much translation.]

(last:174-8)

Extract 7.46

DBE: Tufala lanwis ia hem i save mekem (.) hem i save reduce/um cost blong (.) blong public service blong mifala. ... At the moment you have to employ two people for the same job. One for English one for French. For example mifala long edyukesen? Taem yu tokbaot ol inspector? Yu tokbaot tu ...

[DBE: The two languages can make (.) it can reduce the cost of (.) of our public service. ... At the moment you have to employ two people for the same job. One for English one for French. For example us in Education? When you talk about inspectors? You are talking about two inspectors. One for English]
The point is logical, given the amount currently spent on translation and the duplication of posts. The point is valid that people who speak English and French can function in both languages in the workplace, thus reducing these costs. However, based on this rationale, the same topos could just as easily be used to argue for the removal of one of the former colonial languages, leaving everybody speaking the same one. The fact that this argument is not made is revealing.

A similar issue relates to the need to know L3 in the workplace. The Director of Educational Services (Anglophone-educated) and the Francophone principal both refer to receiving correspondence in their L3:

**Extract 7.47**

DES: Er hemia <points to letter on desk> hem i wan leta we i kam long French. Lelebet French blong mi mi save rid i andastanem. (XX:353-4)

[DES: Er that <points to letter on desk> that’s a letter that came in French. With my small French I can read and understand.] (xx:353-4)

**Extract 7.48**

FP: O taem yumi go long wok be (_) wanem pepa i kam long Frantis mi save. Hemia i kam long Fran- er long Inglis mi save. Hemia nao gavman i nidim tufala. (XVII:227-8)

[FP: Or when we go to work but (_) a document comes in Fre- er in English I can understand. That’s why the government needs both.] (xvii:217-8)

They argue that knowing L3 would enable them to read the information easily. This makes sense but, again, an alternative argument could be put forward that, if only one language was used for such information, then this issue would be avoided.
In summary, there is some sense of English being the more useful of the two ‘international languages’, but this awareness does not override the need for French. Arguments are put forward for the need for both, through the topos of double opportunity, although the examples used to support this need are unconvincing. More convincing arguments are made, through the topos of efficiency, that duplication of personnel and translation costs could be reduced if everyone spoke both English and French, but nobody questions the maintenance of the two languages themselves, rather than choosing only one administrative language. Drawing on a discourse of economic opportunity and access to the wider world, participants apply the logic that, if one ‘international language’ is useful, then two such languages must bring double the benefits.

7.4 Construction of ‘bilingualism’ rather than English or French

7.4.1 Tracing the term ‘bilingualism’ in Vanuatu

The previous section reveals the use of the term ‘bilingualism’ to refer to English and French. All other languages appear to be excluded from the scope of this term, so that competence in French and Bislama, or in two vernaculars, is never referred to as ‘bilingualism’ throughout the data. I deliberately did not use the term myself in my interview questions, wanting to find out whether participants would use it themselves.

No students used the term themselves during the interviews. At the end, I asked whether they knew what ‘bilingual’ (or ‘bilingue’) meant, but nobody knew the word. Only one student out of the 296 questionnaire respondents opted to use the term in explaining that they thought both English and French were important, although revealing unfamiliarity with its spelling:

**Extract 7.49**

*In Vanuatu nowadays our country leaders need people that are Bylinkle.*

(Year 11 Anglophone student)
Adult participants, however, did use the term ‘bilingual’. The two interviews with the school principals contain episodes that illustrate the way the term is conceptualised by many today:

Extract 7.50

AP: So taem yu bilingual yu gat mo janis. Bitim yu we yu wan lanwis nomo.
F: By bilingual yu minim
AP: It means that you can talk both language.
F: Be yu minim Inglis (.) French nomo.
AP: Inglis French.
F: Olsem yu yu bilingual finis yu no iven skul yet be (.) yu save lanwis wetem [Bislama]
AP: [Yeah yeah]
F: Hemia bilingual finis=
AP: =Bilingual means English and French. (XVI:305-14)

Extract 7.51

F: Be hemia taem yu talem bilingual long Vanuatu? Yu minim wanem wetem hem.
FP: Franis Inglis.
F: So hemia yu no minim ol (.) olsem yu yu bilingual finis. Olsem yu toktok lanwis blong yu wetem Bislama.
FP: Yes.
F: Be hem tu i bilingual be=
FP: =Bae mi no save se yumi olsem bilingual olsem yu save toktok lanwis blong yu? Yu toktok long Bislama. Yu toktok Franis ... be hemia nao sam

AP: So when you are bilingual you have more chance. Than if you only have one language.
F: By bilingual you mean
AP: It means that you can talk both language.
F: But you mean English (.) French only.
AP: English French.
F: Like you were already bilingual before you went to school (.) you knew lanwis and [Bislama]
AP: [Yeah yeah]
F: That’s already bilingual=
AP: =Bilingual means English and French.] (xvi:305-15)
blong yumi olsem () sam blong yumi ol Anglophone we oli skul ia oli no bilingual. From oli faenem i had Frenis ia olsem ia nao. Ah Frenis ia yumi no nidim. Yu luk. Be olsem bilingual yumi tokbaot hemia olsem yumi talem se tufala lanwis ia nao be. Yumi no tal- yumi no lukluk bak long hemia we Bislama. Lanwis. Hem i min se (yumi nidim tija blong) narafala lanwis finis yumi bilingual finis. Be olsem yu jes talem gud hemia nao olsem mifala i base nomo hemia long lukluk long wanem we tufala main lanwis we hem i blong tijim. Taem yu yusum tufala evriwan ia? I min se bae hem nao i qualify long (1) hem i save tufala lanwis. (XVII:185-204) us Anglophones who go to school they are not bilingual. Because they find French hard. Ah we don’t need French. You look. But for bilingual we talk about this we say these two languages but. We don’t say- we don’t look back to Bislama. Language. It means (we need teachers for) other languages already we are already bilingual. But like you’ve just explained that now but we base it only on what are the two main languages for teaching. When you use both of these? It means that this now qualifies him (1) he knows both languages.] (xvii:178-96)

In both cases, the principal introduces the phrase ‘bilingual’ and, when asked for clarification, identifies this as referring to English and French. On each occasion, I challenge this definition by saying that ‘bilingual’ could also be used to describe the linguistic repertoire of a ni-Vanuatu child before encountering either of the school languages, but they dismiss this challenge. Whether or not they agree that ‘bilingual’ could refer to any two languages, they are certain that English and French are the two that matter. Admiration for ‘bilingual’ competence is therefore not due to the fact that someone has mastered any two languages.

On occasions, the term was also used by adults outside the school. For example, whilst travelling between the schools one day, the truck driver asked why I was going to Faranako, as he knew that I had previously lived at Angolovo. When I said I was doing research about the way languages were used at both schools, he volunteered that he wished he was ‘bilingual’ but hadn’t studied hard enough in French. I know that he speaks the local language from Ambae and Bislama, and was a Year 12 leaver from Angolovo College, so presumably had a reasonable grasp of English. He confined ‘bilingualism’ to two particular languages.
Miles (1998, p.128) describes similar support for this version of ‘bilingualism’ from his 1991 research, suggesting that the term was the politically correct way to refer to French in Vanuatu, instead of ‘Francophonie’. The earliest trace I can find of the term is in the minutes of the meetings held to draft the national constitution throughout 1979 (Republic of Vanuatu, 2009). There are six uses of the term ‘bilingual’ or ‘bilingualism’ (all during the meeting of 17 April), two of which with reference to other countries. The discussion around the remaining four is given in Extract 7.52, with the education background of each member given in parentheses.

Extract 7.52

“Referring to the discussion on languages, V. Boulekone [Francophone-educated] said that, if no reference was made to languages in the Constitution, the significance of this fact should be made clear: did it mean, he went on, that the Government was not intending to consider bilingualism.”

“D. Kalpokas [Anglophone-educated] touched on the educational aspects of bilingualism: was it plausible to believe that children could be made 100% bilingual in school. M. Carlot [Francophone-educated] said it was also a question of safe-guarding the rights of all, including the right to use two languages. Whilst it would be difficult for all New Hebrideans to be bilingual, the possibility should remain for them to have a first and a secondary official language.” (Republic of Vanuatu, 2009, p.26)

The two Francophone-education members appear to advocate ‘bilingualism’, while the only Anglophone-educated contributor to use the term seems to challenge its “plausib[ility]” on practical grounds. Carlot argues that everybody has the right to “use two languages” and, it can be assumed from this context that he means English and French. It is not possible to read too much into this episode, especially since these are the words of the minute-taker. However, it is reasonable to note that language issues were contentious in the drafting of the constitution, and that it is likely that Francophones were more concerned about retaining French than the Anglophones needed to be about either language, given that they had the political upper hand (Premdas & Steeves, 1995; Van Trease, 1995).

The language provisions of the constitution, which eventually resulted from these meetings, do not include the word ‘bilingual’ or ‘bilingualism’, stating only:
The national language of the Republic is Bislama. The official languages are Bislama, English and French. The principal languages of education are English and French.

The Republic shall protect the different local languages which are part of the national heritage, and may declare one of them as a national language.

The first government was dominated by Anglophone-educated ni-Vanuatu (cf.2.2.1.4). In the only national education document I could access from archives of this period (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1980), the only mention of ‘bilingualism’ is linked to Francophone concerns:

Further meetings were held with the French and British Governments in March 1980, when the main proposal of the Vanuatu Government was for France to provide aid for Education alone, whilst the United Kingdom Government would provide budgetary aid for everything else. ... The Vanuatu Government believed that the French Government was mainly concerned about the protection of the French language (“francophonie”) and English-French “bi-lingualism”, a misnomer which should be described as dual language provision. The Vanuatu Government proposal was rejected, perhaps partly because the French Government would pay for the cost of English-medium schools, as well as French-medium schools.” (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1980, p.5)

The extract explains why the post-independence proposal for France to pay for education was rejected. The perspectivization strategies employed here position “the Vanuatu Government” (representing Anglophone and Francophone ni-Vanuatu alike) in opposition to the former colonial powers. However, contextual knowledge of the difficult transition to independence, and of this government’s initial proposal to provide education only in English (see 2.2.1.3), makes it easy to read this text as an Anglophone government’s stance against French and Francophonie. “Bi-lingualism” with reference to English and French (described a “misnomer”) is not portrayed as something worth pursuing by this particular government.

The earliest text that could be obtained from the Ministry of Education during my fieldwork is the Master Plan from 1999, by which time the political norm was for multi-party coalitions that were no longer considered to represent ‘Anglophone’
or ‘Francophone’ interests. This text presents ‘bilingualism’ as a desirable, but multi-faceted, phenomenon:

Extract 7.55

Bilingualism in Use of International Languages. There is also virtually unanimous support among ni-Vanuatu for continuing to use both English and French as international languages and media of instruction. This support goes well beyond the wish to preserve the letter of the law as set forth in the Constitution. We believe that our bilingual society in two international languages makes us unique in the Pacific, and almost all of us, from parents in the village to Parliamentarians, perceive cultural and economic reasons for keeping both languages. We share a vision of a bilingual society where all secondary-school graduates will be bilingual and where the need for translation would have decreased dramatically because virtually everyone will be able to understand everyone else, whichever language is being used. As parents, we hope that our children would be fluent in both. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, p.19)

By this stage, ‘bilingualism’ is presented as a shared concern for all. It is given symbolic orientations, through references to the constitution, but the text explicitly argues that it has instrumental value “well beyond” this. It states that there are well-known cultural and economic reasons to support bilingualism, although does not say what these are, thus appearing to draw on the topos of double opportunity. It then makes more explicit use of the topos of efficiency to state that increased inter-group intelligibility will reduce the need for translation.

This version of ‘bilingualism’ has remained a desirable goal since this time, as evidenced by phrases from recent policy texts:

Extract 7.56

It is the aim of education that every individual, besides knowing his/her mother tongue, will become bi-lingual in English and French (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2004, p.71).

Extract 7.57

Bi-lingualism in English and French is seen as a competitive advantage and a national asset. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2006b, p.33)

Extract 7.58

Objective 14. To promote bilingualism in the Vanuatu education system, consistent with the Vanuatu Constitutional requirement that the principal languages of education are English and French. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2009, p.9)
Our aim is for all children and students to be bilingual in English and French. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2010, p.89)

As noted above, ‘bilingualism’ was not mentioned in the constitution, and the term did not seem to be accepted within education discourse of the period immediately following Independence. It is possible (although by no means conclusively) to interpret texts from that time as showing some differences in the concerns of those educated in the two streams. However, policy texts from 1999 onwards appear to embrace this notion of ‘bilingualism’ and it has become dominant in discourse at the official policymaking level.

7.4.2 ‘Bilingualism’ as a discursive marker of equality

The possession of this 'bilingual' competence is clearly desirable, however this is rationalised. Participants discursively construct a change that has taken place since Independence, challenging the long-held view that Anglophones are advantaged over Francophones. In Extract 7.60, the Francophone teachers discuss the job opportunities for those educated in the two systems:

Extract 7.60

Mr Felix: Ol Francophone o ol Anglophone oli gat mo opportunité blong faenem wan wok. (3) Mi luk se fas(.) bifo ating(.) hem i(.) bae mi talem se ol Anglophone.

Mr Fred: M-m?

Mr Felix: Be naoia? Bae mi save talem se i sem mak.

Mr Fred: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

(2)

Mr Felix: From uh fulap olsem(.) fulap blong mifala ol Francophone hemia mifala i kick off long Francophone finis?

Mr Felix: Do Francophones or Anglophones have more opportunities to find work. (3) I think that first(.) before maybe(.) it was(.) I can say that it was Anglophones.

Mr Fred: M-m?

Mr Felix: But now? I can say it's the same.

Mr Fred: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

(2)

Mr Felix: Because uh many like(.) many of us Francophones those of us who kicked off as Francophones? Many
just went and did foundation courses at USP. Then they completed them so many of them are (.) like many of the tutors? Many of the USP tutors? At USP? Those are some of my friends we were together at Francophone school. Pierre? Joel? Those are all the tutors=

Mlle Felicia: =One from Tanna. Think about that one who teaches science I think? Yes. Francophones.

(3)
Mr Felix: Or what do you think Mr Fred?
Mr Fred: For me it’s like that.
Mlle Felicia: Yes me too I agree. I think that both are the same.
Mr Fred: First. First. It was originally Anglophones.
F: But the group who you say went to USP? ... Do you mean that they have to learn English too in order to have these equal opportunities.
Mr Fred: Yes?
Mr Felix: M-m.
Mlle Felicia: Yes.
Mr Fred: Yes. Yes.
F: But a Francophone who only knows French is he?
Mlle Felicia: He is [xx]
Mr Felix: [Like] a Francophone who only learns French.
F: Uh-uh. Does he have equal opportunities with an Anglophone who only knows English? O::r
Mr Fred: U::m
In this extract, the teachers begin by saying that Anglophones no longer have the edge, since there are a number of Francophones who have also been successful. Since they refer to Francophones currently working at USP, an Angophone institution, I ask whether Francophones have been successful only when they have learnt English. They seem to agree but, when I ask whether a Francophone who does not learn English would have chances equal to an Angophone, they tell me that Anglophones and Francophones now have the same opportunities, even without acquiring L3. Rather than positioning themselves as disadvantaged, this group of Francophones talk themselves into being on an equal footing with Anglophones (cf. XVII:170-4/xvii:173-7).

The Francophone principal also asserts that Francophone students have greater opportunities than previously. However, when challenged (using the term 'Francophone bilingual' that he had used previously), he acknowledges that Francophones without English do not have equal opportunities:

**Extract 7.61**

FP: So long saed blong mifala long gavman? Olsem naoia Minista we i stap hem i Francophone. So naoia? Bae yu luk olgeta (.) pikinini we bambae oli go kasem en long Yia 14 we oli gudfala mak? Be oli go karem skolasip long Philippine. Philippine hem i wan Angophone yunivesiti. Mi ting se blong

[FP: So for us from the government? Like at the moment the Minister who is there is Francophone. So now? If you look at all (.) the children who get to the end of Year 14 with good marks? But they obtain scholarships to the Philippines. The Philippines is an Angophone university. I think for those]
in the Francophone system to go they have no problem. They are suitable.

F: For Francophone bilinguals.

FP: Bilingual.

F: But those who only speak French do you think it's hard for=

FP: =No it's hard.

F: To go outside.

FP: It's hard.] (xvii:401-11)

Interestingly, Anglophone teachers appear to agree that both languages are becoming necessary, i.e. suggesting a disadvantage for themselves, considering that most admit to speaking no French. Mr Aru makes the following claim that preferences for Anglophones in the job market are being overridden by preferences for ‘bilinguals’:

Extract 7.62

Mr Aru: Chances to get jobs (.) as we’ve already talked about. Like right now? Like (.) the opportunities for jobs in Vanuatu most of them are for Anglophones. So we can say that (.) Anglophone uh (.) uh speakers? They have more chances. But then if we look at the other side of it? If we talk about a bilingual uh (.) person? He now has more chances to get a job? Compared to someone who is either just an Anglophone or just a Francophone.] (xiii:439-44)
I attempted to clarify this with the Anglophone principal. He initially said that Anglophones had greater opportunities to find jobs, so I then said that other people were suggesting that things were changing:

Extract 7.63

F: So hem i min se ol Anglophone oli gat mo opportunity blong ol job tu?
AP: Yes.

F: O hem i jenis nao? From mi askem sam oli talem
AP: No

F: Se no i defren nao be
AP: No olsem (1) uh at the moment? Wanem we i stap? Olsem blong karem wan job? Oli lukaotem mostly somebody who is bilingual.

F: M-m.
AP: So taem yu bilingual yu gat mo janis. Bitim yu we yu wan lanwis nomo.
(XVI:297-305)

[F: So does this mean that Anglophones also have more opportunities for jobs?
AP: Yes.

F: Or has it changed now? Because I’ve asked some who say
AP: No

F: That it's different now but
AP: No like (1) uh at the moment? What we have? Like to get a job? They mostly look for someone who is bilingual.
F: M-m.
AP: So when you are bilingual you have more chance. Than if you only have one language.] (xvi:297-306)

In this extract, AP specifically positions ‘bilingual’ candidates as desirable, rather than saying that Anglophones and Francophones now have equal chances. Mr Ala, conversely, begins the following extract suggesting that both languages are essential, but later reveals that competence in English is still the most important:
Mr Ala: Some advertisements appear that say you must be a good English speaker and French. Like it’s in our system already. So now it comes to something that French too is important in these areas. To find a job. If you only know English? You won’t be able to get that job which the advertisement is for. I think that most advertisements now like know a little bit of know English and know a little bit of French. And understand. (xiv: 461-66)

Once again, this example reveals that Anglophones only need a small amount of French in order to be considered to ‘know’ both languages, while a good command of English appears essential for everyone. These episodes were mirrored in numerous others throughout the fieldwork. Although I had expected Francophones to see the value of L3, given the greater opportunities obtainable through the use of English than French, I was surprised to hear Anglophones so vocal in their desire for French (cf. XIII:253-9, 370-4, 560-2/xiii:228-34, 341-5, 516-8; XIV:411-42/xiv:385-414; XVI:83-6/xvi:84-7). Examples told to me either referred to general advantages afforded to Francophones who became ‘bilingual’, or very specific examples in which Anglophones might benefit from a small amount of French. In other words, the argumentation constructed did not reveal, for me, a new equality between Anglophones and Francophones, unless the latter learnt English. However, participants at the two schools were remarkably consistent in their constructions of this equality, making clear that a situation in which Anglophones benefitted over Francophones had been replaced by one in which ‘bilinguals’ benefitted over all others.
7.5 Summary

In summary, despite an apparent dominant discourse of inequality, the greater number of opportunities for employment and further education through the use of English than French, and the status of English as a ‘global language’, this situation is not reflected in the majority of my participants’ discourse. Francophone students and teachers do not refer to themselves as disadvantaged, and Anglophone students and teachers do not refer to themselves as advantaged, expressing the need to know French as well as English. French appears to be commodified (Heller, 2010; Tan & Rubdy, 2008) alongside English, as both languages are constructed as part of the skill set that is necessary for Vanuatu’s development. A new hierarchy in which ‘bilinguals’ are positioned above those who speak only one of the international languages appears to have replaced one in which Anglophones are positioned above Francophones.

However, the examples I am told to support this shift reveal that these new ‘bilinguals’ are all Francophone-educated ni-Vanuatu who have gained opportunities through the acquisition of English. I heard no examples of an Anglophone transferring to a Francophone school, entering a French-medium university, or applying for a job requiring French. All the stories I was told could be heard as evidence of the need for English, and yet they were told as evidence of the need for ‘bilingualism’. There is something more than a practical need for both English and French for everyone, since nobody can explain any benefits that French brings in real terms, and anecdotes reveal that only very small amounts of French are required in order to count. Access to “something that gives the impression of language, a pragmatic and metapragmatic component to language competence that indexically induces the right ideological package” (Blommaert, 2009, p.245) seems important, without necessarily needing to demonstrate the ability to use these ‘languages’. Once again, it seems that access to a limited set of resources in L3, or even taking an interest in this language, may be enough (Blommaert & Varis, 2011, cf. 6.5) to count as being ‘bilingual’.
This ‘bilingualism’ appears to mediate the tension between pragmatic responses to globalised shifts in communications and technologies that construct English as the language of opportunity, and nationalist attempts to ensure equal opportunities for those educated in both streams of the school system (cf. Martin, 2005, p.92). Achieving this relies on demonstrating the economic opportunities that exist for Francophones (cf. Heller, 1999b), while attempting to downplay the fact that such opportunities often require the acquisition of English.

The data in this chapter does not paint an optimistic picture for the incorporation of the linguistic resources that children use in daily life outside school. Only languages that promise access to better opportunities are valued, thus reinforcing the hegemony of the former colonial languages, and potentially eclipsing other pedagogical concerns (Nunan, 2003). The metaphor of an ‘international language’ as a door to opportunity is doubled, given that two such languages are present. Following the logic that one such language brings opportunities, then two languages must bring twice as many benefits. Indeed, if it was seen that English plus French did not bring these double benefits, the entire metaphor of language as a door to opportunity could be called into question. Given that mastery of two international languages is considered to bring double benefits, there is a desire to ensure that both languages are incorporated into the education system, thus further pushing out the vernaculars and Bislama.
8 Language as a marker of national identity

8.1 Introduction
This chapter examines further the way the concept of ‘bilingualism’ in English and French is made sense of. Chapter 7 presented this concept as it is discursively constructed by Anglophone and Francophone participants alike, revealing a concerted interest on the part of both groups to maintain the two languages. However, the arguments made about the instrumental benefits of this version of ‘bilingualism’ were often unconvincing, suggesting that other factors were driving its construction. This chapter will thus examine the final way in which ‘language’ is constructed in the data – as a marker of national identity. When I ask participants about the need for both English and French, i.e. for instrumental justifications for maintaining both languages, I receive answers that are framed by constructions of what it means to be ni-Vanuatu. However, it is clear that the connections between language and national identity have undergone significant changes since Independence.

8.2 Shaking off history: Doubly-oppressed by Britain and France
When Vanuatu became independent in 1980, there was a need to construct itself as a postcolonial nation that could move beyond its colonial past. The opening words of the national constitution (English version) are as follows:

Extract 8.1

WE the people of Vanuatu,
PROUD of our struggle for freedom,
DETERMINED to safeguard the achievements of this struggle,
CHERISHING our ethnic, linguistic and cultural diversity,
MINDFUL at the same time of our common destiny,
HEREBY proclaim the establishment of the united and free Republic of Vanuatu founded on traditional Melanesian values, faith in God, and Christian principles,
AND for this purpose give ourselves this Constitution.
This is unremarkable discourse for the opening of a newly independent nation’s constitution (see Otto, 1997, p.33, for the very similar preamble to the Papua New Guinea constitution, and discussion of such declarations). It uses the first person plural pronoun throughout, thus projecting the shared experience and “common destiny” of the people of Vanuatu; the “struggle for freedom” reminds ni-Vanuatu that the process was difficult, but this is now framed as something to be “proud” of; the “ethnic, linguistic and cultural diversity” and the “traditional Melanesian values, faith in God, and Christian principles” are established as the foundations of the new Republic. The declaration thus constructs a newly-united but traditionally-grounded Vanuatu as the successor to the New Hebrides, drawing on the combined logic of the topoi of united national identity, traditional national identity and postcolonial national identity.

A key tension between colonial and postcolonial values was raised by Fr. Walter Lini (who would become the first prime minister) in a Constitutional Committee meeting held on 18 April 1979:

**Extract 8.2**

W. Lini questioned the need for a Constitution: was it to be built on Melanesian values, he asked – he felt this would be difficult given the Western origins of Constitutions. The imposition of Western standards in a Constitution, he pursued, would not maintain the New Hebridean soul and spirit in existence. W. Lini felt that a Constitution was being prepared simply to satisfy France and Britain. The danger of preparing a Constitution to satisfy France and Britain was that, once the New Hebrides tried to alter it after their independence to suit their needs and culture, they would find themselves already trapped in international, rather than New Hebridean, practices. He concluded by feeling that the Committee was confused by the need on the one hand, to satisfy international requirements and, on the other hand, New Hebridean values and culture. (Republic of Vanuatu, 2009, pp.29-30).

Throughout the extract, an explicit contrast is made between “Melanesian” and “Western”; between “France and Britain” and “the New Hebrides”; and between “international” and “New Hebridean”.

As is the case for all postcolonial nation-states, Vanuatu came into existence through a struggle to be a nation, and yet this struggle had to take place on its colonisers’ terms. The boundaries delineating which islands had to belong together had already been drawn, artificially bonding Aneityum (Anatom) in the south to the Torres Islands in the north, while marking the group as different
from the islands of both New Caledonia and the Solomon Islands (see Map 8.1).

In order to reclaim the islands from the colonial governments, the indigenous people had no option but to recognise the boundaries that had been set. However, the very existence of the Republic of Vanuatu rests on the logic that it is different from the exact same geographical space that was previously the New Hebrides. The construction of a new national identity for Vanuatu was achieved through rejection of what the colonial period represented.

Language policy presents a challenge to this rejection of colonialism, given that English and French, the two former colonial languages, have been enshrined in the constitution as official languages and principal languages of education. The remaining sections of 8.2 examine this tension, addressing the way the two former colonial languages fit into three particular postcolonial discourses.
8.2.1 The importance of indigenous ‘heritage’

One aspect of constructing a postcolonial national identity for Vanuatu has been the ability to talk about ni-Vanuatu kastom (traditional culture) and languages, establishing symbolic, indigenous foundations with which the nation can identify, following the logic of the topos of traditional national identity. Throughout policy texts, many references to ‘heritage’ refer explicitly to the need to retain and value Vanuatu’s indigenous culture and languages. This heritage is often positioned in opposition to the foreign culture and languages associated with the education system.

The Education Master Plan of 1999 includes the following introduction to the vernacular education policy (which has never officially been implemented):

Extract 8.3

Children will be well-grounded in their local language, culture, history, and heritage before they proceed on to knowledge of foreign languages and the wider world. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, p.10)

A contrast is established between “local” and “foreign” knowledge. English and French are “foreign languages” that clearly do not belong to the children in this version of identity. The same document goes further in arguing that the current education system actually works against the maintenance of what is indigenous:

Extract 8.4

There is also a general feeling among parents and national authorities of all parties, social groups, and linguistic persuasions that Vanuatu’s education system is not helping Vanuatu preserve its rich linguistic heritage, its customs and culture, and its identity. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, p.63)

The education system is, once again, placed in opposition to the body of cultural knowledge and practices of Vanuatu, indicating the usage of the topos of heritage. The claim, attributed to a wide sector of society, that education is not helping to maintain Vanuatu’s heritage leaves implicit the argument that this is a bad thing. The underlying conclusion rule is that if something is considered to be of value, then it should be preserved.

A number of Anglophone students raised this point in writing their opinions about the school language rules. The following two questionnaire responses
illustrate the tension between the topoi of successful learning and international languages and the topos of heritage:

Extract 8.5

My opinion about these rules is I think it is good for us students to obey it because it is the main language that we need to know to help us in our studies. English is the main language that will be used in offices and schools. I also think that to speak our mother language is also good because it must not be forgotten. We have to keep our traditional value for island language. (Year 13)

I think the rules a good because to help me with my English in class and also to help me improve with my studies so that I could achieve my aim for the future. But on the other side, I don't like it because English is not the language that I grow up with and if I keep on talking English then I can sometimes forget about my island language and loss it forever. (Year 11)

Both students claim that English will help them succeed in their studies and thus have good futures, but they also argue that it is important to maintain their home languages (cf. XI:61-4/xi:57-9; XIV:236-9, 362-3/xiv:219-22, 340-2; XVII:218-25/xvii:209-15; XVIII:203-61/xviii:197-255; XIX:291-7, 307-9/xix:284-90, 300-1; XX:415-58/xx:415-56; XXI:203-7, 445-6/xxi:197-201, 435-7). The 2010 national curriculum statement attempts to address this perceived dichotomy between school and this heritage, arguing for the incorporation of indigenous culture and languages into the new curriculum. ‘Heritage’, once again, is associated with what has existed for generations:

Extract 8.6

Languages have sustained our cultures from generation to generation over many thousands of years. Vanuatu has a rich cultural heritage and oral traditions that have survived because our languages have survived. Keeping our languages alive is essential otherwise many of our cultural practices will die or survive only in museums. Schools have an important role to play in working with local communities to ensure local languages are used, understood, and valued by children and students. Children and students should be encouraged to use their local languages and be proud of this heritage. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2010, p.49)

The topos of heritage is used explicitly. Lexis of ‘sustainment’ and ‘survival’ is placed in contrast to lexis of ‘death’ and exhibition in museums as a relic of the past. Lexis of ‘richness’, ‘heritage’ and ‘tradition’ is used to argue that there is an obligation to ‘use’, ‘understand’ and ‘value’ this heritage. This is linked,
intertextually, to the constitutional provision that the vernaculars shall be protected as "part of the national heritage" (Article 3(2)).

Similarly, in advocating the use of vernaculars in education, the Director of Policy and Planning also reflects on the country's name (meaning 'our land'):

Extract 8.7

DPP: Sapos ol vernacular oli left out? Er basically blong talem olsem se Vanuatu has shot itself. It has killed itself. So maybe they should change the name. Vanuatu my land. They should change the name to something else. Sapos vernacular hem i no blong hem. (XVIII:960-3)

[DPP: If the vernaculars are left out? Er basically it means that Vanuatu has shot itself. It has killed itself. So maybe they should change the name. Vanuatu my land. They should change the name to something else. If the vernaculars are not in there.] (xviii:925-8)

He links the vernaculars to the land on which they are spoken. The implication is that an education system that does not make use of the languages that have always been spoken on this land is inappropriate for a country whose name reflects the importance of indigenous land. The symbolic links are clear between the nation and its indigenous foundations, drawing explicitly on the topos of traditional national identity.

A final example describes English and French as a different form of 'heritage', in the sense that they have been inherited from the previous system. However, this version of 'heritage' is not valued:

Extract 8.8

In the early 1960s, the use of the French and English languages in our schools was enforced by the condominium authorities. At this time, schools mostly used imported materials from France and England and other colonized countries in Africa and the Pacific. Our Constitution reflects this heritage when it says that the principal languages of education are French and English. Support for Francophone and Anglophone schools by the respective Condominium partners created a dual system of education based on these colonial languages. This dual system still exists today but the curriculum will now become the same for all schools. Our education system is challenging this dual system. We recognize the need to harmonize the curriculum for Francophones and Anglophones so that all children follow the same curriculum and have the same opportunities irrespective of their language background.

(Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2010, p.2)
This version of heritage is not considered positive. The colonial languages are described as “enforced” by “authorities”, alongside other impositions such as “imported” materials. No agency is given to the new national leaders over decisions taken at Independence, with the constitution placed as the grammatical subject of the sentence dealing with these decisions. The implication is that no deliberate decision was taken to retain these languages. However, in putting forward the new national curriculum as the solution, agency is given to “our education system”. The implication here is that there is a collective, national drive to replace the colonial “heritage” with a more equitable alternative.

‘Heritage’, thus, appears to encompass what is indigenous to Vanuatu, and this heritage is considered valuable. The history of the nation appears to be traced back to the pre-colonial era and established as the true identity of those indigenous to the land, through the topos of traditional national identity (cf. De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999 on the construction of a common history as the basis of national identity), and efforts must be taken to maintain this history, following the topos of heritage. Although the education system has also been ‘inherited’, this appears to be an unwelcome version of ‘heritage’, since it conflicts with the cultural and linguistic practices that preceded it. The languages that are symbolically constructed as part of Vanuatu’s heritage are the vernaculars.

8.2.2 Two media of instruction as a source of disunity

Two of my interviewees present strong views about the need to be ‘man Vanuatu’ or ‘ni-Vanuatu’, rather than ‘Anglophones’ and ‘Francophones’. The first is the Francophone principal, who makes this point on two occasions during the interview:
Extract 8.9

FP: A Francophone and an Anglophone? They don’t go together. Something now that we are trying to do so you forget this idea. We become man Vanuatu. If you say that we speak Bislama then we speak Bislama. If we speak English we speak English. But you should no longer say no I’m Francophone we are Anglophone. That’s the idea now that we are creating. ... We say that we are ni-Vanuatu. That’s all. The system of Anglophones and Francophones or even suppose I teach in the Francophone and you teach in the Anglophone? In the English language? But we don’t talk about it like ah you teach English no. It’s an opportunity for all of us you one (.) two languages now. So the system that the government is saying now? When you go around I no longer want to hear Francophone Anglophone. When this happens you see one go here one go there. No. You just say I am Man Vanuatu.] (xvii:301-340)

Here, the principal explicitly contrasts the idealised situation in which people consider themselves “Man Vanuatu”, with the colonial divisions between Anglophones and Francophones. To be united as ni-Vanuatu requires rejecting this duality, following the topos of *united national identity*. The Director of Basic Education (a member of the Education Language Policy team), relies on the same argument in explaining the purpose of language policy reform:
Extract 8.10

DBE: Lanwis polisi? Long purpose we mi andastanem? (2) Polisi ia hem i blong wan? Hem i blong yumi unite/em ol pipol oli become wan tugeta. Still today we say Francophone Anglophone. We speak English. We. Hemia nao lanwis polisi i wantem karemaot barrier ia. Between the two. And we take those two people and they become one. Only one ni-Vanuatu.
(XIX:216-20)

Once again, this is an explicit rejection of the colonial past, and an argument that being ni-Vanuatu must mean *not* being Anglophone or Francophone. This argumentation falls in line with sentiments expressed in the Education Master Plan, in which an overt distinction is made between colonial education and what is appropriate for Vanuatu:

Extract 8.11

Now there is an acute awareness on the part of Government officials and the public that the use of the local languages is key to a reform of the education system. In the words of the Minister of Education, “We need a system that not just an amalgamation of the English and French systems of the colonial period, but a truly Vanuatu system.” (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, p.74)

Extract 8.12

Parents, educators, and political leaders have said they wish to see an education system that is neither a British system nor a French system but rather a ni-Vanuatu system. (ibid., p.63)

The ‘national’ is placed in direct opposition to the ‘British’ and the ‘French’, in both extracts, with the modifier “truly” making clear this distinction in the former. Different perspectivization strategies are used to argue the same point. Extract 8.11 uses direct speech to quote the Minister of Education exactly, while Extract 8.12 uses indirect speech to summarise the views attributed to the general population. The combination serves to project a combined, national consensus about ni-Vanuatu education. This version of national identity discourse considers a national system to be something other than a combination of the two previous systems, and cuts ties with their British and French origins. ‘Ni-
Vanuatu’ is not an uncomfortable compromise between Anglophone and Francophone, but something new.

Once again, we can trace this discourse back to discussions leading up to Independence. Fr. Walter Lini raised the following point in the Constitutional Committee meeting of 9 August 1979:

**Extract 8.13**

France and Britain had divided the New Hebrides, he said, and the nation’s political parties were continuing to spread division. It was therefore essential to promote unity by preparing a Constitution that reflected New Hebridean thinking” (Republic of Vanuatu, 2009, p.102).

Looking back on Independence and the drawing up of the constitution, thirty years later, one of the former committee members (Sethy Regenvanu) reflected:

**Extract 8.14**

We realized together that, while we were fighting over our political differences, we were all legally stateless in our own country, the best of our land was being taken away from our control and our cultures were being undermined by foreign forces. We came to realize that the gravity of the situation confronting us all was far more important and serious than any differences we had harbored, based on French and British influence on us in language and education. We discovered that, when it came to the issues that were of fundamental importance to our people and this country, we stood united (ibid., p.5).

The disunity is linked explicitly, in both extracts, to the divisive influence of the colonial powers, and both former ministers argue for a common New Hebridean way forward (cf. XVIII:368-70/xviii:3589-60; XX: 202-5/xx:202-5; XXI:369-78/xxi:359-68). Once again, an important characteristic of the postcolonial national identity of the country is its progression beyond its colonial past.

**8.2.3 Anglo-French uniqueness as a problematic characteristic**

The final element of national identity problematises Vanuatu’s unusual situation. Chapter 1 opened with a number of publication titles that reflect the way Vanuatu’s colonial past has been documented. The following extracts from two of these sources reveal the way the ‘uniqueness’ of this situation has typically been discussed.
Extract 8.15

The New Hebrides was bogged down by the only condominium government in the world. Governed jointly by France and Britain ... the condominium system was the most out-dated and confused system of government that mankind has ever established on earth. (Sope, 1980, p.15).

Extract 8.16

Many saw the physical siting of the two Residencies, so close to one another, yet separated by a gully, with the Union Jack fluttering in the long shadow of the Tricolour, as an appropriate symbol of the Condominium administration that had come to Vanuatu. ... Visiting journalists found the bizarre workings of the joint administration easy copy for a humorous article with its duplication of services, two police forces, postage stamps officially sold at other than their face value and different exchange rates of the English pound to the French franc depending on what was bought. Geared for relative inactivity and the product of a diplomatic compromise, the Condominium was a frustrating system for any earnest civil servant who wanted to get things done. (MacClancy, 2002, p.104).

Sope describes the condominium arrangement as unique “in the world” and “on earth”, and both authors make clear its failings. They describe it as “out-dated”, “confused”, “bizarre”, and “frustrating”, and they reveal the many problems that resulted from what MacClancy describes as “a diplomatic compromise”. There is nothing positive attributed to ‘being unique’ amongst all colonial systems.

Lini, the future first prime minister of Vanuatu, commented during the meeting of 9 August 1979 that:

Extract 8.17

The New Hebrides unique characteristics made it essential that something specifically suited to the New Hebridean context be devised. (Republic of Vanuatu, 2009, p.102).

Lini’s use of the term “unique” acknowledges the differences between Vanuatu and other nations as a complicating factor. Almost three decades later, the Government of Vanuatu’s Priorities and Action Agenda described the uniqueness of the context in terms of its complexity (erroneously referring to two, rather than three, official languages):
The environment in which [our] goals must be achieved is unique, including more than 105 vernaculars, two official languages and one national language; schools scattered over more than 60 islands; high rates of population growth, and rapid urban drift. The growing population puts considerable pressure on the education system and places increasing demands on the national budget. (Government of the Republic of Vanuatu, 2006, p.29).

The lengthy list included in the first sentence makes clear the number of different constraints placed on policymaking and budgeting by Vanuatu’s “uniqueness”. The problems are further highlighted in the second sentence, in which “pressure” and “increasing demands” are referred to. Linguistic diversity is discussed together with other factors such as growing population, thus implying the difficulties posed by this diversity. Being ‘unique’ can thus be considered a burden.

8.3 Embracing heritage: Doubly-blessed by English and French

8.2 has discussed a number of discourses in which distance from, or explicit rejection of, Vanuatu’s Anglo-French past is established symbolically. Vanuatu is constructed as being different from its colonial past (following the topos of postcolonial national identity), being linked to its pre-colonial traditions (following the topos of traditional national identity), and being united as one nation (following the topos of united national identity). Within these discourses, the ‘unique’ Anglo-French legacy that sets Vanuatu apart from other nations is considered problematic for policymaking, and a reminder of an uncomfortable colonial past. However, the remainder of this chapter will present a number of extracts in which a very different version of national identity is constructed.

8.3.1 The reconstruction of English and French as ‘heritage’

There are a number of occasions on which English and French are also considered to be part of the ‘heritage’, and have thus become legitimate components of the traditional national identity. Some such occasions come from official policy texts. Although the extracts discussed in section 8.2.1 reveal heritage discourses that concern the preservation of the vernaculars and
traditional culture, there are other occasions on which the same discourse of language preservation is applied to English and French:

Extract 8.19

We wish to preserve English and French as the principal languages of our education system (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 1999, p.4)

The statement calls explicitly for the need to “preserve” English and French, thereby using the topos of *heritage* with reference solely to the former colonial languages. Extract 8.20, from the Corporate Plan of 2002, and Extract 8.21, from the Vanuatu Education Sector Strategy of 2006, however, appear to integrate both indigenous and colonial languages within this discourse of language maintenance:

Extract 8.20

Goal Five: Protect our local languages and the principal languages of education English and French (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2002, p.5)

Extract 8.21

Vanuatu’s language policies and languages of instruction are part of the national identity and protection of culture, and are enshrined in the Constitution and the draft National Language Policy, and recently reinforced in the Prime Minister’s April 2006 policy statement. Bi-lingualism in English and French is seen as a competitive advantage and a national asset. Nonetheless, donors put pressures on the Education Sector in terms of either protecting a particular language (which works against the unified system) or questioning the affordability of maintaining two global languages of instruction. (Vanuatu Ministry of Education, 2006b, p.33)

In Extract 8.20, all languages appear to be in equal need of protection. In Extract 8.21, however, despite the vague terminology of “language policies and languages of instruction” used in the opening, it becomes clear from the second and third sentences that the extract relates to English and French only. The topos of *double opportunity* is used to argue for the maintenance of “bi-lingualism”, and donors are criticised for attempts to remove one of the current languages of instruction. Given that the maintenance of English in Vanuatu has never been questioned, it can be assumed that this text is about retaining French as a language of instruction. However, this is achieved by linking both English and French to each of national identity, protection of culture, the provisions of the constitution, and the mandates of the national language policy.
The implication is that the two former colonial languages must be protected as part of the national culture. The reference to the constitution suggests that their protection is enshrined therein, which is a fallacy. One provision of the constitution states that English and French shall be the principal languages of education, while another states that the local languages must be protected (see Extract 7.53). The conflation of these provisions serves to recontextualise the constitutional mandate to protect the local languages as a wider provision for the protection of English and French. The elements are conjoined in such a way that properties of one element become associated with another. It is true that there are statements about English and French “enshrined in the constitution” but not with reference to their protection. To ensure that French is retained in Vanuatu as an equal language to English, it becomes necessary to recontextualise both languages as part of the heritage and identity of the country, in order to argue for their preservation. In the following extract, the Director of Policy and Planning (Anglophone-educated) also draws on the topos of heritage to argue that English and French must be preserved:

Extract 8.22

_DPP: Hem i wan heritage we yumi karem i kam ... we i become wan pat blong laef blong yumi. Because long colonial taem? Yumi karem Inglis yumi karem French. So:: hem i wan samting we yumi karem i kam. Yumi no sud tekem away evri ting. I gat sam gud samting. And er those good things mifala i mas kipim. Mifala i mas kipim from we:: mi talem long olgeta se tingting hem i osem se yu karem wanem we hem i blong yu i stap. Hem i er form/em base. And then afta yu luk around. Wanem we yu karem i defren long hem you look around elsewhere. And olgeta we yu karem elsewhere yu karem hemia i kam blong complement/em wanem we yu yu gat._ (XVIII:368-426)  

[DPP: It is a heritage that we have brought here ... that has become a part of our lives. Because from the colonial time? We’ve got English we’ve got French. So:: it’s something that we have brought forward. We shouldn’t take everything away. There are some good things. And er those good things we must keep. We must keep them because::se I told them that the idea is like you keep what is yours already. That er forms the base. And then you look around. To get things other than that you look around elsewhere. And those things that you get elsewhere you take them to complement what you already have.] (xviii:358-414)

The director refers to French as part of the “heritage”, directly invoking discourses of linguistic or cultural preservation (cf. XVIII:259/xviii:253 where he
laments the loss of ‘heritage’ with reference to vernaculars). The predication strategies he uses to talk about both English and French include lexis associated with such discourses, stressing the importance of keeping what is already there. He describes a change of ownership, acknowledging the colonial origins of these languages but stating that they have become “a part of our lives” and have been brought forward through history by ni-Vanuatu themselves. He contrasts “what is yours already” with other languages that one might “look around [for] elsewhere” to “complement” them, thus incorporating English and French within what belongs to Vanuatu.

The Director of Basic Education (Francophone-educated) makes a similar point, although he describes the shift in ownership of French and English as a more deliberate strategy:

Extract 8.23

F: Olsem yumi talem se yumi nidim Inglis mo Franis. Evriwan i mas bilingual. Be from wanem.

DBE: Ating it’s er (1) Hem i kam long (2) long histri. Blong nation. (2) Bifo taem mifala i stap long condominium? Then tufala paoa i putum Inglis mo French but taem we mifala i kam long independens? We have to make a choice. Have to make a choice so mi stap tingbaot ol lida/s long taem ia. Taem blong oli raetem konstityusen? Oli discuss/em plante yes. Oli argue. Some of them say yumi lego Franis yumi yusum Inglis. Some of them say no yumi lego Inglis yumi yusum Franis. So oli bin argue plante? Be wanem hem i gud se they come (.) oli kam long wan agrimen. Blong (.) oli talem olsem ia. Oli talem se ol Franis man oli go finis. Ol Inglis pipol bae oli go. Be from yumi? Tufala lanwis ia i stap bae yumi adoptem. Olsem lanwis blong Vanuatu. So French English in Vanuatu today? Is not a language for French or English. It’s also Vanuatu language. (XIX:339-51)

[F: Like we say that we need English and French. Everyone must be bilingual. But why.

DBE: It’s maybe er (1) it comes from (2) from the history. Of the nation. (2) Before when we were in the condominium? Then the two powers introduced English and French but when we came to Independence? We have to make a choice. Have to make a choice so I think about the leaders of that time. When they wrote the constitution? They discussed it a lot yes. They argued. Some of them say we should drop French and use English. Some of them say no drop English and use French. So they argued a lot? But what is good is they come (.) they came to an agreement. They said that the French have gone already. The English will go. But us? The two languages that are here we will adopt them. As languages of Vanuatu. So French English in Vanuatu today? Is not a language for French or English. It’s also Vanuatu language.] (xix:331-43)
Structurally, this extract is very similar to Extract 8.8. Both extracts begin by explaining the colonial origins of English and French, move to the decisions taken at Independence, and finish with the ni-Vanuatu solution to the situation. However, the lexis employed by the director here reveals the agency he attributes to the leaders at Independence, and the positive decision that they made to retain both languages (cf. Extract 8.8 in which the retention of English and French did not appear deliberate). He dismisses the importance of the colonial powers in having introduced English and French, by stating that these languages now belong to Vanuatu. He thus gives a very different reaction to the inheritance of English and French.

The subject nouns and pronouns used in Extract 8.23 explicitly differentiate between the colonial powers and ni-Vanuatu as owners of English and French. He notes that “the two powers” imposed the two languages, but “the leaders” (of the new nation) made a conscious decision to keep them (although the decision was not easy). By the end of the extract, the director’s explanation is put forward as the direct speech of these leaders, using the first person plural (inclusive) pronoun to express their appeal to ni-Vanuatu. This perspectivization strategy of using the leaders’ voices adds to the historical contextualisation of his point. He does not look back at what happened as a finished episode in history, but recontextualises what the leaders supposedly said as support for his argument that English and French are now considered to be “Vanuatu language[s]”. He dismisses the idea that they are “for French or English” people.

My question had not been about how the director felt about the two languages, but why it was important for all ni-Vanuatu to speak both. I had framed my question in terms of “need” for the languages, and had thus expected the answer to relate to instrumental purposes. A similar episode occurred in my interview with the former Minister of Education (Francophone-educated), when I asked why there was the “political will” for bilingualism. Even when I pushed for a reason other than just maintaining the status quo, asking directly about “purpose” or “benefits”, he replied with another example that, again, suggested a symbolic orientation to language:
FME: At the level of political will it wants the country to continue to be a bilingual country.

F: But what is the main reason behind that? Like to continue both sides together.

FME: Well I mean it’s in the constitution. They decided when the country reached independence. The constitution adopted three languages. The national languages are French English and Bislama.

F: It means that we just continue because (.) but there’s no (.) I don’t know purpose of it or a benefit [of this.]

FME: [Well its purpose] too because the (.) country was a condominium before. And people have continued to live like this too. If you took one out? That would cause a scandal there would be a revolution. If you changed it. If you took one out and we like continued with one.] (xxi:122-33)

The former minister’s answer reveals both a reliance on the symbolic weight of the constitution as evidence that the status quo must continue and acknowledgment that change would not be possible. Instead of giving any reasons why English or French is useful (for example, using the topos of double opportunity), he relies on the pragmatic difficulties of actually removing one language as support for the status quo.

A similar sentiment of there being no other option was expressed by the Anglophone principal, in response to the same question about reasons for needing both English and French. Previously, he had said that he wished he spoke French so that he could communicate with tourists who didn’t speak English:
I deliberately phrased my question with reference to his earlier point about tourists, but he didn’t answer in terms of the instrumental need for both languages. Instead, he explained that people just went along with the same system, suggesting not a lack of choice, per se, but a lack of deliberate intention. He uses no predication strategies that reveal whether this is good or bad, but appears fairly pragmatic about the maintenance of the status quo (cf. XV:268-90/xv:249-71; XVII:298-310/xvii:285-97). Some interview extracts thus reveal overt inclusion of English and French as part of the ‘national heritage’, while others reveal more of a pragmatic awareness that the situation would be hard to change. These are two different ways of representing the fact that English and French have a long history in Vanuatu, but the interesting finding was that no interviewee would put forward any argument against retaining the status quo.

In summary, despite a dominant discourse in which ‘heritage’ is considered to refer to traditional or indigenous languages and culture, there is another version of this discourse that includes the colonial languages. Both discourses draw on the topos of heritage in very similar ways. However, no single version of ‘heritage’ is presupposed. Different discourses incorporate different versions of what is considered valuable and are thus used to argue different things.

The slightly different concepts of being part of the ‘history’ of the nation (being languages that were used in the past) and being part of the ‘heritage’ (being languages that have been preserved from the past) have become conflated, so that the topos of traditional national identity now links the rationale that English
and French have a long history with the claim that they are part of what it means to be ni-Vanuatu. While it is undeniable that the two colonial languages are literally part of Vanuatu’s past, or history, it seems surprising that this past now appears to be valued in this way. Given both the administrative disarray in which the condominium was run, and the political turmoil and physical violence experienced in the run up to Independence, it seems surprising that ni-Vanuatu appear to conceptualise any reminder of their colonial past as part of the national heritage.

One explanation could be that Ministry of Education officials explain away their inability to change the education system by finding ways to embrace this status quo. Another could be that the emotive term ‘heritage’ is used in different ways, depending on what a policy is trying to achieve. So a policy for vernacular language education relies on public support for the need to preserve the vernaculars, but ministers concerned that the use of the French language might be in jeopardy are likely to draw on the topos of heritage in order to ensure the ‘preservation’ of French.

However, it appears from the discourse of school participants, during interviews and throughout the two periods of fieldwork, that the recontextualisation of national identity discourses is more widespread than can be attributed solely to policymakers attempting to present themselves and their policies in particular ways. The phrase ‘identity’ is used by these participants in ways to suggest that they also very much embrace this heritage.

8.3.2 The construction of unity through ‘bilingualism’

8.2.2 presented data in which the Anglophone-Francophone duality was rejected as an impediment to national unity, following the topos of united national identity. However, an excerpt from one interview with Anglophone teachers, reveals that, while the problem created by the dual system is acknowledged, the duality has come to be considered part of Vanuatu’s ‘identity’:
Extract 8.26

Mme Adrienne: One present problem we have here is that we have a kind of dual system where there is French (.) and then (.) English. If there was a way for us to (.) put the two together if we don’t actually want to lose one? Because however hard you try (.) you say (.) you say that French will be dropped? It started already at Independence. ... That they would never drop it. It’s an identity for the country. So if the government thinks carefully? It should make it so that (.) for us to come now and say that it’s a privilege or it’s an individual privilege then. We find a way. I think we should start with primary? We start with primary? Then we switch to come back to English and then go and go for good. If we want to keep that identity.

(xiv:552-64)

Although Mme Adrienne frames the duality as a “problem”, she refers constantly to wanting to keep both languages, saying that they are part of Vanuatu’s identity. She argues that retaining this identity requires unifying the two streams together as one, rather than rejecting the existence of both languages. Although she acknowledges that it wouldn’t be possible to lose French, therefore drawing on a similar resignation about the status quo as was seen in the previous section, it seems from much of her lexis that Mme Adrienne does want to preserve both languages. ‘Identity’ is explicitly connected to the preservation of English and French. She later says:

Extract 8.27

Mme Adrienne: It’s an identity for us? To know both languages.

(xiv:689-90)
A natural extension of Vanuatu having this dual identity appears to be that being *ni-Vanuatu* (of or from Vanuatu) must entail speaking both English and French. The following statement by a Francophone teacher captures this projection of national identity onto individual identity.

**Extract 8.28**

*Mr Fred: WAN SAMTING WE YUMI WANTED? VANUATU NAOIA. NAOIA WE OLI STAP TOLBAOT NAOIA. HEMIA WE OLI WANTEM SE VANUATU I MAS BILINGUAL IA. SO SYSTEM IA WE HEM I STAP TALEM HEMIA HEMIA. OLI WANTEM EVRIWAN OLI MAS (.) INGLIS YU TOKTOK SEM MAK WETEM FRENCH. I SEM MAK NOMO. SO LONG PLES IA NAO BAE YUMI TALEM SE NO. YUMI KAM BILINGUAL NAO. (XV:310-14)*

[Mr Fred: One thing we want? Vanuatu now. What they are talking about at the moment. They want Vanuatu to be bilingual. So the system we have that says this and this. They want everyone to (. ) you speak English the same as you speak French. Just the same. So here they will say no. We become bilingual now.] (xv:288-91)

The way to move beyond speaking either English (i.e. being ‘Anglophone’) or French (i.e. being ‘Francophone’) appears to be being ‘bilingual’. This conceptualisation of being ni-Vanuatu also entails going further than preserving English and French, as it considers them both to be essential for all. English and French are therefore constructed, together, as a marker of a united national identity, so that all ni-Vanuatu will share a ‘bilingual’ identity. The disunity caused by the coexistence of Anglophones and Francophones has thus been recontextualised as unity through knowing both languages, such that the topos of *united national identity* now appears to connect the dual history with the need for all ni-Vanuatu to know both languages.

### 8.3.3 The construction of bilingual as unique

The final element of national identity that appears to have been recontextualised is that of ‘uniqueness’. A number of episodes reveal that the use of two international languages marks Vanuatu out from other countries, with its status as a ‘bilingual country’.

Miss Adina tells an anecdote from her experience as a Linguistics student at the University of the South Pacific in Fiji:
Miss Adina: Mi wis se mi save French <laughs> from se (.) not only for the purpose of communicating with French people? Be taem yu go aot olsem (.) yu go aot blong (.) aot saed long kaontri? Afta bae ol man oli luk yu? Sapos oli save se yu blong Vanuatu? Oli save se Vanuatu is a bilingual country? Afta yu sud save both languages. And it's (.) such a shame sapos yu save wan nomo. <laughs> <others laugh> Taem yu go sidaon long klas oli talem se hands up you who are from Vanuatu? Afta yu putum han blong yu i go antap afta oli askem yu yu save French <laughs> wetem English mi se no mi save Inglis nomo <laughs>. So hemia hem i wan sem sapos mi no save French. Mi really wantem lanem French. (XIII:245-53)

[Miss Adina: I wish that I knew French <laughs> because (.) not only for the purpose of communicating with French people? But when you go out like (.) you go out (.) outside the country? Then people see you? If they know that you are from Vanuatu? They know that Vanuatu is a bilingual country? Then you should know both languages. And it's (.) such a shame if you only know one. <laughs><others laugh> When you go and sit down in the class and they say hands up you are from Vanuatu? Then you put your hand up and then they ask if you know French <laughs> and English I say no I only know English <laughs>. So that's an embarrassment that I don't know French. I really want to learn French.] (xiii:220-228)

Miss Adina argues that the importance of French goes beyond the instrumental need to communicate with speakers of this language, to the importance of being bilingual in the eyes of others. She links what other people “see” and “know” about Vanuatu to her own shame and embarrassment at not fulfilling the identity that she feels is expected of her. Her anecdote suggests that Vanuatu is singled out during the Linguistics class as different from the home countries of most students attending the university, and she feels ashamed not to be able to represent Vanuatu adequately.

Mr Aru follows this up later in the interview:

Extract 8.30

Mr Aru: Hem i wan sort of an identity as well. Taem you get to know both languages? Then yu go aot yu fil se yes yu blong Vanuatu nao.

Miss Adina: Tru.
Mr Aru: Be sapos yu go yu lanem wan nomo then yu fil se no (.) yu bin (.) pat blong narafala kaontri be i no Vanuatu. From yu no save tufala lanwis.  
(XIII:348-52)  
Mr Aru: But if you go and you only learn one then you feel that no (.) you’ve been (.) part of another country but not Vanuatu. Because you don’t know both languages.] (xiii:319-24)

Again, Vanuatu is distinguished from other countries by virtue of having these two languages (cf. XIII:376-7/xiii:345-6). Being identified by outsiders as ni-Vanuatu thereby involves conforming to the ‘bilingual’ identity attributed to the country. ‘Uniqueness’ is no longer linked solely to complexity or to an unusually problematic colonial arrangement, but to a trait to be proud of, as the ‘bilingualism’ provides Vanuatu with a defining characteristic within the Pacific (as required by the logic of the topos of unique national identity).

A speech given by the then Minister of Education and Minister of Francophonie, Charlot Salwai, on the occasion of La Journée de la Francophonie 2009, makes the same point in the following:

Extract 8.31

L’héritage dont nous avons su si bien garder malgré les divers défis que nous avons rencontré et surmonté de part le passé et que je ne vais pas m’attarder dessus, nous permet aisément de nous identifier comme étant le seul pays de la région à pouvoir revendiquer la langue française et la langue anglaise comme un outil universel de communication en général et de transmission de savoir en particulier.

[The heritage we have been able to maintain so successfully, in spite of the diverse challenges that we have encountered and overcome from the past and that I will not dwell on, easily allows us to be identified as being the only country of the region able to claim the French language and the English language as a universal tool of communication in general and for the transmission of knowledge in particular.] (Salwai, 2009)

In this extract, the minister links the ‘heritage’ of English and French (deliberately maintained) to the accolade of being the only country in the Pacific in this situation. He distances this heritage from the problems that have been experienced in the past, leaving ambiguous whether this refers to the colonial period or, more likely, the era of the first, Anglophone-dominated government. As with all other occurrences of this discourse, in order to claim French as part of the heritage and the unique identity, English must also be heralded in equal measures, despite the speech being given to celebrate Francophonie.
Extract 5.13 presented the Francophone principal’s justification of an attempt to encourage both French and English at school with the rationale that Vanuatu is the “only country in the Pacific that is bilingual”. He explained that students therefore needed to make the effort to learn both languages, in order to achieve something. Following the logic of this argument, it is the learning of English and French that will lead students to greater opportunities (following the topos of double opportunity), rather than the ‘uniqueness’ of Vanuatu’s situation. Yet, the principal conflates the two together, embracing Vanuatu’s unique status as justification for promoting both languages.

Finally, the Director of Basic Education used the specific term “unique” several times in his interview, leading me to question whether he saw this as positive or negative:

Extract 8.32

DBE: Situation blong mifala long Vanuatu? Olsem taem yu compare/em mifala long ol narafala kaontri long wol? Mifala i unique lelebet. In terms of language uh. We have so many language for (.) small density blong pipol uh? Taem yu compare/em mifala wetem ol um Papua New Guinea? Okei olgeta population blong olgeta i bigwan okei. Be mifala i smol. Mi ting se mifala i unique. So sapos mifala i wantem uh (.) mifala i wantem come up wetem wan edyuksesen lanwis polisi? It has to be um (.) what (.) how (.) how I say that. It has to be er (4) from the Vanuatu context.

F: M-m.

DBE: Be i no blong mifala i adoptem wan narafala system from bae hemia i no wok. Situation blong mifala i (.) hem i unique.

F: Be unique hem i gud o hem i bad.

DBE: Mi ting se hem i gud. (XIX:520-32)

[DBE: Our situation in Vanuatu? Like when you compare us with other countries in the world? We are a bit unique. In terms of language uh. We have so many languages for (.) a small density of people uh? When you compare us with um Papua New Guinea? Okay their population is big okay. But we are small. I think that we are unique. So if we want uh (.) we want to come up with an education language policy? It has to be um (.) what (.) how (.) how I say that. It has to be er (4) from the Vanuatu context.

F: M-m.

DBE: But it’s not for us to adopt another system because that won’t work. Our situation (.) is unique.

F: But is unique good or bad.

DBE: I think it’s good.] (xix:510-21)
He demonstrates an awareness of the complexity faced by policymakers (appearing to draw on the characterisation of uniqueness as problematic, as set out in 8.2.3), and yet he also embraces this. One discourse of uniqueness appears to have been recontextualised as another, so that the logic underlying the topos of unique national identity helps Vanuatu to define itself as different from other countries. Concerns about the complexity of Vanuatu’s dual-medium education system have been overridden, in certain contexts, by a new conceptualisation of this complexity as a distinction to be proud of (cf. XVII:90-2, 259, 281-2/xvii:84-6, 249-50, 269-70).

The use of linguistic means to help define political borders is a common phenomenon, contributing to the construction, or imagination, of distinct national identities (Anderson, 1983). In Vanuatu, it is not Bislama (the constitutionally-recognised national language) that helps define the nation-state’s political borders; nor is it the unrivalled linguistic diversity that is considered unique (despite Vanuatu considered to have the highest number of languages per capita in the world); it is the co-existence of two ‘international languages’. Within this discourse, competence in two international languages, rather than the national language or an indigenous language, is considered essential in order to ‘count’ as being from Vanuatu.

8.4 Summary

English and French are considered intrinsic to Vanuatu’s identity since they are both part of the nation’s history. Despite the struggle for independence from the colonial powers, which might suggest a rejection of the languages associated with them (cf. Blaser, 2004 on the new Africanist discourse in South Africa), participants appear to value these particular historical origins. The British and the French are rarely mentioned, but the languages they left behind are embraced as an inalienable part of what Vanuatu has become. Being ni-Vanuatu does not require clutching at remnants of both colonial pasts but recognising English and French as part of the present. The extension of this national identity to the level of the individual leads to the perceived necessity for all ni-Vanuatu to know both English and French. Given that 80% of ni-Vanuatu rely on subsistence farming and have limited use for either English or French in
their daily lives, this is hard to justify in practical terms, but a symbolic motivation for the maintenance of both languages is constructed. The resultant ‘bilingualism’ that is prized in Vanuatu enables citizens to be united as a common people, and define themselves as different from those in other parts of the Pacific.

The use of language as part of the symbolic constructions and reconfigurations of national identity has been described in a variety of contexts (examples include Blommaert, 2011, Belgium; Heller, 2011, Canada; St Hilaire, 2007, St Lucia; Stroud, 1999, Mozambique), with reference to a range of language ideological debates (Blommaert, 1999). The implications of such debates, however, can be far-reaching. In constructing a new national identity that embraces, rather than rejects, their colonial history, ni-Vanuatu justify the maintenance of a divisive and inefficient education system that is poorly-aligned to local needs. The only alternative is considered to be a system in which all children use both English and French as media of instruction, and in which other languages are pushed further out of the system, despite statements of intent to include them. Although the heritage discourse embraces all languages and cultures that are now considered to belong to Vanuatu, the arguments made about the unsuitability of vernaculars and Bislama for education (Chapter 6) and the view that ‘bilingualism’ in English and French is the only version valued (Chapter 7) mean that L1 continues to be excluded.
9 Discussion: Ideological and implementational spaces

9.1 Unutilised space for multiple linguistic resources

The data presented within this thesis has reaffirmed the overall picture of language-in-education policy in Vanuatu as incredibly complex and fraught with tensions. It has also been shown that, for a number of reasons, there has been little desire or commitment to the interrogation of any ideological space that might exist for change, and particularly for the incorporation of additional or alternative linguistic resources that would challenge the de facto monolingual status quo. Firstly, as Chapter 5 has shown, justifications given for the language rules are often simply that they are the rules and therefore must be followed. There is a sense of duty attached to maintaining the status quo that cannot be challenged without failing to behave appropriately. Moreover, participants’ recontextualisations of the rules that lead to the discursive construction of punishment appear to further close down any potential ideological space. This lack of space is equally apparent in Chapter 6, in which data shows little responsibility taken for, or even recognition of, any language problem within the classroom. It is hard to envisage change, as it is easier just to shrug the shoulders and carry on with what has always been. Finally, given that only ‘international languages’ are afforded any instrumental value for future opportunities (Chapter 7), and that the need for ‘bilingualism’ in these languages is constructed as necessary (Chapters 7 and 8), the desire to incorporate both English and French in school only further pushes other languages away.

The notion of ideological and implementational space is often applied in relation to top-down policies that appear to constrain the agency that actors such as teachers are able to use. In such situations, these actors must seek out ways to wedge open the spaces that are left open by the policies. However, the data in this thesis reveals that schools are relatively free from the constraints of top-down dictates about the way languages should be used within classrooms and other areas. Guidelines produced by the Ministry of Education hardly encourage the use of languages other than English and French, but they leave room for a
variety of different interpretations. These guidelines have not been revised since 1998, and interviews at the Ministry in both 2008 and 2011 reveal that policymakers are tolerant and pragmatic about the use of different languages in school. There appears to be little policy traffic from Ministry to schools, and neither principal could recall any instance in which the matter had been raised at principals’ meetings or in bulletins to schools. Schools therefore have quite an open space within which to create school language policies, and the rules that they produce, again, leave space for different interpretations.

Furthermore, despite reaffirmations of what should be done (suggesting a lack of ideological space for change), teachers are far more relaxed about their own language use and that of their students than might be the case. Principals’ accounts reveal a certain amount of ambivalence regarding the enforcement of school rules, and it appears that punishments are given far less frequently than students’ questionnaire answers suggest. The practices I observed also reveal that it is relatively easy to remain in line with norms of institutional appropriateness. Provided that students judge when to use L2 and when they can get away with L1, they appear to be able to navigate the potentially strict policy. They therefore make space amongst the policy for the use of multiple linguistic resources, while appearing to obey the L2-only rule, and thus avoid confrontation (cf. Heller, 1995). There is therefore considerable implementational space, firstly, for principals and/or school councils to deal with language policy as they see fit, and, secondly, for all school participants to actually use language as they feel is appropriate.

Teachers’ discourse about such practices also reveals that they frequently draw on their own personal opinions and experiences about language(s), rather than simply reproducing the official voices of policymakers. Although certain opinions are very much guided by dominant ideologies (particularly with reference to the monolingual use of L2 and to the suitability of Bislama for academic purposes), interviewees do not refer to the influence of teacher training or Ministry of Education policies on their classroom practice. They do not appear to be constrained by top-down policymaking, and may therefore have a considerable amount of freedom both to make their own sense of the language issues and to use language as they see fit.
The question therefore remains of why this implementational space is not being utilised. A key point made by Hornberger (2005, p.606), reproduced here from 1.1.3.4, is as follows:

It is essential for language educators and language users to fill up implementational spaces with multilingual educational practices, whether with intent to occupy ideological spaces opened up by policies or to prod actively toward more favorable ideological spaces in the face of restrictive policies. Ideological spaces created by language and education policies can be seen as carving out implementational spaces at classroom and community levels, but implementational spaces can also serve as wedges to pry open ideological ones.

It appears that the participants in this study are working in spaces of enormous implementational potential, but that they are constrained by a lack of ideological space within which to question what they have always known. The spaces left open by an absence of clear policy are being closed down, or left empty, by deep-rooted beliefs about what is appropriate. The challenge is thus twofold: to find ways to open up ideological spaces in which alternatives can be imagined; and, then, to find ways to occupy and wedge open these and other spaces that already exist, bringing the unrecognised language practices out into the open and making their use official.

The remainder of this chapter will discuss these two issues. It will be argued, firstly, that there are a number of factors that are conspiring to prevent the opening of ideological spaces, which must be tackled before change can be sought. Secondly, it will be argued that, although implementational spaces may be left open for the use of multiple linguistic resources within schools, these cannot be capitalised on in any productive way unless there is accompanying support for their use. I therefore differentiate between implementational tolerance (allowing something to happen) and implementational support (helping something happen).

A number of myths were set out in 1.1.3 that conspire to keep ideological and implementational space for multilingual resources closed. This thesis has explored the way language is currently being used, taught, learnt, controlled and talked about at two schools in Vanuatu, as a way of examining the practices and discourses that serve to keep these myths in circulation. 9.2 will synthesise the practices and discourses through which the first five myths from
1.1.3 are considered to operate, restricting ideological space in particular. 9.3 will address the second five myths from 1.1.3, which I argue prevent the provision of implementational support for change. Of course, the ideological and implementational aspects are far more interconnected than this separation suggests, but it is still helpful to differentiate between arguments that are primarily theoretical (essentially beliefs about languages and language learning) and those that are framed in practical terms (beliefs about the practicalities of implementation). Within these two sections, practices and discourses that point to the potential to challenge each myth will be considered, in order to suggest ways to open up (and keep open) ideological and implementational spaces for change.

9.2 An ideological stalemate

9.2.1 Myth 1: Education operates most effectively through a single medium of teaching and learning

The first and most influential myth that feeds into all others is the belief that education operates most effectively through a single medium of teaching and learning, i.e. a monolingual ideology or habitus (García, 2009; Gogolin, 1997). In 5.2, school language rules have been argued to work alongside other institutional symbols to make public the requirements of appropriate behaviour. Through a combination of the official policy texts, follow-up reminders (in the case of Angolovo College), and discourse about school rules and punishments, it is clear that L2 has become normalised as the only language that should be used, both drawing on and reinforcing the monolingual ideology. Meanwhile, the way teachers work hard to orchestrate classroom interaction through this language alone, taking on most of the work themselves in whole-class interaction and turning a blind eye to the use of alternative resources in student-student interaction (6.2), reveals the same ideology. Classrooms are expected to be monolingual L2 sites, so participants do everything they can to ensure that this norm is upheld.
Discussion of change thus becomes understood to involve a choice between different monolingual alternatives. The question of whether L1 can be made use of in the classroom becomes reimagined as the question of whether L1 can replace L2 as the classroom language, rather than of whether elements of both can work together. Although teachers demonstrate their awareness of the utility of L1 in the classroom throughout 6.3, they are quick to comment that there will be a problem when they have to come back to L2. In particular, there are concerns about the different languages getting mixed up together (see also XIV:569-73/xiv:533-8; XVII:80-84/xvii:75-9; XIX:98-9/xix:93-5). It seems difficult for teachers to imagine a scenario in which resources of a number of languages can be incorporated together. The debate thus focuses on which language is the single best option out of all those in contention.

This myth is perhaps the most deep-rooted of all, and its influence on education policy has been lamented by scholars writing from and about a wide range of contexts (Banda, 2010; Brock-Utne, 2009; García, 2009; Heugh, 2002; Hornberger, 2005; Sierens & Van Avermaet, 2013). However, Vanuatu’s double ‘heritage’ may actually provide potential space within which to challenge the monolingual ideology, due to the ambiguity over whether it is L2, or L2 and L3, that counts as being institutionally appropriate. At Angolovo, English and French are promoted equally in the official set of rules (5.2.2.1), but the latter is never mentioned away from the noticeboard (5.3.1.1); at Faranako, the rules make no mention of English (5.2.2.1), and yet this language is mentioned in a number of interviews and has a presence in a number of public spaces of the school (5.3.1.2). This ambiguity creates the space to question the assumptions on which notions of institutional appropriateness are founded. If only one language is considered appropriate (i.e. L2), then it is easy to rationalise the status quo. All other languages become undesirable simply because they are not L2. However, if the use of both L2 and L3 is what counts as being institutionally appropriate, then the monolingual ideology no longer stands up, and uncomfortable questions need to be asked about why it is only certain languages that are considered inappropriate. If space can be made for one additional language (L3), then explanations must be given for why other languages (L1) cannot be granted space. Given that there clearly is a desire for
both English and French for all students (Chapters 7 and 8), it may actually be beneficial to capitalise on this desire, in order to break down the perception that there is room only for L2. Indirectly, this might open up space for the resources of more familiar languages (L1) within the classroom.

At the same time, empirical evidence that the status quo is not actually L2 monolingualism could be used to question why people go to such lengths to claim that it is. It is clear from 5.3.1.3 that a number of languages are used on a daily basis, and that these are not kept separate in different domains of usage. Students and teachers draw on the resources of a number of different languages, and overt reprimands for flouting the rules are rare. Although aware of the potential linguistic surveillance by teachers who might enforce punishments (5.3.2.4), students navigate the policy through a number of moves such as keeping the volume down, engaging in displays of judicious amounts of L2, or avoiding interaction with teachers altogether. Although pointing out that schools are not following their own policies might simply garner a negative reaction and a tightening of the rules, it is possible that similar data from a greater number of schools would show that this is not a local ‘problem’, but a wider institutional reality that could tell us something about the way language is actually being used productively in schools.

9.2.2 Myth 2: Any language can be mastered by trying hard enough

The second myth is that whichever language is chosen as the medium of instruction can be mastered simply by trying hard enough, and thus be used successfully as the medium of instruction. A number of references to the need to improve levels of L2 are made in Ministry guidelines and school rules (5.2.2), staff meetings (5.3.1.1), interviews and informal discussions (5.3.2.1), and questionnaire responses (5.3.2.3). Miss Agnes summed up the issue in Extract 6.11, as she explained that she had now solved her own lack of confidence using L2 in the classroom, but she was worried that students still struggled. The topos of target language was relied on to make the claim that L2 should be used as much as possible in order to enhance levels of L2 competence (6.3.2). This assumption that difficulties experienced in learning through an L2 can
simply be overcome with practice and determination closes down space for solving the difficulties.

The issue is underpinned by an autonomous conceptualisation of language as a tool that is available to be picked up, learnt, and used by those willing to apply themselves. 6.2.1 examined data in which learning was talked about as the transmission of knowledge (demonstrated through phrases such as “yumi pasem knowledge” (Extract 6.3) and “go insaed long bren blong hem” (Extract 6.5), and it was clear that ‘language’ was considered the instrument through which this transmission could be carried out. 6.2.2 described the construction of teachers and students as separate groups in the classroom, between which language had a role to play in the transfer of information. Feven’s suggestion in Extract 6.14 that teachers could come and ‘give’ them an additional language at the start of secondary school if they wanted them to use both English and French (“oli kam givim Inglish blong yumi bae yumi stap yusum”) made clear that language was conceptualised as a system external to its users.

As a result, there is little interrogation in Vanuatu of what is required in order for students to learn through a language that they have little exposure to outside the classroom. For example, it was pointed out in 6.3.2 that French is described as a difficult language, justifying Anglophones’ struggle to learn it as L3, and yet nobody questions that Francophones will be able to use this language as L2, the medium of instruction for all subjects. Rather than engaging with language learning issues, or seeking space for alternatives, it is easier to talk up the need to improve levels of competence in the conventional medium of instruction. It is easier to project the problem onto others than to deal with it: teachers blame either their students for not applying themselves, or the language teachers and primary teachers for failing to prepare students adequately; students appear to distance themselves from the issue completely, either unable or unwilling to recognise any difficulty (6.3.1). Until a problem is acknowledged openly, it is hard to see space for seeking alternatives.

One way to challenge this myth is by drawing on classroom data to demonstrate that lessons can be kept going with very little use of the L2 by students, since it was shown in 6.2 that teachers do most of the language work. Students were
able to fill in the content within their teachers' carefully orchestrated dialogue, suggesting that they will not simply master the classroom language and begin using it productively to engage with what they are learning. My observations throughout the fieldwork and my assessment of Year 10 students' ability to use both English and French suggest that students have insufficient competence or confidence to participate actively in lessons in the required language, including the students who teachers categorised as hard-working. Discussions with teachers about these results indicated significant ideological space for interrogating some of the assumptions held about language learning but it appears too easy to fall back on the argument that students need to acquire these languages, and thus must work harder at them.

Evidence from these classrooms can be used alongside the wealth of research conducted in a variety of other contexts that makes it clear that submersion programmes do not engender successful learning. Global evidence of indicators such as low attainment figures and high drop-out rates from L2 medium education contexts (Alidou, 2004; Brock-Utne & Alidou, 2011; Heugh, 2011) can be discussed in parallel with Vanuatu's own data on these indicators (Bibi, 2004; Niroa, 2012; Tambe, 2005), attempting to spark debate on the language factor within educational success. Lotherington's (1996) account of the unsuitability of this type of education for Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands, based on contextual factors in these two countries, can be used to consider the issue in terms that are relevant to Melanesia in particular, thus seeking productive discussion of ways forward.

9.2.3 Myth 3: Knowledge of certain languages leads automatically to economic opportunity and development

The third myth, by no means unique to Vanuatu, is that knowledge of certain languages will lead automatically to economic opportunity and development. 7.3 presented a number of extracts in which links were drawn between acquisition of 'international languages' and access to new and different things. The awareness that languages such as English and French are used in a greater number of contexts than Vanuatu’s other languages leads to the false
conclusion that exposure to these languages brings guaranteed access to these contexts. The problem is compounded in Vanuatu as both English and French are considered essential for all, following the logic of what has been referred to here as the topos of double opportunity – the belief that, if one language provides opportunities, then two such languages must provide twice these opportunities (7.3.2). At the level of individuals, families and Vanuatu as a whole, both English and French are considered to bring advantages that cannot be accessed through one of these languages alone. Despite very little evidence that French really does open additional doors for individuals, a very strong theme running through my data has been the assertion that English/French ‘bilingualism’ is essential for everybody.

The result is the privileging of English and French above all others. If these languages are both considered desirable, then it becomes harder to see space for Bislama and the vernaculars to be used. Since policy debates are underpinned by a framework in which each language is kept separate, there can logically only be space for a certain number of languages to be learnt and used. Ideological spaces for the use of known languages are thus shut down by moves to ensure that less familiar languages can be learnt. The desire for both former colonial languages thereby pushes others further out of the system in an attempt to provide ‘bilingual’ instruction in English and French.

The strongest challenge to this situation can be made on pedagogical grounds, building on those presented above. Given that students are already considered to be struggling through the use of L2 in the classroom, it is highly likely that the use of L3 as a further medium of instruction would only compound the problems. Research showing the burden placed on children when placed in submersion programmes (Ouane & Glanz, 2011) can be used to demonstrate just how unrealistic a proposal to submerge children in two foreign languages is. It is important that such an argument makes clear that the burden is not caused by an additional number of languages (since this merely reinforces the monolingual ideology), but by the use of languages that are even less familiar.

It may also be possible to utilise the economic discourse itself to argue that cohorts of failing students will be of no use to Vanuatu’s labour market. A well-
prepared workforce requires more than language skills in order to bring the benefits that education is supposed to deliver, and students who are taught badly in English and French, acquiring no useful skills through any language, will not make productive employees. The danger is that school leavers will have been exposed to languages that are considered useful for further opportunities, and yet not have gained sufficient knowledge and skills through the process of school education to enable them to take up these opportunities. Urban drift and unemployment are becoming increasing concerns in Vanuatu, and it should therefore be possible to open up ideological space, once again, to examine how language factors may fit into this issue.

Finally, a more controversial counter-argument to the topos of double opportunity in particular could be made through a presentation of the statistics (2.2.3) and official policy discourse (7.2.1) to show that ni-Vanuatu do not appear to gain twice as much opportunity by speaking both English and French. Very few employment and scholarship opportunities appear to require competence in both languages, and those who have been educated through the Anglophone system do not appear disadvantaged by a lack of French. Those who have been educated through the Francophone system can access additional opportunities with the help of English, but they often make little use of French from this point forward. It is rare for ni-Vanuatu to have cause to use both English and French on a regular basis, although of course some individuals do so. Indeed, participants were often unsure why both languages were necessary, with both school principals, for example, stating that they were unable to answer this question directly (7.3.2). Meanwhile, some of the anecdotes used can easily be shown to construct an imagined need for these languages, such as when Mr Felix states that he will need English if he ever deals directly with a technical advisor at the Ministry of Education, and when Mrs Angela argues that she needs one of her children to be able to speak French in case a French-speaking tourist should come to her house (7.3.3). 7.4 demonstrates ambiguity over whether this version of ‘bilingualism’ is really about the instrumental gains to be had through two international languages, or whether it is a way of justifying the importance of equal opportunities for all. Data in 8.3 supports the latter suggestion, with arguments made in official policy
texts and interviews that both English and French are considered part of the ‘heritage’. It may therefore be possible to open up space to consider how much of each of these languages would be necessary in order to ‘count’ as speaking both English and French, given that their maintenance appears to be more a matter of pride and identity than economic gain.

The argument to be made is that the relatively small number of ni-Vanuatu who can be shown to benefit from the use of both English and French are far outnumbered by those who struggle to learn anything at all within the school system. The instrumental potential of certain languages for seeking employment and scholarships should not be used to override the need for children to learn effectively at school.

9.2.4 Myth 4: Certain languages have no instrumental value

A related myth draws on the same logic. Bislama and the vernaculars are considered to hold no instrumental value, and are therefore unnecessary to learn. The argument is self-reinforcing, since languages that have historically been kept away from formal domains become tarnished with the assumption that they cannot be used in these domains. The result is that ideological space that might open briefly for the inclusion of these languages in education does not stay open for long.

In addition to challenging the perception that English and French bring automatic opportunities, it is therefore essential to demonstrate the instrumental potential of other languages. Data from within the school contexts themselves can demonstrate Bislama being used to convey meaningful information (such as the posters illustrated in 5.3.1.3, the anecdotes in 6.3.2 that suggest Bislama is used when a teacher wants genuine communication to proceed, and the interviews through which much of my data was collected). Once again, another way in which to do this is to draw on the body of research that has been accumulated internationally to demonstrate the advantage of making use of familiar languages within the classroom (Brock-Utne & Alidou, 2011; García & Flores, 2012; Hornberger, 2005; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 2003).
More importantly, it should be demonstrated that the vernaculars and Bislama do hold enormous instrumental value for life beyond school, in contrast to English and French, which by no means guarantee any opportunity at all for the majority. As Chapter 2 made clear, Bislama and the vernaculars dominate in many spheres outside school, including parliament, the media and the workplace, and these languages are of considerable value for participation as a citizen in Vanuatu. It is also clear that Bislama is now far more widely used in domains such as the media and advertising than was previously the case. The use of mobile phones (and, at a slower rate, email, internet chat and social media) is also having an impact (Vandeputte-Tavo, 2013). As people become aware of the range of functions that Bislama is already fulfilling, and thus the range of topics it is able to deal with (as well as the material value that this language can be considered to have), ideological space may open up for its inclusion in education.

9.2.5 Myth 5: Pidgins and creoles are inferior to other languages

Compounding the fourth issue is the myth that Bislama is unsuitable for use in school. Not only is it less desirable than English and French, it is actually considered problematic within academic contexts. Guidelines sent from the Ministry note that “Although Bislama is an official, national language, ... where possible it should not be used” (see 5.2.2.1). This position is reinforced in the two sets of school rules, and followed up with reminders at Angolovo (5.3.1.1). Although the Faranako teachers and principal appear more tolerant towards this language in the classroom, their discourse makes clear that this should only be as a fallback strategy when children are confused, or when the expected language “doesn’t work” (6.3.1). The topos of linguistic adequacy, discussed in 6.4, constructs Bislama as a language that is not fit for purpose, despite its use as a lingua franca making it a strong candidate for inclusion in the education system. Once again, such attitudes are not unique to Bislama (Rajah-Carrim, 2007; Siegel, 1997b; Tucker, 1998, p.9), and it is clear that an enormous amount of effort would be needed to break down deeply held attitudes against this language due to its categorisation as a pidgin.
The first way that this could be attempted is to draw attention, in addition to the wide range of instrumental functions that Bislama fulfils (cf. 9.2.4), to the nature of the domains in which it is used outside school. It is used in high-status arenas such as parliament, it is the sole language in which the national anthem and motto are written, and it is the medium of instruction in programmes such as police training. All of these are recognised to be high-status contexts, and it is hard to maintain the argument that Bislama is not fit for use in education on account of its intrinsic worth. Opening up discussions around the contradiction between the norms of formal education and those in other high-status contexts may at least force recognition of these double standards. Another source of contradiction that could open up discussions with teachers is found between their descriptions of Bislama and English/French. Although teachers feel their arguments against the use of Bislama are based on rational justifications, the conflict between these and other arguments suggests potential ideological space to examine these arguments openly. For example, by asking teachers to examine the way they refer to Bislama, English and French as living languages, but consider only the first of these to be unstable (6.4.2), it may be possible to break down the perception that Bislama is a ‘made up’ or rule-less language. Similarly, by asking teachers to consider why they feel that Bislama leads only to interference for Anglophones, but only to positive transfer for Francophones, they may be able to assess whether they are simply repeating arguments that they have never questioned. Finally, by pointing out to teachers that they use complex arguments to disparage the academic suitability of Bislama, but do this through the medium of Bislama during my interviews, it may be possible for teachers to realise the complexity that the language is able to deal with. Creating opportunities for such questioning may enable space to be opened up for alternatives.

9.3 From ‘implementational tolerance’ to ‘implementational support’

It has been suggested that there are spaces of considerable implementational potential for the use of multiple linguistic resources, and 9.2 has provided a number of ideological barriers that may underpin the failure to utilise such
spaces. However, it is clear that there is another factor, lying within the implementational dimension. It is argued here that the implementational space identified in 9.1 amounts only to *implementational tolerance*, which is insufficient for the productive use of ideological space, unless actively accompanied by *implementational support* for the use of other resources.

I define *implementational tolerance* as a situation in which students and teachers are not prevented from using the resources associated with certain languages, and may even be encouraged to do so. This may cover a range of situations from ‘turning a blind eye’ to explicitly sanctioning the use of L1. I define *implementational support* as a series of necessary measures that must be in place in order for these resources to actually be used, i.e. to capitalise on the tolerance that may exist. Any attempts at wedging open ideological spaces for multilingual education must be accompanied by practical steps that actually enable multiple linguistic resources to be integrated.

The first area for consideration is assessment. As tests and examinations require answers to be given monolingually, it is not surprising that the focus of teaching is placed solely on this language. Throughout the data in Chapter 6, a clear tension for teachers emerged between ensuring understanding in the classroom (in whichever language worked) and preparing students for exams (in L2). As Shohamy (2006a, p.180) notes, the powerful nature of assessments creates a de facto policy in which “only the tested language counts”. The second, related, area is materials development. Since materials are presented solely in English or French, the implication is once again clear: these are the languages that are appropriate for education. Unless materials incorporate more than one language, it is hard to break down the perception that only one language is fit for academic purposes, and enable teachers and students to bring other languages into the classroom. The final area in which change to implementational support must be made is therefore teacher training.

Supporting the use of other linguistic resources requires giving teachers the skills to manage classrooms in which interaction takes place in languages that they may not, themselves, speak, and allowing them to consider alternatives to the pedagogies that they have always known (Arthur Shoba, 2013, p.379).
In order to see the incorporation of additional and different linguistic resources, significant change is therefore required at many levels. Such implementational changes appear costly and complex, and these concerns cannot be dismissed. However, a number of arguments are consistently put forward that it is simply too difficult to incorporate other languages in education, and these arguments are rarely questioned. Following the same approach as in 9.2, the remainder of this section presents and refutes five such myths that prevent the utilisation of implementational space for alternatives.

9.3.1 Myth 6: Corpus planning in a large number of small languages makes multilingual education impractical

The first implementational myth that serves to close down any serious discussion of multilingual education is that complex corpus planning procedures would be required in several languages that have not previously been used in education. The use of Bislama, in particular, has been argued against, on the grounds that it has an underdeveloped lexicon. It is argued to have an insufficient range of discrete lexical items (6.4.1) and to have an unstable lexical system (6.4.2). It is held up against the norms of English and French, so that a lack of lexical equivalence between Bislama and English (e.g. Extract 6.37, in which Mme Adrienne states that it isn’t possible to explain the word ‘consequence’ in Bislama) is considered to be a shortcoming of the former. It is considered that Bislama would need to undergo extensive lexical development in order to bring it up to some kind of imagined standard alongside the languages that are currently used in school. The result is that corpus planning is positioned as an intermediary step that must be completed before any real consideration needs to be given to the use of Bislama in the classroom, and this myth feeds easily off discourses of a lack of financial resources for such work.

Two approaches can be taken to breaking down this myth. Firstly, an examination of the myriad topics that Bislama is used to discuss in the world outside school (for example, human rights awareness resources produced by Wan Smolbag theatre, political analysis of election manifestos in the 2012 general election, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry website)
demonstrates the expansion in vocabulary that has occurred to meet new needs. Through awareness raising programmes, policymakers and teachers can consider the lexical range that Bislama can and does have, and the range of topics that are already being discussed through this language.

The second approach is to invert the problem so that it is no longer about the language. Comments such as those made by Miss Adina about the tension between getting the message across and lacking a range of lexical items to do so – “Sapos oli save andastanem samting better in Bislama? There is no harm in expl- (.) be problem ia nomo from sam long ol samting long Bislama? Oli minim … tu tri samting at once” (Extract 6.34) – can be used to examine what is actually being done through language. From a social practice perspective, the question is not whether a language is capable of fulfilling a task, but whether learners are able to draw on sufficient linguistic resources in order to fulfil that task, regardless of which language the different resources are considered to belong to. So, rather than seeking to transform the system of Bislama, questions can be asked about how best to discuss new concepts when a topic is introduced that learners have never discussed before. This might entail helping learners to develop strategies for practices such as questioning, comparing, arguing and analysing, but such strategies need not rely solely on what might traditionally be considered ‘question forms’, ‘the language of comparison’, and so on, in any particular language. Space can be opened up for the incorporation of multiple linguistic (and non-linguistic) resources in order to make meaning.

A good example of how this works in practice can be seen in a global warming awareness video produced recently in Bislama (Live and Learn, 2013). In the animated video, one fruit bat explains the concept of ‘greenhouse gas’ to another. Three frames from this explanation are reproduced here, with transcripts of the audio track.
Throughout the video, non-linguistic resources such as diagrams, animation, humour, and the use of the common fruit bat as characters, are used to contextualise the explanation. The verbal explanation primarily draws on the linguistic resources of Bislama, but there are a number of strategies used where a lexical item is not readily available in this language. The term ‘greenhouse gas’, which would be considered to be English, is incorporated directly into both the spoken and written text (maintaining the English orthography, rather than coining a Bislama spelling of grinhaos gas). An explicit definition is given for this term, using Bislama lexical items. Familiar items that are now considered to be Standard Bislama, such as ‘blanket’ and ‘windo’, but which also exist as
Standard English items, are used as similes to explain what greenhouse gases are like. Other Bislama items are used in ways that extend their literal meanings, such as ‘ples’ (which literally means ‘place’ but would be translated more meaningfully as ‘environment’ here) and ‘rabis win’ (which literally means ‘bad winds’ but would be translated more meaningfully as ‘harmful emissions’). A combination of these linguistic and non-linguistic resources means that a complex concept becomes perfectly understandable. The use of Bislama certainly does not hinder intelligibility, but is one strategy that enables the unfamiliar concept to become familiar.

It is perhaps necessary to separate terminology (i.e. the names given to phenomena) from explanation and discussion of these phenomena. It is clearly important that we are able to refer to specific parts, elements, processes and so on with precision and clarity, with the expectation that others will know what we are talking about. Terminology will need to be learnt, and the example of ‘greenhouse gas’ above demonstrates that it may often work best to draw on established terms from a language such as English. It should be remembered that a native speaker of English also needs to learn new terms for concepts they encounter in the Science classroom, even if they are using English as the medium of instruction, because these are often not familiar words from their everyday linguistic repertoires. However, the explanation of what the term ‘greenhouse gas’ means, and the effect it has on the earth, does not need to be restricted by an idealised notion of ‘scientific language’. The important thing in this case is that Pacific islanders have the opportunity to understand the processes that are having such an impact on their immediate environment, and the opportunity to participate in the search for solutions, regardless of the etymology of each term that they use in the process.

The current linear view of corpus planning and language teaching suggests that Bislama will need to be developed as a language, then taught to the students, and then used as a medium of instruction. However, by shifting the focus to the task that needs doing, we may be able to stop thinking about the language, and think instead about how best to accomplish the task by drawing on multiple resources. This point will be returned to in Chapter 10.
9.3.2 Myth 7: Materials development in multiple languages is too costly and complex

The greatest impediment to the use of multiple languages in Vanuatu’s education system may be the perceived cost and complexity of making use of so many different languages. Although steps have been taken to develop materials in certain vernacular languages for the early grades, there remains relatively little written in languages other than English or French. The influence of this situation can be seen in the way students talk about the different languages that provide access to information inside books (6.2.1), and the way the Anglophone principal wants to enforce English only to help students understand what they read (5.3.1.1), as books are known to exist only in languages such as English and French. Similarly, when the Francophone principal states that Bislama cannot be written (6.4.2), he may well be following the logic that it is currently not written very widely or in a standardised way. My participants do not even consider the possibility of producing materials in languages such as Bislama, and a number of policy documents such as the Priorities and Action Agenda 2006-2015 (Government of the Republic of Vanuatu, 2006) refer to the number of languages as one factor that places a strain on the education system and national budget.

From a purely economic point of view, yes, it would be expensive to produce new sets of materials in multiple languages for multiple levels. However, even this argument can be revisited. As Heugh (2002) points out, many postcolonial countries are currently spending vast amounts of money on textbooks written in the former colonial language, with little evidence of successful learning. She notes that, to provide effective education through this medium would require, at the very least, different and better textbooks that are designed specifically for L2 medium programmes across the curriculum, which would also be expensive. From a sheer economics perspective, it could thus be said that a proportion of Vanuatu’s education budget is currently being spent on materials, and that this money could be better spent. Indeed, the fact that Vanuatu is currently spending money duplicating all training and teaching materials in two languages creates a problem for an argument that links use of the fewest languages possible to maximal efficiency.
Secondly, the argument that an expensive range of materials would need to be produced in order for education to proceed in a new language suggests that classrooms in Vanuatu are currently well-resourced with materials in either English or French. This is simply not the case. Although the government is expected to provide class sets of textbooks for each subject up to Year 10, neither Angolovo College nor Collège de Faranako had enough books for the students they were teaching. The principal approach I saw at both schools was for teachers to either dictate notes or write them on the blackboard for students to copy down in their exercise books. The few copies of textbooks that did exist had to be passed around the classroom, or shared on a homework rota system, so that all students had access. These types of observation present a problem for those who argue that a language can only be used as medium of instruction if textbooks exist in that language. Such materials would undoubtedly be useful, but there are currently insufficient supplies of materials in any language.

Finally, although not ultimately successful, the recent programme implemented in Papua New Guinea, discussed in 1.1.3.1, can be used to dismiss the arguments that it is not possible to create materials in over a hundred different languages. It can at least enable thorough consideration of such a programme in Vanuatu. Perceived implementational difficulties must not be allowed to shut down ideological space for the use of these resources before they have even been seriously considered.

9.3.3 Myth 8: Teaching or managing a class in which multiple languages are in use is impossible

Another myth to be examined is that teaching and classroom management are compromised by the use of multiple languages. It is clear from the way teachers describe their own switches to L1 in the classroom throughout Chapter 6 that they consider this a practice to solve immediate communication difficulties before switching back to the intended language. The fact that I saw almost no instances of this practice throughout the fieldwork suggests either that they used it rarely, or that they did not wish to use it in front of me. It was clear to me that the use of L1 and L2 together was not considered a resource to make use of.
It also appears that the strongly teacher-led approach to classroom interaction, described in 6.2, leaves little opportunity to imagine a more fluid use of multiple linguistic resources, given that teachers control almost all classroom talk. In particular, it might be difficult to conceive of a classroom in which a teacher allowed the use of languages that he or she did not personally speak. However problematic teachers consider the current submersion model to be, they at least know that they can retain control of their classes, since the language policy effectively keeps most students silent. It is hard for teachers to imagine teaching and controlling a class in which so many other languages are openly used.

Talking about such prospects and concerns would be valuable. In many cases, the imagined scenario is more extreme than reality and there would not be so many languages used. In many primary classrooms, a vernacular and/or Bislama is likely to provide an additional resource for both teachers and pupils, regardless of the number of other languages spoken by some children in the class. At secondary level, Bislama would almost certainly be shared by the teacher and all students. Bringing additional languages into the classroom would predominantly mean drawing on these shared languages, thereby enabling many students to participate more actively, without lessening the teacher’s control.

However, there is also no reason why a greater number of languages cannot be used, regardless of the teacher’s linguistic repertoire. If this issue is addressed in conjunction with those of assessment and materials, the role of language within the classroom can be discussed from the perspective of ensuring understanding and communication. Different opportunities can be explored for students to draw on whichever linguistic resources they have access to, by considering pair and group activities as well as whole-class interaction. Undoubtedly, this would reduce the level of control that teachers maintained over what was said within the classroom, but the whole-class data within Chapter 6 reveals that the current patterns of interaction are so dominated by teacher turns that students can be carried along with very little receptive or productive use of any language at all. Helping teachers to see how little language is currently being used would at least open up space to consider alternatives. Again, keeping this space wedged open through implementational
support for change would require changes to teacher training, without which teachers may feel they face a choice between losing control of their classes, or, in order to retain their authority, resorting to a language such as English in which all participants have limited competence.

9.3.4 Myth 9: Assessment in multiple languages is impractical

An area of education that appears particularly resistant to the use of different languages is assessment. Throughout interviews and informal discussions, considerations of exams very rapidly closed down any talk about the potential to use multiple languages in the classroom. For example, Miss Adina talked on a number of occasions about the tension between using any language to ensure that content was understood and needing to prepare students to sit the exams in English (e.g. Extract 6.28). As with materials development, nobody seemed to question the fact that assessment had to be conducted in L2. This is undoubtedly underpinned by the monolingual ideology, discussed in 9.2.1, but there is also considered to be a practical constraint on the provision of alternative forms of assessment. To produce, standardise, and mark tests in multiple languages requires personnel with sufficient linguistic competence in all of the necessary languages. Concerns are already raised about standardisation between the Anglophone and Francophone streams, so it is hard to see space for a greater number of languages being used.

Two points can be made here that can at least problematise this issue. Firstly, questions need to be raised about the extent to which students are able to fully demonstrate their knowledge in a second language. A matched guise test that I carried out at Angolovo College in 2008 (Willans, 2008) showed that teachers consistently rated the Bislama guises higher than the English guises (for understanding, successful explanation, intelligence, and high academic achievement) when asked to listen to students defining academic concepts in both languages. At the end of the experiment, the teachers were very interested in the results and recognised that they might be judging students on their English rather than content knowledge. They were certainly aware that many of their students struggled to express themselves through the medium of L2, although they often fell back on the argument that students should be able to
express themselves in L2 (drawing on Myth 2). More interrogation of this issue needs to be made in order to question whether assessments are testing what students feel safely able to express in L2, rather than what they really know.

However, teachers felt they had no alternative given their task to prepare students for national exams, which also needs to be questioned. Following the same principles as were used in 9.3.1, we should focus on finding ways for students to demonstrate knowledge and understanding, rather than on mastery of the designated language that will be used to test these things. Teachers in Vanuatu are already responsible for administering a significant amount of internal, school-based assessment throughout primary and secondary levels, and there is therefore potential for this assessment to be carried out with flexibility regarding the linguistic resources used. If the teacher and students share knowledge of L1(s), there is no practical reason why students shouldn’t be able to use resources from these languages in completing written and spoken internal assessments.

Decisions on national written assessments that are marked externally, such as the Year 8 and Year 10 examinations, would need to be made with regard to practical constraints. So, for example, students would not be able to write in a local vernacular, since it is unlikely that a marker in the central assessment team would be familiar with this language. However, students would never address someone from another island in their own vernacular, so this constraint conforms to Vanuatu communication norms. There is no practical reason why students should not be able to use Bislama, English and French in assignments marked nationally, as the human resources are available.

9.3.5 Myth 10: The use/teaching of familiar languages takes up time that could be spent learning additional languages

The final implementational myth is that there is insufficient time available to master new languages if time is taken up using or learning languages that are already spoken. It is considered that opportunities to pass higher level exams and apply for scholarships to institutions that require the use of English or
French as the medium of instruction will be compromised unless sufficient time is spent practising these languages. The result is that such languages are used as media of instruction, enabling the maximum amount of exposure to them. Given the desires to learn both English and French, what is known as the ‘time-on-task’ argument (Siegel, 1997b) is compounded in Vanuatu, since time must be found for two foreign languages. The recent policy proposals for a double transitional model, discussed in 2.2.2.2, are clear evidence of the impact of this myth, as the timetable has been divided up to accommodate English and French as separate media.

A possible way to break down these assumptions is through separating “the dual focus” of language teaching and content teaching (Arthur Shoba, 2013, p.379). If certain languages are considered important to know, then ways for teaching them as foreign languages can be found. However, it is necessary to break down the assumptions that using a language as the medium of instruction will lead to competence in this language and, conversely, that the teaching of this language will automatically provide sufficient foundations for teaching through this language.

Once these two aspects can be separated, periods can be designated for the teaching of each of English and French, by specialist teachers, using specialist language pedagogy, if these languages are both considered necessary to learn. Evidence from other contexts can be used to demonstrate that it is perfectly possible to learn a language such as English to a high standard without using it as the medium of instruction throughout the entire school system.

If it is education, then let us teach it in the language that most learners and teachers understand. If it is English language then let us talk about how best to teach English, and assign this work to those who are trained to teach it. (Qorro, 2006, p.13)

### 9.4 Summary

Locating and making use of ideological and implementational spaces for a realistic multilingual language policy thus requires several factors to operate. Seeking ideological spaces entails breaking down the ideologies against particular, named languages, as well as deconstructing the belief that it is necessary to choose between (or add together) separate languages.
Meanwhile, opening up these spaces with implementational moves requires more than tolerance for the use of multiple linguistic resources. Currently, there is implementational tolerance for the use of all linguistic resources, but there is only implementational support for the resources of a single language – English at Anglophone schools and French at Francophone schools – to which learners have limited exposure outside school. Implementational space may be being left open through implementational tolerance or ambivalence (often in spite of strong ideological opposition), but can only be wedged open or used productively through implementational support.

This chapter has attempted to tease apart the ideological and implementational aspects of the debate in order to examine why the space that appears to be left open for multilingual education is not being utilised. However, the myths that I have dealt with in ten separate subsections are clearly interrelated and mutually reinforcing, and there has been a certain amount of repetition and overlap throughout. This is in part because many of the issues discussed in both 9.2 and 9.3 are underpinned by the ideological assumptions that education works best through a single language, and that only certain languages are worthy of this role. Many of the challenges I have presented to the ten myths point towards the need to rethink these core assumptions.

At the same time, it is helpful to question implementational arguments in the practical terms on which they are based. So, for example, if an argument is made that learning cannot be tested through multilingual assessments, then I would want to ask why not? What are the practical grounds on which this cannot happen? It is too easy to accept the existence of these constraints, given that Vanuatu does not have limitless resources with which to implement change, but it is important not to take these implementational myths at face value. It is necessary to deconstruct them and decide which elements really are matters of implementation, and which are simply masks for a desire to maintain the status quo. However, any attempts to open up and utilise ideological and implementational spaces can only be fulfilled through awareness raising that something is actually wrong with the current system.
10 Conclusion

10.1 Summary

10.1.1 Sinking within two separate submersion models

This thesis has set out to examine the potential for change within Vanuatu’s language-in-education policy. It is generally accepted that submersion models are ineffective (Benson, 2009; Heugh, 2003; Lotherington, 1998; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981). Children struggle to understand what they are being taught, and to participate meaningfully in their own learning, because they have limited exposure to the language they are expected to use. Many therefore fail to engage in the education process, and drop out of school altogether. Others manage to get by, but leave school with few skills that really help them. Only a minority appear to actually benefit from this form of education. Skutnabb-Kangas (1981, p.139) refers to this as the “sink or swim” approach. Vanuatu operates a dual submersion approach in which some children are submerged in English, while their siblings are submerged in French.

Meanwhile, proposals have been put forward recently (Education Language Policy Team, 2010b) for what would effectively become a double transitional programme: an early-exit transition from a familiar language to one foreign language, before a second transition to another foreign language (2.2.2.2). This appears to be driven by considerations of the languages that Vanuatu and its citizens are perceived to need, rather than by what is both pedagogically appropriate and implementationally realistic. This would surely sink those who were currently managing to stay afloat (if not exactly swim). Those that were currently doing well would have to be doing extremely well if they were to survive an additional transition.

None of the models discussed in Table 1.1 is appropriate in Vanuatu. Each model is guided by a language-oriented goal that is underpinned by a monoglossic ideology, thereby treating each individual language as a discrete system that needs to be mastered in order to be used for educational purposes. Decision-making becomes underpinned by beliefs about learning in one language only, the ease with which any language can be used for this purpose,
the opportunities that can be accessed (automatically) through some languages but that are considered inaccessible through others, and the inadequacy of some languages to fulfil educational goals (9.2). It is also impeded by beliefs that corpus planning, assessment innovation, materials production and classroom management are too complicated and costly in multiple languages, and that there is insufficient time available to learn all the necessary languages (9.3).

10.1.2 Interrogation of alternatives

10.1.2.1 An unconvincing display of ‘good’ linguistic behaviour

The first research question asked was: How is ‘language’ constructed within education practices and discourses? Chapters 5 and 6 have described a situation at two schools where education is not actually conducted solely in L2, but where teachers and students give the impression that this is the case. School language rules, which are talked about as being more draconian than they really are, are displayed on the noticeboards, stipulating the domains in which English and/or French should be used. The use of these languages becomes emblematic of how to behave in these schools, such that speaking in Bislama or a vernacular must remain covert. Meanwhile, in the classrooms, almost all public talk is done in either English or French, and teachers do most of the talking. Students appear to understand much of the content being taught, and they are able to respond to teachers’ questions, provided that they are phrased in such a way as to enable very short, formulaic answers. Teachers work hard to ensure that classroom activity does not break down, and they avoid uncomfortable silences by rephrasing their questions and instructions to make them more manageable.

Students never directly challenge the expectation to respond in L2. They either provide an answer when asked to do so, or they remain silent until the attention is redirected elsewhere. Interaction outside the classroom also avoids overtly challenging the rules. Students draw on a range of interaction (and avoidance) strategies when addressed by a teacher, and they keep much of their interaction with peers out of teachers’ earshot. However, both inside and outside the classroom, practices are far from monolingual. The ‘business as
usual’ discussed in 5.3.1.3 has been shown to draw fluidly on elements of both L1 and L2 (although rarely L3), without keeping these ‘languages’ separate.

Chapters 7 and 8 have described the way the different languages are talked about with reference to the opportunities they are considered to bring, and to the symbolic value they hold in Vanuatu. English and French, together, are constructed both as gateways to ‘double opportunity’ and as part of the national heritage and identity. The two former colonial languages have become reimagined as positive vestiges of the past, and Anglophones and Francophones alike make clear the desirability of ‘bilingualism’ in these two languages. Although the instrumental value of Bislama as a lingua franca, and the symbolic value of the vernaculars as carriers of traditional culture are also recognised, they are considered to limit the opportunities available to ni-Vanuatu. This desire for both English and French overrides any concerns people might have that students are already struggling to learn through one of these languages.

10.1.2.2 Waiting for somebody else to rock the boat

Interview data throughout Chapters 5 and 6 suggests that the situation described above has become normalised. Participants are reluctant or unable to recognise any problem with the use of L2. When a problem is acknowledged, it is assumed that it can be alleviated simply through greater competence in the language. The situation is compounded by the desire for all ni-Vanuatu to have access to both English and French, as outlined in Chapters 7 and 8. People are unwilling to engage with the difficulties faced using unfamiliar languages as the media of instruction, and they are determined to increase the number of such languages that are used.

Chapter 9 has discussed ten myths that are considered to be preventing change. The chapter has attempted to account for the circulation and perpetuation of these myths with reference to the practices and discourses identified in this particular case study. It has been suggested that many barriers to the use of a greater range of linguistic resources in Vanuatu are ideological in nature but that a number of myths also feed off perceived practical constraints. Despite indication of implementational tolerance for the incorporation of
languages other than the official medium of instruction, these barriers are considered to prevent implementational support for these to be made use of. It has been suggested that there is indeed great potential for change, but that this would require a number of conditions to be in place.

Participants are also all too well aware that the government is politically unstable, lacks coherent policies, and has limited resources. It is very hard to imagine a policy innovation being developed and implemented because the government keeps changing, and the country has seen so many Ministers of Education coming and going. Participants in three different interviews (XIV:609-15, 801-2/xiv:573-9, 754-5; XVII:417-9/xvii:401-3; XIX:503-5/xix:494-6) made the point that the future of the education language policy depends on whether the next incumbent is Anglophone or Francophone. The teachers told me that it was up to the government to decide (XIV:487-8, 606-8/xiv:456-7, 570-2; XVII:527-8/xvii:509-10), while representatives from the Education Language Policy team told me that they were waiting for the Director General to make a decision (XIX:251-66, 591-3/xix:244-61, 577-8; technical advisor, personal communication, October 2011), and the Director of Educational Services, who was the Acting DG when I spoke to him, simply said that the whole idea was “on hold” (XX:142-70/xx:141-69). Within this configuration, it is hard to imagine change.

10.1.2.3 Finding space amongst the bits and pieces of language

The second research question asked was: Can ideological and implementational spaces be identified amongst the education practices and discourses that indicate opportunities for additional or different linguistic resources to be used? The data in this thesis shows that the resources of a number of different languages hold functional and symbolic value for ni-Vanuatu, both inside and outside school contexts. English is considered to be of high functional value for all ni-Vanuatu, but this recognition does not detract from desires for French. Both languages are considered to be a vital part of Vanuatu’s heritage and national identity, within discourses that rely on the equality of status between the two former colonial languages. French cannot be part of the heritage without English, and vice versa. However, there is no
suggestion that these are the only languages needed, and considerable value is also placed on the vernaculars as the indigenous languages of Vanuatu. Meanwhile, Bislama has both de jure and de facto importance as the national language that is used by all. In summary, no single language is considered to hold sufficient functional and symbolic value by itself.

From the way participants talk, it appears that it is therefore necessary to be proficient in at least four different languages – one or more vernaculars, Bislama, English and French – in order to be a true ni-Vanuatu. This suggests a complex of discrete languages, within which each separate system must be mastered. However, the data has shown that this is not necessarily the case, as there are many occasions on which the use of fairly limited linguistic resources is enough, in both national and institutional contexts.

For example, there is a desire for ‘bilingualism’ in English and French, and Anglophone participants express regret that they don’t speak French, but it has become clear that mastery of both languages is unnecessary. Although participants suggest a functional need for both former colonial languages, the anecdotes and justifications given reveal that only small amounts of each of these languages may be necessary, and people are well aware of the lack of scholarship and employment opportunities in French-speaking institutions. The arguments put forward, in instrumental terms, for all students to become competent in both English and French appear to be underpinned by the desire to maintain what people are accustomed to, rather than rocking the boat through change. Provided that some French is being used, this may satisfy the criterion to maintain this language, without the whole school system having to be transformed into the complex double-transitional model put forward in 2010.

Similarly, school participants tell me that it is essential to speak L2 at all times around the campus, since this is the medium of instruction. There clearly is a need for students to feel comfortable using whichever language(s) are used in the classroom, but there appears to be a greater concern with being seen to do the right thing, conforming to the longstanding belief that schools are institutions in which only English or French should be spoken. This sense of institutional appropriateness is thus instrumentalised as a need for mastery of the medium of instruction. However, the data from Chapters 5 and 6 shows that school life
proceeds through the use of a number of different languages, provided that sufficient amounts of the official school language are seen to be being used. A range of texts such as school mottos, constant reminders to speak in L2, and a day of celebration of Francophonie served to reaffirm each institution as an officially L2-only space without compromising the heteroglossia of daily life.

Finally, a number of mentions are made of the importance of preserving the vernaculars, even during interviews in which the focus was predominantly on the two former colonial languages. Negative opinions were expressed about those who had no knowledge of any vernacular, as this was equated to not knowing 'your own language' (see XIV:362-3/xiv:340-2; XX:448-58/xx:446-56). The indigenous languages are clearly considered extremely important, and there is no indication that the desire for 'bilingualism' in English and French overrides this importance. However, once again, there are a number of ni-Vanuatu today, particularly in urban areas, who have fairly limited competence in the language(s) spoken on their home islands, and this is generally considered acceptable – it is only the shift away from the vernaculars and traditional culture by whole communities or families that is frowned upon.

Being ni-Vanuatu seems to entail knowledge of one or more vernaculars, Bislama, English and French, but it does not appear to require mastery of any of these ‘languages’. The discourse reveals the valuing of a repertoire that is a composite of the linguistic resources of all these languages, with the ability to draw on different resources for different situations, without separating these into discrete codes. The notion of ‘repertoire’ has become widely used in Sociolinguistics. Hymes (1996, p.33) suggested the need to think of communities and speakers “in terms, not of a single language, but of a repertoire”, which he defined as “a set of ways of speaking” and, more explicitly, as “the mixes of means and modalities people actually practise and experience” (p.207). This observation has been built on recently by those who have attempted to describe the complexity of language use in terms of the different features associated with different linguistic varieties, rather than in terms of those varieties themselves (Blommaert & Backus, 2012; Jørgensen et al., 2011; Snell, 2013). The practices and discourses described within this thesis suggest that participants make use of a range of features associated with ‘English’,
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‘French’, ‘Bislama’ and various vernaculars, in order to fulfil institutional and national identities, and to negotiate their daily routines, but that they are unlikely to consider themselves fluent speakers of each of these languages. They command complex linguistic repertoires comprising the resources associated with several languages, which they employ in different ways for different purposes.

Ideological space may well, therefore, exist for a more democratic and plurilingual reimagining of a national education system than it at first appears. If we can build on the fact that ni-Vanuatu make use of complex repertoires of linguistic resources, without separating these into discrete codes, we can begin to think about how best to capitalise on this in the classroom.

10.2 Moving towards a more flexible framework

10.2.1 From language-oriented education policy to learning-oriented language policy

I consider that an appropriate version of education is one that, firstly, recognises and develops the existing linguistic resources that children already have access to; secondly, makes productive use of whichever linguistic resources are necessary in order for learning to be successful; and thirdly, provides opportunities to develop new linguistic resources that are considered necessary. Rather than arguing for the implementation of a particular type of programme, I suggest the need for a broad framework within which teachers and learners have greater freedom to draw on whichever linguistic resources are appropriate in negotiating learning.

In this way, I therefore make learning, rather than language(s), the focus, aiming to undermine “the centrality of the school language, and challenge its hegemonic role in education” (Hélot & Ó Laoire, 2011, p.xiii). I believe there is a need to reorient the problem from an approach to education policy and planning that is driven by language, to an approach to language policy and planning that is driven by learning. The difference between these two approaches is shown in Figure 10.1 and Figure 10.2. In the former, the desire for English and French creates demands for competence in these languages that drive subsequent
demands on teaching and assessment. In the latter, considerations of teaching and assessment are driven by the desire to ensure that learning actually takes place.

Figure 10.1 A language-oriented education policy

English and French are necessary for perceived societal reasons

Student must demonstrate competence in these languages

Assessments are therefore in these languages

Teaching is therefore in these languages

High levels of competence are needed in these languages so that learning is successful

More effort must be put into teaching these languages and rules are needed to ensure they are practised

These languages must be introduced as early as possible and spoken as much as possible

Figure 10.2 A learning-oriented language policy

It is important that learning is successful

Children understand and engage more meaningfully when using familiar resources

‘Familiar’ is not the same for all children, and is likely to involve multiple resources

If content is taught using multiple resources, then children should be assessed using multiple resources

Teacher training must be provided, and materials must be developed, that enable these changes to teaching and assessment

The resources of less familiar languages are also considered necessary

Different ways must be found to incorporate these resources

No distinction is made between the teaching of content and the teaching of languages

Teaching of content

Teaching of languages

Figure 10.2 prioritises learning, and then considers the best way to achieve this, rather than trying to accommodate learning within a framework that is oriented
to proficiency in certain languages (cf. Figure 10.1). It suggests that familiar resources will enable children to understand and engage more meaningfully with their learning than if unfamiliar resources are used. Snell (2013, p.122) argues that learners should “be encouraged to respond, question, challenge and elaborate their thinking using whatever language they find most comfortable”, following the constructivist principle that classroom dialogue is essential for learning (Lefstein & Snell, 2011; Vygotsky, 1978). Such dialogue engenders what Van Avermaet (2013) refers to as a “powerful learning environment” that “exploits learners’ plurilingual repertoires as didactic capital for learning” (Sierens & Van Avermaet, 2013, p.206), so that education doesn’t become something that is “simply done to students” (García & Flores, 2012, p.232).

The use of a language that learners are not accustomed to using compromises this active engagement. It also leads to the teacher-dominated interaction patterns observed in classrooms at Angolovo College and Collège de Faranako. The “poverty of classroom dialogue” (Black, 2013) that occurs when teachers persistently reformulate their open questions into closed questions, or give insufficient wait time for learners to think, closes down productive learning environments. Brock-Utne and Alidou (2011) provide similar critique based on observations from two different classes in Tanzania, taught by the same teacher about the same topic – one in English and one in Kiswahili. They present clear differences in the way learners were engaged, showing the Kiswahili medium group to be building on prior knowledge, co-constructing new knowledge, and competing to be heard in the class discussion, while the English medium group were silent, fearful, and learning only the strategies needed to survive the lesson. The authors make the same call to keep the learner at the centre of multilingual education discussions, although their account continues to pit one discrete medium of instruction against another, whereas it is suggested here that learners may be able to draw productively on the resources of several languages from their repertoires.
10.2.2 From media of instruction to repertoires of learning and teaching

As a potential way forward within Vanuatu, the case can be made for the fuller use of teachers’ and learners’ linguistic repertoires within the content classroom than is currently the case. There is potential for a framework in which teachers and learners are given more freedom to negotiate teaching and learning through whichever resources are available to be used (Willans, 2013), such that languages are “deployed pragmatically, as a resource rather than an undesirable obstacle” (Arthur Shoba, 2013, p.377). Children in Vanuatu learn to understand and participate multilingually in all other areas of life, from formal occasions such as church services and traditional ceremonies to less formal events such as socialising with relatives from a different island. If children are used to using multiple linguistic resources to negotiate meaning from an early age, then it makes no sense to insist that formal classroom learning is conducted through a single language only (and particularly one that is rarely used outside school). Even within schools, teachers and learners already do draw on multiple linguistic resources to negotiate meaning, so this proposal simply validates what people are already doing.

Such a proposition moves beyond the debate between a single medium and plural media of instruction. It calls for the need to rethink the notion of media of instruction, and to look for ways to foster the productive use of repertoires of learning and teaching. It requires us to stop thinking in the categories we have always known, thereby opening up possibilities for something other than a different language (as is the case in proposals for ‘mother tongue education’) or an additional language (as is the case in proposals for ‘bilingual education’).

The suggestion to foster repertoires of learning and teaching is underpinned by what García (2009) refers to as a heteroglossic framework, and challenges the belief that one subset of resources must be bound together in a discrete system (called ‘English’, for example) and used in the classroom, while all other resources must be left at the door.

The particular resources used will be different in different classrooms, for different individuals, and at different times, as this will depend on which resources are available to be used. This factor of availability is important.
Whichever resources learners have at their disposal can be used. The converse logic should also make clear that it is unrealistic to expect resources to be used actively within the classroom if they are not available within learners’ repertoires. In the current submersion model, the linguistic resources that are expected to be used (i.e. those of English and French) are not available to the vast majority of children when they start school, and yet they are expected to learn (monolingually) through one of these languages. Far greater implementational support is needed in order for these resources to become part of an active repertoire of learning and teaching, rather than assuming that children will be able to pick the language up and use it.

However, this does not stop new resources being added to the repertoire. If it is considered desirable that languages such as English and French are learnt, then they can continue to be taught as foreign languages, by trained language teachers using appropriate materials, with a clear idea about why these languages are being learnt (Murray, 2012, with reference to different language curricula used in South Africa). Provided that the desire for these languages does not override the importance of learning in content subjects, there is no reason why students should not have the chance to learn both English and French to a high level. Indeed many of the resources of these languages will become active within the repertoires of learning and teaching, as learners become skilled at drawing on an increasing range of resources to negotiate the content they are encountering, and as they encounter an increasing range of texts. At the same time, pressure to ‘master’ these less familiar languages will be reduced, if the sole burden of learning is not placed on one L2.

This is not a radical policy suggestion. The Council of Europe (2007, p.8), for example, recommends “a holistic and coherent approach” to language education in order to “promote an integrated competence and a consciousness...”

26 The junior French teacher at Angolovo College trained as a Science teacher in the Francophone system. However, his wife teaches at the school, so he asked to be posted there to join her. The only subject it was felt he could teach at an Anglophone school was French.

27 The English textbook currently used in Francophone schools is called Apple Pie. It is published in France and its content and tasks appear oriented to European learners of English who are likely to travel to the UK and US. Meanwhile, in a French lesson at an Anglophone school, I saw students having to label pictures according to the nationalities of the characters shown. Students were unable to identify that the speech bubble with ‘G’day mate’ necessitated the answer ‘Il est Australien’.
of learners’ existing repertoires and of their potential to develop and adapt those repertoires to changing circumstances” (p.41). They define an individual’s plurilingual repertoire as a “group of language varieties ... mastered by the same speaker, to different degrees of proficiency and for different uses” (p.51). However, despite the rhetoric to recognise existing repertoires, emphasis has typically been placed on the acquisition of additional resources (i.e. those that are considered to have high instrumental value) (Sierens & Van Avermaet, 2013). It also appears that, while discussion of the development of repertoires is becoming common with reference to the learning of languages, insufficient attention has been paid to the potential to make use of the full range of linguistic repertoires in the learning of content subjects.

The proposal made here challenges the assumption that a language needs to be mastered before it can be used in the classroom. If teachers and students have more freedom to talk about Science, Geography, and so on, using resources from L1 and L2 together, they will adapt their repertoires to accommodate and develop the resources they have at their disposal. From this perspective, students become repositioned as active learners rather than swimmers struggling to stay afloat. This falls in line with Van Avermaet’s (2013) call to shift from a proficiency-based model of language learning (with a single target language) to a performance-based model that recognises and draws productively on linguistic repertoires.

The proposal also avoids many of the arguments that can close down implementational space for additional languages. Traditional, monoglossic approaches to multilingual education require each language to be developed and codified through formal corpus planning, they require teaching and assessment materials to be produced in each language, and they require teachers who speak each language to be trained to teach in it, as well as being posted to an area in which the language is spoken. With over 100 languages, the government of a developing country such as Vanuatu understandably sees this groundwork as too costly and complex. However, by shifting the focus to a learning-oriented policy, the question is not whether a language has sufficient vocabulary, material resources or teachers, but whether learners have sufficient
linguistic and non-linguistic resources at their disposal to make sense of the topics they are encountering.

10.3 Implications

10.3.1 Implications for Vanuatu

A long-term vision for multilingual education in Vanuatu is therefore one in which the learning of content is negotiated through the use of multiple linguistic resources. This requires the removal of school rules and associated practices that perpetuate the belief that Bislama and the vernaculars have no place within schools. This also requires changes to assessments, teaching materials and teacher training, in order to ensure that children are able to learn through whichever resources help them make sense of what they are learning. Finally, this requires a more explicit separation between the teaching of content and the teaching of languages, so that all ni-Vanuatu can have the opportunity to learn a certain amount of both English and French without affecting their progress in all other subjects. A long-term vision thus probably moves beyond a dual education system, and achieves the government’s desire to avoid Anglophone/Francophone polarisation.

However, I don’t believe it is productive at the present time to suggest another major education innovation. The government has been criticised for trying to change too many things (with teachers and even Ministry of Education personnel particularly critical of the ‘top-up’ reform of 2002). Government instability makes effective change hard to foresee. However, I also do not believe that it is productive to dream of ideal conditions, thereby justifying stalling any attempt to implement change. Undoubtedly, any education programme would work best in well-resourced classrooms with teachers who were well-trained in pedagogy and fluent in multiple languages, administered by a supportive and stable government with access to limitless funds, impervious to the agendas of supranational bodies and indeed to the implications of global economic and political developments. The Vanuatu Ministry of Education is not working within these imagined conditions.
In the short-term, it is assumed that the dual system will continue, and there will therefore be greater use of English in some schools and greater use of French in others. Many schools have stocks of teaching materials in these languages, and these will continue to be used. The first step is thus to open up spaces for additional linguistic resources alongside those that have traditionally been used (whilst removing policies that ban or devalue these resources). While an ideal situation would see “flexible multiplicity” (García & Flores, 2012, p.240) in the integration of languages within curricula and materials, if only monolingual materials are currently available, other linguistic and non-linguistic resources can still be employed to “talk the texts into being” (Martin, 1999, p.50). In this way, multilingual talk can help to “unpack the meaning of the written word” (ibid., p.41), thereby bridging the gap between the world of the textbook and the students’ existing knowledge” (Ndayipfukamiye, 1996, p.43). As Heugh (2009) documents, even when the structures and materials in place are less than adequate, and when attitudes are initially against such an approach, positive results can be achieved (including a significant change in attitudes), thus wedging open space for a more permanent change.

Changing mindsets about how this can be done requires demonstrating that this will work. A practical step is therefore to use examples of positive practice from around Vanuatu’s schools that show how teachers already are drawing on multiple resources within their classrooms. A teacher at the primary school attached to Collège de Faranako, who I had the opportunity to observe for a morning, provides one such example that really demonstrated to me the potential for this type of approach. She drew on the resources of North-East Ambae, Bislama and French in order to explain and reinforce new concepts, and the Year 1 and 2 children responded using all three languages. Video recordings of such classroom practice and copies of multilingual materials already being produced can be used to open up dialogue amongst teachers, trainers and policymakers about the possibilities that exist. Such items can be shared at relatively low cost and with limited technology. Teacher training can therefore be bottom-up, through the sharing of effective practice. Concurrently, internal school-based assessments can be modified to enable students to demonstrate their knowledge using the resources of any language(s) with which
they and their assessors are familiar. Schools can make decisions about how to do this, based on their human resources, but this requires very little systemic change.

At the same time, more systematic data on low attainment figures can be used to build up a case for change, and to begin discussing the problem with the current dual submersion model. Assessment-driven discourses that are informed by Vanuatu’s results in tests such as VANSTA and EGRA (Niroa, 2012; Tambe, 2005) should be made use of to challenge the belief that the status quo is adequate, and open up dialogue for change. Even at a very local level, the recent public consultations held by the curriculum and language policy teams appeared to have had a significant impact on the way people on Ambae were talking about education, in a way that I had never seen during the time I lived there from 2004 to 2006. People are clearly interested in the education system, and are open to new ideas, so this must be capitalised on.

To move towards longer-term goals, more work is needed in order to make changes to national assessments, to the provision of materials that are compatible with a repertoires approach, to the training of content teachers, and to the training of specialist language teachers. Work being carried out by the multitude of NGOs and other organisations in Vanuatu to create dictionaries and literacy materials in many of the vernaculars (e.g. the Summer Institute of Linguistics) and to create educational materials about topical issues in Bislama (e.g. Wan Smolbag, Live and Learn) can help pave the way for materials development, given that there is currently still so little that is written in any of Vanuatu’s languages other than English or French. Similarly, there are plenty of organisations such as Alliance Française and several English-dominant NGOs who have the resources to help develop more realistic approaches to the teaching of English and French as foreign languages. If a goal of multilingual education became a genuine vision for the government, it would be possible to harness some of these activities, picking out the elements that join up with other curriculum and teacher training developments. With the current work being done on a new national curriculum, this is an appropriate time to be having these discussions.
10.3.2 Implications beyond Vanuatu

This case study contributes to the body of research on multilingual education, providing a perspective from a region that is under-represented within the field. Given that Melanesia is the most linguistically diverse region in the world, there is a significant amount that can be learnt about multilingual education from school-based studies in this context. More specifically, Vanuatu’s unique historico-political background presents an intriguing site in which to examine the complexity of language-in-education policy. The current period of intense education reform in Vanuatu makes this an apt time to conduct this case study. The ongoing language policy debates present an opportune moment to understand the mechanisms that can close down (or prevent the opening of) ideological and implementational spaces for change, whilst identifying how other potential spaces may be sought, opened up and exploited.

In addition to presenting a case study from a less-researched context, this thesis has examined the possibilities for new ways of thinking about multilingual education, through a combination of ethnography and discourse analysis. It has drawn on the concept of ideological and implementational spaces, as a useful metaphor for examining the potential for change amidst the complexity, and used the tools of the Discourse-Historical Approach to help make sense of this complexity through the perspectives of those involved. This section returns to the four areas that were set out in 1.1.3, summarising the contributions made by this thesis to the field of multilingual education.

10.3.2.1 Education within postcolonial, multilingual contexts

1.1.3.1 summarised a range of education models that have been used throughout postcolonial, multilingual contexts, and it seemed that these models provided a reasonable frame of reference for the research. It made sense to categorise the existing model of education in Vanuatu as a dual submersion programme, and the recently proposed model (Education Language Policy Team, 2010b) as a double transitional programme. It was also noted that scholars such as Heugh (2011) argue strongly for late-exit transitional and additive bilingual programmes, following the linguistic and pedagogical
principles that sufficient foundations must be built up in L1 before a transition can be made to L2.

However, it is clear that these models provide a short-hand for complex realities. This case study has shown that, although the medium of instruction can be said to be L2, being ‘submerged’ in this language clearly does not keep all other languages out. In addition, teachers take on most of the L2 burden, with the unintended consequence that many students are actually using very little of the expected language themselves. Despite the characterisation of the current system as a dual submersion model, this does not paint a very accurate picture of the way language(s) are actually being used in schools. It is unlikely that changing to another model would produce different results, as teachers and students would find new ways to navigate the spaces for alternative practices to meet their needs, rather than following the norms intended.

Insights gained through ethnographic attention to these realities should be used to drive a more realistic approach to policy change. Rather than considering what the best ‘model’ may be, through which content and languages can best be learnt under ideal conditions, we should consider how teaching and learning actually proceed, and how local perceptions may shape interpretation. We should be starting from current practice, and working out how to harness the ways that teachers and students negotiate learning, in order to establish an appropriate approach (García, 2009; Leung, 2005). It has therefore been suggested that a more appropriate approach would be to start from classroom practice, and build on what teachers and learners are currently doing, giving them more freedom (and, crucially, legitimacy) to negotiate learning through whichever resources are available. By re-orienting from a language-oriented approach to a learning-oriented approach, we can move beyond ‘bilingual education’ typologies.

10.3.2.2 Languages jostling for inclusion: Language ideologies

1.1.3.2 discussed three aspects of the language ideological component of language policy: the prioritisation of former colonial languages, the relative positions of two former colonial languages, and the denigration of pidgins and creoles.
With reference to the first and second aspect, it is clear from the data in this thesis that English and French retain their hierarchical position above all indigenous languages in Vanuatu, thus reaffirming findings from so many other postcolonial contexts. However, it appears that the dominance of English, itself, is not absolute, as French is vociferously argued to be of both instrumental and symbolic value to ni-Vanuatu. This may present a certain amount of optimism in the face of the wealth of research findings that suggest the universal desire for this ‘global’ language. In a comparative analysis of attitudes towards English and French in both Vanuatu and Cameroon (Abongdia & Willans, 2014), Abongdia and I argue that there is a strengthening of the desire for English/French ‘bilingualism’ in both countries, but that French is not being pushed aside in attempts to access English. The global hegemony of English is thus tempered to a certain extent, although this still paints a dismal picture for indigenous languages.

This finding also challenges arguments that language policies in developing countries are simply de facto responses to the machinery of supranational organisations such as the World Bank, driven by the publishing and technical assistance strings attached to aid packages (Brock-Utne, 2007, 2008; King, 2007; Mazrui, 1997). On the one hand, Vanuatu’s determination to maintain a balance between Anglophone and Francophone interests shows that postcolonial countries are adept at maintaining strategic links with a range of sources of support, and are not simply swept along by the agendas of powerful organisations. On the other hand, it reminds us of the historical processes through which language ideologies are formed, since it is clear that the resurgence of support for French in Vanuatu is not driven by the orders of the current global (or regional) sociolinguistic economy (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011), and is not solely in response to donor agendas. Ideologies of heritage and national identity, which appear resilient alongside instrumental ideologies, clearly draw on long histories that continue to shape local responses to global processes.

In terms of the third ideological aspect, the data in this thesis reaffirms the negative attitudes documented elsewhere towards pidgins and creoles (Siegel, 1999b, 2006a, 2008). Although both the high status of Bislama outside school
and its uncontested position as the lingua franca throughout the entire island group present this language as an ideal candidate for a dominant role within education, this is clearly not considered a desirable prospect. The study demonstrates the clear conflict between the way a pidgin may be used and talked about by the same group of speakers. Bislama was the primary language of all interviews, in which sophisticated arguments were put forward, and yet the language was consistently denigrated as being incapable of dealing with complexity and precision. The points of conflicting logic between the linguistic and the metalinguistic present a clear case of the operation of a “complex of micro-hegemonies within which subjects situate their practices and behavior” (Blommaert & Varis, 2011, p.3).

The absence of any change in attitudes towards pidgins and creoles, despite consistent and repeated challenges by linguists (Siegel, 2007), demonstrates the need to go beyond the “different-but-equal” approach (Snell, 2013). As Snell notes, debates about language inequality have long been polarised between notions of deficit and notions of difference, following the work of early Sociolinguists such as Labov (1969) and Trudgill (1975) in demonstrating that all language varieties can be considered equal, on strictly linguistic terms. With reference to UK dialects of English, Snell argues instead for a move from difference to repertoires, acknowledging that speakers draw fluidly on resources that would be considered to belong to both standard and non-standard varieties, rather than speaking one bounded ‘dialect’. This circumvents judgements of the relative worth of different varieties.Pidgin and creole studies has been trapped in the same dichotomy, with specialists (Da Pidgin Coup, 1999; Siegel, 2007, 2008) demonstrating that pidgins and creoles are just as systematic and rule-governed as any other languages, i.e. that they are different but equal, but with little impact on attitudes towards their inclusion in education. The approach to repertoires of learning and teaching suggested in 10.2.2 may enable a similar move to be made towards recognising that speakers draw fluidly on the resources of pidgins and creoles, but also of other languages, and that there is no need to force an either/or choice between distinct languages. The re-orientation towards learning-focused approaches that I have been arguing for
may avoid many of the arguments about whether a language such as Bislama is equal to others such as English.

10.3.2.3 Rethinking the ‘multilingual’ in ‘multilingual education’

1.1.3.3 summarised the monoglossic framework (García, 2009) within which multilingual education tends to be conceptualised. It was suggested that for multilingual education to offer anything other than multiple strands of monolingual education (cf. Banda, 2009), it is necessary to think in terms of repertoires rather than languages. This study therefore attempts to push the debate beyond the search for additional or alternative media of learning and teaching, i.e. beyond the arguments for mother tongue education, or for additive models of bilingualism (cf. Heugh, 2011). Although the inclusion of plural media of learning and teaching appears to go beyond a monoglossic approach to education, it requires a further move towards repertoires of learning and teaching before this can be realised. The study suggests the need to value and utilise the linguistic resources that children use in other contexts of their lives, helping them to develop a repertoire of learning and teaching through which they can navigate the learning process.

Taking this perspective thus avoids many of the implementational myths discussed in 9.3 that often serve to close down space for multilingual education before it has even been attempted. Where implementation appears costly, hard to coordinate across multiple languages, and a threat to the learning of languages of wider communication, de facto monolingual policies inevitably maintain the status quo. Instead, the perspective is more about opening up space for the use of all resources that are available, linguistic and non-linguistic, adding and adapting further resources as necessary.

This perspective also forces the focus back to learners rather than languages. The typologies of models that frame discussions of bi/multilingual education tend to set out which language(s) are used when and for what purposes. Similarly, implementational debates centre on whether a language is adequately developed for use in particular subjects, rather than on whether learners have sufficient linguistic resources to deal with those subjects. To refocus attention on learners, we should use the insights from ethnographic data to focus on the
way learning is or isn’t being achieved. We should ask questions about how students can understand new knowledge, how they can relate this new knowledge to what they already know, how they can demonstrate this knowledge, and how we can prepare them for their future lives, through the different linguistic and non-linguistic resources available to them.

10.3.2.4 Ideological and implementational spaces

Hornberger’s (2002) notion of ideological and implementational spaces was introduced in 1.1.3.4 as a useful metaphor to help focus on potential for policy change. Chapter 9 has attempted to operationalise this notion, by separating its ideological and implementational aspects, and noting how implementational space may be left unutilised for two main reasons – the absence of ideological space, and the limitations of ‘implementational tolerance’ without the addition of ‘implementational support’ for the use of alternative or additional linguistic resources. Chapter 9 exemplified these different aspects with the help of a series of ideological and implementational myths about multilingual education that are kept in circulation by complex practices and discourses.

Language policy has been defined in this thesis as a constantly evolving process that is created and sustained through such practices and discourses. The myths set out in Chapter 9 synthesise the different practices and discourses that serve to keep ideological and implementational spaces shut, and it was noted that these myths were overlapping and interrelated. It is therefore useful to return to the metaphor of the policy network (Vidovich, 2007) introduced in 3.1.2.4 that enables simultaneous attention to be paid to practices and discourses at several points at once, and avoids feeding into the dichotomy of ‘top-down’ versus ‘bottom-up’ policy. Instead, it considers the interrelatedness of these points and the multidirectionality of their linkages.

Myths about multilingual education are serving to keep spaces shut at points across and throughout the policy network. At the same time, what practices and discourses there are that indicate spaces opening up for alternatives (such as the discourse of the importance of learning through whatever means necessary) are also working at a number of points across this network. Students, teachers and policymakers respond to the realities of the social roles that they occupy,
and draw on logics that make sense in those realities. There are thus little bubbles of opportunity all over the network, but they are in constant tension with the practices and discourses that oppose change and keep ideological and implementational space closed. A number of authors have made the point that micro-level changes can have only limited effect without simultaneous changes at the macro-level (Chick, 1996; Hornberger, 2010; Weber, 2008), and it is clear that attention is required at multiple points in the network.

Importantly, this research has demonstrated that there is no ‘top-down’ discourse that is quelling counter-discourses and practices from the classrooms, but that the discourses both for and against multilingual alternatives are circulating at all levels. There is not such a difference between the views of my interviewees at the schools and at the Ministry of Education and there is certainly no draconian directive from above that can alone account for the denigration of L1. The challenge is thus to find a way to work simultaneously at all these different points, wedging open spaces that appear to be closing, finding new opportunities to open up other spaces, and so on. Clearly, this is a complex task, and it is hard to work at all levels and domains of an education system, responding to all the different logics in conflict. However, opening up dialogue between those who work at these different levels and domains, and engaging sufficient policy actors in this dialogue, may present an opportunity to look holistically at the issue. The nexus between the different perspectives and logics may thus be a productive space for policy change, rather than a sign of contestation and conflict. By combining Ethnography with the Discourse-Historical Approach to discourse analysis, this thesis has attempted to build up a detailed case study of the complexity of a policy network within which spaces for change open and close at different points.

10.4 Future directions

10.4.1 Engaging with policymakers, teachers and the public
For the myths discussed in Chapter 9 to be broken down, and for space to be wedged open for an appropriate approach to multilingual education, there is a
clear need to find new and better ways to communicate with policymakers, teachers, and the public. Siegel (2007), for example, argues that academics have been demonstrating for forty years that pidgins and creoles are valid languages, without having any apparent effect on attitudes towards these languages. He calls for a more proactive linguistic community that disseminates findings through teacher training and community programmes, and publishes in formats and places that are accessible to those outside academia.

A key difficulty is establishing the terminology through which to communicate about research. Most opposition to multilingual education is framed, intentionally or otherwise, by Western conceptualisations of 'language' (Banda, 2009). So arguments for and against each language within the education system draw on the monolingual ideology with its origins in language learning in the West (Brock-Utne, 2009). Engaging with stakeholders requires one of two approaches: either making use of similar conceptualisations and their associated terminology to frame counter-arguments (such as that Bislama is a systematic language, or that French does not bring the benefits that it is assumed to); or problematising the notion of discrete, bounded languages on the grounds that this lies at the root of the problem. The latter solution risks never even being able to start a conversation.

10.4.2 Building collaboration into the research

Some of the challenges of dissemination could be circumvented if there was greater collaboration from the outset with those for whom the research is intended to be relevant. Given the ethnographic endeavour to value and draw on local perspectives, a limitation of this study has been that participants were insufficiently involved throughout the research process. I have done my best to present the opinions and accounts of the participants, and to reflect on my impact on what they might otherwise have said. However, from the decision to begin the research in the first place, through the design of the study, to the analysis and writing up of the data, participants had little involvement in the research process. The research certainly changed direction in response to what I sensed was important to people, but the decisions taken were ultimately my
own. Indeed, whenever I approached the Faranako principal to ask his permission to do something, I received the same response:

_Hem i risej blong yu. Wanem we yu wantem, yu gohed._

[It’s your research. Whatever you want, just do it.]

It would not have been possible, given the constraints of the PhD process, to build collaboration with participants into the initial design of the research, particularly given the difficulty I face communicating with people on Ambae when I am in the UK. However, this is an angle to pursue for future research. There is potential to incorporate greater involvement with, and the voices of, policymakers, teachers, students and communities, through approaches such as ethnographic team methodologies (Blackledge & Creese, 2010pp. 82ff.), ethnographic monitoring (Hymes, 1980; Van der Aa & Blommaert, 2011) or the model that Johnson (2013) sets out as Educational Language Policy Engagement and Action Research. Interview data from this study reveals that participants are often aware of the contradictions between their views about language(s), so opportunities for user-collaborative research might provide ways to interrogate and keep open what are currently only _potential_ ideological and implementational spaces.
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12 Appendices
Appendix I – Glossary

Basic education: Kindergarten and Years 1-8 (This classification cross-cuts the division between Primary and Secondary education, and is in response to the desire to provide eight years of education for all (following the global Education for All strategy).

Bilingual schools: Schools that contain both Anglophone and Francophone streams. Both streams continue to learn through the medium of one language only.

Centre schools: Schools catering for pupils from Years 1-8 (or 3-8), transformed from former primary schools offering Years 1-6. Centre schools were created by the addition of ‘top-up’ classes to primary schools, which enabled students not selected into Year 7 at existing secondary schools to continue their education for a further two years. While the ‘top-up’ provision initially catered only for those who would otherwise have been pushed out of the mainstream system, all children are now expected to remain in centre schools until the end of Year 8, before competing for a place in secondary schools in Year 9.

Diplôme d’accès aux études universitaires (DAEU): An internationally-recognised diploma that Francophone students completing Year 14 are eligible to sit for.

Dropouts: Those who leave the education system before the end of the cycle in which they are already enrolled (thus, for reasons other than a lack of places, cf. pushouts).

Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA): A US-Aid funded assessment tool developed to measure foundational literacy skills, recently used in Vanuatu.

Emalus Campus: The Vanuatu campus of the University of the South Pacific

Harmonisation: The alignment of the two streams of education, in terms of structure, curriculum content and assessment, whether or not the same medium of instruction used

Junior secondary education: Years 7-10 (following a national programme in separate Anglophone and Francophone streams).

Pacific Secondary School Certificate (PSSC): The regional certificate taken by Year 12 Anglophone students across the Pacific.

Primary education: Years 1-6 (following a national programme in separate Anglophone and Francophone streams).
Pushouts: Students who are unable to continue with their education because of limited numbers of places at the next level of education (cf. dropouts).


Senior secondary education: Years 11-13 for Anglophones, Years 11-14 for Francophones (with the two streams following entirely different curricula and assessments).

Top-up education: Years 7-8 offered at former primary schools for students not selected to Year 7 at a secondary school, thus enabling them to rejoin the mainstream system in Year 9 if successful (under review).

Union of Moderate Parties (UMP): Political party formed in 1981 out of predominantly 'Francophone' parties.

Université de la Nouvelle-Calédonie (UNC): The University of New Caledonia

University of the South Pacific (USP): An institution that is financed and controlled by Fiji, Western Samoa, Tonga, Vanuatu, The Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Nauru, Kiribati, Tuvalu, Niue, The Marshall Islands and The Cook Islands. The three main campuses are in Fiji, Vanuatu and Samoa.

Vanuatu Standardised Test of Achievement (VANSTA): National literacy and numeracy assessment carried out in Years 4 and 6.

Vanuatu Institute of Teacher Education (VITE): The institution at which the majority of primary and junior secondary teachers are trained to diploma level.

Vanua’aku Pati (VP): The first political party to rule Vanuatu.

Wan Smolbag Theatre: A non-government organisation that organises educational workshops, resources and services.
Appendix II – Ethical approval from King’s College London

Fiona Willans,
Department of Education & Professional Studies,
18th August 2010,

Dear Fiona,

REP(EM)/09/10-60 ‘An investigation into the enactment of a single language policy in Vanuatu’s dual-medium education system: An ethnographic case study of one Anglophone school and one Francophone school.’

I am pleased to inform you that the above application has been reviewed by the E&M Research Ethics Panel that FULL APPROVAL is now granted.

Please ensure that you follow all relevant guidance as laid out in the King’s College London Guidelines on Good Practice in Academic Research (http://www.kcl.ac.uk/college/policyzone/attachments/good_practice_May_08_FINAL.pdf).

For your information ethical approval is granted until 17th August 2012. If you need approval beyond this point you will need to apply for an extension to approval at least two weeks prior to this explaining why the extension is needed, (please note however that a full re-application will not be necessary unless the protocol has changed). You should also note that if your approval is for one year, you will not be sent a reminder when it is due to lapse.

If you do not start the project within three months of this letter please contact the Research Ethics Office. Should you need to modify the project or request an extension to approval you will need approval for this and should follow the guidance relating to modifying approved applications: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/research/ethics/applicants/modifications.html.

Any unforeseen ethical problems arising during the course of the project should be reported to the approving committee/panel. In the event of an untoward event or an adverse reaction a full report must be made to the Chairman of the approving committee/review panel within one week of the incident.

Please would you also note that we may, for the purposes of audit, contact you from time to time to ascertain the status of your research.

If you have any query about any aspect of this ethical approval, please contact your panel/committee administrator in the first instance (http://www.kcl.ac.uk/research/ethics/contacts.html). We wish you every success with this work.

Yours sincerely

_________________________________________
Daniel Butcher
Research Ethics Administrator
Appendix III – Research approval from the Vanuatu Cultural Council

Research Agreement

AN AGREEMENT made the 15th day of 2011

BETWEEN: THE CULTURAL COUNCIL, representing the Government of the Republic of Vanuatu and the local community, (hereinafter called “the Council”) of the one part.

AND: FIONA WILLANS

of (institution) KING’S COLLEGE LONDON

(hereinafter called “the Researcher”) of the other part.

WHEREAS:

(1) The researcher has applied to the Council to do research work in the Republic of Vanuatu, and agrees to the conditions placed upon her/him in this document and to compliance with the intent of the ethics described in the Vanuatu Cultural Research Policy.

(2) The Council has agreed to allow the Researcher to do such research, and has agreed to the obligations placed upon it by this document and by the Vanuatu Cultural Research Policy.

AND THEREFORE THE PARTIES AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

(1) The Council hereby authorises the Researcher to undertake research work in Vanuatu on the subject of

with the community(ies) of ANGOLLOVO COLLEGE + COLÈGÈ COLLEGE

on the island/s of AMBAE

on the island/s of

in the capacity of (if more than one research is involved)

for the period up until (Specify if research will involve more than one visit) 26 MAY 2011

(2) The Research has paid an authorisation fee of 25,000 vatu to cover all administrative costs incurred in the setting up and implementation of the research venture, or this fee has been waived by the Council.

(3) The right to the products of research shall belong to the Researcher shall be entitled to reproduce them for educational, academic or scientific purposes, provided that traditional copyrights are not compromised and the permission
to use material has been obtained, through the Traditional Copyright Agreement, from copyright holders. The products of research shall not be reproduced or offered for sale or otherwise used for commercial purposes, unless specified under section 12 of this agreement.

(4) Copies of all non-artefact products of research are to be deposited without charge with the Cultural Centre and, where feasible, with the local community. Two copies of films and videos are to be provided, one for public screening and the other for deposit in the archives. In the case of films, a copy on video is also required. Any artefacts collected become the property of the Cultural Centre unless traditional ownership has been established in the Traditional Copyright Agreement. The carrying of any artefacts or specimens outside the country is prohibited as stipulated under cap.39 of the Laws of Vanuatu. Artefacts and specimens may be taken out of the Country for overseas study and analysis under cap.39(7). The conditions for the return of the following materials are:

(Specify artefacts/specimens/other materials and conditions for return)

The Researcher has either
(a) provided a letter from the institution to which they are affiliated guaranteeing the researcher’s compliance with the above conditions, or
(b) provided a retrievable deposit of 40,000 vatu to ensure their compliance with these conditions.

(5) The Researcher will be responsible for the translation of a publication in a language other than a vernacular language or one of the three national languages of Vanuatu into a vernacular or one of the national languages, preferably the one used in education in the local community. They will also make the information in all products of research, subject to copyright restrictions, accessible to the local community through such means as audio cassettes or copies of recorded information, preferably in the vernacular. The Researcher will also submit an interim report of not less than 2000 words no later than 6 months after the research languages and in “layman’s terms” so as to be of general use to all citizens.

(6) There will be maximum involvement of indigenous scholars, students and members of the community in research, full recognition of their collaboration, and training to enable their further contribution to country and community. The Council nominates the following individuals to be involved in research and/or trained, in the following capacities:

(7) A product of immediate benefit and use to the local community will be provided by the Researcher no later than 6 months after termination of the research period. This product is:

(8) In addition to their research work, the Researcher will, as a service to the nation of Vanuatu, undertake to: (section 3 (viii) of the Cultural Research Policy suggests possible services of benefit to the nation)
(9) In undertaking research the Researcher will:

a) recognise the rights of people being studied, including the right not to be studied, to privacy, to anonymity, and to confidentiality;

b) recognise the primary right of informants and suppliers of data and materials to the knowledge and use of that information and material, and respect traditional copyrights, which always remain with the local community;

c) assume a responsibility to make the subjects in research fully aware of their rights and the nature of the research and their involvement in it;

d) respect local customs and values and carry out research in a manner consistent with these;

e) contribute to the interests of the local community in whatever ways possible so as to maximise the return to the community for their cooperation in their research work;

f) recognise their continuing obligations to the local community after the completion of field work, including returning materials as desired and providing support and continuing concern.

10) In all cases where information or material data is obtained by the Researcher, a Traditional Copyright Agreement will be completed by the Researcher and the supplier of data regarding this material. The Researcher has a responsibility to make such informants fully aware of their rights and obligations, and those of the Researcher, in the signing of the Traditional Copyright Agreement.

11) A breach of any part of this agreement by the Researcher or a decision by the local community that it no longer wishes to be involved in the researcher venture will result in the termination of the research project.

12)(Addition clauses/conditions) (This section will detail commercial ventures, extra costs incurred by the Vanuatu Cultural Centre, etc).
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AMBONG THOMPSON.
Vice Chairman, Vanuatu National Cultural Council.
Appendix IV – Information posters displayed at the schools

What am I doing here?
Vanuatu’s education system is one of the most complicated in the world because of language:

- English-medium and French-medium schools
- Difficulties teaching children to read in a foreign language
- Debates since independence about how to change the system
- The big question: Do these language issues affect the QUALITY of education in Vanuatu?
- 2 different senior curricula
- So many different mother tongues that are never used at school
- The national language (Bislama) banned from school

To answer this question we need to know how languages are actually being used within schools. I will be staying at Angolovo and Faranako throughout this term, comparing the ways that the two schools use different languages.

Your opinions are very important to me …

I will
- listen to the different languages used and to the way people talk about language
- talk to different groups of students and staff about their opinions
- ask students to fill in a short questionnaire

When I use a microphone to record people talking, I will always give you more information first. I will never record anybody speaking without their knowledge.

I may come and ask you if you can share some ideas with me but, if you don’t want to, that is fine. Please feel free to come and approach me any time, if you would like to help me.

Remember…

I will never use your real name when I talk about what you have said. I will call you ‘a boy in Year 10’ or I will give you a completely different name.

I will tell people that I am doing research at an English-medium secondary school and a French-medium secondary school on Ambae. People from Vanuatu will probably know that I am writing about Angolovo and Faranako.

I will not tell other students and staff what you have told me.

If you change your mind and don’t want me to use something you have told me, that’s fine. Just come and tell me any time before I leave Ambae at the end of term.

If you have any questions for me come and ask me any time. When I am back in England, you can contact me through the principal or secretary.

What will happen to your data?

When I go back to England, I will have regular meetings with my two supervisors. We will look at all the information I have collected and talk about what it means. One of my supervisors lives in Germany, so we talk to him using Skype, which is a way of talking using the Internet – you can see him on the computer screen!

I will go to conferences, where I will talk to other researchers about what I have been doing on Ambae. Some will be international conferences, where I will talk about Vanuatu with researchers from all over the world. In this picture, I am giving a presentation to staff and students at my university in London. I am showing them a picture of Angolovo.

I will also write articles about my data from Vanuatu. Other researchers around the world will be able to read my articles because they will be published on the Internet. In this picture, you can see an article that I wrote about my previous research at Angolovo. If you want to read this article, there is a copy in your library.

When I finish my PhD (2012), the final copy of my thesis will be kept in the library at my university in London. Other people will be able to come to the library and read it. My dissertation written about my 2008 research at Angolovo is already there. There is also a copy in your library that you can read.
Que fais-je ici?

Le système éducatif de Vanuatu est peut-être le plus compliqué dans le monde à cause des langues:

- Des écoles anglophones et francophones
- Difficultés d'apprentissage de la lecture dans une nouvelle langue
- Les débats de changement du système dès l'indépendance
- 2 programmes d'études au niveau de lycée
- Tant de langues maternelles qui ne sont pas utilisées à l'école
- La langue nationale (Bislama) interdite à l'école

Pour répondre à cette question, il faut que nous comprenions comment est-ce que des langues sont utilisées dans des écoles. Je vais passer ce semestre à Angolovo et à Faranako, comparant la manière dans laquelle des langues sont utilisées.

Vos pensées sont très importantes pour moi ...

Je vais:
- observer des pratiques langagières autour de la communauté scolaire, en écrivant ce que j'écoute
- faire des discussions avec des groupes d'enseignants et d'élèves au sujet des langues dans le collège
- donner un questionnaire court à tous les élèves

Avant d'enregistrer un dialogue avec un microphone je vais toujours vous donner plus d'information. Je n'enregistrerai jamais quelqu'un sans sa permission.

Je vous invite à me faire part de vos remarques ou de votre aide. Si cela ne vous intéresse pas, ce ne sera pas un problème.

Souvenez-vous ...

Je n’utilisera jamais votre réelle identité quand je ferai mon rapport sur ma recherche. Je vous appellerai « un garçon de 3ème » ou je vous donnerai un nom imaginaire.

Je signalerai dans mon rapport que je fais ma recherche dans un collège anglophone et un collège francophone sur Ambae. Donc n’importe quelqu’un de Vanuatu va probablement savoir que j’ai écrit au sujet d’Angolovo et de Faranako.

Je ne disai jamais à un autre élève ou enseignant ce que vous m’avez dit.

Si vous changez d’avis à propos de quelque chose que vous m’avez dit, et si vous ne voulez pas que je l’utilise, ce n’est pas un problème. Venez me le dire avant que je parte à la fin du semestre.

Si vous avez des questions, venez me voir. Vous pouvez me contacter en Angleterre en passant par le principal.

Qu’est-ce qui arrivera à vos données?


Je vous appellerai « un garçon de 3ème » ou je vous donnerai un nom imaginaire. Je signalerai dans mon rapport que je fais ma recherche dans un collège anglophone et un collège francophone sur Ambae. Donc n’importe quelqu’un de Vanuatu va probablement savoir que j’ai écrit au sujet d’Angolovo et de Faranako.

Je ne disai jamais à un autre élève ou enseignant ce que vous m’avez dit.

Si vous changez d’avis à propos de quelque chose que vous m’avez dit, et si vous ne voulez pas que je l’utilise, ce n’est pas un problème. Venez me le dire avant que je parte à la fin du semestre.

Si vous avez des questions, venez me voir. Vous pouvez me contacter en Angleterre en passant par le principal.

Appendix V – Consent forms signed by principals on behalf of the school communities

King’s College Research Ethics Committee Ref: REP(EM)/09/10-60

CONSENT FORM FOR PRINCIPAL IN RESEARCH STUDY

Title of Study: An investigation into the single language policy of Vanuatu’s dual-medium education system

Thank you for considering taking part in this research.

Please complete this form after you have listened to an explanation about the research. If you have any questions, please ask me before you sign this form. You will be given a copy of this consent form for your reference.

I understand that this research will be carried out during the whole of Term 1 2011 and I agree to this research taking place at this school. I am signing this form on behalf of the whole school community.

I agree that the researcher can do the following activities (please tick or cross each box):

☐ • talk to students, staff and community members to find out their opinions about languages and the school language policy

☐ • record some of these conversations (ONLY with the prior permission of the people involved)

☐ • ask some students to wear a portable microphone for a whole school day, to record language use (ONLY after permission has been given by the community)

☐ • observe some classes (with the prior permission of the teacher) and other school activities

☐ • ask all students to complete a short written questionnaire

☐ • Copy or photograph written documents or notices

I understand that if I decide at any time during the research that I no longer wish for the school to participate in this project, I can notify the researcher and withdraw from it.

Signed: _______________________________ (College Principal)

Date: ___________________
FORMULAIRE DE CONSENTEMENT

Titre de l'étude: An investigation into the single language policy of Vanuatu’s dual-medium education system (Une étude de la seule politique linguistique dans le système éducatif du Vanuatu qui utilise deux langues)

Je tiens à vous remercier d’avoir décidé de considérer ma recherche.
Merci de signer ce formulaire après avoir entendu une explication de la recherche. Si vous avez des questions, merci de me les poser avant de signer ce formulaire. Je vous donnerai une copie pour votre information.

Je comprends que cette recherche aura lieu pendant l’ensemble du premier trimestre entier de 2011 et je donne permission que cette recherche ait lieu au Collège de Tagaga. Je signe ce formulaire de la part de la communauté entière.

Je suis d’accord que la chercheuse peut … (cochez les cases):

- Parler avec des étudiants, des enseignants et des membres de la communauté pour découvrir leurs avis sur les langues et la politique linguistique de l’école.
- Enregistrer quelques conversations (SEULEMENT après avoir obtenu l’accord des personnes concernées)
- Donner un microphone portable à 2 élèves pendant une journée pour enregistrer des pratiques langagières pendant la journée (SEULEMENT après avoir obtenu l’accord de la communauté)
- Donner un questionnaire court à tous les élèves
- Observer des classes (avec la permission de l’enseignant) et d’autres activités scolaires
- Faire une copie (ou prendre une photo) des formulaires ou des affiches

Je comprends que, si je décide n’importe quand pendant la recherche que je ne veux plus que la communauté participe à celle-ci, je pourrai notifier la chercheuse et nous pourrons terminer notre participation.

Signature: _______________________________ (Principal)

Date: ____________________
Appendix VI – Consent forms signed by all interviewees

CONSENT FORM

Title of Study: An investigation into the use of language within Vanuatu’s education system

Thank you for taking part in this research.
Please complete this form after you have listened to an explanation about the research. If you have any questions, please ask me before you sign this form.

Fiona Willans (King’s College London, UK)

☐ I agree to take part in a recorded interview.

☐ I agree that the researcher will use the information I give in her research report. (Names will be changed for students and teachers; job titles will be used for principals or Ministry officials.)

☐ I agree that I will inform the researcher before Sunday 20 November 2011 if I decide that I do not want my information to be used.

Signed: ________________________________
Name: ________________________________
Date: ________________________________
FORMULAIRE DE CONSENTEMENT

Titre de l’étude: An investigation into the use of language in Vanuatu’s education system (Une étude de l’usage des langues dans le système éducatif du Vanuatu)

Je tiens à vous remercier d’avoir décidé de participer dans ma recherche.
Merci de signer ce formulaire après avoir écouté une explication de la recherche. Si vous avez des questions, merci de me les poser avant de signer ce formulaire.

Fiona Willans (King’s College London, UK)

☐ Je suis d’accord de participer dans une interview enregistrée.

☐ Je suis d’accord que la chercheuse utilisera cette information dans son rapport sur sa recherche. (Des noms imaginaires seront utilisés pour les étudiants et les enseignants ; des titres d’emploi seraient utilisés pour les principaux et des personnels du Ministère de l’Éducation.)

☐ Je suis d’accord d’informer la chercheuse avant dimanche, le 20 novembre 2011 si je décide que je ne veux pas qu’elle utilise mes informations.

Signature: _______________________________

Nom : _______________________________

Date: _______________________________
## Language questionnaire

### Part 1 – About you

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Which year are you in now?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>Year 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>In which years have you attended Angolovo College?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Year 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Which island(s) are you from?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambae</td>
<td>Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Where do you usually spend your school holidays? (Choose ONE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your home island(s)</td>
<td>Port Vila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Which language(s) do you speak with your family?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Which language(s) do you speak when you are at school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Write the name of the languages, or the places where these languages are from)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 2 – About languages

7. What are the Angolovo College rules about the way languages should be used at school?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
8. What happens if you break these rules?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

9. What is your opinion about these rules?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

10. Do you think the following languages are important in your life? For every language, please tick one box and then explain why you think this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Quite important</th>
<th>A little bit important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bislama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your participation.
Questionnaire sur les langues

Section 1 – Sur toi-même

1. Dans quelle classe es-tu maintenant?
   - 9
   - 11
   - 10
   - 12
   - 13
   - 14

2. Dans quelles classes es-tu allé(e) au Collège de Faranako?
   - 7
   - 11
   - 8
   - 12
   - 9
   - 13
   - 10
   - 14

3. De quelle île(s) viens-tu?
   - Ambae
   - Pentecost
   - Maewo
   - Autre (Ecris le nom de cette île)

4. Ou passes-tu tes vacances scolaires habituellement ? (Choisis une seule case)
   - Ton île d'origine
   - Port Vila
   - Luganville
   - Autre (Ecris le nom de ce lieu)

5. Quelles langues parles-tu avec ta famille?
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________

6. Quelles langues parles-tu quand tu es à l'école?
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________
   - ______________________________

   (Ecris les noms de ces langues, ou les lieux dans lesquels ces langues sont parlées)

Section 2 – Sur les langues

7. Quelles sont les règles du Collège de Faranako concernant l'usage des langues à l'école ?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
8. Qu’est-ce qui se passe si on désobéit à ces règles?

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

9. Quel est ton avis sur ces règles?

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

10. Est-ce que tu crois que les langues suivantes sont importantes dans ta vie ? Pour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Langue de l'île</th>
<th>Très important</th>
<th>Assez important</th>
<th>Un peu important</th>
<th>Pas important</th>
<th>Pourquoi ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bislama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Français</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chaque langue, coche une case, et puis explique pourquoi tu le penses.

Voici la fin du questionnaire. Merci de ta participation.
## Appendix VIII – Interview guides

### Interview guide overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific areas of interest</th>
<th>Area specific questions</th>
<th>Additional prompts and follow-up points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The school language (Focus on L2) | a) Difficulty of using an L2 medium of instruction  
   b) Proficiency in L2  
   c) L2 language use outside class  
   d) Space for other languages in education | • Inject the word ‘bilingualism’ if this hasn’t come up, e.g. ‘other groups have mentioned bilingualism. Do you know what this means?’  
   • Push hard for why ‘bilingualism’ is important if people say it is.  
   • Overall summary of A vs F – ‘do you feel different from the students at [other school]?’ ‘think about your own opportunities as a A/F student’  
   • Clarify terms and check statements that are unclear |
| 2. English and French (Focus on E and F) | a) Proficiency in L3  
   b) Benefits to individuals of using both E and F  
   c) Benefits to Vanuatu of using both E and F | |
| 3. English or French | a) Anglophone/Francophone chances of going overseas to study  
   b) Anglophone/Francophone chances of finding a job  
   c) Anglophone/Francophone language learning  
   d) Prevalence of English and French in Vanuatu  
   e) Prevalence of English and French throughout the world | |
| 4. An appropriate education system for Vanuatu | a) Single or dual system  
   b) Language(s) of instruction  
   c) Language(s) of study | • Practicalities of any suggestions e.g. if they think both E and F should be used equally from Class 1  
   • Clarify any terms used, e.g. ‘bilingual school’  
   • Check any statements made e.g. with ‘so you don’t think’ + opposite idea etc |
Anglophone students

1. The school language
   a) Do you find it easy or difficult to use English to learn all of your subjects?
   b) Are you good at English? Do you wish you spoke it better?
   c) Students do not speak English very often outside the classroom. Why is this?
   d) Do you think any other languages (e.g. French, Bislama, Ambae languages) should be used more in school?

2. Using English and French
   a) Are you good at French? Do you wish you spoke it better?
   b) Is it good that you have the chance to know both English and French?
   c) Is it good that Vanuatu uses both English and French?

3. Anglophones and Francophones
   a) Do Anglophones or Francophones have better chances of going overseas to study?
   b) Do Anglophones or Francophones have better chances of finding a job?
   c) Do Anglophones or Francophones learn English and French better?
   d) Do more people speak English or French in Vanuatu?
   e) Do more people speak English or French throughout the world?

4. An appropriate education system for Vanuatu
   a) Do you think there should be one type of school for everybody in Vanuatu or separate Anglophone and Francophone schools?
   b) Which language(s) do you think schools should use to teach all the subjects?
   c) Which language(s) do you think students should study in school?
**Francophone students**

1. **La langue de l’école**
   a) Est-ce que tu trouves que c’est facile ou difficile d’utiliser le français pour apprendre toutes les matières ?
   b) Est-ce que tu es fort en français ? Est-ce que tu aimerais le parler mieux ?
   c) Les étudiants ne parlent pas souvent le français au dehors de la classe. Pourquoi ?
   d) Est-ce que tu penses qu’on doit utiliser des autres langues (par exemple l’anglais, le bichelamar, les langues d’Ambae) plus souvent à l’école ?

2. **Utiliser le français et l’anglais**
   a) Est-ce que tu es fort en anglais ? Est-ce que tu aimerais le parler mieux ?
   b) Est-ce que c’est bon que tu aies l’opportunité de savoir à la fois le français et l’anglais ?
   c) Est-ce que c’est bon que le Vanuatu utilise à la fois le français et l’anglais ?

3. **Des Francophones et des Anglophones**
   a) Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones ont plus d’opportunités pour aller à l’étranger pour continuer leur éducation ?
   b) Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones ont plus d’opportunités pour trouver un emploi ?
   c) Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones apprennent le français et l’anglais le mieux ?
   d) A ton avis, y a-t-il plus de personnes qui parlent le français ou l’anglais au Vanuatu ?
   e) A ton avis, y a-t-il plus de personnes qui parlent le français ou l’anglais dans le monde ?

4. **Un système éducatif approprié pour le Vanuatu**
   a) A ton avis, devrait-il y avoir un seul type d’écoles pour tout le monde au Vanuatu ou des écoles séparées pour des francophones et anglophones ?
   b) A ton avis, les écoles devraient utiliser quelle(s) langue(s) pour enseigner toutes les matières ?
   c) A ton avis, les étudiants devraient apprendre quelle(s) langue(s) à l’école ?
Anglophone teachers

1. The school language
   a) Do you find it easy or difficult to use English to teach your subject(s)? Do you think the students find it easy or difficult to use English in your classes?
   b) Are you a confident user of English? Do you wish you spoke it better?
   c) Students and staff do not speak English very often outside the classroom. Why is this?
   d) Do you think any other languages (e.g. French, Bislama, Ambae languages) should be used in school?

2. Using English and French
   a) Do you speak French? Do you wish you spoke it better?
   b) Is it good for individuals to know both English and French?
   c) Is it good that Vanuatu uses both English and French?

3. Anglophones and Francophones
   a) Do Anglophones or Francophones have better chances of going overseas to study?
   b) Do Anglophones or Francophones have better chances of finding a job?
   c) Do Anglophones or Francophones learn English and French better?
   d) Do more people speak English or French in Vanuatu?
   e) Do more people speak English or French throughout the world?

4. An appropriate education system for Vanuatu
   a) Do you think there should be one type of school for everybody in Vanuatu or separate Anglophone and Francophone schools?
   b) Which language(s) do you think schools should use to teach all the subjects?
   c) Which language(s) do you think students should study in school?
Francophone teachers

1. La langue de l’école
   a) Est-ce que vous trouvez que c’est facile ou difficile d’utiliser le français pour enseigner toutes les matières ? Croyez-vous que les étudiants trouvent facile ou difficile de l’utiliser en classe ?
   b) Est-ce que vous utilisez le français avec assurance ? Est-ce que vous aimeriez le parler mieux ?
   c) Les étudiants et les enseignants ne parlent pas souvent le français au dehors de la classe. Pourquoi ?
   d) Est-ce que vous pensez qu’on doit utiliser des autres langues (par exemple l’anglais, le bichelamar, les langues d’Ambae) plus souvent à l’école ?

2. Utiliser le français et l’anglais
   a) Est-ce que tu parles l’anglais ? Est-ce que vous aimeriez le parler mieux ?
   b) Est-ce que c’est bon que les individuels sachent à la fois le français et l’anglais ?
   c) Est-ce que c’est bon que le Vanuatu utilise à la fois le français et l’anglais ?

3. Des Francophones et des Anglophones
   a) Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones ont plus d’opportunités pour aller à l’étranger pour continuer leur éducation ?
   b) Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones ont plus d’opportunités pour trouver un emploi ?
   c) Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones apprennent le français et l’anglais le mieux ?
   d) A votre avis, y a-t-il plus de personnes qui parlent le français ou l’anglais au Vanuatu ?
   e) A votre avis, y a-t-il plus de personnes qui parlent le français ou l’anglais dans le monde ?

4. Un système éducatif approprié pour le Vanuatu
   a) A votre avis, devrait-il y avoir un seul type d’écoles pour tout le monde au Vanuatu ou des écoles séparées pour des francophones et anglophones ?
   b) A votre avis, les écoles devraient utiliser quelle(s) langue(s) pour enseigner toutes les matières ?
   c) A votre avis, les étudiants devraient apprendre quelle(s) langue(s) à l’école ?
Principals

1. The school language
   a) How well do you think (L2) is being used in classrooms in this school? Do teachers find it easy to teach in (L2)? Do students find it easy to learn through (L2)?
   b) /
   c) Students and staff do not speak (L2) very often outside the classroom. Why is this? What are your thoughts at the moment about an L2-only rule?
   d) Do you think any other languages (e.g. (L3), Bislama, Ambae languages) should be used more in school?

2. Having English and French
   a) Do you speak (L3)? Do you wish you spoke it better?
   b) Is it good for individuals to know both English and French?
   c) Is it good that Vanuatu uses both English and French?

3. Anglophones and Francophones
   a) Do Anglophones or Francophones have better chances of going overseas to study?
   b) Do Anglophones or Francophones have better chances of finding a job?
   c) Do Anglophones or Francophones learn English and French better?
   d) Do more people speak English or French in Vanuatu?
   e) Do more people speak English or French throughout the world?

4. An appropriate education system for Vanuatu
   a) Do you think there should be one type of school for everybody in Vanuatu or separate Anglophone and Francophone schools?
   b) Which language(s) do you think schools should use to teach all the subjects?
   c) Which language(s) do you think students should study in school?
Interview question guide – Ministry of Education

1. The principal languages of education

a) How well do you think English and French are being used in classrooms in Vanuatu?
   Do teachers find it easy to teach in these languages?
   Do students find it easy to learn through these languages?
   (Primary / secondary ...)
   Is the Ministry looking at any ways to improve the teaching of the principal languages?

b) Which schools did you attend?
   Did you ever have difficulties using [whichever L2 is used at these schools]?

c) Students and staff do not speak English or French very often outside the classroom.
   Is this a problem?
   What are your thoughts about English-only or French-only rules?
   Do you think the situation has changed at all over the years?

d) What do you think about the use of Bislama and mother tongues in school?
   How is the Vernacular Language Education policy going at the moment?
   What about the second international language? Are you looking at any ways to improve the use of both principal languages at schools?

2. Having English and French

a) Do you speak [L3]? Do you wish you spoke it better?

b) Is it good for individuals to know both English and French?

c) Is it good that Vanuatu uses both English and French?

3. Anglophones and Francophones

a) Do Anglophones or Francophones have better chances of going overseas to study?

b) Do Anglophones or Francophones have better chances of finding a job?

c) Do Anglophones or Francophones learn English and French better?

d) Do more people speak English or French in Vanuatu?

e) Do more people speak English or French throughout the world?
An appropriate education system for Vanuatu

a) What is the current thinking about the dual system or a single, combined system?  
   Do you agree with these plans?  
   Any problems with them?

b) What is the current thinking about language(s) of instruction?  
   (What is happening with the Education Language Policy at the moment?)  
   Do you agree with these plans?  
   Any problems with them?

c) Which language(s) do you think students should study in school?
Appendix IX – List of interviewees

The interviewees are referred to by the initials identified below, whereby the first initial represents their school (A for Angolovo, F for Faranako), the second their institutional role (P for principal, T for teacher, S for student), and the third, where necessary, a unique initial to differentiate between participants of the same role:

**Angolovo College**

Angolovo Students (Aston, Andrina, Amboline and Arthur)

Angolovo Teachers (Group 1) (Mr Aru, Miss Adina and Miss Agnes)

Angolovo Teachers (Group 2) (Mr Ala, Mr Andrew, Mrs Anne, Mrs Angela, Mme Adrienne)

Angolovo Principal (AP)

**Collège de Faranako**

Faranako Students (Fylene, Feven, Frinston and Frazer)

Faranako Teachers (Mr Felix, Mr Fred and Mlle Felicia)

Faranako Principal (FP)

**Ministry of Education**

Director of Policy and Planning (DPP) (educated in the Anglophone system)

Director of Education Services (DES) (educated in the Anglophone system)

Director of Basic Education (DBE) (educated in the Francophone system)

Former Minister of Education and Minister of Francophonie (FME) (educated in the Francophone system)
Appendix X – Transcription conventions

Emphatic stress
?
Rising intonation
.
Falling intonation

/ Boundary between morphemes of different ‘languages’ (see Appendix XXII)

(.) Pause of less than 1 second
(1) Pause of 1 second or longer (number of seconds)
:: Lengthened sound

= Latching
[ ] Overlapping speech
(xx) Unclear utterance
( ) Transcription doubt

... Ellipsis (only used in data extracts in body of analysis chapters)
<> Description of non-verbal action

Bold type will be used in extracts within the body of the thesis to mark particular features discussed.
Appendix XI – Interview with Angolovo College Student Group (Original)

Date: 31-10-11

Location: An empty classroom

Participants: Aston, Arthur, Amboline, Andrina

Notes: I approached Arthur to ask if he would be willing to take part. When he agreed, I asked him to find three friends (one other boy and two girls) to participate the following day. Aston and Amboline are considered to be above average students, according both to class records and my own language assessment. Arthur and Andrina are considered to be average students.

On the day, before starting the recording, I gave the students the list of questions and gave them time to look through them. I asked if they wanted me to explain any in Bislama, and Aston asked whether ‘Anglophone’ and ‘Francophone’ means people who school English and French. When they were happy with this and said they had no other questions, I turned the recording on. For the first 28 seconds, they each tried to encourage each other to be the first one to start, whispering and moving their heads, until Aston started.

Aston: Okei. Fes kwestin hem i se <reads> “do you find it easy or difficult to use English to learn all your subjects?” Mi mi ting se (. ) samfala nomo oli isi blong (1) samfala nomo oli isi be samfala? Ating oli had. (1) Olsem French. French mi mi tekem olsem French? Ating hem i had from (. ) taem tija i eksplen long Inglis? Most bae mi andastan. Be sapos we (. ) hem i (. ) continue blong (. ) eksplen long French nomo? Ating bae mi no (. ) bae mi no save andastanem nomo.

Andrina: Okei. Mi. Tingting blong mi? Hem i olsem. (1) Er. Olsem. Mi luk se i (. ) difficult smol olsem long Inglis olsem (. ) ol tija oli stap yusum olsem (. ) expensive words? Olsem (. ) blong (1) blong talesm olsem (. ) olsem long ples ia bae oli sud talesm se mining blong hem (. ) mekem se bae mi andastan. Se bae wod ia i olsem ia long Inglis nomo.

Amboline: <whispers> Talem kwestin.

Arthur: <reads> “Are you good at English? Do you wish (. ) you spoke it better?” Mi ting se (. ) hem i gud blong (. ) mi mi ting se mi mi gud blong Inglis from (. ) long Inglis? Sapos yu speak long hem? Bae (. ) mo yu save gud bae evri samting long buk we (. ) long defren kaen sabjek (. ) we hem i had? Hem i (. ) yu save andastanem nomo bae yu save gud Inglis.
Amboline: Okei yu (.) yu save toktok gud Inglis sapos we yu stap practise/im toktok long hem evri taem we yu save (.) toktok gud long hem. Sapos we yu (.) yu toktok Bislama be Inglis smol nomo? Bae i had smol ia blong toktok long Inglis. Proper English.


Aston: Yes afta wan samting tu? Sapos we (.) yu continue blong toktok Inglis evri taem? Bae olsem (.) taem yu wantem raet (.) raet long Inglis? Bae hem i isi nomo blong yu save raet.

Amboline: Yes?

Andrina: <reads> “Students do not speak English very often outside the classroom. Why is this.” (1) Hemia? Mi ting se (.) from (.) se sometimes oli stap speaking olsem (.) speak tumas long mother tongue blong olgeta mekem se (.) olsem taem blong Inglis hem i no save speak Inglis. Olsem hem i no save talem ol samting olsem.

Aston: Afta wan (.) wan samting tu from (.) olsem yumi long Vanuatu olsem (.) yumi gat olsem toktok long tri lanwis (.) olsem especially Inglis olsem Inglis ia long taem blong klas. Be taem yumi kam aot saed? Olsem naioa olsem ol man olsem (.) ating oli (.) oli no gat intres (.) afta tu? From yumi no gat ol fren olsem (.) oli stap toktok Inglis evri taem (.) blong kam oli stap wetem yumi blong yumi stori o mek fan olsem wetem olgeta (.) blong toktok Inglis. Mekem se yumi stap continue nomo blong (.) toktok Bislama olsem (.) evri taem.

(8)


Amboline: Mi tingting blong mi mi luk se Bislama i mo gud from taem yu toktok Bislama? Bae i save helpem yu blong save toktok (.) er Inglis sapos yu toktok lanwis bae (.) bae yu no save toktok gud Inglis tumas.

(2)

Aston: Yes afta wan samting tu from olsem (.) long (.) oli mention/em Ambae lanwis long ples ia? Be (.) mi mi ting se i no gud blong yu stap lanem Ambae lanwis nomo from (.) Ambae lanwis yu save yusum nomo long Ambae. Be taem yu aot i go long ol defren aelan/s? Olgeta oli gat defren lanwis o bae yu save toktok wetem olgeta nomo long Bislama [o French] olsem.

Amboline: [Yes]
Arthur: Mi mi ting se (. ) ol lanwis ia mi ting se hem i gud blong yumi (. ) yusum
insaeg long skul from (. ) hem i save yus long (. ) iden- identification blong yumi?
Olsem wanem aelan yumi belong long hem o wanem kaontri yumi belong long hem.
Sapos yumi go long nara ples/es.

Amboline: <reads> “Are you good at French? Do you wish to spoke it better?”

Andrina: [Okei]
Amboline: [Mi] stap ting se sapos (. ) sapos we yu (. ) since we kindy up to (. ) yu
finisim edyukesen blong yu? Sapos we yu stap skul French? Bae yu save toktok
French be sapos yu lanem Inglis since yu smol be (. ) bae yu save Inglis nao (2)
sapos yu lanem taem yu smol bae yu save French.

Aston: Um (2) mi mi ting se mi no gud tumas long French? From mi jes (. ) mi jes
skul long (. ) statem skul long French long (. ) Klas 6 nomo? Afta (. ) olsem fulap
samting (. ) mi no andastanem gud fulap wod/s long French mi no andastanem gud
mekem se taem (. ) mi no save (. ) bae i tekem hamas yia bifo mi save toktok French.

Andrina: Okei mi tu olsem mi no gud long French? Olsem mi no save toktok gud
long hem from (. ) olsem mi lanem French nomo long Yia 7? Se Yia 7 (. ) kasem
naoa? From (. ) olsem (. ) tija blong hem i nogat mekem se (. ) taem mifala go olsem
long top-up olsem oli jes stap sanem ol tija i kam. Hem i olsem French (. ) olsem ale
translate i go long Inglis. Mekem se mi no save olsem toktok French long (. ) er (. )
blong (. ) er (. ) se blong speak it good.

Arthur: <reads> "Is it good that you have the chance to know both English and
French?" Mi long tingting blong mi mi ting se i gud blong yumi lanem both English
and French. From tudei long kaontri blong yumi? Whole/fala kaontri we i go i gat
fulap wok i stap long hem? Many people oli yusum both English and French. So mi
mi ting se hem i gud blong yumi lanem both English and French long skul. Blong
hem i save helpem mi (. ) helpem yumi that (. ) sapos yumi go long other places be
(. ) yumi save Inglis and French sapos wan person hem i toktok long yumi.

Amboline: Okei communication bae i isi sapos we yumi save fulap kaen lanwis.

Aston: <reads> “Is it good that Vanuatu uses both English and French?” Mi mi ting
se hem i gud blong yumi lanem tugeta lanwis Inglis wetem French. From tudei long
Vanuatu? Ating (. ) yumi gat er sam (. ) olsem bifo Indipendens? Yeah French wetem
France wetem British oli bin lukaotem kaontri blong yumi? Mekem se tudei samfala
olsem (.) oli stap yet olsem (.) oli toktok French? Mekem se bae yu mas lanem both lanwis nomo from sapos yu go wetem (.) yu go (.) go stap wetem ol famli we olsem oli toktok French nomo evri taem? Bae yu save hao blong communicate wetem olgeta.

Amboline: <reads> “Do Anglophones or Francophones have better chances to (.) of going overseas to study?”

Andrina: Mi ting se (.) i gud olsem blong go oversea? Se blong gat janis blong lanem ol samting? <others exchange looks and laugh> Olsem (.) blong attend nara kaontri? Blong tekembak kam long kaontri blong olgeta.

Aston: Mi mi ting se (.) both Anglophones and Francophones oli gat be tetter janis blong go aot overseas (.) blong stadi. From tudei i no (.) ol man nomo we oli stadi Inglis oli go aot. Ol man tu oli stadi French? Olgeta tu oli go aot blong (.) stadi oversea.

Andrina: <reads> “Do Anglophone or Francophone have better chance to find (.) of finding a job?”

Amboline: Yes?

Andrina: Se?

Amboline: Sapos long dei olsem tudei? Fulap man oli (2) se i gat ol man we i skul French? Hem tu i employ. Afta man we i skul Inglis hem tu i gat er (.) janis blong employ long wan er (.) wok. Long eni kaen ofis de- (.) defren kaen man we i employ long hem.

Aston: Mi mi ting se (.) tugeta oli gat better janis blong faenem job from (.) long (.) kaontri blong yumi tudei? From loa blong (.) long kaontri blong yumi? Yumi yusum uh (.) yumi yusum tu lanwis olsem hem i nasonal lanwis blong yumi Inglis wetem French. Mo tudei oli se (.) yu we yu gud yu save toktok Inglis mo French? Bae yu save stap long wan ofis. So mi mi ting se tugeta oli gat (.) better janis blong faenem job.

Amboline: <reads> “Do Anglophones or Francophones learn English and French better?”
Aston: Mi mi ting se Francophone? Oli save la-(.) lanem Inglis and French better.

From (.) as mi experience finis? Ol smol boe we oli go (.) oli stat long praem- long
Klas 1 i go antap? Oli tekem French? Oli tekem hariap nomo be (.) oli (.) taem oli
stap long Klas 1 nomo oli save toktok French finis. Be Anglophone? Taem yu stat
long (.) yu stap long Klas 1 nao (.) bae i had blong yu toktok Inglis. Bae yu save
kasem Klas 6 olsem? Afta bae yu save hao blong (.) toktok Inglis. (1) Be mi ting se
(.) French nao i gud from (.) taem (.) oli lanem French? Hem i isi. Afta blong kam
long Ing- (.) blong kam long Inglis? Bae oli save tekem hariap nomo.

Amboline: M-m.

Andrina: M-m.

(15)

Arthur: <reads> “Do more people speak English or French in Vanuatu.” Long
tingting blong mi mi ting se (1) mo Inglis nao oli speak (.) long Vanuatu. From tudei
bae yu go bae yu luk (.) fulap (.) insaed long ofis (.) ol olfala jobs blong yumi (.)
insaed long Vanuatu (.) mi mi ting se Inglis nao fulap (.) sapos yu go insaed long
wan ofis/es bae yu (.) ol (.) sam wok we i stap insaed fulap oli yusum ol Inglis wod/s
nomo. Be French hem i no tumas insaed long Vanuatu. (1) So mi mi ting se mo
pipol long Vanuatu nao oli speak/im mo Inglis (.) than French.

(18)

Andrina: <reads> “Do more people speak English or French throughout the world?”
Mi ting se (.) se evri pipol nomo? Olsem long wol oli toktok long Inglis mo French se
blong communicate wetem nara wan? Se (.) blong (.) mekem wan olsem (.) wan
wok blong (.) divelopem kaontri blong olgeta.

(4)

Arthur: Mi long tingting blong mi mi ting se (.) the world? Fulap pipol nao oli speak
Inglis. From (.) fulap (.) ol fulap jobs mo occupation we i kam insaed blong yumi mo
fulap pipol we oli go aot long kaontri? Oli go oli skul long Inglis. Be French oli no
stap skul long hem tumas from (.) fulap pipol raon long wol olgeta long (.) olsem oli
no save toktok (.) gud er French. Be oli save tok Inglis nomo. (1) So long tingting
blong mi mi ting se (.) throughout long wol? Many people nao oli speak Inglis.

(4)

Amboline: Se mi tu mi ting se (.) long wol ia olsem fulap kaontri oli speak Inglis from
(.) French ating hamas kaontri nomo oli speak French be (.) whereas fulap oli speak
Inglis.

(4)

Andrina: Mi ting se er (.) ol (.) samfala tu oli speak French nomo. (1) Olsem long ol
(.) olsem long nara kaontri/s taem oli kam olsem (.) se eksampol olsem samfala
waetman oli kam olsem long mifala long Maewo we oli kam ia? Hemia oli speak
French nomo olsem samfala(.) samfala tija we oli(.) ol French tija oli go blong(.)
olsem toktok long olgeta? Mekem se(.) blong talem wan samting blong olgeta oli
tolem.

(13)

Amboline: <reads> “Do you think there should be one type of school for everybody
in Vanuatu or separated Anglophone and Francophone schools.” Mi? Blong mi ting
se i gud se yumi separate/em from(.) sapos we yumi miksim hem i had lelebet uh
blong yu tekem both.

Andrina: [No]

Amboline: [Both] English and French.

Andrina: Mi mi ting se(.) mi mi ting se bae yumi go tugeta nomo from bae yumi(.)
tugeta bae yumi stat long Klas 1 go kasem antap olsem bae yu go mekem se bae i
isi nomo. Blong yumi speak French wetem Inglis wantaem.

<Amboline shakes her head and pulls a face>

(3)

Arthur: Long tingting blong mi mi tu mi ting se hem i gud blong yumi save putum
Anglophone wetem Francophone(.) tugeta from(.) sapos yumi stat? Olsem taem
yumi smol yumi go antap long Klas 1 yumi lanem tugeta lanwis bae i mo isi.

Andrina: Yeah.

Arthur: From sapos yumi separate/em? Bae yumi grow up long wan gogo:: be taem
yumi bigwan? Bae yumi kam go long narawan? Be from yumi no stat taem yumi
smol i kam antap. Mekem se bae yumi no save(.) save gud mo yu no save
andastanem nara wan. Long tingting blong mi mi ting se hem i gud yumi putum
Anglophone wetem Francophone tugeta. Oli skul long wan skul nomo.

F: Sapos yu disagree Amboline yu save go bak bakegen. Talem opinion blong yu.
<amboline shakes her head> Mi luk se yu harem i se no(.) yu no agri wetem
tufala? Yu save talem poen blong yu nomo i oraet. Yu no stap kwaet nomo sapos
yu no agri. <laughs>

(5)

Andrina: Olsem olsem mi(.) tingting blong mi se(.) se(.) nowadays long Vanuatu
oli separated from(.) olsem blo::ng <laughs> samfala(.) olsem from samfala
styuden oli(.) er samfala styuden tu oli wantem lanem French mo samfala oli
wantem lanem(.) Inglis mekem se oli separate/em? So blong mekem se intres
blong ol styuden bae oli kam(.) samfala oli French samfala long Inglis.

Aston: Ah mi? Mi mi ting se i gud blong yumi(.) joenem tugeta nomo(.) an-joenem
Anglophone wetem Francophone tugeta nomo from olsem(.) mi mi(.) yumi long
Vanuatu? Olsem(.) ol gavman i nidim ol man nomo we oli save(.) toktok Inglis mo
French blong stap long ofis.
Andrina: <reads> “Which languages do you think schools should use to teach all the subjects.”

Arthur: Long tingting blong mi mi ting se ating bae (.) yumi save yusum (.) Inglis nomo? Mo French. (1) Inglis mo French. From (1) tudei ol tu- ol sabjek blong yumi we yumi stap yusum long skull? Tugeta oli yusum Inglis wetem French. From tufala sabjek ia nomo? Uh tufala lanwis ia nomo? Be yumi stap lanem blong yumi save andastanem ol wod/s we olsem oli had insaed long ol buk (.) textbook o ol buk we bae yumi stadi long hem. From sapos yumi lanem ol narafala lanwis? Naoia bae i mekem i difficult blong yumi nao. Blong yumi andastanem ol (.) ol er (.) wod/s insaed long buk o (.) ol texts we bae yumi ridim. Mi mi ting se bae yumi save yusum tufala lanwis ia nomo.


Arthur: Mi mi ting se oli mas yusum tu noma from sapos oli stat i kam antap we oli smolsmol i kam antap wetem tufala Inglis ia? Bae hem i no iven had wanpis blong ol tija we oli eksplenem bakegen long Bislama. From olgeta oli save gud Inglis finis taem oli smol oli kam antap wetem French. Mekem se bae hem i isi blong olgeta. Oli save andastanem wanem we ol tija blong olgeta i mekem. Be sapos oli ademap Bislama i go bakegen? Naoia bae i jes stap mekem i had ia nao from (.) wan i wantem toktok Inglis? O French? Wan i wantem tok Bislama? Mekem se tufala lanwis er trifala lanwis ia bae oli no save gohed gud wanpis. So bae oli mas yusum tu ia noma from (.) mi ting se hemia nao bae i save mekem yu save catch up long ol wok blong yu? Bae yu save andastanem ol texts mo (.) wod/s insaed long (.) buk blong yu.

Amboline: [Mi ting]

Andrina: [Mi mi ting] se (.) mi mi ting se yumi save yusum (.) yusum noma? From se yumi spekim long own taem blong hem olsem (.) taem blong olsem ol explanation. Se Inglis we oli no andastanem? Mas eksplenem long Bislama from (.) er <laughs> olgeta oli andastanem. So bae yumi yusum tri lanwis noma. Olsem hemia tingting blong mi. Tangkiu.

Amboline: Mi mi ting sapos Anglophone skul? Hem i sud uh tij wetem (.) hem i sud uh (.) tijim ol sabjek ia wetem Inglis from hem i wan Inglis skul ia. Be sapos Francophone hem i sud (.) tij wetem French. Bae i no save Anglophone tija i no save go tijim ol (.) uh Francophone tija oli no save kam tijim Fran olsem (.) French.
I toktok French se i tijim ol pikinini from bae oli no andastanem. So Francophones tij (.). sud er wanem ia (.). tija/s blong oli sud tijim wetem French bakegen olsem ol er Anglophone er skul sud toktok Inglis. Er tij wetem Inglis. Olsem.

Andrina: No from ol (.). se ol tija ah (.). taem olsem oli go tekem ol kos blong kasem olsem wok blong olgeta olsem tija? Mas oli tekem evri sabjek blong kam wan tija uh? Bae oli tekem French mo Inglis blong oli kam wan tija taem yu kam long klasrum yu save eksplenem.

Aston: Uh mi mi ting se (1) mi mi ting se i gud blong (.). ol tija oli eksplenem ol sabjek ia long (.). both French wetem Inglis from tru long ol buk/s we yumi stap stadi long hem ia? Fulap instruction (.). oli raetem long (.). Inglis and French. From yu no save faenem wan instruction long ol buk we yumi stap stadi long hem? We instruction oli raetem long Bislama.

(4)

Andrina: <reads> “Which languages do you think students should study in schools.”

Amboline: Mi ting se both. I gud blong yumi lanem both.

Andrina: French and English?

Amboline: Yes. From se yu save (1) faenem defren kaen jobs.

Aston: Uh mi mi ting se (.) mi tu mi ting se i gud blong yumi lanem uh both French wetem Inglis from (.). sapos yu skul gogo yu go further stadi blong go stadi overseas? Be from fulap kaontri long wol olsem oli toktok French wetem Inglis. Be sapos i hapen blong yu go long wan French kaontri we ol pipol oli stap toktok (.). French nomo (.). be yu save (.). yu yu bin stadi hao blong toktok French finis? So bae yu save go nomo from yu yu save toktok French nomo. O yu save toktok Inglis.

(6)

Amboline: Yes.

F: From wanem?

Amboline: Eh mi no

F: From wanem yu ting se ol smol pikinini long French oli save toktok French be yufala yu wet long
Aston: From (.) ol French ol Francophone styuden? Taem we oli stat long Klas 1?
Ol tija blong olgeta oli stap tijim olgeta hao blong toktok French mo evri samting oli eksplenem long French. Be ol Anglophone styuden taem oli stat long Klas 1 (.)
olsem yumi long Vanuatu? Bae samtaem ol tija bae oli eksplen long Bislama o bae oli save eksplen long lanwis. Be French taem yu stat long Klas 1 be (.) evri samting ol tija oli eksplen long French.

F: So hem i experience blong yufala evriwan long praemeri? [(.) Ol] tija blong yufala oli yusum Bislama nomo o lanwis uh?
Amboline: [Yes.]
Andrina: [Yes.]
Arthur: Yes.
Andrina: [No olsem mifala i no andastan (.) Bislama (.)] blong mifala i andastanem gud.
Amboline: [(xx) ]
F: Be yu yusum Inglis smol? Long Klas 1.
All: Yes.
F: Tija i mekem poen blong hem long Inglis [be taem] yufala i no kasem (.) Bislama i go.
Amboline: [Yes]
Bislama ia.
Andrina: Bislama.
F: Okei afta yu talem se ol Francophone we oli jenis i kam long Inglis? Naoia oli gud bakegen? Be (.) hemia from wanem?
Amboline: Yu talem wanem?
F: Olsem wan pikinini we hem i skul French fastaem? Afta hem i jenis i kam
Amboline: Ah okei (.) long Inglis?
F: Long Inglis? Yu talem se bae hem i save kasem hariap?
Amboline: Yes=
Aston: =Yes from Inglis hem i more easier than=
Andrina: =Yes than French.
Arthur: From French sapos yu stat [i kam antap]
Arthur: [French i had] we.
320  F: Be from wanem Inglis hem i mo isi?
321  Aston: Inglis hem i isi from=
322  Andrina: =Inglis i sem mak nomo olsem Bislama.
323  Amboline: M-m.
324  Arthur: Bislama hem i both French and English oli joenem tugeta blong yu save (xx).
325  Olsem i mo isi blong French i go long Inglis.
326  F: Okei. So yu save fulap pikinini we oli stat French? Afta oli muv i kam long Inglis=
327  Aston: =[Yes.]
328  Amboline: =[Yes] wan ia long Yia 11.
329  F: Okei Simon we hem i stap long Yia 11 yes.
330  Amboline: Yes.
331  F: Afta yu save eniwan we oli Inglis fastaem? Ale oli jenis i go long French?
332  Arthur: Olsem mifala?
333  F: Uh-uh.
334  Arthur: I stap long Inglis i go antap blong mifala i go long French bae i had we i had.
335  Amboline: I had.
336  F: Be yu save sam fren we oli bin traem?
337  Arthur: No.
338  Andrina: Yes. Sista blong mi.
339  Amboline: Si?
340  F: Uh?
341  Andrina: Hem i stap long Collège de Faranako finis afta hem i aot i go long Londua.
342  F: Be Londua hem i Inglis.
343  Andrina: Yes.
344  F: No be yu save wan we hem i bin stat long Angolovo College afta hem i aot i go long Collège de Faranako. Defren direction ia. Long Inglis fas wan afta i go long French.
345  <all shake heads>
346  F: Yu save eniwan we oli bin
347  All: No.
F: From wanem? From wanem ol Francophone oli wantem jenis i go long Anglophone be
Amboline: Yes wan Tariella ia
F: Tariella hem i Francophone i aot i kam Anglophone. I gat fulap cases ia. Be mi mi neva mitim wan we hem i go long (.). Inglis go long French.] Be from wanem?
Amboline: [Inglis (.). go long French]
Arthur: Um (.). from [i had tumas.]
Amboline: [I had we] (.). French i had.
F: Lanwis nomo i had?
Arthur: Yes.
Andrina: Sapos i bigwan finis bae i go long (.). olsom i go long French bakegen blong statem smol oli go antap? Hemia bae i sem blong hem ia. <laughs> From i bigwan finis be i go stadi long (.). stadi French bakegen.
F: Okei. Okei wan kwestin bakegen. Um (1) okei taem yumi bin stap long kwestin (.)
4 (.). A? (1) Yufala evriwan i bin tokbaot (.) eh 4 wanem? Yes A. <reads> “Should there be one school for everybody or separate Anglophone Francophone.” Yufala evriwan i stap talem se yes (.). hem i gud se yumi lanem Inglis mo French long sem taem long Klas 1 i go antap.
Andrina: Yes. Yes.
F: Be sapos yu (.). bae yu putum system ia? Hao nao bae yu save divide/em taem?
Bae i gat evri klas bae i gat Inglis French insaed? O bae i gat haf timetable hem i Inglis? Nara haf hem i French? O long Klas 1 2 3 hem i Inglis? Ale French? Hao nao bae yu save mekem?
F: From Klas 1 i go antap?
Andrina: Yes.
Arthur: Yes.
F: So hem i min se bae i gat Maths evri dei long moning? Maths bae i stap long Inglis nomo? O bae yu yusum sam dei (.). Mande Maths hem i long Inglis? Ale Tusde Maths hem i long French?
Andrina: Yes.
Arthur: Yes.
F: Which one?
Andrina: Olsem (. ) olsem (. ) long moning? Se long Inglis ale long (. ) olsem moning kasem lunch? Inglis. Ale (. ) lunch kasem aftenun hemia French.

F: Be sapos yu traem tingbaot timetable naoia?

Amboline: Hemia bae i fesem stret.


Andrina: Yes.

F: Bae yu yusum tufala lanwis tugeta long wanwan sabjek? O bae evri taem (. )

Social Science Inglis nomo.

F: Be sapos yu traem tingbaot timetable naoia?

Amboline: Hemia bae i fesem stret.

Social Science Inglis nomo.

Andrina: Yes.


Andrina: Yes.

F: Bae yu yusum tufala lanwis tugeta long wanwan sabjek? O bae evri taem (. )

Social Science Inglis nomo.

F: Be sapos yu traem tingbaot timetable naoia?

Amboline: Hemia bae i fesem stret.

Social Science Inglis nomo.

Andrina: Yes.


Andrina: Yes.

F: Bae yu yusum tufala lanwis tugeta long wanwan sabjek? O bae evri taem (. )

Social Science Inglis nomo.

F: Be sapos yu traem tingbaot timetable naoia?

Amboline: Hemia bae i fesem stret.

Social Science Inglis nomo.

Andrina: Yes.


Andrina: Yes.

F: Bae yu yusum tufala lanwis tugeta long wanwan sabjek? O bae evri taem (. )

Social Science Inglis nomo.
Andrina: No olsem oli toktok Inglis finis? Ale (.) oli tanem olsem (. ) toktok olsem sem sentens bakegen long French.

(2)

F: Blong evri sentens?

Andrina: Yes.

Amboline: Kas. Mekem se (xx)

F: Afta long eksam blong yu? Wan sentens long Inglis wan long French?

Amboline: Mekem long wan nomo.

Aston: Mi mi ting se ( . ) olsem evri sabjek blong Inglis? Oli sud tijim nomo long Inglis be ( . ) long taem blong French? Hemia nao bae olsem oli tijim olgeta long=

F: =Be yu talem evri

Amboline: Olsem yumi dis taem olsem taem aoa olsem lesen blong French? Afta yu

Aston: Yes.

F: Yu min lanwis nomo? [Bae] yu tijim long French?

Amboline: [No] Lanwis no.

F: So i min se evri klas bae i hapen long Inglis nomo? Social Science. Science.

Maths. Evriwan Inglis nomo?

Aston: Yes.

F: Be i gat wan period nomo blong French? [Ale hem nao French.]

Amboline: [Ah bae yu no save lanem nomo.]

F: Be hemia yumi tokbaot kwestin ia se yumi evriwan bae yumi skul long sem wei?

O bae i gat sam Anglophone? Sam Francophone. Be yu yu talem se evriwan ( . ) wan system.

Amboline: Yes.

F: So min se lego French nomo uh?

<all laugh>

F: Wanem bae hapen long olgeta we oli wantem lanem French? (3) So hemia olsem hem i wan difficult question. I no olsem se i isi [ansa]. I no gat ansa long hem.

Yu save gavman i stap faet from.

Andrina: [Yes]

F: Be from fas wan Amboline i talem se no. Bae yumi gat Anglophone Francophone.
Amboline: Yes.


Andrina: M-m.


Amboline: [Hemia nao] i had blong yu mekem.

F: So. Bae yumi traem kwestin 4 A bakegen? Wanem nao ansa blong yufala?


Amboline: K:\s.

Andrina: Mekem se bae long

Arthur: Naioia bae i mekem ol sabjek ia bae oli miks uh. [From]

Andrina: [No.] Olsem i gat timing blong ol tija bae oli tijim.

(3)

Amboline: <very quiet> Bae i tijim wanem?

<laughter and whispering>


Amboline: [Sabjek? Evri sabjek] blong Fra- wanem ia Anglophone evri sabjek long er Francophone i sem mak nomo=

Aston: =Okei so naioia i min se

F: M-m. Oli folem sem syllabus nomo. French wetem Inglis nomo i defren.

Aston: Okei so i gud blong yumi separate/em nomo.
Amboline: *Hm?*.

<all laugh>

Aston: From (.) Inglis hem i gat evri sabjek olsem (.) [French] nomo. Be olsem hemia nao=


F: So hao nol bae yu save (.) olsem yu talem se yu wantem se evriwan oli toktok Inglis mo French. O yu yu harem se i no impoten?

Amboline: *Si* impotent bae yumi (.) tekem both.

F: So hao nol bae yumi improve/um French? Sapos yumi kipim tufala system ia?

(2)

Amboline: Ating bae yumi mekem olsem ia (.) taem yu smol yu go antap French nomo? Ale bigwan (.) ale jes stap go long Inglis olsem we Simon i stap mekem.

F: Uh?

Arthur: [No bae yu]

Amboline: [From bae i] isi (.) from sapos yu statem Inglis bae yu go long French (.) i had. So that yu save both.

F: So min se evri pikinini oli skul French fastaem? (2) Afta oli go long Inglis?

Arthur: Mekem olsem ia bae samfala topic long Inglis tu bae yu no save andastanem.

Andrina: M-m.

Amboline: Be [French] sem topic nomo ol sem samting long buk blong Inglis evri samting.

Arthur: No from (.) yu luk long samfala buk tudei (.) fulap buk ia? Bae yu luk long Inglis oli mekem ol working out blong hem ol kaen (xx) i defren? Afta long French buk (2) er (.) sabjek=

Amboline: =Ol topic oli sem mak nomo bae yu go jekem long Faranako.

F: Yes ol topic oli sem mak. From mi mi kam long Faranako ia. Mi mi luk se topic hem i sem mak. Be lanwis (.) no be (.) sapos yu tingbaot? Yu stap long Klas 6?
Sapos yu harem se yu weak lelebet long Maths. Hem se namba yu stap konfius from. Yu save sam pikinini oli no really gud long Maths.

Andrina: Yes.

F: Afta sapos yu stap struggle from? Be long sem taem tu yu jenis i go long nara lanwis ia?

Amboline: Okei.

F: Naoia yu harem se ol namba oli confusing yet? Be lanwis tu i mekem se i go worse nao. Bae yu jes faenem se yu konfius. Hem i had blong switch be

Arthur: M-m.

(2)

F: So yu okei <addresses Amboline directly> (. ) final ansa bae yu talem se evri pikinini oli French fas wan? Afta i go long Inglis?

(3)

Amboline: No olsem mi talem nomo from sapos we:: (. ) [xx]

F: [O yu] minim wanwan pikinini nomo?

Amboline: Sapos wan pikinini i wantem se i save gud (. ) speaking blong French wetem Inglis? Be (. ) hemia nao yu stat wetem French. From sapos yu stat wetem Inglis bae i had blong yu (. ) ol=

F: =Be basically bae yu kipim tufala system ia?

Amboline: M-m.

F: Inglis wetem French.

Amboline: M-m.

F: <addresses Andrina directly> Yu tu bae yu agri wetem tu system o yu wantem se yu joenem.

Andrina: <quietly> Bae yu save joenem (. ) yu save joenem. <laughs>

<all laugh>

Amboline: Be yu stap tingting se (. ) olsem long ples ia? Hemia we yumi lanem lanwis nomo.

Andrina: Lanwis nomo.

Aston: [Okei olsem]

Olsem hemia olsem (.) yu talem hemia (.) hemia i tru. Be from olsem (.) yumi long Vanuatu oli wantem se (.) yu nomo we yu save (.) Inglis? Wetem French? Bae yu save stap long (.) se bae yu save stap long wan ofis. Be (.) sapos we (.) yu (.) yu stap skul F- Fra- yu stap skul long French nomo. Afta hao nao bae yu save Inglis?

Amboline: Be bae yu go kasem antap ale yu jenis yu::

Andrina: No bae i take [long taem]

Aston: [Be taem yu] kasem an[tap? (1) Kasem] antap? (.) Blong go long Inglis?

Amboline: [No bae i isi nomo]

Aston: Hemia (.) mi ting se ating bae i had smol long yu.

Amboline: But look Simon afta wan mo (xx) sem system.

Andrina: Be olsem samfala wod long Inglis oli no save olsem bae oli andastanem gud.

(1)

F: Be yu <addresses Amboline> yu stap tokbaot wanwan pikiñini nomo. Be yu <addresses Andrina> ating yu stap tokbaot evri

Amboline: Evri (.). [hol]

F: [Evri] styuden long Vanuatu uh?

Andrina: Yes.

F: From hemia i defren. Yes wanwan pikiñini yumi gat evidence se oli save jenis.

Olsem Simon.

Arthur: Yes.

F: Be sapos yumi tingbaot ful kaontri nao? Yu no save decide se evri pikiñini oli switch from (.) system ia bae i no stap.

Andrina: Yes.

Arthur: Samfala nomo.

<bell rings>


Arthur: No.

F: Bi-ling-ual
Arthur: Hem i wanem ia?

F: <laughs> Hem i wanem ia?

Aston: Hem i wan Inglis wod o wan French wod?

<F writes “BILINGUALISM BILINGUISME” and shows the paper to the group>

Arthur: Inglis ia.

F: Okei hemi i Inglis wan?

Amboline: Bi:: lalala Bi


Amboline: Nogat.

Aston: No.

Arthur: No.


Amboline: M-m.

F: Bi hem i minim tu.

Amboline: Tu.

F: So bilingual i min se someone we hem i save toktok tufala lanwis.

Andrina: Oh yes.

Amboline: Yes.


Amboline: Wan.

F: So sapos yu monolingual yu save wan lanwis nomo. Yu harem multilingual?

Amboline: Multilingualism?

Arthur: Um (.) no.

F: No. Hem i minim many. Many languages. Hem i wan kwestin we mi intres long hem from mi harem wod ia fulap taem long Vanuatu? Taem oli tokbaot ol lanwis. Be hem i interesting yufala i neva harem wod ia so (.) lego nomo. Bae yumi nomo tokbaot. (1) Okei. Any more comments blong ademap?

<all laugh and shake heads>
F: Okei tangkiu tumas.
Appendix xi – Interview with Angolovo College Student Group (Translation)

Date: 31-10-11

Location: An empty classroom

Participants: Aston, Arthur, Amboline, Andrina

Notes: I approached Arthur to ask if he would be willing to take part. When he agreed, I asked him to find three friends (one other boy and two girls) to participate the following day. Aston and Amboline are considered to be above average students, according both to class records and my own language assessment. Arthur and Andrina are considered to be average students.

On the day, before starting the recording, I gave the students the list of questions and gave them time to look through them. I asked if they wanted me to explain any in Bislama, and Aston asked whether ‘Anglophone’ and ‘Francophone’ means people who school English and French. When they were happy with this and said they had no other questions, I turned the recording on. For the first 28 seconds, they each tried to encourage each other to be the first one to start, whispering and moving their heads, until Aston started.

Aston: Okay. The first question says <reads> “do you find it easy or difficult to use English to learn all your subjects?” I think that (.) some are easy to (1) some are easy but some? I think they’re hard. (1) Like French. Take French like French? I think it is hard because (.) when the teacher explains in English? I can understand most of it. But if (.) he (.) continues to (.) explain in French? I don’t think I (.) I will be able to understand.

Andrina: Okay. Me. My opinion? Is like this. (1) Er. Like. I think it is (.) quite difficult like in English like (.) the teachers use like (.) expensive words? Like (.) to (1) to explain (.) whereas they should explain their meaning (.) so that I understand. That these words are like this in English.

Amboline: <whispers> Say the question.

Arthur: <reads> “Are you good at English? Do you wish (.) you spoke it better?” I think that (.) it is good to (.) I think that I am good at English because (.) in English? If you speak it? Then (.) and you know it well then everything in the books from (.) the different subjects (.) that is hard? It (.) you can understand it if you know English well.

(2)
Amboline: Okay you (. ) you can speak good English if you practise speaking it all
the time so that you can (. ) speak it well. If you (. ) you speak Bislama but only a little
English? It will be quite hard to speak English. Proper English.

Andrina: These things? Like. We start in like Class 1 until (. ) up to the upper
classes? Like we learn English uh? So that when we go up to the upper classes we
can speak er (. ) English (. ) like speak it well. We will be able to understand a lot. But
if the teachers explain to us (. ) we can answer them. (12) But sometimes? When the
students like (. ) they do well in (. ) Class 1 up to:: like (. ) the big classes? Then like
English will be easy for them.

Aston: Yes and something else? If (. ) you continue to speak English all the time?
Then like (. ) when you want to write (. ) write in English? Then it will just be easy for
you to write.

Amboline: Yes?

Andrina: <reads> “Students do not speak English very often outside the classroom.
Why is this.” (1) This one? I think that (. ) because (. ) sometimes they speak like (. )
speak too much of their mother tongue so that (. ) when it’s time for English they
cannot speak English. Like they don’t know how to say things.

Aston: And then one (. ) one thing too because (. ) like us in Vanuatu like (. ) we have
like we speak three languages (. ) like especially English like English during classes.
But when we come outside? Like now like people like (. ) maybe they (. ) they aren’t
interested (. ) and also? Because we don’t have friends who (. ) speak English all the
time (. ) who hang around with us to story or have fun with them (. ) speaking English.
So we just continue to (. ) speak Bislama (. ) all the time.

(8)

Bislama. Ambae languages? Should be used more in (. ) in school.”

Amboline: In my opinion I think that Bislama is better because when you speak
Bislama? It will help you to speak (. ) er English but if you speak lanwis then (. ) then
you cannot speak English very well.

(2)

Aston: Yes and then another thing because like (. ) in (. ) it mentions the Ambae
language here? But (. ) I don’t think we should learn the Ambae language because
(. ) you can only use the Ambae language on Ambae. But when you leave and go to
different islands? They have different languages or you can speak to them in
Bislama [or French].

Amboline: [Yes]
Arthur: I think that these languages I think it’s good that we use them in school because they can be used as our identification. Like which island we belong to or which country we belong to. If we go to other places.

Amboline: “Are you good at French? Do you wish to spoke it better?”

Andrina: [Okay]

Amboline: [I] think that if you since kindy up to the end of your education? If you learnt French? You would be able to speak French but if you have learnt English since you were little then you will know English if you learn it when you are little you will know French.

Aston: Um (2) I think that I am not very good at French? Because I just I just learnt started learning French in Class 6? And then like many things I don’t understand many of the words well in French I don’t understand them well so when I don’t understand it will take years before I can speak French.

Andrina: Okay me too like I’m not good at French? Like I can’t speak it well because like I just learnt French in Year 7? From Year 7 to now? Because like there was no teacher so when we went to top-up then they just sent the teacher. He was French so he translated into English. So I don’t know how to speak French.

Arthur: “Is it good that you have the chance to know both English and French?” In my opinion I think it’s good for us to learn both English and French. Because today in our country? In the whole country there are lots of jobs? Many people use both English and French. So I think that it is good for us to learn both English and French at school. So that it can help me help us that if we go to other places then we know English and French if a person speaks to us.

Amboline: Okay communication will be easy if we know many different languages.

Aston: “Is it good that Vanuatu uses both English and French?” I think that it is good that we learn both languages English and French. Because today in Vanuatu? Maybe we had er some like before Independence? Yeah French and France and British ruled our country? So today some like they are still here they speak French? So we have to learn both languages because if you go with you go go and spend time with families who just speak French? Then you will know how to communicate with them.
Amboline: <reads> “Do Anglophones or Francophones have better chances to (. ) of going overseas to study?”

Andrina: I think that (. ) it’s good like to go oversea? To have the chance to learn something? <others exchange looks and laugh> Like (. ) to attend other countries? To bring this back to our country.

Aston: I think that (. ) both Anglophones and Francophones have a better chance to go out overseas (. ) to study. Because today it’s not (. ) only people who study English who go out. People who study French too? They can also go out to (. ) study oversea.

Andrina: <reads> “Do Anglophone or Francophone have better chance to find (. ) of finding a job?”

Amboline: Yes?

Andrina: It’s?

Amboline: In times like today? Many people (. ) there are people who school French? They are also employed. And then people who school English they also have er (. ) the chance to be employed in a er (. ) job. In any kind of office di- (. ) there are different people employed there.

Aston: I think that (. ) both have a better chance to find a job because (. ) in (. ) our country today? Because the law (. ) of our country? We use uh (. ) we use two languages as our national language English and French. And today they say (. ) those of you who speak English and French? You can work in an office. So I think that both have (. ) a better chance to find a job.

Amboline: <reads> “Do Anglophones or Francophones learn English and French better?”

Aston: I think that Francophones? They can lea- (. ) learn English and French better. From (. ) as I have experienced? The little ones who go (. ) start in prim- in Class 1 and go upwards? They learn French? They learn it quickly (. ) they (. ) when they are just in Class 1 they can already speak French. But Anglophones? When you start in
you are in Class 1. It will be hard for you to speak English. You will be in about Class 6. And then you will know how to speak English. But I think that French is good because they learn French. It is easy. And then to come to English. They can learn it easily.

Amboline: M-m.

Andrina: M-m.

(15)

Arthur: “Do more people speak English or French in Vanuatu.” In my opinion I think that more English is spoken in Vanuatu. Because today if you go you will see inside the offices all our jobs in Vanuatu, I think that there is a lot of English if you go into an office you will the some work in there many just use English words. But there is not much French in Vanuatu. So I think that more people in Vanuatu speak more English than French.

(18)

Andrina: “Do more people speak English or French throughout the world?” I think that everybody? Like in the world they speak English and French to communicate with others? To do like work to develop their countries.

(4)

Arthur: In my opinion I think that the world many people speak English. Because many many jobs and occupations that come into the country for us and people who go outside of the country? They go and study in English. But they don’t study in French much because many people around the world like they don’t speak or French well. But they just speak English. So in my opinion I think that throughout the world? Many people speak English.

(4)

Amboline: Me too I think that in the world like many countries speak English because French there are many just a few countries that speak French but whereas many speak English.

(4)

Andrina: I think that er some some too just speak French. Like in like when people from other countries come for example like some white people come to our place on Maewo? They just speak French so like some teachers who the French teachers go to like speak to them? So that to explain things for them to understand.

(13)

Amboline: “Do you think there should be one type of school for everybody in Vanuatu or separated Anglophone and Francophone schools.” Me? I think that
it’s good that we separate them because if we mixed them it would be quite hard
for you to learn both.

Andrina: [No]

Amboline: [Both] English and French.

Andrina: I think that I think that we should just go together because we would be
(together if we started in Class 1 and went up like it would be easy. For us to
speak French and English at the same time.

Amboline shakes her head and pulls a face>

Arthur: In my opinion too I think that it would be good if we could put Anglophones
and Francophones (.) together because (.) if we started? Like when we were small
and we went up from Class 1 learning the two languages it would be easier.

Andrina: Yeah.

Arthur: Because if we separate them? Then we grow up with one and on and o::n
but when we are big? For us to come to the other one? But we haven’t started when
we were small and all the way up. It means that we can’t (.) know it well and you
can’t understand the other one. In my opinion I think that it is good for us to put
Anglophones and Francophones together. They study in one school.

F: If you disagree Amboline you can come back again. Give your opinion.

Amboline shakes her head> I feel that you (.) you don’t agree with these two? You
can give your point it’s okay. Don’t sit there quietly if you don’t agree. <laughs>

Andrina: Like me (.) my opinion is (.) that (.) nowadays in Vanuatu they are
separated because (.) like to:: <laughs> some (.) like some students (.) er some
students want to learn French and some want to learn (.) English so they separate
them? So to make the students interested to come (.) some are French and some
are English.

Aston: Ah me? I think that it’s good that we (.) just join them together (.). an- join
Anglophones and Francophones together because like (.) I (.) us in Vanuatu? Like
(.) the government needs people who can (.) speak English and French in the
offices.

(7)

Andrina: <reads> “Which languages do you think schools should use to teach all the
subjects.”

(3)

Arthur: In my opinion I think that maybe (.) we should use (.). just English? And
French. (1) English and French. Because (1) today to- our subjects that we use in
school? Together they use English and French. Because just these two subjects? Uh just these two languages? But we learn them so that we can understand the words that are hard inside the books (.) textbooks or books that we study with. Because if we learn other languages? That will make it difficult for us now. For us to understand the (.) the er (.) words inside the books or (.) the texts that we’ll read. I think that we should only use these two languages.

Andrina: I think we should use three. That is English French and Bislama. Because if they like the teachers go and speak English? And then like they don’t understand? Then they explain again in Bislama. Because uh some students like they haven’t learnt English well like us? Or French? So they (.) they should use Bislama to explain to them. They will understand properly.

Arthur: I think that we should just use two because if they start and come up from when they are tiny and come up with these two Englishes? Then it won’t be hard at all and the teachers won’t need to explain again in Bislama. Because they already know English from when they’re small onwards and French. So it will be easy for them. They can understand what their teachers are doing. But if they add Bislama in again? That will just make it difficult now because (.) one wants to speak English? Or French? One wants to speak Bislama? So that the two languages er the three languages can’t go ahead at all. So they should just use these two because (.) I think that will mean you can keep up with your work? You will be able to understand the texts and (.) the words inside (.) your books.

Amboline: [I think]

Andrina: [I think] that (.) I think that we can use them (.) just use them? Because if we speak them at the right time (.) like during explanations. If they don’t understand in English? Must explain in Bislama so that (.) er <laughs> they understand. So we should use three languages. Well that’s my opinion. Thank you.

Amboline: I think that if it’s an Anglophone school? It should teach in (.) it should uh teach the subjects in English because it’s an English school. But if it’s Francophone it should (.) teach in French. Anglophone teachers can’t go and teach uh Francophone teachers can’t come and teach Fre- like (.) French. If they speak French to teach the children they won’t understand. So Francophones teach (.) should er what’s that (.) their teachers should teach French again while the er Anglophone er schools should speak English. Er teach in English. Like that.

Andrina: No because (.) the teachers ah (.) when like they go and take their courses to train to become teachers? They must take every subject to become a teacher uh? They should take French and English to become a teacher so when you come to the classroom you can explain.

Aston: Uh I think that (1) I think that it’s good for (.) teachers to explain subjects in (.) both French and English because throughout the books that we study from? Many
of the instructions are written in English and French. Because you won’t find any instruction in the books that we study from? Where the instructions are written in Bislama.

(4)

Andrina: <reads> “Which languages do you think students should study in schools.”

Amboline: I think both. It’s good that we learn both.

Andrina: French and English?

Amboline: Yes. So that you can find different jobs.

(6)

Aston: Uh I think that me too I think that it’s good for us to learn uh both French and English because if you school all the way and you go for further studies overseas? Many countries of the world like speak French and English. But if you happen to go to a French country where people speak French only you will know you will have learnt how to speak French already? So you can just go because you will be able to speak French. Or you can speak English.

(9)

F: Any other comments on that? <all laugh and shake their heads> Okay I just have two questions I want to ask two things. Okay the first one I think it was Aston? You said that uh Francophone children when they are in Class 1? They can speak French already.

Amboline: Yes.

F: And you all said yes yes. You agreed.

Amboline: Yes.

F: Why?

Amboline: Eh I don’t.

F: Why do you think that these little children in French they can speak French but you wait until

Aston: Because the French the Francophone students? When they start in Class 1? Their teachers teach them how to speak French and they explain everything in French. But when Anglophone students start in Class 1 like us in Vanuatu?

Sometimes the teacher will explain in Bislama or they can explain in lanwis. But for French when you start in Class 1 the teachers explain everything in French.

F: So is that the experience all of you had in primary? [Your] teachers just used Bislama or lanwis uh?

Amboline: [Yes.]
Andrina: [Yes.]

Arthur: Yes.

Andrina: [No if we didn’t understand (.) Bislama (.)] so that we would understand.

Amboline: [(xx) ]

F: But you used English a bit? In Class 1.

All: Yes.

F: The teachers made their points in English [but when] you didn’t get it (.) Bislama was used.

Amboline: [Yes]

Bislama.

Andrina: Bislama.

F: Okay and then you said that Francophones who switched to come to English? They were good again? But (.) why is that?

Amboline: What do you mean?

F: Like a child who schooled French first? And then changed to come to

Amboline: Ah okay (.) to English?

F: To English? You said that he would learn quickly?

Amboline: Yes=

Aston: =Yes because English is easier than=

Andrina: =Yes than French.

Arthur: Because French if you start [and come up]

Arthur: [French is really hard].

F: But why is English easier?

Aston: English is easy because=

Andrina: =English is just the same as Bislama.

Amboline: M-m.

Arthur: Bislama is both French and English joined together so you can (xx) Like it’s easier for French to go to English.

F: Okay. So do you know lots of children who have started in French? And then moved to English=
Aston: [=Yes.]

Amboline: [=Yes] there’s one here in Year 11.

F: Okay Simon who is in Year 11 yes.

Amboline: Yes.

F: And then do you know anyone who was in English first? And then changed to French?

Arthur: Like us?

F: Uh-uh.

Arthur: Being in English and going up for us to go to French would be really hard.

Amboline: It would be hard.

F: But do you know any friends who have tried it?

Arthur: No.

Andrina: Yes. My sister.

Amboline: Really?

F: Uh?

Andrina: She was at Collège de Faranako and then she went to Londua.

F: But Londua is English.

Andrina: Yes.

F: No but do you know any who have started at Angolovo College and then left to go to Collège de Faranako. The other direction. In English first and then going to French.

<all shake heads>

F: Do you know anyone who

All: No.

F: Why? Why do Francophones want to change to Anglophone but

Amboline: Yes one is Tariella

F: Tariella was Francophone and then came to Anglophone. There are many of these cases. But I’ve never met anyone who went from (.) [English to French.] But why?

Amboline: [English (.) to French]
Arthur: Um (.) because [it's too hard.]

Amboline: [It's really hard] (.) French is hard.

F: It's just the language is hard?

Arthur: Yes.

Andrina: If he’s grown up already to go to (.) like to go to French he will have to start
at the bottom again and go up? He will be ashamed. <laughs> Because he’s
already grown up but he’s studying (.) studying French again.

F: Okay. Okay one more question. Um (1) okay when we were on question (.) 4 (.)
A? (1) You all talked about (.) eh 4 what? Yes A. <reads> “Should there be one
school for everybody or separate Anglophone Francophone.” You all said that yes
(.) it’s good that we learn English and French at the same time from Class 1
upwards.

Andrina: Yes. Yes.

F: But if you (.) suppose you had this system? How would you divide the time?
Would you have every class with English and French in there? Or would half the
timetable be English? The other half French? Or would Class 1 2 3 be English? And
then French? What would you do?

Arthur: Like they would separate them. If we had English today in the morning. You
would do the English subjects in the morning. Then when you go to the afternoon?
You would learn French with the French subjects so it would be easy.

F: From Class 1 onwards?

Andrina: Yes.

Arthur: Yes.

F: So that means that if you had Maths every day in the morning? Maths would just
be in English? Or would you use some days (.) on Mondays Maths would be in
English? And then on Tuesdays Maths would be in French?

Andrina: Yes.

Arthur: Yes.

F: Which one?

Andrina: Like (.) like (.) in the morning? If it was English okay in (.) like the morning
up until lunch? English. Okay (.) from lunch until the afternoon it would be French.

F: But if you think about the timetable?

Amboline: That would be impossible.

F: So Social Science for example. When you are in Year 10? Yes you’re a bit older
but still (.) Year 5 6 7 you have Social Science. Science. Maths.
Andrina: Yes.

F: Would you use both languages together in each subject? Or would (.) Social Science always just be in English.

Arthur: We’d do Social Science just in English. For the French subjects we would just speak French.

Andrina: Yes.

Arthur: For English we’d just speak English.

Amboline: French subjects?

F: But which (.) which would be the French subjects? (3) Would you just choose them?

Arthur: M-m.

Amboline laughs, everyone joins in>

F: Okay but=

Andrina: No I [think that]

Amboline: [if not we] just use French.

Andrina: Yes (1) I think that every like for every subject we should speak English and French together.

F: Uh?

Andrina: [Yes.]

Amboline: [Yes.]

F: From Class 1?

Andrina: Yes. Like from Class 1 up to Year 13 uh? So that they speak English? Er and French at the same time.

F: But how would they do it? Like they would have five minutes and then switch to French?

Amboline: There you? go.

Andrina: No like they speak English first? Okay (.) they like turn (.) and say the same sentence again in French.

F: For every sentence?

Andrina: Yes.
Amboline: Wow. That means (xx)

F: And then in your exams? One sentence in English one in French?

Amboline: Just do it in one.

Aston: I think that (.) like all the English subjects? They should just teach in English but (.) when it’s time for French? That’s when they should teach in==

F: =But you say all the

Amboline: Like we this time like when it’s the hour like the French lesson? Then you

Aston: Yes.

F: You mean just for language? [Then] you teach in French?

Amboline: [No] Not language.

F: So that means that every class would happen in English only? Social Science. Science. Maths. Everyone just English?

Aston: Yes.

F: But there would be just one period for French? [Okay that would be French.]

Amboline: [Ah you just won’t learn it.]

F: But we talk about this question of whether we all school in the same way? Or there are some Anglophones? Some Francophones. But you say that everyone (.)

one system.

Amboline: Yes.

F: So that means we leave out French uh?

<all laugh>

F: What would happen to those who wanted to learn French? (3) So this is like a difficult question. There is no easy [answer]. It doesn’t have an answer. You know the government is arguing about this.

Andrina: [Yes]

F: But to start with Amboline said no. We should have Anglophone Francophone.

Amboline: Yes.

F: And then you all said no. We combine them. But the problem is this now? Like we think that oh combining them yes that would be good.

Andrina: M-m.

F: We would all be the same. We would all learn both. But when we come to the details? How would you be able to [do it?]
Amboline: That's it, it would be hard to do it.

F: So. Let's try 4 A again? What would your answer be now?

Amboline: Like at Collège de Faranako? They learn whatever Agriculture. Maths. Then like they give the instructions in French. But do you think that if we did like (.) both here. And then we just learn language in French we just wouldn't learn French. With like how many (.) just one lesson a day? And then you learn the French language? You wouldn't understand (xx).

F: So what's the answer. Should we have Anglophone Francophone the two systems? Or should [we] combine them. We join them.

Andrina: [No.] I think that (.) if for Anglophone? They have a teacher an English teacher. And then (.) for (.) like for Francophone? We have a (.) a (.) French teacher.

Andrina: That would mean that

Arthur: That would mean all the subjects would mix uh. [Because]

Andrina: [No.] Like there would be times for the teachers to teach them.

(3)

Amboline: <very quiet> To teach what?

<laughter and whispering>

Aston: Okay because French? Like Francophone? Their subjects are just the same as [Anglophone]

Amboline: [Subject? Every subject] for Fra- what's that Anglophone every subject for Francophone it's just the same=

Aston: =Okay so then that means that

F: M-m. They follow the same syllabus. Only French and English are different.

Aston: Okay so it's good to just separate them.

Amboline: Hm?-m.

Aston: Because (.) English has all its subjects just like (.) [French]. But like for=

Amboline: [French]

Aston=Us here we make it so that we just learn the French language we have one lesson every day there is one lesson. But we only know a little in it. But there is no
subject in it we just learn language in French. But French has all the subjects that
are the same as us. Like they give the instructions and everything in French. The
answers are just in French.

F: So how could we (.) like you said that you wanted everyone to speak English and
French. Or do you not think this is important?

Amboline: Yes it’s important that we (.) have both.

F: So how do we improve French? If we keep these two systems?

(2)

Amboline: I think we shou

(2) when you’re small you go up with just
French? Okay when you’re older (.) then you just go to English like Simon has done.

F: Uh?

Arthur: [No you should]

Amboline: [Because that will be] easy (.) because if you start in English to go to
French (.) would be hard. So that you know both.

F: So you mean that every child should school French first? (2) And then they go to
English?

Arthur: If you do that then you wouldn’t be able to understand some of the topics in
English.

Andrina: M-m.

Amboline: But French has just the same topics the same things in all the books as
English everything.

Arthur: No because (.) you see some books today (.) many books? If you look at
English they do the working out (xx) differently? And then the French books (2) er (.)
subjects=

Amboline: =The topics are just the same you can go and check at Faranako.

F: Yes the topics are the same. I’ve just been at Faranako. I saw the same topics.
But language (.) no but (.) think about? If you are in Class 6? If you feel that you are
a bit weak in Maths. It’s like you find numbers confusing. You know some children
aren’t really good at Maths.

Andrina: Yes.

F: And then if you are struggling? And then at the same time you change to another
language?

Amboline: Okay.

F: Now you will find the numbers are still confusing? But the language will also
make it worse. You will just find that you are confused. It is hard to switch but
F: So you okay <addresses Amboline directly> (.) your final answer you think that all children should go to French first? And then go to English?

Amboline: No like I just say that because i::f (.) [xx]

F: [Or you] just mean individual children?

Amboline: If a child wants to be good at (.) speaking French and English? Then (.) that's it you start with French. Because if you start with English it will be hard for you

F: =But basically you would keep the two systems?

Amboline: M-m.

F: English and French.

Amboline: M-m.

F: <addresses Andrina directly> You too do you agree with the two systems or do you think you should join them.

Andrina: <quietly> You should join them (.) you should join them. <laughs>

<all laugh>

Amboline: But you think that (.) like here? Where we just learn language.

Andrina: Just language.

Amboline: But like Fran- Francophone schools? They are the same topics (.) just the same topics. Like I said (.) we learn [on and on] but all the information is in French.

Aston: [Okay like]

It's like (.) you say that (.) that's true. But because (.) in Vanuatu we want (.) people who know (.) English? And French? To work in (.) to be able to work in the offices.

But (.) if you (.) you school F- Fra- you just school French. And then how will you know English?

Amboline: But when you go up then you change you::

Andrina: No it will take [a long time]

Aston: [But when you] get [up there? Get] up there? (.) To go to English?
Amboline: [No it will be easy]

Aston: That (.) I think it will be quite hard for you.

Amboline: But look Simon and also (xx) have done the same thing.

Andrina: But like some words in English they won’t know like to be able to understand well.

(1)

F: But you <addresses Amboline> you’re just talking about individuals. But you <addresses Andrina> I think you are talking about every

Amboline: Every (.) [whole]

F: [Every] student in Vanuatu uh?

Andrina: Yes.

F: Because that’s different. Yes individual children we have evidence that they can change. Like Simon.

Arthur: Yes.

F: But if we think about the whole country? You can’t decide that every child can switch (.) because there won’t be this system.

Andrina: Yes.

Arthur: Just some.

<bell rings>

F: Oh the bell’s rung. Okay just my last question it’s a very quick one. You haven’t used one word at all that I have heard a lot? This word is bilingualism. Or bilingual. Do you know this word? Or not.

Arthur: No.

F: Bi-ling-ual

Arthur: What is it?

F: <laughs> What is it?

Aston: Is it an English word or a French word?

F writes “BILINGUALISM BILINGUISME” and shows the paper to the group>

Arthur: It’s English.

F: Okay this is the English one?

Amboline: Bi:: lalala Bi
F: That’s both together this is the English and the French. This one <points> “bilingualism”. That’s English. Or <points> “bilinguisme”? That’s French. It’s the same thing. Have you ever heard this word in your life?

Amboline: No.
Aston: No.
Arthur: No.

F: Okay. No it means two languages. If you are bilingual? You know ling that means language.

Amboline: M-m.

F: Bi means two.

Amboline: Two.

F: So bilingual means someone who can speak two languages.

Andrina: Oh yes.

Amboline: Yes.

F: Or monolingual? Mono means one.

Amboline: One.

F: So if you are monolingual you only know one language. Have you heard of multilingual? Multilingualism?

Arthur: Um (.) no.

F: No. That means many. Many languages. It’s a question I’m interested in because I hear the word a lot in Vanuatu? When they talk about languages. But that’s interesting you have never heard the word so (.) let’s leave it. We won’t talk about it.

(1) Okay. Any more comments to add?

<all laugh and shake heads>

F: Okay thank you very much.
Appendix XII – Interview with Collège de Faranako Student Group (Original)

Date: 02-11-11

Location: An empty classroom

Participants: Fylene, Feven, Frazer, Frinston

Notes: I hadn’t been able to arrange my visit in advance, and I discovered on arrival that there was no school that day because the teachers were in a meeting. There were quite a few students around, so I asked Fylene and Feven if they would be willing to take part. They then saw Frazer up by the dormitory so called him down, and he found Frinston to make up the group. Frazer is considered to be an above average student, according both to class records and my own language assessment. Fylene and Feven are considered to be average students. Frinston is considered to be below average.

Having given students time to read the questions, I asked whether there were any that they wanted me to explain. They said no, although it became clear later on that they weren’t sure about some of them. Later in the interview, they did ask me to explain a few.

I appointed Fylene as chairperson to keep the discussion moving. As a result, students tended to answer questions round in the group.

1 Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que tu trouves que c’est facile ou difficile d’utiliser le français pour apprendre toutes les matières.” (2) Long tingting blong mi? Se (.) from mi skul kam praemeri mo long secondary i facile blong (.) isi blong toktok long French. (2) Long evri matièrè.

5 (5)

6 Feven: Mi (2) Mi tu hem i isi long mi we mi skul long praemeri? Mi lanem i go kam kasem naia. Long evri matièrè.

8 Frinston: Toktok strong.

9 (7)

10 Frazer: Mi tu long tingting blong mi mi luk se (1) long (.) taem mi stat long praemeri mi kam long secondary mi luk se (.) uh (.) French i no (.) i no had long mi. Mi luk se hem i (.) isi.

13 (6)

14 Frinston: Mi mi tingting ia nomo. (2) Taem mi skul long praemeri i kam.

15 Frazer: Toktok strong.

16 Frinston: Finis? Mekem ol matièrè we ol tija i stap givim (.) i isi nomo.

Feven: Mi tu long tingting blong mi mi laekem toktok French from mi lanem taem we mi smol. Mi stap lanem blong (. ) mi laekem blong lanem tok.

Frazer: Mi tu. Long (. ) lanwis French? Mi mi (. ) mi harem se hem i isi blong mi lanem.

Frinston: Olsem olgeta i talem finis? Ating (. ) mi laekem (. ) toktok French from mi statem long praemeri finis i kam.


<whispering between Feven and Fylene>


Frinston: Ating mi long tingting blong mi? Yumi stap insaed long klasrum yumi lanem French yumi toktok French nomo insaed long yad blong skul. Be taem yumi go aot saed yumi jes toktok ol own lanwis blong yumi.

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que tu penses qu’on doit utiliser des autres langues par exemple l’anglais, le bichelamar, les langues d’Ambae plus souvent à l’école.” (3) Long tingting blong mi se long skul bae yumi lanem French mo Inglis. Blong yumi save toktok French mo Inglis long skul.
Feven: Mi tu long tingting blong mi () olsem bae yumi lanem French mo Inglis long skul. (2) Ol tija oli givim ol wok long yumi oli eksplenem long Inglis mo French i gud blong yumi lanem Inglis mo French.

(6)

Frazer: Mi long tingting blong mi? Mi luk se (1) bae yumi () bae yumi bae yumi lanem French mo () er Inglis nomo.

(4)

Frinston: Long tingting blong mi () ating olsem ol narawan oli talem? Ating () i gud blong yumi lanem French mo Inglis nomo.

(2)

F: Okei hemia fas pat blong hem? Bifo yu go on long nekis pat bae mi jes talem wan samting we mi forget/em. Sapos yu () especially yu <to Frinston> yu las wan evri taem? Sapos yu harem se ol narawan oli talem samting ia? Yu no nid blong talem sem samting. Sapos yu harem se blong yu i defren? Yu no fraet blong talem se no. Mi mi no agri wetem hemia. Mi mi ting se yumi sud yusum Bislama o () samting olsem. Yu no fil se () eh hem i talem hemia mi tu bae mi mas talem sem samting.

From mi luk se yufala evriwan i talem se yes mi tu. Mi tu. Be hemia fas pat hem i orae from fas pat ating bae yufala evriwan i gat sem tingting long hem. Be bae yumi kam daon long later kwestin ia? Bae yu luk se no samtaem yu no really agri wetem ol fren blong yu. Yu no fraet blong talem sam samting we hem i defren. Okei? Mo tu i no nid blong evri taem Fylene hem i fas wan blong givim tingting blong hem. Sapos wan blong yufala i harem se yu gat samting blong talem yu go insaed nomo. Okei o sapos Feven i no wantem toktok? Hem i stap nating yet? Ale yes <to Frazer> yu go insaed nomo yu go fastaem. Yu no wet se evri taem Frinston i las wan. (2) Okei? (2) Okei chairperson yu gohed bakegen.

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que tu es fort en anglais? Est-ce que tu aimerais le parler mieux.” (2) Long tingting blong mi mi laek- () Inglis i gud mo () bae yu toktok long () Inglis.

(3)

Frazer: Long mi mi luk se (1) uh mi lanem tufala lanwis ia? Mi luk se () Inglis olsem () naoia olsem () mi laekem blong lanem. Inglis. Olsem long tingting blong mi mi no save long tingting blong olgeta.

(4)

Frinston: Long tingting blong mi? Inglis mi no (1) laekem tumas nao from () samtaem mi rid mi no () andastanem? Ating () mi laekem blong lanem be () i no tumas.

(2)
Feven: Mi long ti- <clears throat> mi long tingting blong mi from Inglis? Taem mi skul French gogo mi kam long (. ) secondary taem mi lanem Inglis mi harem se i had long mi tu.

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que c’est bon que tu aies l’opportunité de savoir à la fois le français et l’anglais?”


Frinston: Ating mi long tingting blong mi? I gud blong lanem tufala (. ) lanwis ia wantaem. French mo (. ) Inglis.

F: From wanem. Traem talem ol risen blong yufala yu no olsem yes no nomo.

Frinston: From (. ) blong yu go aot saed luk er (. ) sam man we oli tok Inglis o French? Bae oli toktok long yu bae yu save toktok long olgeta.

Feven: Mi long tingting blong mi mi laekem. French mo Inglis? Blong yu go wea? Ol fren we oli no save toktok French mo Inglis bae yu save finis yu save toktok wetem olgeta.

Frazer: Mi tingting blong mi i sem mak nomo wetem tufala.

Fylene: Mi tu.

<all laugh>

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que c’est bon que le Vanuatu utilise à la fois le français et l’anglais.”

F: C’est la même question mais (. ) fas wan yumi tingbaot yu nomo olsem blong wanwan man yu luk se i gud. Be naoia yumi go long hol kaontri yu luk se i gud se Vanuatu i stap yusum tufala lanwis tugeta? O yu luk se hem i impoten o (. ) naoia yumi luk long hol kaontri wantaem.
Frinston: Mi long tingting blong mi mi luk se (.) hol Vanuatu i yusum (.) Inglis bitim er (.) French.

(2)

<Fylene and Feven laugh>.

(1)

Fylene: Ating long tingting blong mi se Vanuatu i yusum tufala (.) lanwis Inglis mo French.

F: Yu luk se hem i gud?

Fylene: Yes i gud.

F: From.

Fylene: Er.

<Feven laughs>

(6)

F: From wanem hem i gud.

Feven: Long olgeta we oli kam long oversea blong oli kam long Vanuatu? Bae oli (.) sapos oli save toktok Inglis wetem olgeta o French.

(8)

Frazer: Mi mi luk se (2) i gud. I gud blong yumi lanem (.) olsem long Vanuatu i gud blong yumi lanem tufala lanwis ia. From (.) se sapos (.) olgeta aot saed sapos oli kam stap long ples ia oli toktok French o Inglis hem i bae yumi tu bae yumi save (.) toktok long olgeta.

(13) <whispering. Others trying to make Frinston turn his chair round to face the others as he had slowly turned himself further from me and the group throughout the interview. Then whispers to Fylene to move to number 3>

Fylene: Namba 3. <reads> “Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones ont plus d’opportunités pour aller à l’étranger pour continuer leur éducation.”

(14)

Frazer: Long mi mi luk se uh (5) ol hem ol Inglis skul nomo (.) oli go (.) oli go aot saed long kaontri blong yumi blong oli lanem ol sam samting o::

(24) <whispering>

Frinston: Ating mi long tingting blong mi mi tu (.) i gud blong ol Francophone wetem Anglophone bae oli jes go aot saed blong (.) continue leur (.) édu.

Feven: <laughs> <whispers> Leur édu.
Frinston: Aot saed long kaontri blong yumi.

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones ont plus d’opportunités pour trouver un emploi?”


<whispers>

F: Be sapos yu no save hem i oraet. Yu talem nomo mi mi no save o samting olsem.

F: O sapos yu wantem gobak long narawan i oraet yu gobak.

Frazer: Mi luk se (7) ol Inglis ia? Ol olgeta we oli skul Inglis nao olsem oli (.) oli save (1) oli save kasem wok blong olgeta. Bitim ol (.) olsem ol French skul. Olsem long tingting blong mi mi luk se i olsem nao.

<whispers>

Frinston: Ating

Fylene: Ating i sem mak olsem Frazer i talem.

(9)

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones apprennent le français et l’anglais le mieux?”

<whispers>

Feven: <whispers to Frazer> Er kwestin?

(7)

Frazer: <to me> Yu traem eksplenem kwestin?

F: Okei hem i minim (.) hemia C uh?
Frazer: M-m.

F: Okei hem i min se (.) uh yu luk se ol Francophone? Oli (. ) oli save lanem Inglis mo French oli save tekem hariap? O ol Anglophone oli gud long saed blong lanwis.

Yu luk se i gat eni defrens long hem? O evriwan i sem mak nemo.

(1)

Frazer: Mi mi luk se (.) olsem mi mi skul ( .) from mi mi skul long French. Mi luk se ( .) taem mi skul French? Naoia mi stap long secondary mi luk se ( .) Inglis hem i isi blong mi blong mi lanem.

(4)

F: Be yu ting se blong ol Anglophone hem i defren?

Frazer: Mi luk se from ( .) mi harem sam styuden blong Anglophone ia sam se ( .) oli harem se hem i had blong ol lanem French. Be long mi mi luk se olsem mi luk se ( .) Inglis hem i isi nemo.

(7)

F: Yufala i traem tingbaot se from wanem? From wanem Inglis hem i isi blong yufala be French hem i had blong olgeta.

(10) <whispers>

Frinston: From taem yu skul long French yu (1) yu tekem French? Taem yu go blong yu (1) olsem tija blong Inglis i kam tijim yu hemia yu andastanem hariap nemo. From hem i sem mak nemo wetem (3) French.

(4)

F: Be ol Anglophone? Yu talem se Inglis hem i sem mak wetem French? So hemia i min se olgeta we oli skul Inglis? Oli no sud fesem had taem wetem French uh?

From tufala i sem mak nemo.

(1)

Frinston: Uh.

F: No mi no talem se tingting blong yu i rong be mi askem nemo se hao nao (. ) olsem mi mi harem sem samting fulap taem? Ol Anglophone oli harem se i had blong oli tekem French. Be mi no save from wanem? Wanem i defren?

(5)

Frazer: Mi from ( .) mi harem hem i isi nemo from
Feven: <whispers> Mifala i toktok.

(4)

Frazer: Yumi yusum toktok Bislama finis? Afta sam

(2)

Feven: C'était wod blong yumi long Inglis.

Frazer: Yes.

Feven: O

(4)

Frazer: Sam

Feven: <whispers> Sam wod blong yu.

Frazer: Mekem se <laughs>

Feven: <whispers> Sam wod?

Frazer: <laughs> Sam wod olsem () hem i klosap i kam olsem Inglis. Mekem se () oli toktok Inglis be hemia nao. Olsem naoia () yu save harem save nombo.

(21) <whispering>

Fylene: <reads> “A ton avis y a-t-il plus de personnes qui parlent le français ou l'anglais au Vanuatu.”

(3) <whispers>

F: So hem i min se sapos yumi kaontem evri man we i save toktok French long Vanuatu? Afta yumi kaontem evri man we oli toktok Inglis long Vanuatu? Yu luk se i hamas. Which wan i gat mo.

(1)

Fylene: Long tingting blong mi mi no save.

(4)

Feven: <whispers> Mi no save.

Frazer: Mi? Mi luk se () mi tu mi no save be (2) mi luk se (1) Inglis ia nao olsem. I fulap. I fulap. Fulap man i toktok er () Inglis.

(2)

Frinston: Ating blong mi bae mi no save talem.

<all laugh>
Feven: Mi tu (.) mi luk se ol man oli toktok Inglis.

(2)

Fylene: <reads> “A ton avis y a-t-il plus de personnes qui parlent le français ou l'anglais dans le monde.”

(9)

F: Hem i sem mak mais dans le monde entier. C'est pas au Vanuatu nomo. (8)

Long tingting blong yu nomo. Yu no fraet se i no stret ansa.

Frazer: Mi long tingting blong mi mi luk se (.) mi luk se mi no save.

Feven: Mi tu mi no save.

(15)

Frinston: Long tingting blong mi mi ting (1) fulap (1) oli toktok French? Samfala oli toktok Inglis.

(15)

Frazer: Yes. Mi mi luk se (2) long (1) most ia nao se (.) ol lanwis nao oli toktok plante long hem.

(26)

F: So yufala i ting se long Vanuatu mo man i toktok Inglis bitim French?

Fylene: Yes.

Feven: Uh-uh.

F: From wanem nomo yufala i ting se ol man oli toktok mo Inglis bitim French.

(5)

Frinston: From se (2) fulap Inglis skul.

(2)

Feven: From fulap man oli skul Inglis.

(4)

Frazer: Tingting blong mi olsem ia nao.

(2)

F: Okei blong foemap sem poen bakegen olsem (.) long section tri ia? Yu yu bin
talem se yu luk se ol man we oli skul Inglis oli save kasem job hariap. Oli save go
overseas blong stadi bakegen. From i gat fulap skul we oli skul Inglis. Yu luk se hem
i wan gud situation o no yu luk se i gat wan problem blong yufala we yufala i skul
French. Mekem se laef blong yu bae i had o (.) hemia i wan problem long Vanuatu.

(19)

Frazer: Mi luk se (1) olsem long Inglis oli (. ) olsem wok kwik from (. ) olsem fulap man olsem (. ) fulap wok Inglis. Olsem ol Inglis (. ) man (. ) mekem se (. ) naoia oli save (. ) er save

(3)

Frinston: <whispers> Save (. ) kasem.

Frazer: Oli save kasem wok blong olgeta hariap. Eksampol French skul from (. ) sam (. ) i no gat (1) fulap man we oli toktok French mekem se i no gat fulap wok. Oli no save (. ) continue.

(8)

F: Okei yumi muv i go long las pat uh?

(3)

Fylene: <reads> A ton avis, devrait-il y avoir un seul type d’écoles pour tout le monde au Vanuatu ou des écoles séparées pour des francophones et anglophones.

(20)

Frazer: Yu save eksplenem kwestin bakegen?


Yumi skul French. Longwe long Angolovo College olgeta oli skul Inglis. So i gat tu kaen skul. Inglis French. So long tingting blong yufala i gud se yumi gat tu kaen skul olsem naoia? O hem i mo gud se yumi joenem tufala tugeta i gat wan skul nomo.

(3)

Frazer: Mi mi luk se (. ) i gud blong yumi karem tufala tugeta. (3) From er (. ) olsem tugeta lanwis ia (. ) yumi stap toktok long hem. Olsem evri man i stap toktok long evri dei. Olsem yu save go aot long kaontri yu save toktok French o Inglis. Mekem se (. ) mi luk se i gud blong yumi lanem tufala (. ) lanwis tugeta. Tugeta lanwis.

(4)

Frinston: Mi long tingting blong mi mi no save se bae mi talem se olsem wanem. (3) Mi nomo save nomo se (. ) bae mi no save talem.
319  (2)
320  Fylene: Ating tingting blong mi i sem mak se Frazer we i talem finis.
321  (4)
322  F: Okei so sapos we yumi tekem tingting blong Frazer? I talem se yumi evriwan
323  yumi skul tufala tugeta. Hao nao bae i save wok. Yu traem talem se long Klas 1 i go
324  antap? Bae evri pikinini i yusum Inglis French wantaem? O yumi skul French
325  fastaem? Afta yumi jenis i go long Inglis? O yumi lanem Sciences Sociales long
326  Inglis Maths long French? Hao nao bae yumi save mekem. Olsem hemia nao mi
327  talem se i no gat wan strey blong hem be yumi save talem se yumi wantem se
328  yumi kasem tufala lanwis tugeta. Be traem tingbaot timetable blong skul. Blong Klas
329  1 i go antap. Hao nao bae yumi save mekem.
330  (10) <whispering>
331  Feven: Mi hareem se
332  Frinston: Mi hareem se i fasfas.
333  <all laugh>
334  F: Yu luk se Klas 1 bae oli olsem wanem. Bae oli yusum wanem lanwis.
335  Frinston: Oli yusum wan nomo.
336  (2)
337  F: Okei. Long Klas 2?
338  Frinston: Ating oli kam kasem long Klas
339  (2)
340  Fylene: 7.
341  Frinston: 6. Mi hareem se oli yusum wan lanwis nomo. Bae oli kam antap long Yia 7
342  afta bae oli jes stap yusum tufala.
343  F: So yu talem se bae oli yusum wan nomo long praemeri? Which wan.
344  Feven: <whispers> French.
345  Frinston: French o Inglis?
346  F: Min se bae i gat tufala skul yet? (.) Narawan i yusum Inglis narawan i yusum
347  French?
348  <all laugh>
349  F: Hemia nao yu luk se problem nao.
350  <all laugh loudly>
F: <to Fylene and Feven> Wanem tingting blong yutufala? <points to Frazer> Hem i talem se tufala wantaem uh? Be Frinston i talem se narawan fastaem ale narawan i joen long secondary?

Fylene: <whispers> Wan nomo.

F: Afta? Sapos yu stap long Ministri blong Edyukesen naoia? Bae yu talem wanem?

Fylene: <whispers> Wan nomo.

Frazer: Mi no save. Mi no save se bae(.) hem i talem wan lanwis be bae yumi yusu which wan.

Feven: <whispers> Bae yumi yusu French.

Frinston: (xx)

F: Frinston? Yu traem toktok strong from smol samting ia nomo <points to voice recorder>. Yu traem talem tingting ia.

Frazer: Wanem tingting blong yu. <to Frinston>

Feven: French mo Inglis. Ol tija oli kam givim Inglis blong yumi bae yumi stap yusu.

Frazer: M-m.

F: Okei mi mi luk se yumi gat tri option i stap long tebol. Narawan ia? Hem i yumi evriwan yumi skul French fastaem? Kasem Yia 7 uh?

Frazer: M-m.

F: Afta Yia 7 bae yumi introduce/m Inglis i go insaed bae yumi yusu tufala tugeta.

Frazer: Uh?

Frazer: M-m.

Frinston: No.

F: No wanem tingting blong yu? Yu talem wan nomo be yu no save se which wan. Be i min se i stap long wanwan skul nomo blong jusum?

Frinston: No.

Frazer: Ating i gud blong yumi <laughs>

(6)

Fylene: Ating i gud blong yumi lanem tufala tugeta.

F: Long Klas 1 i go antap?

(3)

Fylene: Yia 7 i go antap.

F: Tija bae i (. ) olsen wanem. Bae i talem finis long French talem bakegen long Inglis?

(5)


F: Afta bae oli yusum wan lanwis nomo yet? Be narawan?

<all laugh>

F: Ol Anglophone oli yusum French nomo long secondary? (2) O tufala tugeta.

Frazer: Tufala tugeta.

<all laugh loudly>

(10) <whispers>

F: Eni mo samting blong ademap nomo?

<very quiet whispering – French and English are mentioned>

F: Yu wantem talem wan samting bakegen?
Feven: Talem.

Frinston: <very quiet> (xx)

Frazer: Toktok strong.

F: Mi tu mi no harem. Traem talem bakegen.

Frinston: Tingting blong mi ating bae mifala i yusum wan nomo. French.

F: Olwe i go kasem long Yia 13?

Frinston: M-m.

F: Min se lego Inglis nomo uh?

<all laugh>


Frinston: M-m. Yumi evriwan yumi skul French kasem Yia 13. Lego Inglis. <laughs>

Frazer: Mi luk se yumi lanem Bislama nomo.

<all laugh loudly>

F: Yu luk se hem i possible? Yumi yusum Bislama long skul.

Frinston: Non.

Feven: No.

F: From?

(3)

Frinston: From

(10)

Frazer: Sapos yumi lanem Bislama nomo? From klosap evriwan i toktok Bislama.

F: Yu ting se sapos ol tija oli tij oli yusum Bislama bae yu save kasem? (1) Bae hem i mekem se i mo isi blong yufala?

(1)

Fylene: Yes

Frinston: Yes::

F: Okei mi harem se bae yumi finis long ples ia nomo. Mi luk se yufala i wantem slip nomo.

<all laugh>
F: Okei. Yumi finis long ples ia nomo. Tangkiu tumas blong taem blong yufala.
Appendix xii – Interview with Collège de Faranako Student Group
(Translation)

Date: 02-11-11

Location: An empty classroom

Participants: Fylene, Feven, Frazer, Frinston

Notes: I hadn't been able to arrange my visit in advance, and I discovered on arrival that there was no school that day because the teachers were in a meeting. There were quite a few students around, so I asked Fylene and Feven if they would be willing to take part. They then saw Frazer up by the dormitory so called him down, and he found Frinston to make up the group. Frazer is considered to be an above average student, according both to class records and my own language assessment. Fylene and Feven are considered to be average students. Frinston is considered to be below average.

Having given students time to read the questions, I asked whether there were any that they wanted me to explain. They said no, although it became clear later on that they weren't sure about some of them. Later in the interview, they did ask me to explain a few.

I appointed Fylene as chairperson to keep the discussion moving. As a result, students tended to answer questions round in the group.

1 Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que tu trouves que c’est facile ou difficile d’utiliser le
français pour apprendre toutes les matières.” (2) In my opinion? (. ) Because I’ve
learnt it through primary and secondary it’s easy to (. ) easy to speak French. (2) In
every subject.

5 (5)

6 Feven: Me (2) Me too it is easy for me because since I was in primary? I’ve learnt it
until now. In every subject.

8 Frinston: Speak loudly.

10 (7)

10 Frazer: Me too in my opinion I think that (1) from (. ) the time I started primary and
came to secondary I think that (. ) uh (. ) French is not (. ) is not hard for me. I think
that it is (. ) easy.

14 Frinston: That’s my opinion. (2) Because I’ve learnt it since primary.

15 Frazer: Speak loudly.
Frinston: Already? It means that the subjects which the teachers give us are easy.

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que tu es fort en français? Est-ce que tu aimerais le parler mieux?” In my opinion I like it. I like French? At school? And I like speaking French too.

Feven: Me too in my opinion I like speaking French because I learnt it when I was little. I am learning it to I like learning to speak it.

Frazer: Me too. For the language French? I think it’s easy for me to learn it.

Frinston: Like the others have already said? Maybe I like speaking French because I started it in primary onwards.

Fylene: <reads> “Les étudiants ne parlent pas souvent le français au dehors de la classe. Pourquoi.” My opinion is that students should speak French in the school yard. And they should just go outside to speak their own language.

Frazer: I think that like in class? It's like we you cannot speak our other languages. We can only speak the language that we learn in school. But like outside? Outside school? It's like we can speak lanwis or Bislama like in the school yard. Inside class we can only speak French or English.

Frinston: Maybe me in my opinion? When we are in the classroom we learn French and we speak French only in the school yard. But when we go outside we just speak our own languages.

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que tu penses qu’on doit utiliser des autres langues par exemple l’anglais, le bichelamar, les langues d’Ambae plus souvent à l’école.” In my opinion at school we learn French and English. So we can speak French and English at school.
Feven: Me too in my opinion (.) like we learn French and English at school. (2)

When the teachers give us work they explain in English and French so it's good that we learn English and French.

Frazer: In my opinion? I think that (1) we should (..) we should learn French and (..) English only.

Frinston: In my opinion (.) as the others have said? Maybe (..) it's good to learn just French and English.

F: Okay that's the first part? Before you go on to the next part let me just say something that I forgot. If you (..) especially you <to Frinston> you are the last one each time? If you feel that the others have said one thing? You don't need to say the same. If you feel that for you it's different? Don't be afraid to say no. I don't agree with that. I think we should use Bislama or (..) something like that. Don't feel that (..) eh she said that so I have to say the same thing. Because it seems that all of you are saying yes me too. Me too. But for the first part that's okay because maybe you all have the same opinions about it. But when we come down to the later questions? You will find that something you don't really agree with your friends. Don't be afraid to say something different. Okay? And also Fylene doesn't always need to be the first one to give her opinion. If one of you feels that you have something to say just go in. Okay or if Feven doesn't want to speak? She's not saying anything? Okay yes <to Frazer> you just go in you go first. You don't have to wait so that Frinston is always the last one. (2) Okay? (2) Okay chairperson you go ahead again.

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que tu es fort en anglais? Est-ce que tu aimerais le parler mieux.” (2) In my opinion I like- (..) English it's good (..) if you speak in (..) English.

Frazer: For me I think that (1) uh I learn both languages? I think that (..) English like (..) now like (..) I like learning. English. Like that's my opinion I don't know what the others think.

Frinston: In my opinion? English I don’t (1) like it much because (..) sometimes when I read I don’t (..) understand? Maybe (..) I like learning it but (..) not too much.

Feven: Me in- <clears throat> in my opinion English? As I've learnt French all the way up to (..) secondary now I'm learning English I find it's hard for me too.
Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que c'est bon que tu aies l'opportunité de savoir à la fois le français et l'anglais?”

(2) <Fylene and Feven whispering>

F: You (...) you er what do you think? Do you think it's good that you can learn English and French together? Or do you think that it doesn't really help you. You could just learn French. Do you think it's good that you learn both languages together.

(4)

Frinston: Maybe in my opinion? It's good that we learn both (...) these languages together. French and (...) English.

(2)

F: Why. Try to give reasons and not just say yes or no.

Frinston: Because (...) when you go out and meet er (...) people who speak English or French? When they speak to you you can speak to them.

(2)

Feven: In my opinion I like them. French and English? Wherever you go? If you have friends who don't speak French and English you know them already so you can talk to them.

(8)

Frazer: I think the same as those two.

(2)

Fylene: Me too.

<all laugh>

(3)

Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que c'est bon que le Vanuatu utilise à la fois le français et l'anglais.”

F : It's the same question but (...) the first one we were thinking about you like as an individual if you think it's good. But now let's think about the whole country do you think it's good that Vanuatu uses both languages together? Or do you think that it is important or (...) now we are thinking about the whole country.

(6)

Frinston: In my opinion I think that (...) the whole of Vanuatu uses (...) English more than er (...) French.

(2)
122  <Fylene and Feven laugh>.
123  (1)
124  Fylene: In my opinion Vanuatu uses both languages English and French.
125  F: Do you think that’s good?
126  Fylene: Yes it’s good.
127  F: Because.
128  Fylene: Er.
129  <Feven laughs>
130  (6)
131  F: Why is it good.
132  Feven: For those who come from overseas to Vanuatu? They so they can speak
133  English with them or French.
134  (8)
135  Frazer: I think that it’s good. It’s good for us to learn like for Vanuatu it’s good
136  that we learn these two languages. Because if people from outside come here
137  and they speak French or English then we can also talk to them.
138  (13) <whispering. Others trying to make Frinston turn his chair round to face the
139  others as he had slowly turned himself further from me and the group throughout
140  the interview. Then whispers to Fylene to move to number 3>
141  Fylene: Number 3. <reads> “Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones ont
142  plus d’opportunités pour aller à l’étranger pour continuer leur éducation.”
143  (14)
144  Frazer: To me it seems that uh it’s only English schools who go outside our country to learn things or
145  (24) <whispering>
146  Frinston: In my opinion maybe it’s good for Francophones and Anglophones to
147  go out to continue their education.
148  Feven: <laughs> <whispers> Their education.
149  Frinston: Outside our country.
150  (15)
151  Fylene: <reads> “Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones ont plus
152  d’opportunités pour trouver un emploi?”
F: For every question in this section? Think about Anglophones? People who school English? Francophones who school French. So for the first one. Who has more chances to go overseas to study. Who has the best chance to get a job. Do you think that it’s mainly Anglophones who get jobs? Or mainly Francophones who get jobs or both together.

F: But if you don’t know that’s okay. Just say that you don’t know.

F: Or if you want to go back to the other one that’s okay go back.

Frazer: I think that those who school English now like they can find work for themselves. More easily than those from French schools. Like in my opinion I think it’s like that.

Frinston: Maybe

Fylene: It’s maybe like Frazer says.

Fylene: “Est-ce que les Francophones ou les Anglophones apprennent le français et l’anglais le mieux?”

Feven: Er the question?

Frazer: Can you explain the question?

F: Okay it means C uh?

Frazer: M-m.

F: Okay it means uh do you think that Francophones? They learn English and French do they learn them easily? Or are Anglophones good at languages. Do you think there is any different between them? Or is everyone just the same.
Frazer: I think that (.) like I learnt (.) because I school French. I think that (.) when I school French? Now I’m at secondary I think that (.) English is easy for me to learn.

F: Do you think it’s different for Anglophones?

Frazer: I think that (.) I’ve heard some Anglophone students say (.) they find it hard to learn French. But for me I think it’s like I think that (.) English is easy.

F: Can you try and think about why? Why is English easy for you but French is hard for them.

Frinston: For me? I school French and English is easy for me. When you school English to come to French (.) is hard for you.

<Feven and Fylene laugh>

(whispers)

Frinston: Because when you school French you (1) you take French? When you go (1) like the English teachers come and teach you that you can understand easily. Because it’s just the same as (3) French.

F: But Anglophones? You say that English is the same as French? So that means that those who school English? They shouldn’t face a hard time with French uh? Because they’re both the same.

Frinston: Uh.

F: I’m not saying that your idea is wrong but I’m just asking how (.) like I’ve heard the same thing many times? Anglophones find it hard to learn French. But I don’t know why? What is different?

Frazer: For me (.) I just find it easy because

Feven: <whispers> We speak.

Frazer: We use we already speak Bislama? And some
Feven: They are the words from English.

Frazer: Yes.

Feven: Or

Frazer: Some

Feven: <whispers> Some of your words.

Frazer: <laughs> Some words like (.) they are similar to English. So (.) they speak English but that's it. Like now (.) you can understand.

(21) <whispering>

Fylene: <reads> “A ton avis y a-t-il plus de personnes qui parlent le français ou l'anglais au Vanuatu.”

(3) <whispers>

F: So this means that if we count all the people who speak French in Vanuatu? And then we count all the people who speak English in Vanuatu? How many do you think. Which one has more.

(1)

Fylene: In my opinion I don't know.

(4)

Feven: <whispers> I don't know.

Frazer: Me? I think that (.) me too I don't know but (2) I think that (1) It's English now like. There are many. Many. Many people speak er (.) English.

(2)

Frinston: For me I don't think I can say.

<all laugh>

Feven: Me too (.) I think that people speak English.

(2)

Fylene: <reads> “A ton avis y a-t-il plus de personnes qui parlent le français ou l'anglais dans le monde.”
F: That’s the same but in the whole world. It’s not just in Vanuatu. (8) Just in your opinion. Don’t worry if it’s not the right answer.

Frazer: In my opinion I think that (.) I don’t think I know.

F: So you think that in Vanuatu more people speak English than French?

Fylene: Yes.

Feven: Uh-uh.

F: Why do you think that people speak more English than French.

Frinston: Because there are (2) many English school.

Feven: Because many people school English.

Frazer: That’s what I think.

F: Okay to follow up the same point again like (.) in section three? You said that you thought that people who school English can get a job quickly. They can go overseas to study again. Because there are lots of English schools. Do you think that this is a situation or do you think there is a problem for those of you who school French. Does it mean that your life will be hard or (.) is this a problem in Vanuatu. (24)

Because we are talking about us in Vanuatu? We are not talking about a book that is talking about a country on the other side of the world. It’s like us here in a French school. So when you talk about people who school French? You are talking about yourselves now. So do you think this situation is okay? Or (.) like what will your lives be like.
Frazer: I think that (1) like English speakers (.) find jobs quickly (.) like many people like (. ) many work in English. Like English (. ) speakers (. ) so (.) now they can (. ) er can

(3)

Frinston: <whispers> can (.) get.

Frazer: They can find work easily. For example French schools (.) some (.) there aren’t (1) many people who speak French so there isn’t much work. They can’t (. ) continue.

(8)

F: Okay shall we move to the last part uh?

(3)

Fylene: <reads> A ton avis, devrait-il y avoir un seul type d’écoles pour tout le monde au Vanuatu ou des écoles séparées pour des francophones et anglophones.

(20)

Frazer: Can you explain the question again?

F: Okay. So let me say first that this is a question that doesn’t have an answer. Just think about your own ideas. The teachers yesterday? They couldn’t answer this question. We just trying to think which one is best. So the question is (.) at the moment in Vanuatu? We have two kinds of school. Here? We school French. Down there at Angolovo College they school English. So there are two kinds of school. English French. So in your opinion is it good that we have two kinds of school like this? Or would it be good if we joined the two together into one school.

(3)

Frazer: I think that (. ) it would be good if we brought the two together. (3) Because er (. ) like both these languages (. ) we speak them. Like everybody speaks them every day. Like you can go out of the country and speak French or English. So (. ) I think that it’s good to learn both (. ) language together. Both languages.

(4)

Frinston: In my opinion I don’t know what I would say. (3) I don’t know (. ) I can’ say.

(2)

Fylene: I think my opinion is the same as what Frazer said.

(4)

F: Okay so if we take Frazer’s idea? He said that all of us should school together. How would it work. Try and say from Class 1 upwards? Would all children use English and French at the same time? Or would we learn French first? And then
change to English? Or would we learn Social Science in English Maths in French?

How would you do it. Like this is what I said there is no straight answer but we can say that we want us to learn both languages together. But try and think about the school timetable. From Class 1 upwards. How would we do it.

(10) <whispering>

Feven: I think

Frinston: I think it would be a mess.

<all laugh>

F: What would they do in Class 1. Which languages would they use.

Frinston: They would use just one.

(2)

F: Okay. In Class 2?

Frinstein: They should come to maybe Class

(2)

Fylene: 7.

Frinston: 6. I think they should just use one language. They would come up to Year 7 and then just use two.

F: So you say that they should use just one in primary? Which one.

Feven: <whispers> French.

Frinston: French or English?

F: Do you mean there would still be two schools? (. ) Some using English and others using French?

<all laugh>

F: That’s it you see the problem.

<all laugh loudly>

F: <to Fylene and Feven> What do you two think? <points to Frazer> He says both at the same time uh? But Frinston says one first and then join the other one at secondary?

Feven: <whispers> Just one.

F: So? If you were at the Ministry of Education now? What would you say?

<all laugh>
Frinston: I don't know.

Frazer: I don't know (.) he says one language but which one would we use.

(2)

Feven: <whispers> We would use French.

Frinston: (xx)

F: Frinston? Try and speak clearly because of this thing <points to voice recorder>. Do you want to say your idea.

(10)

Frazer: What's your idea. <to Frinston>

<all laugh>

Fylene: Say it.

Feven: In my opinion we should use French when we’re in primary school upwards. Until Class 6. Then when we (?) go to secondary in Year 7 we should go to

Fylene: <whispers> Both languages.

Feven: French and English. The teachers will come and give English to us and then we'll use it.

(2)

F: Okay it seems we have three options on the table. One? We all school French first? Up to Year 7 uh?

Frazer: M-m.

F: And then in Year 7 we introduce English and we use both together. Uh?

Frazer: M-m.

F: Okay that’s one option. I will ask each of you to decide which one. Another option? We join the two so that from Class 1 onwards? There is some English and some French. Or the last option? We leave it? Some just use English? Some just use French? Up to Year 7. And then (?) we combine them uh?

Frinston: No.

F: No what's your idea? You said just one but you don't know which one. But do you mean it's just up to each school to choose?

Frinston: No.

Frazer: I think we should <laughs>

(6)
Fylene: I think we should learn both together.

F: From Class 1 upwards?

Fylene: Year 7 upwards.

F: How will the teachers do it. Will they use French first and then repeat it in English?

Frazer: Maybe those in primary those in English will speak um English? Then? Those uh on the Francophone side will speak French? Up to Class 6? And then Francophones like starting from Year 7 upwards? Speak English. And then? The others others like the others in Anglophone will change the language and try and speak French.

F: So they will still use one language only? But the other one?

<all laugh>

F: Anglophones will use French only in secondary? Or both together.

Frazer: Both together.

<all laugh loudly>

F: Any other ideas to add?

<very quiet whispering – French and English are mentioned>

F: You want to say something else?

Feven: Say it.

Friston: <very quiet> (xx)

Frazer: Speak loudly.

F: I didn’t hear either. Try and say it again.

Friston: In my opinion I think we should just one. French.

F: All the way up to Year 13?

Friston: M-m.

F: So just leave out English uh?

<all laugh>
F: It's alright you can say that. Like it's a possibility. We could all just school French.

Frinston: M-m. We should all just school French up to Year 13. Leave out English.

F: Mm. We should all just school French up to Year 13. Leave out English.

Frazer: I think we should just use Bislama.

<laughs>

Frazer: I think we should just use Bislama.

<all laugh loudly>

F: Do you think that's possible? To use Bislama in school.

Frinston: No.

Feven: No.

F: Because?

(3)

Frinston: Because

(10)

Frazer: What if we just learnt Bislama? Because almost everyone speaks Bislama.

F: Do you think that if the teachers taught using Bislama would you understand? (1)

Would it make it easier for you?

(1)

Fylene: Yes

Frinston: Yes::

F: Okay I think maybe we should just finish here. You're all looking really tired.

<all laugh>

F: Okay. Let’s finish here. Thank you all for your time.
Appendix XIII – Interview with Angolovo College Teacher Group 1 (Original)

Date: 01-11-11

Location: On the grass outside a teacher’s house

Participants: Miss Adina, Miss Agnes, Mr Aru

Notes: This was originally intended to be a pilot interview, but it went smoothly and all participants agreed that I could use the data. At the end, they suggested electing a chairperson to keep the discussion moving, and I followed this suggestion in subsequent interviews.

Miss Adina and Miss Agnes had agreed in advance to take part. Two others didn’t show up so I grabbed Mr Aru at the last minute. I realised as we sat down that Mr Aru was quite senior to the other two, and had been at the school for a long time, while Miss Agnes and Miss Adina were relatively new. I didn’t want the Mr Aru to dominate, and did raise this issue. Mr Aru also pointed out that all three participants were English teachers, which was not ideal.

By this time, it was getting late, so we just sat under the tree outside Mr Aru’s house, rather than looking for a suitable location. This presented certain noise problems, particularly when the chapel service started nearby. A few parts are also obscured by rooster noises.

I explained the format and gave participants time to read the questions before starting the recording.
mi mas kamdaon long level blong olgeta (. ) eksplenen slowly or putum long simple terms. Sometimes? I can go as far as explaining it in Bislama. (1) From se mi ting se olsem (. ) long eria me mi tijim ia hem i ing- (. ) hem i lanwis? So it doesn't matter if I use any language in passing on the knowledge. Be olsem (. ) since skul rul/s hem i stap hem i talem se (. ) uh yes English is er medium of passing instruction so (1) mas yusum Inglis evri taem? Be sometimes se out of school taem oli kam askem mi for help? Long haos? Mi tend to use Bislama sometimes to (. ) explain things easier blong oli easier blong oli grasp/em aedia. (1) Yeah and I think styuden/s oli tekem oli no (. ) oli faenem Inglis i difficult. Afta? Oli no save tekem tumas samting long Inglis be oli (. ) oli tend to andastanem samting yu eksplen long Bislama. (2) And then yes. Afta mi se both (. ) both (. ) both English and Bislama mi save yusum blong mi save pasem knowledge since language is any language (1) yusum blong communicate/em information.

(4)

Miss Agnes: Okei mi ating long lukluk blong mi? Olsem mi:: (. ) er fastaem we olsem blong mi tijim Inglis? Hem i mi faenem i had lelebet blong mi tijim from (. ) er (. ) olsem (. ) mi mi bin er (. ) olsem go long French fastaem. French skul so taem mi kam blong tijim Inglis olsem fulap taem bae mi mas prepare/em mi wan fastaem? Olsem especially taem fas yia blong mi mi tij. Afta taem se i kam go olsem naolia seken yia? Mi mi filim se naolia olsem se (. ) mi save yusum (. ) i streit nomo long klas wetem ol styuden. Be samtaem bae ol styuden bae oli nid blong mi ripitim bakegen mi wan? Samtaem i no kila tumas long olgeta so bae mi mas ripitim (. ) er (. ) instruction blong mi bakegen blong mekem i mo kila long olgeta. So (. ) i no isi tumas blong mi blong mi (. ) er yusum long klasrum. Hemia lukluk blong mi.

Mr Aru: Long seken pat blong kwestin se (. ) <translates from question> ol styuden oli faenem i isi o i had? Olsem Miss Adina hem i talem hem i (. ) hem i (. ) i gat few styuden/s nomo we bae oli traem blong (. ) yu givim ol explanation long Inglis we olgeta i grab/em (. ) er straightaway. Fulap blong olgeta bae yu introduce-m bae yu ripitim sem information o sapos no? Olsem long level blong pikinini olsem Bislama yumi yusum hem i much more kila long olgeta? Olgeta i prefer blong yu givim wan explanation long Bislama. And wan o tu taem i gat sam (. ) olsem ol streit styuden/s we oli kam long (. ) we mifala i yusum sem lanwis? Bae mi mi traem bes blong mi blong eksplenem long lanwis. And mi luk i gat sam oli andastanem Bislama? Sam oli andastanem long lanwis much quicker than Bislama.

(2)

Miss Adina: Yes olsem bak tu long (. ) bak long kwesten ia bakegen? From se (. ) olsem yumi stap traem blong yusum from olsem purpose blong yumi hem i blong helpem ol styuden uh? Afta olsem taem yumi yusum tumas Bislama? Yusum tumas lanwis. Olsem mi samtaem mi stap mekem? Afta bae mi faenem se in the end bae olgeta nomo oli suffer/em consequences because they are writing their exams in English. (1) Afta (. ) olsem bae mi mas traem bes blong mi (. ) se taem mi yusum Bislama long klas o aot saed of klas be mi mas sometimes yusum Inglis afta olsem (. ) blong pasem on knowledge from se bae oli stil raetem eksam/s long Inglis. Hem i difficult blong styuden/s i grasp/em samting long Inglis olsem (. ) olsem sam
styuden/s nomo oli (. ) oli save hariap blong tekem long Bislama (1) I mean English
but Bislama? Olsem oli save tekem i isi nomo. Wetem lanwis. (1) And also long (. )
olsem (3) long seken kwestin ia? Afta ( . ) afta we olsem (. ) sapos (. ) mi luk se oli no
save grasp/em samting long Inglis? Afta dis taem olsem (. ) taem yu mekem (. ) i
mekem yu yu eksplenen samting long Bislama? <laughs> Afta nao yumi stap
competent long nara lanwis nao. So mi samtaem bae mi go be bae mi mas gat wan
limit we you stop here. Yu no eksplenen <laughs> tumas samting long Bislama.
With lanwis. (1) Own mother tongue.

(5)

Mr Aru: Long long seken (. ) long seken kwestin ia? Ating long seken pat blong (. )
yusum that language. But er ( . ) all the time because Inglis? Hem i wan seken lanwis
blong yumi. So yumi ol seken lanwis speakers blong Inglis? Yumi no speak that
fluent. Olsem uh yufala ol fas speakers blong Inglis. So er hem i really (. ) wan nid.
Though mi toktok mi fil comfortable wetem ol ( . ) lanwis blong mi be mi stil wantem
sapos mi save improve/um (. ) mo. Mi save improve/um mo. Long sense se (. ) taem
we yu speak/im fluently? Then hem i not only fluent. But hem i mekem i isi. I isi long
olgeta listeners we oli stap lisin. Sapos yu (. ) yu speak/im olsem wan (. ) wan starter
blong lanwis then hem i really had blong olgeta oli andastanem yu. So mi lukum
hemia we hem i stap long ples ia? Olsem (. ) at this point of time mi confident? But
mi really wantem save hao nao mi save improve/um ia. (12) And blong add up long
hemia bakegen? Bae yumi faenemoat (. ) ol (. ) ol contexts o ol environment we yumi
stap yusum lanwis long hem? Hem i (. ) hem i mekem a lot of difference. Hem i
contribute to difference blong hao yu yusum. Er samtaem olsem sapos we yumi
stap in front of students hemia you speak very fluent.

Miss Adina: M-m.

Mr Aru: Be sapos yumi stap wetem defren (. ) mature people naoia bae lanwis ia i go
defren nao. Bae hem i nomo <Miss Adina and Miss Agnes laugh> sem mak olsem
blong toktok wetem olgeta

Miss Adina: Tru.

Mr Aru: Ol styuden/s.

(6)

Miss Adina: Yes tru ia. I tru tumas long context. Different context you tend to use
different (. ) languages. Long (. ) afta antap long hem tu olsem (. ) ol defren concepts.
Ol defren concepts we yu yusum? Samtaem hem i ol (. ) yumi nid we oli foreign? O
samtaem i gat nem (. ) i gat nem blong hem nomo long Inglis? So taem yu talem
nem blong hem long Inglis? Naoia you tend to use English. Afta sapos concept ia
hem i olsem (. ) hem i wan local concept nomo? Bae you tend to use Bislama o uh
own mother tongue taem yu stap traem blong olsem. Olsem defren concepts ia? Oli
karem ol defren lanwis we yumi stap yusum. (5) Um yes. Long namba (. ) kwestin C
ia? <reads> “Students and staff do not speak English very often outside the
classroom. Why is this.” <laughs> (3) Mi mi ting se (. ) ating yes. Environment tu
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<laughs> hem i (. ) taem yumi long klasrum yumi luk se (. ) taem yumi klasrum afta
yumi se klasrum yumi tok Inglis nomo. Be taem mi stap long haos blong mi o long
wan defren aot saed environment? Mi save toktok eni lanwis olsem mi wantem.
<laughs> Afta olsem expressing myself hem i more easier tu.

Mr Aru: Long kwestin C ia? Hao we mi lukum and most of the time mi traem blong
faenemaot ansa blong hem. From wanem yumi olsem. And then mi come up to
maen blong mi hem i olsem. Taem we mi lukum wan Ni-Vanuatu? Olsem
straightaway bae mi laek blong speak long hem long Bislama nomo. (1) Er i no
minim se mi no no toktok that language be taem we mi lukum wan man we olsem
wan man Vanuatu? Olsem straightaway hemia wan (. ) mentality i kam finis se bae
mi mas tok Bislama long hem. Be bae yu faenem defrens long skul uh? Olsem
yufala? Yufala i kam wetem ol expatriate tija/s oli stap wetem mifala? Aot saed bae
mi mi tok long yu long Inglis nomo. Be wetem wan man Vanuatu no. Mi tok Bislama
long hem nomo. So hem i come to wan (. ) olsem wan attitude uh? Wan attitude.
Taem we yumi lukum whoever hem i kam? Then straightaway yumi decide wanem
lanwis nao bae mifala i yusum.

Miss Agnes: Ating long ples ia tu mi luk se sapos we (. ) olsem ol pikinini oli gro i
kam antap? Olsem oli (. ) sapos oli stat yusum Inglis i kam gogo oli go long skul?
Ating bae hem i (. ) hem i isi blong oli yusum inside and outside. From taem oli grow
up i kam oli yusum Bislama o lanwis olsem. Afta taem oli kam long skul bae oli sem
blong yusum (. ) uh hemia nao. Bislama o lanwis instead of uh (. ) Inglis outside the
classroom. Mi ting se wan (. ) risen hemia nao. Olsem ol pikinini oli (. ) lan blong
yusum tumas Bislama o lanwis finis i kam.

F: Mi save askem yufala i toktok strong lelebet. Mi wari se smol samting ia bae i no
save kasem. Mi fraet nomo se (. ) bae mi save check afta? Be lukaot mi lusum evri
data blong yufala.

Mr Aru: Okei long (. ) olsem hemia namba tri kwestin ia hem i (. ) hem i sem mak
olsem bae yumi tokbaot context long we yumi stap long hem. Mi givim eksampol. Er
yumi stap wetem olgeta (. ) ol Fijian. Hemia straightaway bae yumi tok Inglis nomo.
No matter what the (. ) olsem wan understanding behind that is these people don't
know how to speak er Bislama so straightaway bambae yu (. ) be olsem mi mi
harem blong mi? Se why yumi tok English we olgeta i save andastanem Bislama
nomo. So bambae yumi stap communicate wetem Bislama ia nao. (1) Ating i no gat
eni spesel risen we biaen long that one? Then mi ting se hem i matter of wan
attitude we you get used to that attitude we yu wantem speak/im in Bislama. (19)
Nekis kwestin D ia? Hem i (. ) ating yumi discuss/em lelebet pat blong hem antap ia?
Wetem hemia bae yumi kambak bakegen nao hem i (. ) ol lanwis/es yumi save
yusum be yumi yusum long ol specific taem ol risen/s blong hem. Then bambae
yumi save yusum olgeta. Like for example sapos yu (. ) yu save yusum Bislama nao
sapos we wan explanation i go to wan extent we olgeta ol styuden oli nomo
andastanem? Nao bae yu kamdaon ia nao. Be (.) olsem kwestin about whether
yumi save yusum olgeta insaed long klasrum mi ting se bae yumi save mekem. But
only that (.) hao we yumi provide/em syllabus long olgeta lanwis/es ia bambae hem i
must be long wan depth (.) quality so bambae yumi save yusum. Olsem mi mi
tekem eksampol naoia? Long Bislama ia? Yumi no really save yusum because yu
faenemaot se most long olgeta vocabularies ia? Yumi no save (.) yumi no save.
Yumi tend to yusum wan wod for two three four five different things. So taem we
yumi yusum olsem ia? Yumi practise/im wan (.) pikinini se (.) taem we oli kam bae
(.) taem we oli gobak long Inglis? Then olgeta bae oli adoptem Bislama system ia
bae i go long Inglis. Then hem i really had blong olgeta i (.) express/em olgeta long
Inglis.

Miss Adina: I tru. Ol styuden/s oli faenem i had taem yu eksplen long Bislama? Oli
putum daon long pepa i had we. So eni single wod we yu author/em in Inglis?

They tend to copy down everything you say. Olsem word by word. So
blong oli save yusum insaed long essay blong olgeta. O samtaem bae oli askem yu
blong yu ripitim bakegen wanem yu talem long Inglis? From se (.) olgeta i had blong
i translate/em i kam long (.) olsem (1) raetem daon insaed long olsem (.) long own
wod/s blong olgeta. Afta mi luk se i no fair. Considering polisi blong yumi which is (.)
er what’s it? (2) er that all children can go to school. Have equal chances in
education. So sapos oli save grasp/em samting better in Bislama? Why don’t we
use Bislama all throughout o (1) so mi ting se olsem (.) polisi blong yumi olsem hem
i talem. Equal chances evri pikinini bae oli mas (.) olsem gat edyukesen be (.) sapos
oli no save grasp/em samting long Inglis? Afta? Hemia ia i no suit/um polisi i no
satisfy/em polisi blong yumi nao. Be sapos sapos oli save andastanem samting
better in Bislama? There is no harm in expl- (.) be problem ia nomo from sam long
ol samting long Bislama? Oli minim olsem Mr Aru i talem? Tu tri samting at once. So
mi ting se sapos olsem (.) sapos oli save andastanem samting long Bislama? (1)
Why not tijim olgeta long Bislama. From se purpose hem i them grasping the
knowledge. From olsem for example? In Fijian they use standard Fijian blong (.)
oli toktok. And in Samoa? Oli skul long lanwis blong ol. In Tonga they (.) oli skul
long lanwis blong ol. Why don’t we use Bislama olsem standard lanwis olsem.
Nasonal lanwis blong yumi. (2) Yes. <laughs>

Mr Aru: Yes bae yumi gobak long (.) long lanwis ia. Yu putum wan eksampol long
plies ia olsem Ambaean lanwis. Um mi really agri wetem hemia olsem bae yumi
save yusum lanwis blong tijim long skul/s. But only provided that er yumi gat yumi
prepare/em wan syllabus. So that yumi folem syllabus. From sapos we yumi go (.)
olsem long own tingting blong yumi? Then bambae yumi tijim so many different
things. Er but mi mi agri wetem lanwis? Because er (.) sapos yumi compare/em
olgeta lanwis (.) lanwis I mean mother tongue Ambaean lanwis wetem Bislama? Er
Ambaean lanwis hem i mo rich. Bitim er Bislama. Hem i mo rich long in terms of
vocabulary. And then olgeta (.) ol uh oda blong olgeta sentens we yumi raetem
olgeta (.) i gud. And then mi bilivim plante from bae mi givim eksampol se sapos we
(.) er wan pikinini we i grow up hem i yusum lanwis nomo. Bambae yu faenemaot se
pikinini ia taem hem i lanem seken lanwis bae hem i master/em much more quicker than blong i yusum Bislama. Because er long that language we hem i yusum ia? I
gat ol vocabularies we bae oli similar long Inglis nomo. Er i gat wod blong hemia
long lanwis ia? We i gat long Inglis blong yu(.) you just conv- olsem translate/em
mining blong hem hem i go. Mi mi lukum at the moment? Olsem long(.) long (.)
edyuken polisi blong yumi hem i stap tokbaot(.) ol priskul/s oli stap long er
vernacular. But then hao mi bin visitim hamas we mi lukum. Hem i no really wok aot
long sense se oli traem aot. Olsem(.) long(.) long beginning blong hem? Oli traem
aot blong yusum evri lanwis/es i go without mentioning any word in English? And
then taem oli go kasem longwe? Taem blong translate nao i had. I had nao. So hao
we mi lukum? Yumi save yusum effectively nomo sapos we(.) yumi(.) yumi(.) yumi
draft/em wan syllabus we bae hem i(.) wan core syllabus? Er English and then i gat
lanwis. Then? Taem oli go kasem the end? Automatically bae olgeta i save
master/em Inglis. Be sapos yumi ting se oh yumi go long(.) lanwis nomo? And then
bae yumi afta wan yia tu yia/s time? Bae ol pikinini olsem bae oli stat ova long (1)
Inglis bae i no wok. (2) That’s hao mi lukum. (19) Yes long sem kwestin yet about
French? Olsem hem i wan sort(.) olsem(.) wan(.) polisi blong kaontri blong yumi
se yumi traem evri bes blong yusum tufala lanwis/es ia. Insaed long olgeta skul/s
blong yumi. So yumi traem bes blong yumi olsem(.) er as much as possible so as
we yu(.) yu save(.) lanem(.) French lanwis samwea? O yu save toktok lelebet?
And then bambae hem i helpem lelebet. Olsem bae yumi talem ating bae yumi
discuss/em samwea raon the line ia be bae(.) hem i easier long sam pipol. Olsem
French oli kam blong lanem Inglis hem i no problem be blong yumi blong lanem
French? Hem i wan difficulty we hem i stap. Olsem. Unless oli starting(.) olsem
Miss Agnes hem i tokbaot? Yu start off wetem French then yu go long Inglis then
hem i oraeat. (17) Sapos long D yu no gat eni ting mo blong yumi tokbaot then yumi
muv on long nekis wan?

Miss Adina: Okei.

(2)

Mr Aru: <reads from question> “Do you speak French? Do you wish to speak it
better?” (1) Yes ating er bae(.) sam blong yumi bae oli talem yes? Sam bae oli
talem se hardly. Sam bae oli talem no nothing at all. (1) Er mi personally mi
andastanem French. Mi andastanem French be hao bae mi speak/im hemia olsem
se bae mi speak wetem olgeta very ol ol(.) ol start off blong speaking French. But
mi mi do andastan. Um only that sapos we eniwan we hem i speak French long(.)
wan conversation between two people long French se tufala i toktok slo? Nao bae
mi save andastanem be sapos oli go faster? Nao intres blong mi i lus nao. Bae mi
no save catch up wetem tufala nao. But er(.) mi intres. Mi intres since er kaontri(.)
kaontri Vanuatu hem i olsem wan bilingual kaontri and then most long olgeta
samting bae(.) raet nao hem i(.) oli meki i kam wan(.) wan demand we each
wan(.) o wan sitisen blong Vanuatu hem i mas traem blong gat janis blong
acquire/em tufala lanwis/es. Because sapos we for example yu tekem wan job long
ples ia bae mebi wan requirement long ples ia? You have to understand English
and French at the same time. So hem i meki hemia encourage/im(.)
encourage/im yumi se(.) yumi traem bes se sapos yu wan English speaker? You
learn French as well. And sapos yu wan French speaker? You learn English as well.
Miss Adina: <laughs> French.

<all laugh>

Miss Adina: French. (8) <laughs> Er French. Long mi? French. (2) Mebi ol basics yes. I mean je ne sais pas? Ca va? Ol kaen olsem ia oli isi blong mi andastanem isi blong mi speak. Smolsmol basics olsem smolsmol lanwis olsem. But olsem Mr Aru i talem blong mi kasem two French speaking people as they talk too fast? I cannot understand at all. Mi wis se mi save French <laughs> from se (.) not only for the purpose of communicating with French people? Be taem yu go aot olsem (.) yu go aot blong (.) aot saed long kaontri? Afta bae ol man oli luk yu? Sapos oli save se yu blong Vanuatu? Oli save se Vanuatu is a bilingual country? Afta yu sud save both languages. And it's (.) such a shame sapos yu save wan nomo. <laughs> <others laugh> Taem yu go sidaon long klas oli talem se hands up you who are from Vanuatu? Afta yu putum han blong yu i go antap afta oli askem yu yu save French <laughs> wetem English mi se no mi save Inglis nomo <laughs>. So hemia hem i wan sem sapos mi no save French. Mi really wantem lanem French. Wetem yes. (2)

Olsem apart blong Inglis. (3) Yes hem i wan interesting (1) i no (.) olsem (.) mi laekem harem ol man i stap toktok. Mi laekem saon blong hem. Mi laekem harem saon blong man i toktok French be mi blong mi toktok <laughs> i had lelebet ol smolsmol toktok nomo mi save talem be (.) deep conversation? Then bae mi no save andastanem mo mi no save talem nomo <laughs>. Be hem i gud blong ol Vanuatu (.) olsem ni-Vans? Should speak both English and French.

Miss Agnes: Okei ating long mi? French? Olsem mi save toktok French? Olsem mi save toktok French? Olsem mi talem mi bin go long French skul ating (.) mi mekem praemer long (.) long French skul so i mekem se (.) mi save toktok gud French. Afta be wan samting taem mi switch i go long Inglis? Olsem taem mi stap long environment we yumi yusum Inglis plante so mi no (.) olsem tend blong yusum French mekem se mi faenem i had bakegen blong mi stap toktok be mi andastanem fulwan? Olsem mi save uh wanem olsem long conversation mi save harem save evri samting. Taem mi stap tumas long environment we yumi no yusum French naoia olsem bae mi no save (.) toktok French tumas. Be (.) mi stap intres nomo blong mi toktok French ol taem.

F: Yu switch long wanem yia. Yia 7?

Miss Agnes: Yes Yia 7 mi go long Inglis. So mekem se (1) mi andastanem (.) French be i had blong toktok. Mi no stap toktok tumas long hem.

Miss Adina: Hao nao yu faenem Inglis? Taem yu switch i go. Isi.

(1)

Miss Adina: Why nao ol pikini oli faenem (.) olsem oli harem se i had blong toktok Inglis. Whereas French oli totally flexible.

(1)

Mr Aru: Mi (.) mi stap traem blong wokemaot uh risen (.) hemia olsem yu talem ia? Mi stap luk olsem se (.) mebi i gat plante risen/s be wan long olgeta because taem we yumi tijim Inglis long olgeta? Yumi (.) yumi traem blong encourage/im olgeta blong oli speak/im wan gud Inglis uh?

Miss Adina: Ah okei.

Mr Aru: So oli fraet ia. Oli fraet taem we oli no save mekem wan (.) oli yusum ol tenses (.) ol raet tenses wetem (.) pronunciation (.) dis taem oli tend (.) hem i givim wan threat long olgeta. Nogud bae mi mestem bae oli laf long mi. Be olsem hem i talem long French? Mi stap andastanem olgeta (.) nomata what tense? I raet o i rong yu go nomo. Be olgeta i practise/im. Oli practise/im long en blong hem oli faenem hem i no really had blong yumi lanem French. Er wan (.) wantfala styuden we hem i stap long ples ia. And then after all hem i mekem (.) taem hem i folem wan man? Hem i folem olgeta (.) olgeta ol Wallis we oli yusum. I mean French nomo. Dis taem? Afta tu tri yia/s hem i speak French very fluently. Hem i speak very fluent. And then mi faenemaot tu i gat ol relatives blong yumi we oli stap oli Inglis speaker long Vanuatu? Taem oli go stap long New Caledonia for wan o tu yia? Oli kambak ia yu jes sek long olgeta nomo. So i minim se conversation every now and then yu realise se i possible kwiktaem nomo.

(6)


Mr Aru: Yes.

Miss Adina: Inglis. Olsem ol defren variety blong speaking English. Variety or stael. Olsem hemia tu bae i save influence/em ol (.) olsem i gat impact insaed long ol
styuden/s speaking English as well. Especially English. Mi no save. Inglis? O defren wod/s. Defren stael blong toktok?

F: M-m.

Miss Adina: Whereas French i gat wan stael nomo uh?

(1)

F: No i sem mak nomo.

Miss Adina: &laughs Be ating olsem ol def- () that’s why ol styuden oli faenem i had blong oli toktok Inglis? Afta &laughs mi luk se i had blong oli () oli toktok from oli wantem se bae oli toktok olsem yu bae yufala i mas toktok stret. Mekem se () taem oli toktok? Bae i had blong oli toktok Inglis. Bae oli fraet blong yusum Inglis. Hemia nao. (1) So mebi sapos yumi really wantem se styuden i toktok Inglis? Yumi sud gat wan () wan stael nomo &laughs blong toktok Inglis. Wan stael ia. Wan () blong evriwan i stap toktok sem mak. Wan tingting nomo. (1) Mi no save hao nao bae yumi achieve/im hemia be olsem wan tingting nomo.

(2)

Mr Aru: Wan () wan nara risen we yumi talem se yumi reluctant blong yumi stap yusum Inglis olsem () lanwis blong communication blong yumi? Hem i wan () wan () er wan kalja? Wan kalja blong yumi ol man Vanuatu. Bae yu faenem defrens blong hem. Uh Solomon wetem Vanuatu wetem Fiji ia? Bae hem i to- () Fiji? Olgeta hemia yumi jes tokbaot naoia? Whether wan gud Inglis o whatever nogat?

Miss Adina: Yes.

Mr Aru: Olgeta i go nomo. Oli go nomo. Oli speak Inglis. So wan attitude we olgeta i gat ia? Hem i () oli no wantem save oli jes go nomo. Be yumi olsem se () wan habit we yumi folem ia? Yumi fraet. Nogud mi mekem mistake. So hemia nao bae yumi lukum across the board nomo. Uh evri ting taem yu do/im? Yu tingting se sapos mi mekem rong bae oli laf long mi so wan () bifo yu mekem wan samting fraet i stap finis.

(3)

Miss Adina: Tru.

(8)

Mr Aru: Yeah blong kwestin we hem i stap () <translates from question> wan individual hem i () er save both Inglis wetem French? Mi ting se () olsem yumi stap long ples ia hem i () hem i wan sort of an identity as well. Taem you get to know both languages? Then yu go aot yu fil se yes yu blong Vanuatu nao.

Miss Adina: Tru.

Mr Aru: Be sapos yu go yu lanem wan nomo then yu fil se no () yu bin () pat blong narafala kaontri be i no Vanuatu. From yu no save tufala lanwis.
Mr Aru: Long nekis kwestin we hem i stap ia C ia? <reads question> “Is it good that Vanuatu uses both English and French? Mi ting se yes ating () olsem in terms of naoia hem i hemia. Se yumi traem as much as possible blong yumi yusum tufala lanwis/es and then () oli kam antap wetem education master plan we hem i stap naoia? Oli stap unify/em wan curriculum we both English and French olgeta i yusum. So i minim se () wan requirement we hem i stap long Vanuatu hemia. Olsem i dipen long wanwan blong yumi nao. Hao yumi () yumi () I mean. Firstly?

Olgeta antap long Ministry blong Edyukesen or Curriculum er oli kamdaon wetem ol syllabus we olgeta i unify/em olgeta? Then bammbae yumi save yusum. Be mi ting se hem i wan gud aedia. From now rel olsem se wanwan man hem i traem blong toktok. Sapos hem i wan English speaker? Yu traem toktok French ia? Hem i long own way blong yu nomo. Hao nao bae yu save mekem wei blong yu blong go tru.

But sapos yumi save gat wan unified curriculum we hem i stap in ples? Ating bae hem i easier long yumi. Yumi yusum () because yumi folem curriculum ia yumi tijim insaed the classroom at the same time you learn. As a teacher you learn too. (18).


Miss Adina: <laughs> Yumi muv i go long namba 3.
Miss Adina: Kwestin 3 A. Olsem Mr Aru i talem? Mi ting se ol Anglophones oli gat mo janis/es blong go overseas. Olsem at the moment. Mi no save from wanem be olsem lately mi ridim long Daily Post mebi? Ol styuden/s we oli go long Noumea?

Oli perform very badly. I don’t know why be (.) be mi no save olsem hemia Noumea. Ol geta we oli kam long USP? Oli perform i gud. Olsem ol Francophone we oli kam long USP we i yusum Angl- er Inglis nomo? Oli perform gud we (.) long Inglis. Afta mi no sua se wanem i rong long ples ia be mebi hem i because of different environment we i go stadi long hem? Olsem (1) olsem for example olsem Fiji or Noumea? Comparison? Fiji hem i olsem (.) bae i olsem Vanuatu. So mebi (1) be Noumea hem i more advanced. So mebi hemia hem i contribute tu long olsem (.) performance blong olgeta? Performance blong olgeta long klasrum as well. (1) So that is why ating mi no save (.) mi no sua? Be ating gavman i stap katemdaon (.) i bin katemdaon budget blong styuden/s go for Francophone studies ia? Afta oli increase/im Francophone sponsorship we i kam olsem long Inglis. (1) Long nara stream. (1) Be olsem at the moment mi save long ol Anglophone styuden/s we oli kam oli perform very good in (.) olsem. Ol Francophone styuden/s perform very good in English. (1) Afta olsem ol (.) olgeta oli mo advan- i gat more advantage than ol Anglophone styuden from oli save both lanwis/es. (1) Mi jalus. <laughs>

Miss Agnes: Yes ating long kwestin ia? Hemia i tru ol Anglophone nao oli gat mo janis blong stadi oversea. And (.) mi mi luk se from ating ol Anglophone oli gat ol olsem (.) fulap ples/es blong go.

Mr Aru: M-m.

Miss Agnes: While er Francophone olgeta oli gat wan nomo be (.) mi stap gat kwestin tu long ples ia se sapos we gavman i (.) olsem yumi olsem wan (.) bilingual kaontri bae i sud mekem i fair. Olsem blong karem ol skolasip (.) ol styuden i mekem i fair blong mekem se yumi maintain/em both er lanwis ia long (.) kaontri blong yumi. Although olsem sapos oli no perform gud? Be (.) from yumi wantem se bae (.) tugeta lanwis i stap long kaontri bae (.) at least yumi (.) olsem oli offer/em sem (.) janis/es long both Francophone and Anglophone blong go oversea. (1) Hemia lukluk blong mi long saed ia.

Mr Aru: Ating bae (.) bae hem i (.) mebi long fiuja (.) long near fiuja bambae ol janis/es ia bae oli jiam olsem because insaed long wan niufala curriculum blong edyukesen long Vanuatu naioa? Er sapos we yu lukum uh (.) uh structure blong hem? Then bae yumi (.) yumi start off olgeta wetem Francophone nomo. Bae yu statem uh Yia 1 up to wanem (.) Yia 7 nao bae yu jes go insaed long Inglis ia nao.

Miss Adina: Okei.

Mr Aru: Hemia wan niufala curriculum we (.) er wan blong olgeta i kam givimaot long yumi. Be sapos yu luk structure blong hem? Hem i olsem ia nao. Taem yumi
start off bae yumi start off long Francophone. So (.) uh wetem ol experience we sam
blong olgeta styuden/s we oli stap go olsem ia? Hem i show/em yumi se hem i wo-
hem i gud. Hem i gud. Olsem hem i tales? Taem hem i go as far as um (.) uh Yia 7
Yia 6 Yia 7? Then hem i switch i kam long Inglis ia? Then hem i no gat difficulty
nating. And for information blong yu Fiona? I gat wanfala styuden we hem i stap
long ples ia. Hem i skul long French gogo kasem Yia 11.

F: M-m. Simon ia?

Mr Aru: Simon. So hem i decide. Hem i decide se mi wantem switch from uh
Francophone i go long Anglophone. Be hao evri dei mi stap luku klosap hem long
wok and then mi intres long ripot blong hem? Yu lukum hao nao hem i stap compete
wetem olgeta (.) pure uh Anglophone styuden. Be hem i (.) hem i far better than
fulp blong olgeta long klas blong hem. Iven long (.) olsem hem i tekem uh (.) hem i
stap insaed long Science stream ia? And most long olgeta wok blong hem long
Science ia oli so outstanding nomo. And iven Inglis ia? Inglis ia olsem (.) wan klas
blong Science (.) naoia hem i out of twante fo olsem. Taem we hem i go tru long
Inglis test bae hem i no save kam beyond ten. Bae hem i anda ten. Position blong
hem bae hem i anda ten. Which is really good. So mi bilivim se (.) yumi save
mekem. Olsem sapos we i gat wan compulsory structure we hem i stap blong yumi
folem? Then bambae yumi achieve/im nomo. Olsem we mi stap talem wan niufala
wan we hem i stap ia? Er Yia 1 up to Yia 7 o samting. Hemia French nomo. Then
taem yu kasem hemia? Nekis level nao bae yu jes go long Inglis.

Miss Adina: Long mi? Sapos yumi tokbaot olsem mi personally? Sapos yumi
tokbaot (.) quality edyukesen? Sapos yu gat quality edyukesen yu sud gat both (.)
knowledge o er fluent in both English and French. Hemia nao olsem (.) long mi mi
ting se sapos yu gat wan quality edyukesen yu sud gat both. Olsem yu sud lanem
both. Olsem sapos yu lan Inglis nomo (.) yu gat haf <laughs> haf nomo. Se hao yu
tekem haf nomo be mi tu mi sapos quality edyukesen hem i really gud sapos yu
lanem both languages. Sapos nhoa both languages yu yusum (.) yu yusum blong
yu faenem job. Yu yusum blong yu communicate wetem nara (.) nara man. So mi
really sapos (.) olsem sapos yumi wantem gat wan quality edyukesen long kaontri
blong yumi yu sud save both English and French.

Miss Agnes: Okei ating blong add on long hemia mi mi ting se hem i gud tu from uh
sapos we yu save both lanwis ia? Olsem yu wan tija? Hem i (.) yu gat uh mo
janis/es blong tij. Olsem yu save go long French skul blong tij o Inglis. Sapos yu
save both. Olsem fluently. Mo content blong tufala. So yu gat mo janis blong yu tij in
uh Anglophone o Francophone skul.

Mr Aru: Janis/es blong kasem job (.) olsem yumi discuss/em finis. Olsem bae raet
nao? Olsem se (.) ol opportunities blong olgeta job/s insaed long Vanuatu ol most
long olgeta hem i long Anglophone saed. So bae yumi save talem se (.) ol

Miss Adina: <reads question> “Do more people speak English or French throughout the world?” (1) Kwestin E. (7) Mi no save se bae mi ansarem hemia olsem wanem. (4) F: So long ples ia yu luk se i hamas Inglis speaker evriwan long wol? O long Vanuatu fas wan afta hamas French speaker? Miss Agnes: Ah. F: Be sem samting long hol wol. Miss Adina: Okei. (4) Miss Adina: Vanuatu first. (6) Mr Aru: Kwestin ia olsem bae sapos yumi ansa long level blong Vanuatu ating bae hem i lelebet easier long yumi. Uh o sapos we yumi start/em off? Yumi start/em off long (. ) for example long aelan. (1) Ambae. Between population long ples ia directly bae yumi talem nomo se i gat more English speakers than ol French speakers. Be sapos yumi extend mo long provins? Ating bae yumi stil maintain/em hemia (. ) more English speakers than French speakers. And sapos yumi go as far as Vanuatu? Ating bae yumi stil maintain/em hemia. Bae yumi stil maintain/em hemia. From raet nao olsem se sapos yumi lukum ol hao edyukesen system blong yumi i go? Yumi sort of gat wan percentage like er (. ) siksti foti? Or seventy teti. Siksti hem i bong ol Anglophone? And then foti hem i blong ol Francophone. Be throughout long wol ia? Mi no really sua but sapos we yumi tekem category blong Vanuatu ia? Um sem taem we yumi stap tokbaot ol Inglis speakers long wol ia? Mi ting se (. ) ating bae (. )
mebi sapos we tufala i equal o smol percentage defrens nomo. Olsem mi stil fil se (. ) ol English speakers long wol oli more than ol Francophone.

Miss Adina: I think so too. Because considering olsem yumi? Olsem yumi yumi save Inglis tru long ol (. ) olsem (. ) <turns to me> no offence (. ) British colonising Vanuatu. So long histri? Inglis? Er (. ) British? Hem i colonise/em most parts of the world. So i minim se (. ) i mas gat more English speakers than French.

(4)

Miss Agnes: [Yes i tru]

Miss Adina: So [yes. Taem] oli kam colonise/em Vanuatu? Oli kam wetem olsem (. ) wetem (. ) ol samting ia nao. So wan ia nao Inglis oli kam wetem. So yumi yumi lanem Inglis. Oli go oli colonise/em wan nara kaontri oli go wetem Inglis tu. So i minim se olgeta oli mas (. ) of course oli speaking English. Be minim se (. ) mi mi ting se yes. (1) Taem we Mr Aru i stap stori? Mi jes (. ) come to mebi (. ) realise/em se maybe there is more English speakers than French. Speakers. (4) So hemia tingting blong mi nomo.

(2)

Miss Agnes: Mi (.) olsem mi lukluk long hemia? Mi luk se hemia i tru. Olsem (1) i gat more Anglophone (. ) speakers than um French. Be (. ) olsem long olsem se blong lanem? Hem i more English. Hem i lanem olsem more ni-Van oli lanem Inglis than French. Be (. ) blong kam long wan olsem taem we blong toktok long Inglis? Mi mi luk se olsem although more uh pipol oli lanem? Be ating fiu nemo we oli yusum (. ) often. Be bae sapos yu lukluk long saed blong French? Taem yu go long wan olsem (. ) institution we i French? Olsem although oli smol namba olsem oli lanem French be oli (. ) oli toktok mo long hem. Mi givim wan eksampol long Alliance long Vila. Yu go insaed hemia olsem ol staf insaed oli speak French nemo. Be taem se for example long ples ia sapos yumi wan Inglis skul? Bae yumi (. ) yumi no speak English tumas olsem (. ) although yumi (. ) yumi lanem Inglis be bae yumi no harem tumas. Blong yumi toktok aot saed compared long French. Hao oli yusum. Be (. ) Anglophone? Ol ni-Van oli lanem mo Inglis be the way oli yusum hem i smol. Olsem hao mi luk olsem.

(4)

F: Mi luk se bae yumi muv i go long 4 A nomo. Mekem se las kwestin. From ating 4 B C yumi tokbaot finis. Be from lukaot service hem i gohed bae i blokem saon blong yumi. So yumi tokbaot las pat nemo. 4 A.

(9)

Mr Aru: Okei bae mi mi stat long ples ia. Olsem. Mi bin traem blong express/em finis i kam. Mi biliv tumas. Oli traem bes blong olgeta blong unify/em ol curriculum blong olgeta. Long mi mi ting se hem i very very proper nao (. ) i proper nao blong yumi talesm se er ol ni-Vanuatu oli mas lanem Inglis wetem French. Oli mas yusum Inglis wetem French. And then bambae hem i help aot plante. Not by (. ) yumi lukum wan o tu risen/s blong olgeta nemo. Olsem advantage blong Inglis. O advantage blong
French. Be sapos yumi lulkuk klosap mo? Then wan we bae hem i go tru blong
hem i mekem (.) wan (.) either blong tufala lanwis. (1) So long kwestin we hem i
stap ia? Mi agri? O mi sapotem strong se sapos we (.) er wan (.) this unified
curriculum material we hem i kamaot blong yumi yusum? We from hao oli
design/em hem we i stap naioa? Bae i start off long priskul? I kam antap across
long praemeri skul. I go long secondary i go kasem (.) yeah i go as far as Yia 13.
From uh priskul to Yia 13. So sapos yumi gat wan unified uh curriculum ia? Syllabus
we bae yumi yusum? Then bae mi biliv very much se bae hem i wok aot. Then bae
hem i ged tumas. I ged tumas.

(3)

F: Be unified curriculum? Yu min se (.) bae i gohed long Anglophone stream
narasaed? Ale Francophone stream. O bae yu joenem tufala tugeta so i nomo gat
Long basic edyukesen. Be yumi long ples ia yusum Inglis (.) olgeta daon oli yusum
French. So kwestin ia hem i askem se bae yumi gohed we yumi gat Angolo
College Collège de Faranako oli defren? O bae yumi joenem system mekem se (.) i
gat wan kaen skul nemo we yumi evriwan yumi no gat label blong Anglophone
Francophone. Yumi evriwan i jes (.) sem samting nemo.

(1)

Mr Aru: Okei long ples ia olsem understanding blong mi long this er unified
curriculum ia? Olsem (.) bae content (.) content blong olgeta syllabus ia bae oli
exactly the same. Lanwis nemo bae hem i defren. Olsem Yia 7 i go antap ia blong
Social Science ia? Bae content insaed ia bae i sem mak long French nemo. Be
lanwis nemo bae tufala i defren. So sapos yu gogo kasem Yia 10 antap ia yu
wantem swap i kam insaed? I no gat eni ting niu. Er lanwis nemo bambahem hem i
jenis. Olsem hao mi andastanem this curriculum hem i olsem ia. Be mi bin
kwestinim. Yu minim se (.) uh yumi givim janis blong tijim Inglis (.) Inglis long French
skul o i sem mak nemo? O olsem hamas lesen we bae i gat long Inglis i sem mak
long French? Oli se no. Wanem we i stap yumi traem blong (.) uh mekem olgeta
content blong olgeta courses ia oli (.) olsem I mean (.) definitely the same. Olsem
lanwis blong hem nemo bae yumi yusum long defren lanwis be content long
courses ia i gogo i kasem antap i sem mak nemo. Whatever yumi lanem long Inglis i
sem mak long French.

(22)

Miss Adina: Okei. Opinion blong mi se (.) olsem mi talem finis mi serem opinion finis
(.) fastaem yumi statem discussion kasem naioa? Olsem (.) the (1) olsem main
purpose blong mi (.) mi ting se hem i (.) hem i blong styuden i andastanem samting?
Olsem naioa yumi kambak long skul bakegen. Afta olsem yu yu pasem knowledge?
Styuden i karem knowledge. So qua- blong quality edyukesen mi ting se hem i (.)
hem i gud mo sapos yumi yusum both languages? O sapos i gat ol nara lanwis
bakegen blong yumi yusum. Mi mi ting se sapos (1) olsem (.) the whole purpose
hem i blong styuden hem i kasem wan samting. (1) Be sapos hem i save kasem mo
in (. ) French? Mo o mo in Inglis? Mebi mi ting se hem i no wan problem blong yumi yusum both languages. Olsem (. ) purpose blong mi olsem mi mi jes tingting nomo olsem blong styuden i anastanem samting blong yumi gat quality edyukesen. Mi no wantem save se hem i kaseim long which <laughs> which uh (. ) which lanwis? Mi wantem save nomo se styuden karem save we blong i gan wan fiua. <laughs> (11) Olsem hemia tu se bae yumi save argue/m both sides. Olsem. Olsem sapos hem i kaseim wan knowledge tru long wan lanwis nomo? Olsem hemia bae yumi no fulfil/im identity blong yumi. Olsem sapos hem i kaseim tru long Inglis nome bae hem i no fulfil/im identity. From identity is (. ) um mebi lanwis blong yumi o identity hem i (. ) lanwis/es blong ol colonisers blong yumi. Sapos (2) mi nomo save nao se bae yumi olsem wanem bakegen be (. ) purpose blong mi? Olsem <laughs> bae mi blong styuden i anastanem samting? Mo yusum knowledge ia blong fiua blong hem.

F: So hem i olsem se wan (. ) bigfala samting ia we oli stap tokbaot plante long Ministri naoia. I no wan isi kwestin. Hemia olsem se i no gat ansa long hem. Be olsem i gat sam long Ministri we oli wantem se (. ) yumi joenem tufala saed tugeta. Mekem se yumi no differentiate/em se (. ) olsem brata blong yu i stap skul French? Be yu yu skul Inglis o samting olsem. Yu evriwan yu skul long sem system nomo. Olsem yu no separate/em. Be long (. ) i gat sam bakegen we oli se no. Yumi maintain/em nomo be yu yu skul Inglis longwe? Ale yu yu skul French longwe? Bae hem i gud mo. (1) Olgeta we oli talem se bae yumi joenem? Naoia hem i kambak long nambatu kwestin se hao nao bae yumi save joenem.

Miss Agnes: Yes.


(7)

Mr Aru: Olsem mi (. ) sapos yu lukum education master plan we i stap ia? Oli really wantem (. ) olsem at the back of their mind oli (. ) hao we mi lukum oli wantem se (. ) wan dei (. ) wan dei long taem hem i come up. Everybody has to be fluent French and English speakers. Insaed long kaontri blong Vanuatu. Hem i hao mi lukum. I gat sam observation? Sam er (. ) sam er (. ) oli go tru long hem? And then oli tekem olsem se ol eksampol/s and then bambae yumi save base long ol eksampol/s oli go. Hemia olsem gud eksampol Miss Agnes hem i talem. Hem i go as far as (. ) from French hem i had uh. So taem hem i had yu lanem fastaem. Uh which wan hem i isi i come in later on. So wetem pro- uh (. ) disfala curriculum we hem i stap ia? Sapos we yu lukum hemia we olgeta oli kam givim long yumi lastaem ia? Bae yu lukum system blong edyukesen blong yumi bae hem i stap olsem ia? Priskul. Uh priskul I mean uh yes. Uh vernacular bae hem i (. ) stat long Yia 1 Yia 2? Vernacular. Then
stat long Yia 2 kasem Yia 7 hemia French nomo. And then aot long French (. ) long

Yia 7 ia nao? Hemia nao bae oli jeso mekem choice blong yu go in saed long Inglis ia
nao. (1) Which is why bae hem i isi from. Long taem ia nao? Olsem taem yu kasem

Yia 7? Uh yu continue long wan French uh decision blong go long (. ) French? Hem i
isi long yu. Hem i isi sapos we yu decide blong (. ) hemia nao yu lanem French yu
decide blong kam long Inglis? Bae hem i isi long yu tu. Bae hem i isi so (. ) wan wei
we mi lukum long ples ia? Oli lukum se that's how we learn bae yumi save (. )

transition period ia? Bae hem i save tekem ples long as far as Yia 7 o Yia 8. Be
olsem long Klas 1 o Klas 2 hemia i late ia. I mean i too early. Bae yumi no save
mekem bae yu go yu forget/em evri ting nomo.

(6)

Miss Agnes: Long lukluk blong mi sapos we hemia olsem blong yu go long (. )

French olsem long (. ) start off long praemeri go kasem 7 8? Afta switch i go? Mi ting
se hemia bae i gud tumas from hem i isi blong yu go long Inglis. Afta? French bae

yu stil (. ) wanem we yu kasem? Bae yu stil save i stap mo yu andastanem i stap. So

hemia bae (. ) olsem taem se yu go long Inglis? Be yu save French finis i stap.

Olsem ia bae (. ) at the end yu save both French and English.

F: I min se evri wan bae oli skul French fastaem?

Miss Agnes: Yes.

F: Be sapos yumi go long practicality blong hem? Olsem bae yumi tingbaot

<addresses Mr Aru> waef blong yu? We i stap longwe? Wanem bae i hapen long
hem? Sapos (. ) yumi talem se evri praemeri tija i mas French nao. Bae hem i lanem

French? O bae hem i aot long teaching profession nomo. O hao nao bae yumi

faenem ol French tija blong go in saed long praemeri.

Mr Aru: Yes.

F: From naoia? Olsem yu talem finis se siksti percent oli Inglis. So naoia olsem se

yumi no gat (. ) olsem yumi wantem se yumi implement/em long hol praemeri long

French? Be wem ol tija? Hao nao bae=

Miss Agnes: =Yu min se evri tija bae i mas French tija?

F: Uh-uh.

Miss Adina: French fastaem.

F: Be sapos yu talem system ia? We yutufala i stap tokbaot? Se evriwan bae oli (. )

Klas 2 i go antap long Klas 7 o samting olsem? French. Be wem ol tija? Hao nao

bae yumi save faenem ol man we oli save toktok French in saed long klasrum long

praemeri.

Mr Aru: Long discussion ia? Olsem oli [tekem into account.]

Miss Agnes: [Trenem French praemeri] tija French nomo.

F: Be wem olgeta? I nogat.
Mr Aru: Oli tekem into account olsem se (. ) oli (. ) oli (. ) oli (. ) stap tokbaot wan period of time olsem we bambae yumi save apply/em (. ) uh system ia? Until dis taem ia?

Miss Agnes: Yes.

Mr Aru: Long sense se okei. While (. ) long taem naoia i go? Bae yumi nid blong re/trenem. Olgeta pipol.

Miss Agnes: M-m.

Mr Aru: From sapos yumi talem se (. ) yumi tokbaot gogo (. ) yu finis i stap? Then yumi traem blong (. ) switch straightaway bae i no save wok aot nomo because ol human resources ia oli nogat. I no gat insaed long system we i stap. So yumi nid blong se tekem at least (. ) faef ten yia/s (. ) then yumi prepare/em olgeta tija? From bae yumi nid blong trenem olgeta praemeri skull tija ol French tija nomo. And then ol secondary school tija? Bae hemia nao Inglis wetem French antap. So that olgeta i do/im wok ia daon ia long behalf blong yumi evriwan antap. So yumi no forget tu olsem discussion we hem i go long hemia yumi no forget too se yes sapos for that case then what do we do with all these existing teacher. Ol praemeri skull tija. Do they have to finish? O yumi nid blong givim in-service training long olgeta so oli have some knowledge blong French blong tij long French? Hemia olgeta oli consider/em as well.

F: M-m. Yumi stap toktok plante se (. ) i had blong ol Anglophone blong oli lanem French. So sapos i had? Bae yu talemaot long ol praemeri tija we oli Inglis fastaem? Ale bae yumi trenem olgeta blong toktok French? Be (. ) hemia bae i realistic? O:: <laughs> (2) Olsem mi mi stap (. ) mi mi no argue agensem hemia? Olsem mi mi save ol argument finis from mi mi harem plante toktok i kamaot long Ministri. So eni samting we yu putum? Mi bae mi talem defren ansa long hem? <laughs> Hemia olsem real situation nao yumi gat problem blong implementation nomo. (2) Be mi no save se i gat ansa long hem o nogat.

(4)

Mr Aru: Yes directly long ples ia? Sapos yumi (. ) blong ansarem kwestin se (. ) hao bes nao bae yumi save (. ) switch/im olgeta Inglis tija oli go long French? Hemia olsem ansa blong hem yumi save finis. Bae hem i (. ) hem i no isi. Because olgeta oli mature pipol and mature pipol blong oli lan (. ) i really had ia. Ol yang pipol ol styuden? Yes hem i isi long olgeta from oli adapt quickly. Ol uh mature pipol bae hem i really tekem taem. Hem i really tekem taem. So (. ) i minim se (. ) ating bambae yumi luk olsem se (. ) uh long fijuja sapos we you wanted to become a

Miss Adina: Teacher.

Mr Aru: A primary school teacher? Then you have to go for French teaching. Because that is the foundation of our education system in Vanuatu? Uh all the way from pre-school up to Year 7? Bae yumi talem basic education? So Year 6 7? Basic education. Up to Year 8? Hemia bae olgeta i mas French tija nao. And then sapos
Further beyond that nao olgeta Inglis tija bae oli kam insaed. (1) Hem i no wan isi samting.

Miss Adina: So yu minim se long period of time ia? We yumi stap consider/em ia?
Mebi faef yia/s ten yia/s taem? Yu minim se taem ol tija olsem we (.) yumi long
Vanuatu ol (.) ol tija olsem we (.) ples we tija i save kasem edyukesen is Teachers College? And mebi sam other institutions. So min se taem olgeta i apply long
Teachers College bae olgeta oli screen/im olgeta (.) mas save se olgeta ol Francophone speakers bfo (.) olsem ol tekem training blong olgeta? Afta taem bae oli kamaot long field? Bae oli save tijim French. So hemia olsem se hem i no (.) hem i no (.) problem blong olsem (.) i no olsem bae wan man nemo i mekem? I minim se bae evriwan i mas contribute olsem evri ples we oli (.) olsem oli concern? Olsem Teachers College. Wetem (.) olsem (.) Ministri wetem (.) ol nara ples ia? We oli involve long edyukesen sistem blong Vanuatu? Bae oli mas consider/em ia se bae oli mas statem gud foundation blong hem bfo (2) for example mi talem sapos from (.) yu apply blong go stadi long Teachers College blong praemeri skul tija? Bae oli mas save se sapos yu Francophone? Bae oli accept/em yu <laughs>. (1) Mi harem olsem (.) tingting.

(1)

F: Ating sapos long las poen ia yumi kambak long poen blong Miss Adina ia. We hem i talem se (.) long en blong evri samting yumi mas tingbaot quality blong edyukesen.

Miss Agnes: Yes.

F: So hemia wan kwestin nemo? Se (.) yumi really wantem ol (.) Inglis French?

Mr Aru: M-m.

F: So hemia yu luk se wan conflict we

Miss Adina: Yes.

F: Bae i mekem i had? O no yu luk se i no really wan problem long hemia. (1)
Hemia olsem wan tingting blong mi nemo. Olsem yumi stap argue from bilingualism be (.) naoia men objective hem i lus bakegen.
Mr Aru: Yes, hemia says you go for (2) long evri pikinini Vanuatu i mas karem tufala lanwis/es ia? Then naioa yumi no tokbaot quality nao. Yumi spend/em a lot of time blong yumi into this a lot of speaking both languages. But the quality yumi no tokbaot nao. While oli tokbaot uh (.) uh (1) dual system? O wanem ia we hem i stap ia? Yumi mas take/em into account okei. Hemia nao? Yumi go from hemia be then (. ) let's not forget that sapos yumi really wantem quality ia. Then bambae yumi mas lukluk sam criteria we yumi mas folem tu. Sapos yumi jes go for (1) er yumi (.) yumi receive/im ol (.) yumi able blong save toktok tufala lanwis nomo? Then quality i nogat finis. Yumi do away wetem quality nomo. (2) Further long explanation hemia? Mi mi ting olsem wan personal tingting blong mi mi ting se (.) ating sapos bae yumi lukum hemia? Bae matter blong hem nomo o olsem wanem we yumi wari long hem hem i how to speak the language only. Yumi no nidim blong yumi mekem evri ting. As long as yu save andastanem lanwis ia yu speak/im. Sapos we yu Anglophone yu andastanem narawan i speak/im narawan be naf ia nao. Naf nao. From we sapos we yumi tokbaot ol system insaed long content insaed long syllabus ia? Bae oli sem mak nomo. But the only thing is the language. Lanwis ia nao bae yumi nid blong save. Then bambae mebi somehow somewhere? Then bambae yumi save maintain/em stret quality edyuksen ia. Be sapos we yumi focus plante long hemia? Yumi givim mo taem long hemia? Then bambae quality hem i jes finis nao.

F: Any final comments? Long ol kwestin ia. (2) O bae yumi finis nomo long ples ia.

Miss Adina: No hem i tru ia yumi stap toktok gogo? Yumi tend to forget quality edyuksen. And er (.) ol man we ol main pipol we oli involve. Ol recipients blong edyuksen wetem ol man we oli pasem edyuksen. Along. Pasem knowledge. So (3) bakegen? Bae mi restate/em bakegen se hem i matter of (.) yumi pasem knowledge and styuden i grasp/em aedia. From se in the end? Bae olgeta ia nao bae oli (.) olgeta wetem yumi? Olsem olgeta nao oli (.) edyuksen ol kasem hem i helpem olgeta long fiuja laef blong olgeta. So (6) styuden i karem sam uh (.) understanding nomo. I don't care how we pass the knowledge along (.) as long as styuden i kasem knowledge hem i yusu knowledge long wan raet wei mo hem i kasem edyuksen blong hem. From (.) sapos yumi pasem long (.) pasem long wan? Wan olsem long wan lanwis? Afta hem i no andastanem? Afta what is the purpose of education. Bae i nomo relevant nao. So (.) yumi stick to mebi wan lanwis blong <laughs> pasem knowledge? Then i andastanem? Then mi satisfy wetem. Be sapos yu pasem knowledge long wan lanwis we olgeta oli no andastanem? Bae oli no save yusu knowledge ia we oli kasem ia. From se oli no andastanem purpose blong knowledge ia. From se knowledge ia oli no andastan hao nao bae oli yusum knowledge ia so (2) mi go for as long as students grasp the knowledge whatever lanwis yumi yusuum blong pasem uh pass the knowledge?
F: Be naoia yu gobak yu stap argu agensem fas poen blong yu. From yu yu olsem yu (. ) yu regret plante se yu no save toktok French.

Miss Adina: Yes.

F: So naoia se (. ) o yumi go from wan lanwis nomo yumi lego narawan? So i min se wanem? Bae yu jusum wan nomo? Lego (1) o yumi gobak se no yumi mas (. ) Inglis French? Yumi=


As long as styuden oli anstastan.

F: So sapos yumi faenemaot se bes wei se Bislama nomo? Lego Inglis French bae Vanuatu i nomo toktok Inglis French uh?

Miss Adina: Then we go for Bislama. (2) But then again olsem (. ) i min se yumi mas reform/em evri samting bakegen. The writing purpose in Eng- I mean Bislama. Curriculum i jenisi i kam long Bislama bakegen. Olsem hemia wan hadwok bakegen. Be hemia nao? As long as styuden oli anstastanem wan samting.

Mr Aru: Olsem. Hao mi lukum naoia? Olsem. Long lanwis blong Bislama ia? Bae olsem mi mi stap long Vanuatu for the rest of my life. Be mi mas speak/im wan gud Bislama. From sapos we yumi lisin long yumi? Bae most long olgeta toktok we yumi tokbao- yumi toktok long Bislama hem i repetition and fulap long ol samting we (. ) we hem i no mekem eni ting nomo. So sapos we olsem (. ) yumi save mekem se okei. Yumi do away wetem French? Do away wetem Inglis and then yumi go for Bislama? Then bae yu tekem wan huge taem bakegen. A huge amount of time blong <Miss Agnes and Miss Adina laugh> kambak long raetem gud Bislama (. ) evri smolsmol grammar evri ting long Bislama? Then bambae yumi have to kambak bakegen olsem mi talem? Naoia yumi stap speak/im uh Bislama? Naoia ol broken wan nomo. I no wan gudwan nating? Yestedei i gat wan expression blong one particular thing tudei bae hem i defren. Tumora yumi tok defren lanwis nao. Even though hem i stil Bislama but then yumi yusum ol defren wod/s altogether than yumi yusum ol same wod/s. So sapos yumi tekem wantaem finis i go? Ale yumi decide se bae yumi go for Bislama? Then bae hem i kambak yumi raetem syllabus daon ia. Everybody we hem i speak Bislama yestedei bifo yestedei finis? Then yumi kam stat long ples ia. Hem i jes wan samting we mi no save bilivim nomo <laughs>.

<sighs dramatically> A::h too complicated. <Miss Adina laughs>.

F: Okei ating bae yumi finis long ples ia nao. Tangkiu.
Appendix xiii – Interview with Angolovo College Teacher Group 1
(Translation)

Date: 01-11-11

Location: On the grass outside a teacher’s house

Participants: Miss Adina, Miss Agnes, Mr Aru

Notes: This was originally intended to be a pilot interview, but it went
smoothly and all participants agreed that I could use the data. At the end, they
suggested electing a chairperson to keep the discussion moving, and I
followed this suggestion in subsequent interviews.

Miss Adina and Miss Agnes had agreed in advance to take part. Two others
didn’t show up so I grabbed Mr Aru at the last minute. I realised as we sat
down that Mr Aru was quite senior to the other two, and had been at the
school for a long time, while Miss Agnes and Miss Adina were relatively new. I
didn’t want the Mr Aru to dominate, and did raise this issue. Mr Aru also
pointed out that all three participants were English teachers, which was not
ideal.

By this time, it was getting late, so we just sat under the tree outside Mr Aru’s
house, rather than looking for a suitable location. This presented certain
noise problems, particularly when the chapel service started nearby. A few
parts are also obscured by rooster noises.

I explained the format and gave participants time to read the questions before
starting the recording.

1 Mr Aru: The first questions asks whether <translates from question> we find it easy
2 or hard to teach (1) using English to teach our subjects. For me I think that (.)
3 maybe it’s (.) yeah like we can say that it’s hard? But then I have discovered myself
4 that when I use English to explain something it is much easier than when I try to put
5 it in Bislama. So for me:: in terms of how you use English to (.) teach the subjects I
6 feel flexible with it? I feel alright with it? Er (.) most of the time when I use Bislama I
7 feel that some words it’s ha- (.) it is hard for me to identify these words. So I (.) I feel
8 that (.) using English er (.) to teach a subject in school? I feel comfortable with it.
9 (7)

10 Miss Adina: As Mr Aru has said? Yes teaching using English? Teaching students it
11 is easier but I think it’s because it is a matter of (.) us transferring the knowledge. So
12 it’s a matter of understanding what (.) so I think when I use English I find it easy but
13 (.) for the students to get it? They find it a bit hard to get it. So sometimes?
14 Sometimes I don’t (.) I don’t use the English approach all the time sometimes I have
15 to come down to their level (.) explain it slowly or put it in simple terms. Sometimes?
I can go as far as explaining it in Bislama. (1) Because I think that like (.) in the area that I teach which is Eng- (.) it's language? So it doesn't matter if I use any language in passing on the knowledge. But like (.) since the school rules are there they say (.) uh yes English is er medium of passing instruction so (1) we must use English all the time? But sometimes out of school when they come and ask me for help? At the house? I tend to use Bislama sometimes to (.). explain things easier to make it easier for them to grasp the idea. (1) Yeah and I think the students to get it they don’t (.) they find English difficult. And then? They don’t get it much in English but they (.). they tend to understand things when you explain in Bislama. (2) And then yes. I see that both (.) both (.) I can use both English and Bislama to transfer knowledge since language is any language (1) used to communicate information.

Miss Agnes: Okay I think for me? Like me:: (.) er when I was first teaching English? I found it a bit difficult to teach. Because (.) er (.) like went to French first. French school so when I came to teach English like much of the time I had to prepare myself first? Like especially in my first year of teaching. Then now time goes on now to the second year? I feel that now like (.) I can use it (.) it’s fine in the class with the students. But sometimes the students will need me to repeat myself again? Sometimes it’s not very clear to them so I’ll have to repeat (.) er (.) my instructions again to make it clearer for them. So (.) it’s not very easy for me for me (.) er to use it in the classroom. That’s my opinion.

Mr Aru: In the second part of the question (.) <translates from question> do students find it easy or hard? Like Miss Adina said it’s (.) it’s (.) there are only a few students who will try to (.). you give the explanations in English and they grab it (.) er straightaway. Many of them you’ll introduce it and you’ll have to repeat the same information or if not? Like at their level it’s much clearer for them when we use Bislama? They prefer you to give an explanation in Bislama. And once or twice there are some (.) like the students who come straight (.) where we use the same language? I will try my best to explain in lanwis. And I think there are some who understand in Bislama? Some understand in lanwis much quicker than Bislama.

Miss Adina: Yes like back to (.). back to this question again? Because (.) like we are trying to use it because our purpose is to help the students uh? And then like when we use too much Bislama? Use too much lanwis. Like I sometimes do? Then I’ll find in the end that they will just suffer the consequences because they are writing their exams in English. (1) Then (.) like I must try my best (.) that when I use Bislama in class or outside of class but I must sometimes use English like (.) to pass on knowledge because they will still write their exams in English. It is difficult for students to grasp something in English like (.) like just some of the students (.). can understand quickly in Bislama (1) I mean English but Bislama? Like they can get it easily. And lanwis. (1) And also for (.) like (3) for the second question? Then (.) Then like (.) if (.) I see that they haven’t grasped something in English? And in this situation you (.) when you do it (.) you explain something in Bislama? <laughs> Then now we become competent in another language now. So sometimes I'll go but
I must have a limit where you stop here. You don’t explain <laughs> too many things in Bislama. And lanwis. (1) Own mother tongue.

Mr Aru: For the second (.) for the second question? I think the second part of (.) of the question. (1) The answer is maybe yes. Like we are actually doing it. We are using that language. But er (.) all the time because English? It is a second language for us. So we are second language speakers of English? We don’t speak it that fluently. Like uh you first speakers of English. So er it is really (.) a need. Though I speak it and I feel comfortable with (..) my languages I still would like to be able to improve them (.). more. Able to improve them more. In the sense that (..) when you are speaking fluently? Then it is not only fluent. But it makes it easy. Easy for the listeners who are listening. If you (..) you speak like a (..) a beginner in language then it is really hard for them to understand you. So I think about this? Like (..) at this point of time I am confident? But I really want to know how I can improve it. (12) And to add to this again? We find out that (..) the (.) the contexts or the environments in which we use language? It (..) it makes a lot of difference. It contributes to the difference in how you use them. Er sometimes like if we are in front of the students then you speak very fluently.

Miss Adina: M-m.

Mr Aru: But if we are with different (..) mature people now you will see the language go different. It will no longer be <Miss Adina and Miss Agnes laugh> the same as when talking with the

Miss Adina: True.

Mr Aru: Students.

Miss Adina: Yes it’s true. It’s really true about the context. In different contexts you tend to use different (..) languages. To (..) and then on top of that too (..) the different concepts. The different concepts that you use? Sometimes it’s (..) we need concepts that are foreign? Or sometimes there are names (..) things have names that only have names in English? So when you say its name in English? Now you tend to use English. But if the concept is like (..) it’s just a local concept? You will tend to use Bislama or uh own mother tongue when you try to like. Like these different concepts? They come from the different languages that we use. (5) Um yes. For number (..) question C? <reads> “Students and staff do not speak English very often outside the classroom. Why is this.” <laughs> (3) I think that (..) maybe yes. The environment too <laughs> it is (..) when we are in the classroom we feel that (..) when we are in the classroom we know that it’s the classroom and we just speak English. But when I’m at my house or in a different environment outside? I can speak any language I want. <laughs> And then like expressing myself is easier too.

Mr Aru: For question C? The way I see it and most of the time I have tried to find the answer to it. Why we are like this. And then I come up to my feeling is this. When I
see a ni-Vanuatu? Like straightaway I want to speak to him in Bislama. (1) Er it
doesn’t mean that I can’t speak that language but when I see someone who is like a
man from Vanuatu? Like straightaway it is a (.) the mentality is there already that I
should speak Bislama to him. But you will find a difference at school uh? Like you?
You come here and the expatriate teachers who are here with us? Outside I will just
speak English to you. But with a ni-Vanuatu no. I will just speak Bislama to him. So
it comes to an (.) like an attitude uh? An attitude. When we see whoever is there?
Then straightaway we decide which language we will use.

Miss Agnes: Maybe on this I also think that if (.) like children grow up? Like they (.) if
they start using English and then they go to school? Maybe it will be (.) easy for
them to use it inside and outside. But when they grow up using Bislama or lanwis
like this. Then when they come to school they will be ashamed to use it (.) uh that’s
it. Bislama or lanwis instead of uh (.) English outside the classroom. I think that one
reason is that. Like children (.) learn to use too much Bislama or lanwis already
when they come.

F: Can I ask you all to speak a bit louder. I’m worried that this small thing won’t
catch it. I’m just not sure (.) I can check afterwards? But I don’t want to lose all your
data.

Mr Aru: Okay for (.) like the third question it’s (.) it is the same like we can talk about
the context we are in. I’ll give an example. Er if we are with (.) Fijians. Straightaway
we will just speak English. No matter what the (.) like the understanding behind that
is these people don’t know how to speak er Bislama so straightaway you will (.) be
like I feel that for me? Why do we speak English if people can just understand
Bislama. So we will just communicate in Bislama. (1) I don’t think there is any
special reason behind that one? Then I think it’s a matter of an attitude that you get
used to that attitude when you want to speak in Bislama. (19) Next question is D? It
is (.) we have maybe discussed part of this already? With this we come back again
to (.) the languages we can use but we use them in specific times and reasons for
them. Then we can use them. Like for example if you (.) you can use Bislama if an
explanation goes to an extent that the students no longer understand? Now you
come down to this. But (.) like the question about whether we can use them in the
classroom I think that we can do it. But only that (.) the way we provide a syllabus
for these languages must be of an in-depth (.) quality so that we can use them. Like
I will take an example? In Bislama? We can’t really use it because you find out that
most of its vocabulary? We can’t (.) we can’t. We tend to use one word for two three
four five different things. So when we use it? We practise a (.) children (.) when they
come (.) when they go back to English? Then they will adopt this Bislama system
into English. Then it’s really hard for them to express themselves in English.
Miss Adina: It’s true. The students find it hard when you explain in Bislama? Putting it down on paper is really hard. So any single word that you author in English? <laughs> They tend to copy down everything you say. Like word by word. So for them to use it in their essays. Or sometimes they will ask you to repeat what you have said in English? Because it’s hard for them to translate it into like (1) to write it down in like (1) in their own words. And then I think it’s unfair. Considering our policy which is (2) or what’s it? (2) or that all children can go to school. Have equal chances in education. So if they can grasp something better in Bislama? Why don’t we use Bislama all throughout or (1) so I think that like (.) our policy says. Every child must have equal chances (.) like to have education but (.) if they can’t grasp something in English? Then? That doesn’t suit the policy it doesn’t satisfy our policy. But if they can understand better in Bislama? There is no harm in expl- (.) but the problem then is that some things in Bislama? They mean like Mr Aru said? Two or three things at once. So I think that if like (.) if they can understand in Bislama? (1) Why not teach them in Bislama. Because the purpose is them grasping the knowledge. Because like for example? In Fijian they use standard Fijian to (.) speak. And in Samoa? They learn in their language. In Tonga they (.) they learn in their language. Why don’t we use Bislama like the standard language like this. Our national language. (2) Yes. <laughs>

Mr Aru: Yes let’s go back to (.) to the language. You put one example here of Ambaean language. Um I really agree with this like we can use this language to teach in schools. But only provided that er we have we prepare a syllabus. So that we follow a syllabus. Because if we go (.) like with own thinking? Then we will teach so many different things. Er but I agree with lanwis? Because er (.) if we compare the languages (.) language I mean mother tongue Ambaean language with Bislama? Er the Ambaean language is richer. Than Bislama. It’s richer in terms of vocabulary. And then the (.) the uh order of sentences that we write (.) is good. And then I really believe this because I’ll give an example that if (.) er a child who grows up only using lanwis. You will find that when this child learns a second language he will master it much more quickly than if he had used Bislama. Because er in that language that he uses? There is vocabulary that is just similar in English. Er if there is a word for it in lanwis? That there is in English (.) you just conv- like translate its meaning across. I see at the moment? Like in (.) in (.) the education policy they are talking about (.) pre schools are in the er vernacular. But then I’ve visited several that I’ve seen. It’s not really working in the sense that they are trying. Like (.) at (.) at the beginning? They tried using just lanwis without mentioning any word in English? And then when they moved over there? And it was time to translate it was hard. It was hard. So the way I see it? We can use it effectively if (.) we (.) we (.) we draft a syllabus which is (.) a core syllabus? Er English and then lanwis. Then? When they reach the end? Automatically they will be able to master English. But if we think that oh we just go with (.) lanwis? And then after one or two years’ time? The children will like start over with (1) English it won’t work. (2) That’s how I see it. (19) Yes on the same question still about French? Like it is a sort (.) like (.) a (.) policy of our country that we try every best to use these two languages. In our schools. So we try our best (.) er as much as possible so that you (.) you can (.) learn (.) French
somewhere? Or you can speak a little? And then it will help a little. Like we will talk
about maybe we’ll discuss it somewhere round this line but (.) it is easier for some
people. Like when the French come to learn English it’s no problem but for us to
learn French? That is a difficulty we have. Like. Unless they start (.) like Miss Agnes
mentioned? You start off with French then you go to English then it is okay. (17) If
you don’t have anything else to talk about for D then let’s move onto the next one?

Miss Adina: Okay.

(2)

Mr Aru: <reads from question> “Do you speak French? Do you wish to speak it
better?” (1) Yes maybe er (.) some of us will say yes? Some will say hardly. Some
will say no nothing at all. (1) Er me personally I understand French. I understand
French but how to speak it is like I will speak with the very (.) basics of speaking
French. But I do understand. Um only that if anyone is speaking French in (.) a
conversation between two people in French if they speak slowly? I will be able to
understand but if they go faster? I will lose interest now. I won’t be able to keep up
with them. But er (.) I’m interested. I am interested since er the country (.) the
country Vanuatu is like a bilingual country and then most things (.) at the moment (.)
they have made it a (.) a demand that each one (.) or every citizen of Vanuatu must
try to have the chance to acquire both languages. Because if for example you take a
job here it might be a requirement? You have to understand English and French at
the same time. So they’ve done this to encourage (.) encourage us to (.) try our best
so that if you are an English speaker? You learn French as well. And if you are a
French speaker? You learn English as well.

(10)

Miss Adina: <laughs> French.

<all laugh>

(4)

Miss Adina: French. (8) <laughs> Er French. For me? French. (2) Maybe the basics
yes. I mean je ne sais pas? Ca va? Things like that are easy for me to understand
easy for me to speak. Tiny basics like tiny language like that. But like Mr Aru says
for me to follow two French speaking people as they talk too fast? I cannot
understand at all. I wish that I knew French <laughs> because (.) not only for the
purpose of communicating with French people? But when you go out like (.) you go
out (.) outside the country? Then people see you? If they know that you are from
Vanuatu? They know that Vanuatu is a bilingual country? Then you should know
both languages. And it’s (.) such a shame if you only know one. <laughs><others
laugh> When you go and sit down in the class and they say hands up you are from
Vanuatu? Then you put your hand up and then they ask if you know French
<laughs> and English I say no I only know English <laughs>. So that’s an
embarrassment that I don’t know French. I really want to learn French. And yes. (2)
Like apart from English. (3) Yes it is an interesting (1) it’s not (.) like (.) I like listening
to people speak. I like the sound of it. I like hearing the sound of people speaking
French but for me to speak <laughs> it’s quite hard I can only say a few little things but (.) deep conversation? Then I won’t understand and I won’t be able to say anything <laughs>. But it’s good for Vanuatu people (.) like ni-Vans? Should speak both English and French.

Miss Agnes: Okay maybe for me? French? Like I can speak French? As I said I went to French school (.) I did my primary (.) at a French school so it means that (.) I can speak French well. But one thing when I switched to English? Like now I am in an environment where we use English a lot so I don’t (.) like tend to use French so I find it hard again to speak but I understand everything? Like I know uh what like in a conversation I can understand everything. When I spend too much time in an environment where we don’t use French now like I can’t (.) speak much French. But (.) I am interested to speak French all the time.

F: Which year did you switch. Year 7?

Miss Agnes: Yes in Year 7 I went to English. So it means that (1) I understand (.) French but it’s hard to speak. I don’t speak much in it.

Miss Adina: How did you find English? When you switched. Easy.

Miss Agnes: It was easy. Because when you school French to go to English is easy. In my experience I also found that when you school French? Like at French schools? They’re not ashamed to speak. Like we used French outside inside the classroom? It didn’t matter if it was like broken French? They weren’t ashamed to speak it. They just used it. But English like if you speak English they’ll laugh at you. So it means that (.) the children don’t like speaking English much but French it’s not like that. When the children go outside you hear them just speaking French so (.) if you are at a school that’s a (.) French school? You will just speak French.

Miss Adina: Why do children find it (.) like they find it hard to speak English. Whereas French speakers are totally flexible.

Mr Aru: I (.) I have been trying to work out the reasons (.) for what you’ve said? I think that like (.) there are maybe several reasons but one of them is because when we teach them English? We (.) we try to encourage them to speak a good English uh?

Miss Adina: Ah okay.

Miss Agnes: Yes that’s true.
Mr Aru: So they are afraid. They are afraid when they don't know how to form a (.) to use the tenses (.) the right tenses and (.) pronunciation (.) they tend (.) it threatens them. What happens if I get it wrong and they laugh at me. But like she says with French? I understand that they (.) no matter what tense? Whether it's right or wrong you just go. But they practise. They practise and in the end they find that it's not that hard for us to learn French. Er one (.) one student who was here. And then after all he did (.) he went around this this man? He spent time with (.) these people from Wallis where they use it. I mean French. And then? After two or three years he spoke French very fluently. He spoke very fluently. And then I found out too that some of our relatives who are English speakers in Vanuatu? When they go to New Caledonia for one or two years? When they come back you are shocked by them. So it means that conversation every now and then you realise that it's possible really quickly.

Miss Adina: So it is (1) it is a matter of like (.) the environment context that we use it. If (.) like we speak different (.) speakers? They have different (.) ways? Or (1) what do you call it? To speak uh (6) what do you call it? Different varieties? Different people have different varieties of speech.

Mr Aru: Yes.

Miss Adina: English. Like different varieties of speaking English. Varieties or styles. (2) Like that can also influence (.) like it has an impact on the students speaking English as well. Especially English. I don't know. English? Or different words. Different styles of speech?

F: M-m.

Miss Adina: Whereas French has just one style uh?

(1)

F: No it's the same.

Miss Adina: <laughs> But maybe like the dif- (.) that's why the students find it hard to speak English? And then <laughs> I think it's hard for them (.) them (.) them to speak because they want to speak like this but you say you must speak the right way. So (.) when they speak? It's hard for them to speak English. They are afraid to use English. That's it. (1) So maybe if we really want the students to speak English? We should have one (.) just one style <laughs> of speaking English. One style. One (.) so that everyone speaks the same. Just one idea. (1) I don't know how we would achieve it but it's just an idea.

(2)

Mr Aru: One (.) one other reason that we say we are reluctant to use English as (.) our language of communication? It is a (.) a (.) er a culture? A culture of people from Vanuatu. You can see the difference between. Uh Solomons and Vanuatu and Fiji?
They will- (..) Fiji? They will what we were just talking about now? Whether it’s good English or not whatever?

Miss Adina: Yes.

Mr Aru: They just go ahead. They just go. They speak English. So one attitude they have? It's (..) they don't care they just go ahead. But we it’s like (..) a habit we follow? We are afraid. What if I make a mistake. So we see this across the board. Uh everything you do? You think about what if I do it wrong they will laugh at me so (..) before you do anything you already have this fear.

(3)

Miss Adina: True.

Mr Aru: Yeah for the question here (..) <translates from question> an individual (..) er knowing both English and French? I think that (..) like because we are here (..) it's sort of an identity as well. When you get to know both languages? Then you go out you feel that yes you are from Vanuatu now.

Miss Adina: True.

Mr Aru: But if you go and you only learn one then you feel that no (..) you’ve been (..) part of another country but not Vanuatu. Because you don't know both languages.

Miss Adina: True.

Mr Aru: For the next question here which is C? <reads question> “Is it good that Vanuatu uses both English and French? I think maybe yes (..) like in terms of it's like this now. That we try as much as possible to use both languages and then (..) they have come up with the education master plan in place at the moment? They are unifying a curriculum for both English and French to use. So it means that (..) it's a requirement in Vanuatu. Like it depends on each of us now. The way we (..) we (..) I mean. Firstly? Those up at the Ministry of Education or Curriculum er have come down with these syllabus which are unified? Then we can use them. I think it’s a good idea. Because right now like if an individual wants to speak. Suppose he is an English speaker? Trying to speak French? It's just up to you. How you can make your way to go through. But if we have a unified curriculum in place? It might be easier for us. To use them (..) because we will follow this curriculum that we teach in the classroom and at the same time you learn. As a teacher you learn too. (18). And yet here? Like we talk about the two languages of Vanuatu? At the level of Vanuatu? That's where you will find them. You will find that (..) especially those (..) the airlines or (..) they need somebody who is bilingual. You speak French and er after a (..) couple of minutes you (..) uh switch to French that's what they really want. If you are just an English speaker or you are just a French speaker maybe you won’t be a priority. So it means that people (..) like we’ve heard already? When they talk about Vanuatu they expect you to be a bilingual. So when we go like suppose (..) at
first they speak English to you. If we go out of from Vanuatu you speak English. If
you don’t understand the next thing they will try French? So they expect us to know
either of these two languages. (13) Maybe we should move to the next one? If there
is no more discussion on this.

Miss Adina: <laughs> Let’s move to number 3.

(3)

Mr Aru: Okay 3 A? I think this is a good question which we need to discuss. It’s also
an interesting question for us to talk around. (1) Anglophones and Francophones
have better chance (.) which of (.) I mean. <reads question> “Do Anglophone or
Francophone have better chances of going overseas to study.” (1) Okay maybe er
what we can see now I think that most of them are Anglophone. Who go out for
studies overseas. Those who go out especially through the scholarship office? Most
of them are Anglophone. Er some Francophones will (.) I mean some Francophones
go as far as (.) they (.) they (.) when they are at school in Vanuatu they go to French
school. They they go to university entrance? They switch now. From Francophone
to English. And most of the time? Those who go come back successfully. They
never (.) the never fail here. They come back having completed their studies.

(13)

Miss Adina: Question 3 A. As Mr Aru says? I think that Anglophones have more
chances to go overseas. Like at the moment. I don’t know why but I’ve read in the
Daily Post maybe? Students who go to Noumea? They perform very badly. I don’t
know why but (.) I don’t know if it’s Noumea. But those who come to USP? They
perform well. Like Francophones who come to USP where only Angl- er English is
used? They perform really well (.) in English. And then I’m not sure what’s wrong
here but maybe it’s because of the different environment that they are studying in?
Like (1) like for example like Fiji or Noumea? In comparison? Fiji is like (.) it’s like
Vanuatu. So maybe (1) but Noumea is more advanced. So maybe this also
contributes to like (.) their performance? Their performance in the classroom as
well. (1) So that is why I don’t really know (.) I’m not sure? But the government may
be cutting down (.) it has cut the budget for students going for Francophone
studies? And they’ve increased Francophone sponsorship for those who come like
to English. (1) To the other stream. (1) But like at the moment I know that among
the Anglophone students who perform very well in (.) like. The Francophone
students perform very well in English. (1) And then like (.) they have more advan-
they have more advantages than the Anglophone students because they know both
languages. (1) I’m jealous. <laughs>

(2)

Miss Agnes: Yes I think for this question? It’s true that Anglophones they have more
chances to study overseas. And (.) I think it’s because the Anglophones have like (.)
many places to go.

Mr Aru: M-m.
Miss Agnes: While er Francophones they have just one. but (. ) I also have a
question about this that suppose the government (. ) like if we are (. ) a bilingual
country then it must make it fair. Like to get scholarships (. ) fair for the students so
that we maintain both er languages in (. ) our country. Although like if they don’t
perform well? But (. ) because we want (. ) both languages in the country then (. ) at
least we (. ) like they must offer the same (. ) chances to both Francophones and
Anglophones to go overseas. (1) That’s my view on this.

(3)

Mr Aru: Maybe (. ) it will (. ) maybe in the future (. ) in the near future these chances
will jump like this because in the new curriculum for education in Vanuatu at the
moment? Er if you look at (. ) uh its structure? Then we (. ) we start off just with
Francophone. You will start from Year 1 up to what (. ) Year 7 and then you just go
to English now.

Miss Adina: Okay.

Mr Aru: That’s a new curriculum that (. ) er one of them gave us. But if you look at its
structure? It’s like that. When we start off we will start off as Francophone. So (. ) uh
with the experiences of some students who have done that? It shows us that it wo-
it’s good. It’s good. Like she has said? When she went as far as um (. ) uh Year 7
Year 6 Year 7? Then she switched to English? Then she had no difficulty at all. And
for your information Fiona? There is a student here. He schooled French all the way
up to Year 11.

F: M-m. That’s Simon?

Mr Aru: Simon. So he decided. He decided I want to switch from uh Francophone to
Anglophone. But every day I look closely at his work and then I’m interested in his
report? You see how he he competes with the (. ) pure uh Anglophone students. But
he is (. ) he is far better than many of those in his class. Even in (. ) like he is taking
uh (. ) he is in the Science stream? And most of his work in Science is so
outstanding. And even English? English it’s like (. ) in the Science stream (. ) he is
one of twenty four. When he goes through the English test he won’t come beyond
ten. He will be under ten. His position will be under ten. Which is really good. So I
believe that (. ) we can do it. Like if there was a compulsory structure for us to
follow? Then we could achieve it. Like I’ve said there’s this new one? Er Year 1 up
to Year 7 or something. It’s just French. Then when you get there? At the next level
you just go to English.

(3)

Miss Adina: For me? If we talk about like me personally? If we talk about (. ) quality
education? If you have quality education you should have both (. ) knowledge or er
fluency in both English and French. That’s it like (. ) for me I think if you have a
quality education you should have both. Like you should learn both. Like if you only
learn English (. ) you have half <laughs> just half. It’s like the way you take just half
but still I think if it’s quality education it’s really good if you learn both languages. If
you can now use both languages (. ) use them to find a job. Use them to
communicate with other other people. So I really think if like if we want to have quality education in our country you should know both English and French.

Miss Agnes: Okay maybe to add to that I think that it’s also good if you know both languages? Like if you are a teacher? It means you have more chances to teach. Like you can go to a French school to teach or an English one. If you know both. Like fluently. And the content of both. So you have more chances to teach in uh an Anglophone or Francophone school.

Mr Aru: Chances to get jobs as we’ve already talked about. Like right now? Like the opportunities for jobs in Vanuatu most of them are for Anglophones. So we can say that Anglophone uh uh speakers? They have more chances. But then if we look at the other side of it? If we talk about a bilingual uh person? He now has more chances to get a job? Compared to someone who is either just an Anglophone or just a Francophone. And when we talk about the country. Yes if we try and extend this issue outside the country? Then the Francophones will have more chances than us. Because for example uh a bilingual. He can work he can go to New Caledonia and find a job. He can go to Fiji and find a job. Whereas those of us speaking only English? We can’t get a job in New Caledonia. You can only get a job in Fiji. So he has more chances. He has more chances. Er maybe in the country according I mean following the situation we have today? Okay we can say Anglophones. Er Anglophones in the sense that there are some workplaces that are English oriented workplaces? Then only those have the chance. But if it is an English Anglophone Francophone oriented place? Then you will give the chance to someone who speaks both languages.

Miss Adina: <reads question> “Do more people speak English or French throughout the world?” (1) Question E. (7) I don’t know how I would answer that.

F: So how many English speakers do you think there are in the world? Or in Vanuatu first and then how many French speakers?

Miss Agnes: Ah.

F: But the same thing in the whole world.

Miss Adina: Okay.
Mr Aru: For this question if we answer at the level of Vanuatu I think it will be a bit easier for us. Uh or if we start off? If we start off with (. .) for example on the island. (1) Ambae. Among the population here directly we can say there are more English speakers than French speakers. But if we extend further to the province? I think we'll still maintain that (. .) more English speakers than French speakers. And if we go as far as Vanuatu? I think we'll still maintain that. We'll still maintain that. Because right now like if we look at how the education system is? We have a sort of percentage like er (. .) Sixty forty? Or seventy thirty. Sixty is for Anglophones? And then forty is for Francophones. But throughout the world? I'm not really sure but if we take these categories from Vanuatu? Um at the same time we talk about English speakers in the world? I think that (. .) maybe (. .) maybe the two will be equal or just a small percentage difference. Like I still feel that (. .) there are more English speakers in the world than Francophones.

Miss Adina: I think so too. Because considering us? Like we know English through (. .) <turns to me> no offence (. .) the British colonising Vanuatu. So in history? The English? Er (. .) British? They colonised most parts of the world. So it means that (. .) there must be more English speakers than French. (4)

Miss Agnes: [Yes it's true]

Miss Adina: So [yes. When] they came and colonised Vanuatu? They came with like (. .) these things. So one of them was English that they came with. So we learn English. When they colonised another country they took English there too. So it means that all those must (. .) of course they speak English. But it means that (. .) I think yes. (1) When Mr Aru was talking? I just (. .) came to maybe (. .) realise that maybe there are more English speakers than French. Speakers. (4) So that's just my opinion.

Miss Agnes: For me (. .) like my opinion on this? I think it's true. Like (1) there are more Anglophone (. .) speakers than um French. Bute (. .) like also for learning? It is more English. More ni-Vans learn English than French. But (. .) coming to a time of speaking English? I think that although more uh people learn it? There are only a few who use it (. .) often. But if you look at French? When you go to an (. .) institution that is French? Like although there's a small number learning French they (. .) speak it more. I can give you the example of Alliance in Vila. If you go in the staff there only speak French. But when for example here if we are an English school? We (. .) we don't speak much English (. .) although we (. .) we learn English but we don't hear much of it. Speaking it outside compared to French. The way they use it. But (. .) Anglophones? ni-Vans learn more English but the way they use it is small. That's how I see it.

(4)
F: I think we should just move to 4 A. And make this the last question. Because I think we’ve talked about 4 B C already. If the service starts it will block out the sound. So let’s talk about the last part. 4 A.

(9)

Mr Aru: Okay I will start. Like. I have tried to express this already. I really believe. They are trying their best to unify the curriculum. For me I think this is very proper (.) it is proper of us to say that ni-Vanuatu must learn English and French. They must use English and French. And then it will help a lot. Not by (.) just looking at one or two reasons. Like the advantage of English. Or the advantage of French. But if we look more closely? Then someone who goes through knowing French and English will have more advantage over someone who knows (.) one (.) either of the two languages. (1) So for this question? I agree? Or I strongly support this (.) er a (.) this unified curriculum material that is coming out for us to use? Which the way they are designing it? It will start off in preschool? It comes up across primary school. It goes to secondary up to (. ) yeah it goes as far as Year 13. From uh preschool to Year 13. So if we have such a unified uh curriculum? A syllabus to use? Then I believe very much that it will work. Then that will be really good. Really good.

(3)

F: But a unified curriculum? Do you mean (.) going ahead in the Anglophone stream on one side? And the Francophone stream. Or joining the two together so we no longer have Anglophone Francophone. Like at the moment we have part- like it’s already partly unified. For basic education. But we use English here (.) and they use French down there. So this question is asking whether we should continue having Angolovo College Collège de Faranako being different? Or should we join the systems so that (.) there is only one kind of school where we all we don’t have this label of Anglophone or Francophone. We are all just (.) the same.

(1)

Mr Aru: Okay like my understanding about this er unified curriculum? Like (.) the content will (.) the content of the syllabus will be exactly the same. Only the language will be different. Like from Year 7 upwards in Social Science? The content will be the same as for French. Only the language will be different. So if you all the way up to Year 10 and then you want to swap and come here? There won’t be anything new. Er only the language will change. This is how I understand this curriculum. I have questioned it. Does it mean that (.) uh we give them the chance to teach English (.) English in French schools or is it just the same? Or will there be the same number of lessons in English as there are in French? They said no. What we are trying to (.) uh do all the content of all the courses will be (.) like I mean (.) definitely the same. It’s just the language we will use a different language but the content of the courses all the way up will be the same. Whatever we learn in English will be the same in French.

(22)
Miss Adina: Okay. My opinion is (.) like I’ve said I’ve already shared this opinion (.) since we started this discussion up to now? Like (.) the (1) like main purpose for me (.) I think it’s (.) it’s for students to understand something? Like if we come back to school again. And like for you to pass on knowledge? Students to gain knowledge. So qua- for quality education I think that it’s (.) it is good if we use both languages? Or if there are other languages again that we can use. I think that if (1) like (.) the whole purpose if for students to achieve something. (1) But if he can achieve more in (.) French? Or more in English? The I think it’s no problem for us to use both languages. Like (.) the purpose for me is like it’s just what I think like for students to understand something for us to have quality education. I don’t care which <laughs> which uh (.) language they learn in? All I care about is that the students get the knowledge for them to have a future. <laughs> (11) Like we can argue both sides. Like. Like suppose he can gain knowledge through just one language? Like that won’t fulfil our identity. Like if he gains knowledge only through English then he won’t fulfil this identity. Because this identity is (.) um maybe our languages or identity are (.) the languages of our colonisers. If (2) I have no idea what we should do (.) the purpose for me? Like <laughs> is for students to understand something? And to use this knowledge for their futures.

F: So this is like a (.) big thing that they are talking about a lot at the Ministry at the moment. It’s not an easy question. It’s like there’s no answer. But there are some at the Ministry who want (.) us to join the two sides together. So that we don’t differentiate between (.) like your brother schools French? But you school English or something like that. All of you will be educated in the same system. Like you don’t separate them. But for (.) there are some others who say no. We should just maintain this so that you school English over there? And you French over there? That’s better. (1) Those who say that we should join them? Then it comes back to the second question of how we can join them.

Miss Agnes: Yes.

F: Because if we join them? Which language do we use. Because at the moment we know that we use English here and we learn French. But down there? They use French. And then they learn English as a subject. So if you join them? Then how will you do it. Would we use two languages together from Class 1 all the way up? Or like you’ve said would there be French first? And then everyone moves to English? (1) O::r are there some other ways? Or (.) so this is a main discussion that the government is talking about. So what are your thoughts on this.

(7)

Mr Aru: Like for me (.) if you look at the education master plan we have? They really want (.) like at the back of their mind they (.) the way I see it they want (.) one day (.) one day to come. Everybody has to be fluent French and English speakers. In the country of Vanuatu. That's how I see it. There are some observations? Some er (.) some er (.) go through this? And then they take these examples and then we can base it on these examples. Like this is a good example that Miss Agnes said. She went as far as (.) because French is hard uh. So when it's hard you learn it first. Uh the one that is easy comes in later on. So with the pro- uh (.) this curriculum we
have? if you look at the one they gave us last time? You will see our education system is like this? Preschool. Uh preschool I mean uh yes. Uh vernacular will (.)
start in Year 1 Year 2? Vernacular. Then starting in Year 2 up to Year 7 then it’s French only. And then after French (.) in Year 7? That’s when they will make a choice to go to English. (1) Which is why it will be easy because. At the moment?
Like when you reach Year 7? Uh you continue with French uh if you decide to go to (. ) French? It’s easy for you. It’s easy if you decide to (.) that’s it you’ve learnt French so if you decide to come to English? That will be easy for you too. It will be easy so (.) one way that I see? They see that that’s how we learn we can have a (.) transition period? That can take place as far as Year 7 or Year 8. But like in Class 1 or Class 2 that’s late. I mean it’s too early. We can’t do this because when you go you will just forget everything.

Miss Agnes: In my opinion if it’s like that you go to (.) French like to (.) start off in primary up to 7 8? And then switch? I think that would be really good because it’s easy to go to English. And then? For French you would still (.) what you have learnt? You would still know it and you would still be able to understand. So that would (.) like when you went to English? You would already know English. So like (.) at the end you would know both French and English.

F: You mean that everyone would school French first?

Miss Agnes: Yes.

F: But if we go to the practicality of this? Like if you think about <addresses Mr Aru> your wife? Who teaches there? What would happen to her? If (.) we say that every primary teacher must be French. Would she learn French? Or would she be out of the teaching profession. Or how would we find the French teachers to go into primary.

Mr Aru: Yes.

F: Because now? As you said sixty percent are English. So at the moment like we don’t have (.) like we want to implement the whole primary in French? But where are the teachers? How would=

Miss Agnes: =You mean that every teacher has to be a French teacher?

F: Uh-uh.

Miss Adina: French first.

F: If you say this system? That the two of you are talking about? That everyone will (. ) from Class 2 up to Class 7 or something like that? French. But where are the teachers? How will we find people who can speak French in the primary classrooms.

Mr Aru: In the discussions? Like they have [taken this into account.]
Miss Agnes: [Just train the French primary]
teachers

F: But where are they? There aren’t any.

Mr Aru: They have taken this into account like they are talking about a period of time like when we can apply this uh system? Until this time?

Miss Agnes: Yes.

Mr Aru: In the sense that okay. While from now onwards? We will need to retrain.

Everybody.

Miss Agnes: M-m.

Mr Aru: Because if we say that we talk all about it you finish with that? Then we try to switch straightaway then it just won’t work out because we don’t have the human resources. They’re not there in the system we have. So we need to take at least five or ten years to prepare the teachers? Because we will need to train all the primary school teachers as French teachers. And then the secondary school teachers? Those will be English and French up here. So that they do the work down there on behalf of all of us up here. So we mustn’t forget too the discussion about that we mustn’t forget too that yes in that case then what do we do with all these existing teachers. The primary school teachers. Do they have to finish? Or do we need to give them in-service training so they have some knowledge of French to teach in French? They are also considering this as well.

F: M-m. We’ve talked a lot about it being hard for Anglophones to learn French. So if it’s hard? If you say to the primary teachers who were English to begin with? Okay we will train them to speak French? But is this realistic? O::r <laughs> (2)

Like I’m I’m not arguing against it? Like I’ve heard these arguments already because I’ve heard a lot of the discussion coming out of the Ministry. So anything you suggest? Like I’m giving you a different answer? <laughs> But this is the real situation that we will have the problem of implementation. (2) But I don’t know if there is an answer to this or not.

Mr Aru: Yes directly on this? If we switch all these English teachers to French? Like we know the answer to this already. It won’t it’s not easy. Because they are mature people and for mature people to learn it’s really hard. Young people students? Yes it’s easy for them because they adapt quickly. For uh mature people it will really take time. It will really take time. So it means that we should look at like if uh in the future you want to become a

Miss Adina: Teacher.

Mr Aru: A primary school teacher? Then you have to go for French teaching.

Because that is the foundation of our education system in Vanuatu? Uh all the way from pre-school up to Year 7? If we say basic education? So Year 6 7? Basic
education. Up to Year 8? They must all be French teachers. And then further
beyond that then the English teachers will just come in. (1) It’s not easy.

Miss Adina: So you mean that in this period of time? That we are considering it?
Maybe five years ten years? You mean that when teachers like (. ) us at the Vanuatu
( .) Teachers where (. ) the place where teachers train is the Teachers College? And
maybe some other institutions. So it means that when they apply to Teachers
College they will screen them (...) to know that they are Francophone speakers
before (. ) like they take them for training? And then when they come out into the
field? They will be able to teach in French. So that it won’t be (. ) it won’t be (. ) a
problem like (. ) it’s not just for one person to do? It means that everyone must
contribute like all the places (. ) concerned? Like Teachers College. And (. ) like (. )
the Ministry and (. ) the other places? That are involved in the education system of
Vanuatu? They must consider this they must start a good foundation before (2) for
example I say that if (. ) you apply to train at Teachers College to be a primary
school teacher? They must know that if you are Francophone? They will accept you
<laughs>. (1) I think this (. ) idea.

(1)

F: Maybe for the last point we should come back to the point that Miss Adina made.
When she said that (. ) at the end of everything we must think about the quality of
education.

Miss Agnes: Yes.

F: So this is a question? that (. ) if we really want (. ) English and French? We want
everyone to know English and French? (1) Do you think there is a conflict now?
When like (. ) this idea about language? Is overtaking the idea about quality? Like we
are thinking a lot about having bilingualism. Like what bilingualism means in
Vanuatu. Like just English and French? We are so busy going for this that we forget
about quality? Or is it possible for us to go for both at the same time. Or (. ) because
this is the main purpose for changing the system. To make it so that everyone
learns French first and then goes to English. It’s not because of quality education.
(1) This will make education harder. Because when you’ve already learnt Maths in
French? And then you go to English? It will make it more complicated. So it’s like its
main purpose is not for quality. It’s just for bilingualism.

Mr Aru: M-m.

F: So do you see a conflict that

Miss Adina: Yes.

F: Makes it harder? Or do you not really see a problem with this. (1) Like this is just
my feeling. Like we are arguing for bilingualism but (. ) then we lose the main
objective again.

(2)
Mr Aru: Yes if we go for (2) for every child in Vanuatu knowing both languages?

Then we’re not talking about quality. We are spending a lot of our time on this a lot of speaking both languages. But we are not talking about the quality now. While they are talking about uh (.) uh (1) a dual system? Or whatever we have here? We must take this into account okay. For this? We go for this but then (.) let’s not forget that if we really want quality. Then we must look at some criteria that we must follow too. If we just go for (1) er we (.) we receive (.) we are only able to speak the two languages? Then we already don’t have quality. We just do away with quality. (2) Further to this explanation? I think like my own personal opinion is that (.) I think if we just look at that? At this matter only or whatever we are worried about is how to speak the language only. We don’t need to do everything. As long as you can understand the language and speak it. If you are an Anglophone and you understand someone else speaking the other one then that’s enough. That’s enough. Because if we talk about the systems and the content in the syllabus? They will be the same. But the only thing is the language. It’s only the language that we need to know. Then maybe somehow somewhere? Then we will be able to maintain good quality education. But if we focus too much on this? And we give more time to this? Then the quality will end.

F: Any final comments? On this question (2) o should we just finish here.

Miss Adina: No it’s true like we go on about this? We tend to forget quality education. And er (.) the main people involved. The recipients of education and the people who are passing the education. Along. Passing the knowledge. So (3) again? Let me restate again that it is a matter of (.) us passing the knowledge and students grasping the ideas. Because in the end? They will (.) with us? Like (.) the education they get will help them in their future lives. So (6) just for students to get some uh (.) understanding. I don’t care how we pass the knowledge along (.) as long as students gain the knowledge can use the knowledge in a good way and they get some education. Because (.) if we pass it (.) pass it in one? One like one language? And they don’t understand? Then what is the purpose of education. It won’t be relevant. So (.) maybe we should stick to one language to <laughs> pass on knowledge? Then they will understand? Then I will be satisfied. But if we pass on knowledge in a language that they don’t understand? They won’t be able to use this knowledge they have gained. Because they won’t understand the purpose of this knowledge. Because if they don’t understand this knowledge how will they use it so (2) I go for as long as students grasp the knowledge we should use whatever language to pass uh pass the knowledge?

F: But now you’ve gone back you’re arguing against your first point. Because you said that like you (.) you really regret not speaking French.

Miss Adina: Yes.
F: So now you (. ) or if we go for just one language and we leave the other one?
What does that mean? Do we just choose one? Forget (1) or do we go back and
say no we must have (. ) English and French? We=
As long as the students understand.
F: So if we find out that the best way is just Bislama? Forget English and French
and Vanuatu will no longer speak English and French uh?
Miss Adina: Then we go for Bislama. (2) But then again like (. ) it means that we
must reform everything again. The writing purpose in Eng- I mean Bislama. The
curriculum would change to be Bislama. Like that would be hard again. Be for this?
As long as students understand something.

(3)
Mr Aru: Like. The way I see it? Like. In terms of this language Bislama? Like I will be
in Vanuatu for the rest of my life. But I must speak a good Bislama. Because if we
listen to ourselves? Most of what we say when we discu- we say in Bislama it’s
repetition and a lot of it (. ) just doesn’t mean anything. So if like (. ) we can do it
okay. We do away with French? Do away with English and then we go for Bislama?
Then this will take a huge time again. A huge amount of time to <Miss Agnes and
Miss Adina laugh> come back and write good Bislama (. ) every little grammar and
everything in Bislama? Then we will have to come back like I said? We’re speaking
Bislama now? It’s just a broken version. It’s not a good one at all? Yesterday there
was an expression for a particular thing today it’ll be different. Tomorrow we’ll speak
a different language. Even though it’s still Bislama but then we use different words
altogether rather than using the same words. So if we take this and do it? Okay we
decide to go for Bislama? Then it will come back to writing the syllabus down.
Everybody who has spoken Bislama yesterday before that? Then we will come and
start here. This is just something that I can’t imagine <laughs> <sighs dramatically>
A::h too complicated. <Miss Adina laughs>.

F: Okay let’s finish here. Thank you.
Appendix XIV – Interview with Angolovo College Teacher Group 2 (Original)

Date: 07-11-11
Location: Staff room
Participants: Mr Andrew, Mr Ala, Mrs Anne, Mrs Angela, Mme Adrienne

Notes: I asked each of the five participants if they would be willing to take part, as these were all people I had had informal discussions with during the first period of fieldwork. I gave them time to read through the questions first, and then Mr Ala was nominated as a chairperson to lead the discussion and move between questions as necessary.

1  Mr Ala: Bae yumi statem discussion long fas pat blong (.) er kwestin hem i <reads>
2   “the school language? (.) Part A? (.) Do you find it easy or difficult to use English to
3   teach your subjects? Do you think that students find it easy or difficult to use English
4   in your classes.” Okei mi putum i go long floa nao?
5
6  Mr Andrew: Okei long saed blong mi mi ting se mi (1) er faenem i isi blong yusum
7   Inglis long (.) klasrum? Um but the problem nomo? Because the students blong
8   yumi oli kam long defren backgrounds? Therefore long sam instances bae oli
9   faenem lelebet difficulty wetem (.) lanwis and himia tu hem i go wetem sabjek (.) er
10  lanwis we yumi yus long hem. For example mifala long Science? A lot of er words
11  we mifala i yusum blong tijim long Science oli very difficult for (.) wan yang learner
12  olsem we hem i kamaot long wan praemeri and hem i hit up i go long secondary
13  level ia. So lanwis blong sabjek tu hem i another contributing factor long difficulty we
14  blong styuden hem i acquire/em. But for the teacher? Mi for the (.) time we mi gat
15  experience as a teacher mi ting se so far (.) mi (.) find it easy to actually go with the
16  (.) yus blong Inglis long klasrum.
17
18  Mrs Anne: Okei long mi? (1) Ating um (.) bae mi olsem Mr Andrew i talem mi
19   faenem i isi blong mi (.) mebi eksplen more long Inglis than long Bislama o (.) yes
20  Bislama? Uh mi bin traem wan taem finis mifala ating las yia? Mifala i bin yusum
21  klas blong mi so (.) mi no save ating bae hem i save possible but mi (.) bin traem
22  long Bislama. Mi traem tijim (.) sam samting long Bislama but mi faenem se hem i a
23  bit difficult <laughs> long mi blong (.) but mi ting se hem i (.) blong mi yusum Inglis
24  hem i much better. But i go long sam eria/s long sa- mebi long sabjek ia? We mi ting
25  hem i better bae mi save tijim long Bislama. From hem i ol styuden bae oli no save
26  andastanem nomo sapos mi (.) mi er tijim be otherwise maybe generally? Mi yusum
27  Inglis. (1) Be:: long saed long ol styuden/s? Hemia olsem (1) mi faenem so far mi
28  faenem se taem (.) nomata yu eksplenem wan samting we yu ting se yu eksplenem
29  hem i very klia long ol styuden long Inglis? But stil bae oli no save er andastanem
nomo. So:: fulap taem mi stap tempted se mi (. ) turnaround mi jes traem blong eksplenenm long (. ) Bislama long olgeta ating bae oli save andastanem mo.

(6)

Mr Ala: Mi long (. ) mi tu olsem mi faenem i isi blong tijim subjek blong mi long Inglis. Olsem from i gat ol terms olsem Mr Andrew i talem. Olsem blong yu mas yusum blong ol correct terms nao blong olgeta. Be:: er wan samting olsem (. ) sapos yumi statem olgeta long (. ) long level we long Yia 7 oli kam antap? From naoia yumi gat er Yia (. ) 9 wetem 10. So system tu hem i wan problem insaed long skul blong yumi. Sapos yu stap wetem olgeta long Yia 7 i kam antap? Bae taem yu talem ol terms ol samting ol (. ) olsem basic ia nao long Yia 7 i kam antap. Be taem we yu tekem olgeta long Yia 9? Olsem (. ) taem yu talem ol terms? Olgeta oli wan- oli no save se wanan ia. Hem i wan problem olsem (. ) er (. ) olsem styuden/s we oli (. ) oli (. ) ating bae oli faenem in difficult naa uh background blong olgeta. Olsem olgeta we oli kam long ol top-ups? Olgeta nao bae oli faenem i had. Sapos we yumi statem olgeta long (. ) long (. ) Yia 7 i kam antap bae i isi. Be i gat wan samting tu olsem mi faenem insaed long klasrum sam styuden/s oli (. ) oli (. ) olsem oli (. ) oli faenem (. ) i had blong yusum Inglis insaed long klasrum. Sometimes. Hem i (. ) mi no save se wanem factor i contribute kam long ples ia. Oli sem? Oli sem blong Inglis blong olgeta? O (2) oli save oli save (. ) o ating grammar o samting olsem mi no save.

(1)

Mrs Angela: Ating bae mi (. ) bae mi kam in long ples ia ating Mr Ala i talem hem i tru. Olsem ating mifala we i tijim Inglis? Olsem (. ) i tru. Bae yumi tijim gud but then yumi kambak long pikinini. Samtaem hem i had. Olsem pikinini hem i faenem i had. Ating wan risen olsem yumi talem finis se (. ) yumi no bring/im olgeta i stap long 7 i kam. Oli kam samwea? Bae yu faenem long wan klas be ol gud styuden/s and then yu faenem ol sam we i very weak. Olsem se yu mekem wan bigfala range tu long olsem (. ) mifala long lanwis olsem wan big grup wan big gap long yumi mas wok wetem wok wetem. Yu wantem wok wetem hemia we i fast wan? O afta yu tingting long hemia we ol weak wan/s be (. ) ating wan (. ) wan nara samting ating (. ) oli no yusum naf. Oli no yusum naf long klasrum blong givim olgeta confidence olsem blong toktok olsem. Samfala bae oli fraet se ating bae mi (. ) mi pronounce/em wod ia hem i rong? O mekem se pikinini tu olsem se (. ) i faenem i had. Mi lukum olsem confidence nomo oli no gat confidence blong yusum lanwis itself. Mekem se oli faenem se hem i had lelebet. Be:: ating bakegen ating (. ) olsem i kambak long yumi ol tija bakegen. Se hao nao yumi helpem ol pikinini. Tru yumi karem olgeta sot taem nomo be (. ) hao nao yumi save mekem blong helpem olgeta.

(7)

Mme Adrienne: Okei long mi. Uh (. ) yusum Inglis long klasrum ating (. ) mi faenem hem i isi. Even though mi tijim French sometimes taem mi kam long ol poen olsem (. ) grammar sapos we mifala i mekem ol lesen long grammar hem i isi much more easier blong mi eksplenem long (. ) mi taem eksplenem long Inglis blong oli harem save. Hem i no min se mi no save long French? But mi lukluk long saed blong pikinini. Ol pikinini sapos we samtaem taem mi eksplenem i go long French mi luk
“Are you a confident user of English? Do you wish to speak” (.) sorry “do you wish”

Mrs Angela: “You spoke”

Mr Ala: “You spoke it better?”

Mrs Angela: Ating bae mi mi stat. From mi mi Inglis tija. <Laughs> Olsem. Olsem bae yumi evriwan mi ting se bae yumi tingting se (.) no mi no confident. Olsem ating mi wis se (.) yumi could have spoken it better be. Ating bae yumi kambak long yumi bakegen ating <laughs> yumi no (.) ating yumi talem ol styuden be ating bae i kambak long yumi bae (.) yumi sem mak olsem se yu harem se oh no bae ol colleagues blong mi bae mi toktok bae (.) er (.) bae mi talem i nogud o (.) sometimes mi stap lukum olsem (.) yumi stap yusum long staf miting uh? Ating somebody hem i gat wan (.) wan point of view i wantem toktok be lanwis itself nao ating from wetem colleagues olsem ia mekem se (.) mi no fil se (.) no tingting ia lego nomo bae mi no toktok but ating at the back long maen blong yumi i stap tingting se no nogud mi talem i nogud. Olsem hemia tingting blong mi nomo <laughs>. Krangke wan. Mi no save blong yufala be:: (.) ating olsem blong olsem mi olsem mi no confident
blong speak/im olsem se yumi stap traem. Though yumi no confident be yumi always traem.

(3)

Mr Ala: Ating mi tu sem mak olsem Mrs Angela i talem. Olsem mi:: samtaem mi no confident be (.) mi fil se sapos mi toktok gud Inglis mo. Blong mi (.) olsem taem yu go long sam pat olsem blong uh askem ol kwestin olsem olsem olsem ia? Yu save? Bae yu mas yusum sam Inglis we. Samtaem mi harem olsem se mi mas go olsem <makes lots of hand gestures, up and down and round in a circle> (.) mas yusum ol terms ia blong go daon blong (.) go daon noma be from (.) sometimes olsem mi harem olsem sapos mi toktok gud Inglis mo blong mi save. Yu save Inglis styu- er tija/s oli olsem ia nao long mi:: sem samting noma be oli tantanem tantanem tantanem <hands rapidly moving round> <All laugh> Mekem se pikinini i krangke uh? <All laugh> So hemia nao olsem se mi harem se hemia nao bae i helpem mi plante blong mi save (.) er mekem olgeta oli picture/em wan picture long (.) long (.) olsem ia mi question/em olgeta mi tanem upside down? Olgeta oli save tanem picture i kam long (.) olsem olsem.

(2)

Mrs Angela: Olsem mi no save but mi stap fil se nacioia? Taem mi stap go mi stap tingting se mi wis se mi styuden nao olsem long ej nacioia long taem olsem se yu (.) yu kam blong lukum save olsem mi stap wis se (.) sapos mi go skul bakegen ating bae mi lan mo olsem yu kam olsem se (.) at the time that yu styuden mebi olsem (.) nacioia i no kia be nacioia we yumi kam wok afta mi stap tingting se (.) mi wis se mi gat janis blong go skul bakegen ating bae mi save toktok Inglis i better o:: <laughs> hemia olsem krangke tingting bakegen se (.) from ating yumi kam long ej we yumi luk save. Afta yu stap regret bak se (.) eh mi stap tingbaot taem blong skul salo sapos mi stap go long klas o sapos mi stap askem tija blong mi long taem ia o. Sapos mi stap smat olsem ol smat pikinini we oli toktok Inglis uh. (2) Yufala we yu skul long Ostrelia? <Looking at Mr Andrew>

(1)

Mrs Anne: Mi mi agri long wanem Mr Ala wetem Mrs Angela tufala i talem. Olsem Mr Ala i talem mi fully agri long hem um (.) ating mi tu mi no really er mi no (.) fil confident blong (.) yusum Inglis long (.) klasrum (.) especially olsem Mr Ala i talem we taem yu tijim wan (.) wan topic and then olsem be yu mas (.) mekem long wan wei blong wan (.) styuden i:: (.) olsem eni kwestin/s we hem i come up long that particular topic? Styuden hem i save ansarem kwestin. Hemi i save tantanem eni other (.) eni wei blong hem i save ansarem kwestin ia. Olsem (.) um (.) sabjek blong mi hem i (.) mainly hem i that particular olsem (.) aedia nai i kam insaed we (.) yu talem wan samting be styuden bae (.) styuden bae hem i lukum (.) that particular mebi wanem (.) wanem yu tijim ia bae hem i lukum long fulap defren eria. Bae yu save blong givim defren ansea/s long that particular topic we yu tijim. So (.) mebi hem i wan problem tu olsem blong complete/im ol kwestin/s ol defren kwestin/s blong ansarem uh (.) that eni kwestin/s blong come up long that particular topic tu hem i wan (.) wan mebi sort of the problem long (.) sabjek we mi gat.
Mme Adrienne: Mi ting se mi yusum Inglis (.) evri dei.

Mrs Angela: <laughs> But?

Mme Adrienne: Olsem (.) mi no gat problem wetem. Wan man we hem i save better Inglis olsem Fiona bae i correct/em. Se whether Inglis blong mi i nogud be (.) blong talem se are you confident? Mi save talem se yes.

Mr Andrew: Mi long saed blong mi? Yes ating olsem Mme Adrienne i talem. Mi (.) olsem taem mi stap long wanem ia long environment (.) local environment? Mi ting se mi confident be taem we mi kam to public speaking o iven we taem we yumi gat ol visita? Then hem i wan test blong traem confidence long saed blong mi long yus blong Inglis. But mi ting se mi biliv long wan saying that taem yu (.) the more you use it? The more you become familiar wetem or confident wetem.

Mr Ala: Okei muv go long C? <reads> “Students and staff do not speak English very often outside the classroom. Why is this.”

Mrs Angela: <laughs>

Mr Andrew: Okei hem i hem i no wan problem we mi save talem se hem i wan problem long (.) ol pipol long Vanuatu? Since yumi long Vanuatu yumi grow up long (.) wan long (.) totally defren climates altogether? Er the reason why yumi no yusum Inglis a lot of times aot saed long klasrum (.) teachers or staff and students? Hem i wan nao hem i hu yu stap wetem long taem we yu stap aot saed long klasrum. Hem i wan contributing factor. Sapos yu stap wetem er (.) yu blong Ambae yu stap wetem wan man we yu kam (. ) yutufala i kamaot long sem ples yutufala i mas speak/im lanwis nomo. So activity aot saed long klasrum tu hem i contribute long (.) how often yu speak/im Inglis (.) especially yu stap aot saed long klasrum? Be yu stap wetem wan waetman? Obviously you must speak in English. So ( . ) long ( . ) why yumi no speak/im a lot of this aot saed long klasrum wan nao hem i ( . ) hem i hu yu stap wetem? That moment aot saed long klasrum. And wan narafala samting tu? Vanuatu hem i full of cultures and ( . ) what ( . ) er ol traditions? Taem yumi stap aot saed long klas sapos yumi dring kava? Yumi blong Vanuatu nomo? Then bae mi go sidaoq stori wetem Mr Ala obviously mitufala i mas speak/im lanwis blong mi. Secret ( . ) er secret long ( . ) lanwis tu hem i another contributing factor. Sapos we mitufala i wantem tokbaot wan man? Mitufala blong Ambae mitufala i mas toktok lanwis nomo. And ( . ) sapos i ( . ) mifala stap wetem wan man we hem i speak/im Inglis hem i no save Bislama? Mifala i sutum hem wetem Bislama ( . ) blong haedem information is another contributing factor. And sapos yu stap long wan traditional ( . ) activity laek mared o olsem? Then mostly bae oli yusum local dialects blong whatever ( . ) uh eria o ( . ) uh yes ( . ) aelan we hem i stap long hem.
Mrs Angela: Ating bae yumi kambak long confidence bakegen nomo uh? Olsem aot saed blong (.) talem se yumi no speak/im aot saed long klasrum. Ating long klasrum from hem i a must. Must olsem hem i wan medium we yumi yusum. Taem we aot saed? Olsem (.) yumi no tingting strong nomo se

Mrs Anne: Yes mi:: mi ting se wanem oli talem i tru from mi stap lukum olsem (.) long mi wan olsem mi luk (.) er (.) to students olsem mi traem bes blong mi. From mi save se hem i wan requirement blong skul skul blong yumi toktok Inglis long olgeta at all times even (.) insaed long klasrum o aot saed. So (.) olsem. Mi olsem mi traem long taem blong skul olsem mi hardly toktok Bislama o eni ting long ol styuden and (.) be wanem mi faenem se (.) taem sapos yumi wokbaot tugeta wetem ol styuden bae yumi go olsem yumi wokbaot go long stadium or yumi go eni wea. Sapos we mi ting se mi communicate wetem olgeta long Inglis? Bae dis taem bae i katemaot conversation long olgeta nao. Bae mi mi wan olsem mi traem bes blong mi. But it comes a time we sapos we yu toktok long Inglis ia? Oli sapos mi kambak nomo sa boil pan saed. Oli yes no oli givim wan smol ansa nomo finis? Oli stop nao. Bae mifala i communication i no save go so. Mifala i jes wokbaot olsem (.) kwaet nomo i go. Be sapos mi jenis ia mi kam Bislama nao conversation i (.) i stat nao i go on. So (.) mi luk se olsem we oli talem (.) we hem i mebi (.) i kambak nomo olsem mi mi no confident nomo blong mi toktok long (.) Inglis.

Mme Adrienne: Bae mi add-em smol long hemia Mrs Anne i talem hem i tru. Mi wan olsem mi traem bes blong mi blong toktok long Inglis aot saed. But it comes a time we sapos we yu toktok long Inglis ia? Olsem we yu toktok long ol styuden we mifala kam long sem ples? Nia mia fil bad tu. Se bae oli talem se woman ia i flas o wanem. <others laugh> Si. So samting olsem hem i stap. But hem i no minim se:: mifala i no sua se Inglis mifala i laekem speek/im but i gat wan samting ating it is to do with tradition blong mifala o (.) yes olsem.

Mr Ala: Mi olsem (.) hemia olsem long nara point of view but nara poen bakegen olsem mi mi luk olsem skul rul tu hem i (.) contribute long (.) long hemia tu olsem. Sapos skul rul i talem se speak English at all times? Olsem nao bae ol pikinini bae oli traem had blong nomata se oli toktok nogud be bae oli gohed nomo blong (.) be sapos skul rul i talem se speak English long ol certain times olsem ia? Nia mia bae i olsem ah no yumi yusum Bislama nomo. Olsem tingting blong mi nomo. Aot saed i mean aot saed long klas. Olsem klasrum. Taem yumi go aot saed hem i defren be (.) around the school boundary olsem. Mainly (.) administration and classrooms.

Mme Adrienne: Be taem yu talem olsem hem i (.) i no se ol man we olsem se oli stap lukum ol skul rul/s ia? Oli (.) taem i kam long lanwis? Oli no wantem enforce/em Inglis tu from oli talem se ol pikinini oli gat raet blong toktok long Bislama. Long lanwis blong olgeta. So hemia long ples ia that will be our problem.

Mr Ala: Oli sud jenisim polisi ia. Speak English and French at all times. From tufala lanwis ia nao oli stap talem long skul.

Mr Andrew: Be (.) olsem Vanuatu i mas divelop into a country so (.) ol local lanwis/es blong yumi tu oli impoten olsem (.) yumi mas kipim traditional cultures and
238 kastom i alive? Be (.) i min se ol pikinini oli mas sam hao practise/im ol lanwis blong
239 olgeta blong kipim histri.
240 Mr Ala: Olsem mi i gat wan argument long ples ia from olsem. Inglis wetem French?
241 Yumi tijim olgeta be Bislama wetem lanwis? Yumi no tijim. So olgeta oli toktok rabis
242 Bislama wetem rabis lanwis.
243 (2)
244 Mr Andrew: Ating hem i wan project blong gavman we i impoten be because
245 Gavman blong Vanuatu hem i politicised tumas? Be mi ting se long wan woksop we
246 mifala i attend/em hemia nao oli traem blong cover/em. Hem i blong mekem sua se
247 evri pikinini long Vanuatu i (.) not just speak/im English and French? But they need
to learn the language from the roots up to the (1) stamba o wanem.
248 <others laugh>
249 F: Be wanem nao skul rul naoia?
250 Mr Andrew: Speak English every day.
251 Mrs Angela: No afta mi ting se oli amen- oli amend/em se (.) long skul aoa/s nomo.
252 Mrs Anne: Up to half past four.
253 Mrs Angela: Up to half past four.
254 F: Ah okei.
255 Mrs Angela: O samting olsem.
256 Mrs Anne: <laughs>
257 Mme Adrienne: Be hemia nao mi talem iven hem i wan- hem i polisi ia? Hem i wan
discussion hem i anda discussion from taem yu talem bae i Inglis nomo? Samfala?
258 Bae oli stil argue se nogat. Yu mas givim taem blong olgeta blong oli save toktok
259 Bislama o lanwis blong olgeta.
260 Mr Ala: Hem i olsem bilif blong mi olsem se sapos yumi talem se toktok Inglis
261 wetem French at all times? Sapos oli mestem oli toktok lanwis hem i no wan
262 samting be (.) from (.) olsem problem ia nao? Insaed long klasrum oli no save
263 andastanem Inglis. Olsem ridim mo speak/im aot uh? So the more they do it the
264 more they become better.
265 Mrs Anne: Yumi (.) yumi talem about lanwis (.) olsem hao yumi speak/im long
266 klasrum o olsem ol styuden-s be (.) olsem hemia i wan problem. Hem i wan bigfala
267 problem finis be (.) olsem mi faenem long sabjek blong mi tu. Wan problem se yu
268 tokbaot olsem bae mi yusum ol (.) terms long wod/s long sentens blong mi. Be ol
269 simple terms we mi yusum ol simple wod oli no save andastanem nomo so hemia
270 mi nomo save nao. Se i olsem wanem. Hem i kambak long wanem (.) hem i go bak
271 long hao yumi (.) yumi raet (.) yumi talem long olgeta? O hem i go back to (.) mebi
272 problem se oli no rid o wanem. From wan simple wod we mi ting se iven hem i go
as far as Yia 13? Yu yusum wan simple wod we (.) olsem consequences for example. Olsem wan wod ia we mi ting se oli sud save be (.) hemia bae oli no save wanem. Bae oli askem se hemia hem i minim wanem oli no save se hem i minim wanem. So mi no save. Hemia bae mi (.) olsem (.) go long (.) go long wanem kaen problem nao. <laughs>

Mme Adrienne: Be yu lukum hemia hem i tru. From naoia yu tekem consequences ia? For example olsem wan wod? Bae yu traem eksplenem long Bislama bae yu talem olsem wanem. Bae ol pikinini bae oli jes konfius mo. Consequence bae yu talem olsem wanem long Bislama. Yumi ting se Inglis hem i we oli sud harem save be yet nogat. Taem we bae yu mekem i go long Bislama? Hemia bae i worse.

Mrs Angela: Be hemia i minim se i foldaon long wanem? Wei we yumi skul i kam? Edyukesen olsem wei we yumi bin attend/em long evri level i kam? O i foldaon long (1) olsem i tru olsem mifalal long lanwis bae mifala i talem olsem wod/s. Yu no save. Dictionary oli go lukum faenem be (.) no oli no wantem. Oli no bothered long (.) wod ia i minim wanem? Hao nao mi save yusum wod ia? O (1) so hemia i kambak long=

Mr Andrew: =Wan problem long yumi long Vanuatu because yumi gat so much lanwis so yumi gat so much vocab so (.) wan stumbling block blong yumi. Olsem Miss Fiona olgeta? The only vocab is English vocab nomo. So they've been grow up since smol i go antap wetem Inglis vocab. Be yumi long (.) Vanuatu? Yumi gat er Inglis and French blong lanem long skull? And then yumi gat Bislama blong yumi lanem long wan yang ej? Yumi gat mother tongue we yumi lanem long very very yang ej so (.) taem yu traem blong bildim i kam yu kosem wan hybrid ia hem i very difficult.

Mr Ala: Mi luk wan samting we olsem (.) sapos (.) long edyukesen level blong bifo? Olsem ol olfala we oli skul finis long Klas 6 nomo. Yumi long ples ia i olsem naoia yumi skul kasem Yia 10? Yia 12 13? Be sapos yumi compare/em Inglis level blong olgeta wetem ol yumi naoia? Olgeta oli speak good English than yumi. (2) Ol olfala blong yumi. (1) Hemia observation nao mi no save se wanem nao i

Mr Andrew: Mi ting se wan long olgeta influences ia we hem i create/em hemia hem i long that period of time? Bislama hem i no wan common lanwis for every citizen long Vanuatu. Like er (.) sapos yu stap long Ambae? Bae yumi speak Ambaean lanwis nomo. So taem yumi jiam aot long Ambaean lanwis (.) sel blong Ambaean lanwis? Yumi jiam i go direct long Inglis o French. Be (.) Bislama nao hem i wan long olgeta er (.) lanwis (.) nasonal lanwis we hem i miksim tumas mekem se hem i isi for young people from (.) young population blong Vanuatu i toktok long hem. Therefore hem i had blong yumi jiam i go long Inglis vocab o French vocab. Because Bislama nao hem i wan hybrid lanwis blong Inglis mo French ia. So i mekem wan bigfala contr- olsem negative contribution long impact long yus blong lanwis long Vanuatu. And sapos yu luk vocabulary blong Bislama? Hem i (.) no match/em Inglis vocab mo French vocab. From oli jes get it from the blue and put it into the language.
Mr Ala: Mi:: agri wetem Mr Andrew tu long eria ia olsem. Bislama blong yumi hem i no wan gudfala Bislama. Hem i (.) hem i made up lanwis nomo. Bae yu harem long dis yia ia bae ol man oli toktok defren? Oli yusum defren wod. Long nekis yia bae yu hareol wanem ol terms o wanem ia? Oli defren nao. Oli made up sam ples i kam ale ol man yusum nao. Mekem se:: i no gud

Mrs Angela: Yes olsem blong [yumi talem?]

Mr Ala: [Hem i con]tribute long olsem (.) long understanding long Inglis blong yumi. Yu save from. Olsem uh. Mi stap long Ranwadi i gat wan pikinini we hem i kam in long Yia 7? Uh olsem skul rul i talem se speak English at all times. Then hem i traem blong speak Inglis be hao i putum olsem ol man oli talem se hem i talem wan toktok hem i giaman. Afta nara wan i talem se eh boe ia i talem long hem se i wan tem talem long Inglis se (.) hem i sud talem se no he is lying. Afta hem i talem se no he is giaman/ing. Olsem hem i yusum Bislama? I putum i-n-g long en. <laughs>

Mme Adrienne: Hem i tru. Bislama hem i plem wan role blong spolem understanding blong tufala lanwis/es olsem French wetem (.) Inglis. Mi talem mi?


Mr Ala: Okei. <reads> “Do you think any other language (.) should be used in school?” (.) Yu min se insaed long klasrum o?

F: Eni wea nomo.

Mrs Angela: Eni wea.

Mme Adrienne: That is what is happening now.

Mr Ala: Olsem. Mi mi yusum Bislama insaed (.) sometimes long klasrum blong ekspelenem wan term we hem i had blong oli andastanem. That’s why hem i:: bae mi talem se:: olsem castration. Bae mi eksplen long Inglis gogo no. Be olsem katem bol blong buluk. Afta ah okei. <laughs>

Mr Andrew: Yes long wan lanwis polisi summit we i bin take place long Saratamata?

Mme Adrienne: I bin gat wan (. ) wan comment i bin kamaot se olsem wanem long ol pikinini we oli stap long Vila mo Santo we oli kam long defdefren (. ) ples/es. Bae yu tiij olgeta olsem wanem long mother tongue blong ol. Actually i no bin really gat wan (. ) um confirm ansa we hem i gud ol wanem we oli bin (. ) hem i stil wan olsem wan discussion nomo taem we (. ) sapos we pikinini blong yu hem i no save (. ) hem i no save (. ) lanwis blong yu? Hem i (. ) hem i fault blong yu long haos. Be yu tijim olgeta olsem wanem long mother tongue blong ol. Actually i no bin really gat um confirm ansa we hem i gud ol wanem we oli bin (. ) hem i stil wan olsem olsem bae yu neva save (. ) bae yu no save yusum vernacular nomo. Bae hem i Bislama nomo long tufala main taon.

Mr Andrew: Ating wan risej hem i find out se:: hem i proper blong jiam long vernacular into English and French rather than jumping from vernacular into Bislama and then into that. Hem i Bislama nao hem i kosem a lot of mess. And ating wan long olgeta emphasis tu i stap naoia? Hem i blong introduce/em uh (. ) Asian lanwis as well insaed long skul/s because maket blong wol this time hem i Asian maket so (. ) ating long (. ) few years’ time? Bambae nara foreign lanwis tu bae hem i likely to be introduced. Hem i Asian lanwis.

8 <some whispering>

Mr Ala: Ol poen/s oli impoten ia. (5) I finis? (3) Okei mov go long namba tu?

<reads> “Using English and Fr

ce? Do you speak French? Do you wish (. ) you spoke it better?”

(9)

Mrs Angela: Ansa blong hem hem i mi no toktok long French. <laughs>

Mr Ala: Mi? Olsem mi::

Mrs Angela: You speak French. <laughs>

Mr Ala: Mi laekem French. Be mi (. ) toktok smolsmol afta mi harem se:: sapos mi traem mi:: mi save mi toktok gud mo long French. Hem i wan (. ) lanwis be (. ) hem i intres blong mi nomo.

(3)

Mrs Anne: Ating mi tu olsem. Be:: (. ) mi save andastanem ol (. ) simple wod/s nomo (. ) ol terms oli yusum be otherwise ol (. ) much harder wan/s ia nogat o mi:: mi stap wis ia sapos we <laughs> mi olsem mi bin tekem French mo mi tekem seriously mebi. From mi lukum long (. ) tudei laek yu go anywhere? French mo Inglis nao hem i surround long ol eria/s o:: iven raon long ples ia yu luk? Yu traem blong (. ) yu luk ol styuden/s oli stap lanem French o wanem. Mi stap regret long (. ) sapos mi bin lanem <laughs> taem mi stap long skul be. Mi wis se mi bin lanem mo. Mebi tekem more seriously.

(3)

Mme Adrienne: Mi mi toktok uh (. ) French? Mi toktok French. Olsem mi lukluk olsem bae (. ) long grammar saed blong hem? Bae mi talen se mi save gud grammar blong French. <reads> “Do you wish to (. ) do you wish you spoke it better?” Ah:: mi
save talem se mi save French from mi stap long environment blong yumi hemia. But
(•) mi gat kwestin. Mi gat kwestin sapos we mi go long wan environment we oli
toktok French naoia? Se bae mi catch up wetem olgeta? From actually French hem
i wan kaen lanwis we olsem hem i laef. Oli Jenisim ol long ol expression olsem we
yumi talem Bislama tudei. Be (•) bae oli talem bae mi still harem save. But blong (•)
toktok long hem? Mi (•) mi wantem sapos we bae mi go insaed mi laekem blong mi
improve/um ol taem. But dis taem mi toktok hem i oraet. Olsem we yumi stap ia wan
man i kam bae hem i toktok wan taem ia? Bae mi harem save. Bae mi ansarem
hem. But maybe somewhere outside? Hem i already Jenis. So long kwestin yes. Mi
wis se mi speak/im better mi stap long wan environment we oli speak/im blong mi
save (•) update/em ol expression ol wod/s olsem.

(6)

Mr Ala: Long B? Uh? Yumi go?

Mme Adrienne: Uh-uh.

Mr Ala: <reads> “Is it good for individuals to know both English and French?”

(1)

Mme Adrienne: Yes=

Mrs Anne: =Yes.

Mr Ala: [Yes.]

Mrs Angela: [Yes.] Ating hem i (•) mi no save mi for one olsem mi stap admire/em ol
Francophones uh?

Mrs Anne: M-m.

Mrs Angela: Yu faenem ol Francophones? Olsem (•) yumi Inglis sapos we yumi ol
Anglophones yumi mitim yumi bakegen? Bae yumi toktok Bislama o (•) be yumi luk
wetem olgeta? Mi stap luk olsem ol French taem oli mitim olgeta? Hemia (•) French
nomo. Oli save toktok French nomo. Ah mi stap luk olsem ia mi stap wis se mi mi
olsem ia nao <laughs> olsem mi stap laekem be:: from yumi no save nomo. Be hem
i gud. Mi luk se naoa hem i impoten uh? Very impoten blong (•) blong yumi save
both languages. Mi ting se i no jes Inglis. Bae i gud blong yumi save both English
French tu?

(4)

Mme Adrienne: Mi kwestin ia? Olsem bae mi talem olsem se (2) mi ting se sapos
we mi save mi (•) mi save tufala lanwis tugeta mi ting se hem i privilege naf blong mi
(•) mi olsem. Mi save both French and (•) English? But mi save se hem i no (•) hem i
no that easy. Hem i isi long mi nomo from mi bin folem system we mi go long
French fastaem. Mi lanem Inglis mi luk se hem i much easier. And then it (•)
somehow it comes that mi save both language mi save toktok tufala tugeta. But mi
save se hem i no that (•) easy. But taem yumi lukum samtaem mi eksplenem long ol
pikinini? Bae mi talem gud long olgeta se (•) hem i samting we yu tekem olsem yumi
talem se hem i wan (.) personal privilege of some individual. Sapos yu save both
languages. Yumi talem olsem from samtæm bae samfala man oli argue. I gat wok
we:: French hem i (. ) olsem sapos yu speak French? Bae hem i no gat tumas
opportunity blong wok. Sam man oli luk olsem. O oli talem se yumi stap long (. ) long
wol we hem i dominated by English. Mi se hem i (. ) hem i oraet. Hem i raet but mi
lukum olsem hem i wan (. ) individual samtæng we yu holem se hem i wan privilege
blong yu. Yu traem blong tingting ol taem olsem.

(5)

<all looking down at question list, whispering>

Mr Andrew: Long mi? Long saed blong issue we blong yus blong Inglis mo French
for individual mo for Vanuatu. As a country? Uh long lukluk blong mi? Se er prior to
Indipendens (. ) straight after Independence long eighties and nineties? Ating (. ) er
individual ni-Van hem i (. ) laek blong save both Inglis mo French. But as taem hem i
go on? Near to the two thousand ia? Mi ting se (. ) Vanuatu hem i become mo
dominant wetem Inglis. So (. ) hem i (. ) mi no save risen why? But that's why lanwis
polisi ia oli traem blong emphasise/em mo mo French se blong evri sitisen i mas
save French. But again? Hemia hem i minim se gavman hem i mas do/im pat blong
hem blong lukluk long ensure that intres ia blong lamem French hem i continue
blong flow. Otherwise hem i jes flow up nemo? Job opportunities nogat? I no gat ol
skul/s blong ol pikinini oli go long hem. Bae hem i wan total waste bakegen. But for
Vanuatu as a whole? Mi ting se so far (. ) uh wol hem i dominantly rule by Inglis? So
(.) er for individual? It can be a privilege to actually learn French. But for the country
as a whole? Hem i sud be more long Inglis? And Asia. Yu save because long saed
blong marketing? Yu tok Asian. Long saed blong communication? We talk English.

(3)

F: So wei we yu talem se wan privilege? Olsem fulap blong yufala i talem privilege o
mi laekem wei we ol man Franis oli toktok o something like that. Be i gat eni
purpose blong (. ) wan man i save tufala lanwis o hem i wan (. ) hem i show/em se yu
gat skil long lanwis nomo o i gat wan (. ) function blong hem? O material benefit o
wanem.

Mr Andrew: Ating wan nomo. Whatever job we yu actually engage long hem? As a
ni-Van? Then hem i sud qualify/em yu the interest to learn both? But for country as
er (. ) glide off while Inglis hem i stap continue blong climb up. So ating hemia nao
that's er reason why the new language policy we mi no ting se naoia (. ) gavman
blong tudei hem i emphasise mo long hem dis taem because gavman blong tudei
hem i wan Inglis gavm- er ruling power so. That policy was introduced by a French-
-speaking power. So

F: Be yu harem se i gud se yumi long Vanuatu yumi gat tufala tugeta? O hem i wan
samting blong histri nomo yumi lego nao o

Mr Andrew: Ating as an individual? Hem i oraet. But as a country? Hem i no really
impoten blong gat tufala lanwis ia hem i (. ) mo impoten blong gat mo lanwis i kam
insaed. Those languages to do wetem marketing especially. So not just French and
English but we should learn other languages as well. But for individuals? Whichever
language you have hem i should be a privilege.

Mme Adrienne: Bae mi mi putum olsem ia se French actually olsem. Yumi (.) hem i
dipen (.) olsem hem i talem hem i dipen long job. Yes job opportunities. But again
hemia hem i se yu nao individual. Olsem kwestin i stap. Uh <reads> "is it good that
Vanuatu uses both English and French?" Stil hem i kambak long kwestin se hem i
stap long yu nomo. Which one from we (.) system blong yumi hem i allow/em?
Sapos yu wantem go long French? Yu go long French. Yu wantem go long Inglis?
Yu go long Inglis. But sapos we gavman i no wantem jenism system ia be hem i
stap long hem.

(1)

Mr Ala: Mi ting se Mme Adrienne olsem ol sam criteria insaed long ol jobs? Yu mas
save both language. Olsem hemia tu we hem i kam long wan (.) eraia we:: sapos yu
save both language yu gat janis blong kasem wan job nao. (1) Olsem sam
advataesmen i kam ia i se yu mas (.) be a good er English speaker and French.
Olsem hem i stap long system blong yumi finis. So naoia i kam long wan samting
we (.) French tu i impoten long ol eraia. Blong faenem wan job. Sapos we yu save
Inglis nomo? Bae yu no save karem that job we (.) advataesmen i kam from. Mi ting
se most ol advataesmen nao (.) olsem know a little bit of (.) save Inglis and
know a little bit of French. Mo andastan. (5) And from we yumi bin (.) olsem kaontri
olsem finis? Taem we wan French man i kam? Samtaem we yumi speak Inglis?
Bae yumi no save toktok nao. From (.) privilege ia from yumi no gat save uh.

(4)

Mr Andrew: Mi ting se wan long olgeta biggest problem tu wetem (.) use of both
English and French long kaontri? Hem i the interest blong ol expat blong lanem
Bislama. Sapos wan French man i (.) fastaem i arrive long Vanuatu? Bae hem i fas
samting we hem i wantem lanem is Bislama. So that's why hem i decline (.) intres
blong kaontri (.) olsem individual tu blong lanem (.) speak/im French o English.
Because again Bislama hem i wan (.) olsem ol Pis Kop olgeta oli kam oli ol Inglis
speakers be oli arrive long Vanuatu? Tu wik/s woksop ia oli generally Bislama. So
instead blong kam delopem English long ol rural eraia/s? Bislama. Ating blong
communication blong olgeta towards long locals hem i gud be (.) blong uphold/em
communication skills blong locals in terms of English?

(2)

Mr Ala: Mi mi ting se olsem i gud blong yumi save both (.) mi tingbaot wan (.) mi
stap long Santo i gat wan woman i kam long Caledonia. I kam kasem long epot?
Hem i no save Inglis? I no save Bislama. So (.) hemia? Olfala Ezekiel i stap long
epot. So hem i traem bes blong speak Ing- er Frans long hem. So mi tingbaot wan
toktok we i talem i putum hanbag blong hem i go insaed finis i talem se (.) c'est
tout? Afta woman i se oui. Ale hemia nao i olsem se woman ia i harem se (.) olsem
mi andastanem smol pat ia mi harem se olfala Ezekiel i win long smol pat ia nao
blong talem c'est tout. <laughs> (3) So hem i helpem hem smol ples ia i helpem
hem blong er=

Mme Adrienne: =Blong communicate.

Mr Ala: Yeah blong communicate. Olsem hem i impoten blong yumi communicate
uh?

Mrs Angela: No be (.) Mr Ala i stap talem olsem mi stap tingting bakegen olsem bae
yumi long Vanuatu? I no se blong yumi waepemaot be i gud blong yumi
encourage/im from (.) bae yumi lukluk nao olsem ol turis. Yumi tokbaot tourism uh.

Hem i wan bigfa- wan biggest um risos revenue blong yumi long Vanuatu. Be olsem
sapos yumi karem turis i kam long ol eria/s? Afta i no gat wan i save toktok French
bae (.) hao. Olsem i gud blong sam at least i save? Olsem mi mi stap talem ating
Fiona i save <laughs> se mi mi talem se wan pikini blong mi mas skul French.
sapos yumi gat wan visita we i kam long haos we i toktok French? At least mi gat
somebody we i andastanem. No gud we bae i kam olsem bae yumi c'est tout finis
taem i kam bakegen? Bae yu no save nao se nekis wan wanem. <all laugh> Olsem
mi stap lukluk se i gud. I no olsem se i nogud. Hem i gud blong save both uh? So
yumi talem. Turis oli kam? (1) Fulap turis i kam long Vanuatu so (.) i gud blong
yumi=

Mr Ala: =Er wan samting tu olsem mi faenemaot se ol man we oli skul French? Oli
toktok gud Inglis than yumi ol we yumi skul Inglis.

(1)

Mr Andrew: Wanem nao risen blong hem.

Mme Adrienne: Mi ting se risen blong hem from grammar nomo.

Mrs Angela: Grammar nomo.

Mme Adrienne: Grammar blong French hem i quite had. Hem i had in itself. Inglis
hem i gat grammar but grammar blong hem hem i se yu harem se yu kia long hem.

French olsem yu gat wan rul yu gat handred exception i mekem i had. So ating yu
save (.) tingting olsem the reason why yu talem se oli speak (.) er better? Ating
that's because grammar blong Inglis hem i simple. Blong French hem i had.

Mrs Angela: So once taem oli grasp/em long French? Olsem se oli (.) i had be once
taem oli kasem finis? Olsem taem we oli kam long lukluk long isi wan? No from oli
save had wan so that's why i isi blong oli switch. (1) Be yumi olsem se blong yumi
sidaon we yumi wantem ah (.) hu i wantem save? Hemia mi no wantem lanem tu.

Laek yumi gat that mentality se (.) blong wanem yumi extra one? Hu i wantem save.
So mekem se yumi no save.

Mr Andrew: Ating hemia hem i (.) wan classic eksampol nomo long (.) las wiken ia?
Long graduation blong yumi i gat wan boe ia we hem i wan Yia 11 styuden. Simon.

Mrs Angela: M-m.
Mr Andrew: Hem i complete/im Yia 11 long Melsisi olsem Francophone and then hem i switch i kam long Inglis long Yia 11. And then hem i manage blong get through long ol Inglis sabjek long (..) Inglis.

Mrs Angela: Hemia hem i tru. Mi gat wan we mi mi tijim (.) hem i 7 to 10 long French? Ale hem i kam 11 12 Inglis? Be (.) taem we hem i raet? Hem i very careful long grammar ol blong hem. Olsem spelling blong hem. Hem i sidaon wetem dictionary olsem se i very careful. Afta iven taem we i raet? Olsem. Samtaem yu ride dim stori bae yu no bilivim se i tru wan Francophone i raetem. Iven i raet better than yumi ol Anglophones i raet.

Mr Ala: Mi mi ting se long olsem (.) from wanem ol French oli lanem (.) oli speak gud Inglis mo bitim yumi? From oli lanem long ej we olsem oli mature. Oli lanem Inglis. Then oli lanem wan gud Inglis oli speak wan gud Inglis. Yumi from yumi statem long kindy i kam antap ia? Olsem yumi miksim Bislama wetem Inglis (.) yumi miksim gogo taem yumi kam antap ia? Olsem that (.) that (.) wanem? Hem i should be olsem (.) proper English olsem ia? Yumi no save speak/im (.) er gud Inglis wantaem uh? Bae yumi karem hemia hemia. Be taem we yu lanem olsem long (.) ej we yu mature? Olsem yu tijim yu lanem ia? Yu (.) olsem ol French. Olsem tingting blong mi nomo. Io no evriwan. Be sam.

Mr Andrew: So wetem (.) trends we mi luk long styuden hem i lan better than hem i switch from er French to English ia. Olsem hemia tu hem i contribute long why a lot more ni-Van oli speak/im Inglis?

Mr Ala: So i min se yumi save yusum French blong yumi (.) blong yumi save tok mo better Inglis. Yumi save toktok French? Be hem i come in long Inglis.

Mrs Angela: [Yes.]


Hemia yu tekem olgeta i kambak long Inglis nao. Wan present problem blong yumi nomo we yumi stap we yumi gat wan kaen dual system we i gat French (.) afta (. ) Inglis. Sapos i gat wan wei blong yumi (.) putum tufala tugeta sapos yumi no wantem actually lusum wan? From bae yu traem had (.) bae yu talem long (.) talem se French i kamaot ia? Hem i stat long Indipendens finis. Man ia Joe hu ia? Carlot?

Mrs Angela: Carlot.

Mme Adrienne: Hem nao hem i protest from. Se bae oli neva karemaot. Hem i wan identity blong kaontri. So sapos we gavman hem i tingting gud? Hem i mekem se (.) blong yumi kam we naoa yumi stap talem se wan privilege o hem i wan individual privilege then. Yumi faenem wan wei. Mi ting se yumi statem long praemeri? Yumi statem long praemeri? Then yumi switch i kambak long Inglis i go i go for good.

Mrs Angela: Hem i dipen nao se hu i ( . ) hu i go long paoa. Hu i ranem gavman. For the day.

Mrs Anne: Yeah but.

Mrs Angela: Iven ( . ) from bae yu luk? Taem wan i kam. Olsem lastaem hem i Charlot ia? Hem i olsem se yu luk we yu luk save nomo hemia hem i wantem se French hem i mas letemap. Naoia bae yumi gat er wan we bae hem i kam olsem Inglis? Bae yu luk bae hem i slakem tingting ia bakegen. Be hemia hem i gud nomo se oli come up wetem wan. Gavman nao i agri long wan se yumi mekem hemia nao.

(2)

Mr Andrew: Mi tingbaot taem yumitu <addresses Mme Adrienne> go long woksop long summit blong lanwis polisi samting long Saratamata ia? Woman ia Madeleine Lesines?

Mme Adrienne: M- m.

Mr Andrew: Hem i bin talem se ( . ) long saed blong communication? Hem i bet- ( . ) pipol oli lan better when oli jiam aot from blue? Blong lanem samting ( . ) wan lanwis.

Mme Adrienne: Oli kolem wanem ( . ) immersion.

Mr Andrew: I min se sapos hem i emerge from ( . ) er that's why oli wantem introduce/um vernacular long stat ia? From bae hem i better hem i no gat wan related vocab blong French mo Inglis? Therefore taem oli kam blong lanem French bae hem i isi. And taem French hem i go blong lanem Inglis bae hem i isi. But taem we hem i jiam from vernacular into English? Bislama tu i stap long ples ia. Bislama English hem i ( . ) olsem Bislama hem i dominated by English. So bae a lot of students bae oli get muddled up wetem hemia=

Mr Ala: =Bislama.

Mr Andrew: So min se hem i better blong ( . ) jump from blue and lanem wan lanwis we bae yu grab/em better.

Mme Adrienne: Hemia olsem se oli kolem kaen system ia immersion. Olsem yu karemaot ia? Taem yu finis long French go long ( . ) [Inglis]
Mr Andrew: [Inglis] (.) From French and English (.) vocabulary blong tufala i totally separate. So that’s why hem i se that’s why students they learn better because (.) not knowing the vocab from English? Taem oli introduce/um oli get interested to learn.

(3)

Mr Ala: <quietly> Yumi muv? Bifo doti Bislama i overtake/em?

<all laugh>

F: Okei mi luk se yumi go long 4 A nomo. <reads> “Should there by one type of school for everybody? (.) Or should we keep Anglophone and Francophone separate schools.” Olsem yumi maintain/em system we i stap naoia? O yu luk se hem i gud se yumi go long system nao we yumi stat long praemeri evri pikinini go long wan? So if yu go from system ia we yumi joinem? Main kwestin blong mi se hao nao bae i save wok aot.

Mme Adrienne: Yu tingbaot graph blong yumi long woksop Mr Andrew? Graph blong yumi actually yumi putum se vernacular? French?

Mr Andrew: French.

Mme Adrienne: And then a little bit Inglis i go in. Taem blong Klas 4 5. And then. Oli save jus samwea long Yia 9 whether oli go long Inglis o French. Hem i bin hemia? Hemia i bin graph blong olgeta tija/s. From se taem mifala i present/em olsem ol toktok blong mifala i olsem (.) bae yufala mekem hamas polisi. But ol tija nao oli lukluk long klasrum.

Mrs Anne: Okei.

Mme Adrienne: From bae oli (.) debate/em gogo? Taem i kam tija nao bae hem i lukum ansa blong hem long klasrum.

Mrs Anne: Yes. <quietly talking to Mrs Angela in background>

Mr Andrew: Mi ting se long saed blong mi mi ting se (.) hem i proper blong ranem ol separate Anglophone and Francophone schools tu from olsem sapos you want to become a Fren- (.) purely a French teacher? Then you have to accelerate on the French stream. Be sapos you (.) want to use it as a communication (.) blong developem communication skills blong yu long tufala lanwis then hem i proper blong stap long wan skul we hem i contain/em both.

(15)

F: Mi luk se tufala nomo we tufala i go long Saratamata (.) ating tufala i practise long taem finis be (.) hem i olsem wan main argument we ol styuden tu oli gat tingting long hem. Se hem i gud se yumi (.) yumi stap olsem naoia we <addresses Mrs Angela> yu yu talem se (.) ale pikinini blong mi bae i skul Inglis be narawan bae i skul French. Hem i gud se yumi gat system ia? We narawan i go olsem narawan i skul French.
F: Olsem wan kwestin blong mi long saed blong hemia se (.) olsem yumi start off
tong discussion ia yumi tokbaot kwestin wan se (.) ol styuden oli gat gudfala Inglis
naoia? Blong yusum long skul. Be yumi tokbaot Yia 10 Yia 12 i go antap. So
kwestin blong mi se sapos yumi start off long French? Yumi go gogo kasem long
Yia 9 o samting olsem yu switch? Bae i possible blong evriwan oli switch? I go long
Inglis. Bae oli catch up wetem Inglis o nogat. From yumi stap tokbaot Simon we i
stap long Yia 11. Yes. Wan i kam insaed i mas toktok Inglis nao from ol fren blong
hem oli Inglis. So mekem se i isi blong wan i switch. Be hem i wan genuine question
nomo. Mi mi no save be yu ting se bae hem i possible se (.) ol styuden oli get used
long French? Mo tu ol tija oli bin tijim French fastaem? Naoia long saed blong
science. We yu talem finis se i gat ol vocabulary blong science insaed we i had long
olgeta long Inglis. So imagine se oli kamaot long praemeri Yia 7 Yia 8. Oli save ol
wod/s blong science o Agriculture long French finis? Naoia yu nao yu fas wan blong
tijim olgeta long Inglis. Yu luk se bae i had o (.) bae i possible blong yu nomo yu fas
man blong (.) bae yu tu yu mas save French. From yu mas relate back long ol
vocabulary blong Yia 8 o. Olsem Mr Ala i yusum eksampol blong castration finis se
(.) naoia hem i go insaed long klas bae i fas bakegen from i gat (.) oli save
castration long French? Afta bae yu mas go bak long Bislama bakegen? From hem
<points to Mr Ala> i no save wod blong castration long French.

F: So minim se hao nao bae yu save mekem (.) brij (.) i go long

Mrs Angela: Tru.

Mr Ala: Phew.

<all laugh>

Mme Adrienne: Hem i wan (.) hem i wan kwestin we hem i had blong yumi talem.
Bae yumi save talem olsem se yu (.) yu se long Simon hem wan. What about like
the whole system.

F: M-m.
Mr Ala: Mi ting se olsem (. ) olsem sapos we yumi switch bae yumi switch long Yia:
er long Yia 6. Bifo oli go long 7. From taem yu go long 7 yumi gat ol basics blong ol
samting ia nao long olsem long Inglis.

Mme Adrienne: Yes.

Mr Ala: We:: yumi tijim uh? Taem we yumi kam in long medel? Hemia nao problem.
Be sapos yu kam in olsem long Yia 7? Olsem yumi long Inglis? Secondary i stat
long Yia 7 nao olsem ol terms we yumi yusum long Yia 7 nao? Yumi yusum for the
rest of ( . ) uh klas kasem long ol er yunivesiti uh. Sem terms ia nao we yumi stap
yusum ol taem. Be long praemeri skul i kam antap? Oli stap lanem ol ( . ) ol ( . ) er
separate er sabjek ia? So i kam kasem long Yia 7? Naoia yumi stap separate/em ol
sabjek nao. Olsem ol main sabjek insaed long ol skul/s. Sapos we yumi bridge/im
long ples ia nao ( . ) bae i much

(1)

F: So wanem nao main risen why yu wantem se yumi joen tugeta long wan system.
Wanem main purpose blong hem?

Mrs Angela: What's the purpose. <laughs>

F: From wanem yumi wantem combine/em?

Mme Adrienne: The very first reason? From hem i olsem hem i wan identity blong
yumi? Blong save tufala lanwis. But ( . ) samfala? Olsem bae yu talem se naoia yumi
luk se ( . ) Inglis ia hem i ( . ) hem i ( . ) wanem nao hem i spoken more long wol? Hem i
Inglis. But bae hem i had blong Vanuatu hem i livim French. So wanem we yumi
traem nao se yumi traem blong fulfil/im but bae yu luk se ( . ) bae yu fulfil/im ia bae yu
( . ) bae yu harem save French nemo be actually yu stap kambak long Inglis ia. Taem
bae yu kam long Yia 7 i go i go i go i go continue studies blong yu long yunivesiti?
Hemia yu harem we yumi livim totally out French. Be yu yu really wantem se pikinini
blong yu i go bak i folim edyukesen blong hem long French? Hemia nao hem i
question mark. Sapos i gat wan skul nomo hem i orae. We hem i offer/em that/fala
janis blong ol pikinini. Hemia nao mi se bae yumi tok raon ia bae i no gat ansa blong
hem.

Mr Ala: Olsem. Sorry but uh ( . ) long ( . ) hemia bae yumi save gobak long fas
kwestin blong yumi ia. Olsem ( . ) blong mekem se ol pikinini oli speak/im gud Inglis.
(2) Olsem oli gat gud understanding. Be hao blong putum long wod/s? Blong talem
long gud Inglis? Hemia nao yumi stap insaed long klasrum. Be sapos yumi traem
olsem long suggestion olsem ia? Bae olgeta. Yumi ( . ) mi no save.

Mrs Anne: Ating yumi talem tu olsem ia from uh yumi stap luk long ol sam
eksampol/s we yumi lukum we oli ( . ) taem oli switch oli kam from French to English
olsem oli perform gud uh? So ( . ) hem i ( . ) yumi no save tu se hem i only for
individual students or maybe for the whole group. Be hem i wan samting we mebi oli
sud ( . ) bifo yumi putum aot olsem oli sud mekem testem long wan smol grup. Blong
lukum se hem i wok aot o nogat. Be ating aedia ia tu hem i kam antap se ( . ) yumi
luk long sam styuden/s we yumi gat? Mo olsem past styuden/s yumi lukum se ol ( . )
Mr Andrew: Yes ating hemia hem i wan tingting we hem i no save hapen overnight. Hem i nid (.) baem hem i wan impoten tingting blong yumi blong putum tufala lanwis/es ia i kam long wan skul nomo. But ating hem i sud tekem taem while yumi nid blong trenem (.) ol risos (.) mekem ol risos blong hem? Then we get what we need. Be mi mi ting se hem i proper blong putum tufala ia i kam tugeta. Long wan skul. Then yumi ranem olsem Arts and Science stream long (.) secondary ol senior level ia. From (.) why mi talem olsem? From hemia (.) jes yumi lukluk long wol? Ating the only country long wol we i ranem French skul long nara fala skul and Inglis skul long wan narafala skul and Vanuatu. So blong go on wetem wol (.) er civilisation blong wol long saed blong (.) er communication? Mekem se tufala i kam wan hem i proper.

Mrs Angela: <laughs loudly>

Mr Andrew: Yes ating for evri (.) long beginning of everything in life? There is always stumbling block. But as taem i go yumi tend to digest it more and then yumi hop long fiuja blong hem bae hem i turn out to be alright.


Mr Andrew: Problem ia nao hem i sapos understanding blong pikinini i nogud? Hem i min se understanding blong papa mo mama i nogud. Understanding blong jif i nogud. Understanding blong pastor i nogud. And understanding blong yumi ol tija tu i nogud. So (.) whatever pikinini hem i mekem as a mistake? Hem i mistake blong (.)
everybody. (3) Yes long saed blong er issue ia? Olsem for the time being mi ting se
separation blong tufala lanwis hem i (. ) stil okei. Be blong putum wan system in
place olsem wan polisi we Vanuatu i stap gat tingting ia (. ) long long run mi ting se
bae hem i benefit/im. Sapos we ol styuden oli save do well long Arts and Science
courses? Mi ting se in terms of language we can do it as well.

Mme Adrienne: Hem i gavman. Actually hem i (. ) hem i should be decision blong
gavman. Be yumi tend blong tingting blong whoever hem i kam hem i Minista blong
Edyukesen hem i wantem enforce/em tingting blong hem? Mi ting se hemia hem i
no really good. So hem i stap long gavman. Wea nao bae hem i stret rod we bae
hem i provide/em wan service we hem i gud from (. ) er ol sitisen blong kaontri. Bae
yumi stap rao se no Inglis bae (. ) bae hem nao bae hem i stap. French yumi
abolish/im o wanem? Yes sapos we gavman i kam long wan level blong ol pipol
hem i eksplenem gud long hem? Yu save ol man bae oli harem save. Hem i stap
long gavman nomo.

F: Okei mi luk se taem i stap go. Bae yumi finis long ples ia nomo. Tangkiu tumas.
Appendix xiv – Interview with Angolovo College Teacher Group 2
(Translation)

Date: 07-11-11

Location: Staff room

Participants: Mr Andrew, Mr Ala, Mrs Anne, Mrs Angela, Mme Adrienne

Notes: I asked each of the five participants if they would be willing to take part, as these were all people I had had informal discussions with during the first period of fieldwork. I gave them time to read through the questions first, and then Mr Ala was nominated as a chairperson to lead the discussion and move between questions as necessary.

1 Mr Ala: Let’s start the discussion in the first part for (.) er the question is <reads>

2 “the school language? (. ) Part A? (. ) Do you find it easy or difficult to use English to teach your subjects? Do you think that students find it easy or difficult to use English in your classes.” Okay I put it to the floor now?

(16)

5 Mr Andrew: Okay in my opinion I think that I (1) er find it easy to use English in (. ) the classroom? Um but the only problem? Because our students come from different backgrounds? Therefore in some instances they find a slight difficulty with (. ) language and that also applies to the subjects (. ) er that language that we use in them. For example for us in Science? A lot of er the words that we use to teach Science are very difficult for (. ) a young learner like who comes from primary and heads up to secondary level. So the language of subjects is also another contributing factor to the difficulty for students learning them. But for the teacher? Personally over the (. ) time I’ve experienced as a teacher I think that so far (. ) I (. ) find it easy to actually go with the (. ) use of English in the classroom.

(3)

16 Mrs Anne: Okay for me? (1) Maybe um (. ) I’m like Mr Andrew has said I find it easy to (.) maybe explain more in English than in Bislama or (. ) yes Bislama? Uh I tried once last year to do it? We were using my class so (. ) I don’t know I think it’s possible but I (. ) tried it in Bislama. I tried teaching (. ) some things in Bislama but I found it a bit difficult <laughs> for me to (. ) but I think that (. ) using English is much better for me. But there are some areas in the su- maybe in this subject? That I think it would be better if I could teach them in Bislama. Because the students just won’t be able to understand if I (.) I teach but otherwise maybe generally? I use English. (1) Bu::t in terms of the students? It’s like (1) I find so far I find that when (. ) even if you explain something that you think you’ve explained very clearly to the students in English? But still they just won’t be able to er understand. So:: I’m often
Mr Ala: For me I also find it easy to teach my subject in English. Like there are
the terms as Mr Andrew said. Like you must use all the correct terms for them. But one thing if we started them at at the level of Year 7 upwards? Because
now we have er year 9 and 10. So the system is also a problem in this school. If
you are with them from Year 7 upwards? Then when you use these terms and these
things like they'd have the basics from Year 7 onwards. But when you get them in
Year 9? Like when you use the terms? They want they don't know what they are.
One problem like for students who who maybe find it difficult is uh
their background. Like those who come from top-ups? They find it hard. If we
started them in in Year 7 upwards it would be easy. But there is something
else that I find in the classroom some students like like they find it hard to use English in the classroom. Sometimes. It I don't know what factors
contribute to this. They are ashamed? They are ashamed of their English? Or (2)
they know they know or maybe grammar or something like that I don't know.

Mrs Angela: Maybe I will come in here maybe what Mr Ala says is true. Like I
think those of us who teach English? Like it's true. We teach them well but then
we come back to the children? Sometimes it's hard. Like the children find it hard.
Maybe one reason is like we have already said that we don't bring them here from Year 7 onwards. They come from somewhere else? You will find in the same
class that you have some good students and then you find some who are very
weak. Like you have a big range too that those of us in language like there's a
big group a big gap that we have to work with. You want to work with the fast ones?
Or then you think about the weak ones but maybe another thing maybe we
don't use it enough. They don't use it enough in the classroom to give them
confidence like to speak. Some are afraid that maybe I'll pronounce the word
wrong? So it means the children also like find it hard. I think it's just confidence
they don't have confidence to use the language itself. So they find it quite hard.
But maybe again like it comes back to us teachers again. The way we help the
children. Even though we have them for just a short time but what can we do to
help them.

Mme Adrienne: Okay for me. Uh using English in the classroom maybe I find it
easy. Even though I teach French sometimes when I come to like grammar points
if we are doing a grammar lesson it is much easier for me to explain in I try to
explain in English so that they understand. It doesn't mean that I can't do it in
French? But I think about the children. If sometimes I explain in French I see that
the children are just more confused so I try my best to use English to explain
especially the grammar points or expressions and terms that are new for the
students. So for me? Using English is not a problem for me. The students? Even
though it’s a French class? They hardly use (..) French. I think it’s the same (..) just
the same reason we’ve said like they just don’t feel confident using it even though
we ask them to use very simple sentences they still find it hard.

(2)

Mrs Angela: Let me add again like for me in the classroom (..) the children like (.)
they are not confident I think they are afraid that (..) what if I use the language and I
speak? Bu::t my friends laugh at me? So it means that they have a fear I don’t know
but maybe we should come back to our culture? I don’t know but (..) like it’s true. In
the classroom like it’s hard to get them to use it (..) to speak? Like they will giggle
over their answers as if they’re just not confident using it. Those smart ones are
good? But then we find the others=

(12)

Mr Ala: =It’s like. If you look outside? They perform differently than inside the
classroom. When they are outside they are open to this and that but inside the
classroom? Like I don’t know. There’s maybe a barrier between (..) between them
when they are near each other? Causing them to be unable to speak out loud. Like
(..) to open (..) open up uh? I (..) like that’s just what I think but I don’t know.

(1)

Mr Ala: Okay let’s move to (..) ah B? <reads> “Are you a confident user of English?
Do you wish to speak” (..) sorry “do you wish”

Mrs Angela: “You spoke”

(3)

Mrs Angela: I think I should start. Because I’m an English teacher. <laughs> Like.
Like we all I think that all of us feel (..) no I’m not confident. Maybe I wish that (..) we
could have spoken it better but. Maybe we come back to ourselves again <laughs>
we don’t (..) we talk about the students but maybe it comes back to us (..) we’re the
same like you feel that oh no if I speak then my colleagues (..) er (..) what if I say it
wrong or (..) sometimes I feel like that like (..) we use it in staff meetings uh? Maybe
somebody has (..) a point of view they want to say but the language itself now
because with colleagues it makes it so that (..) I don’t feel (..) no I’ll just leave it I
won’t say anything but maybe at the back of our minds there’s this worry that I’ll say
it wrong. Like that’s just my thinking <laughs>. A stupid one. I don’t know about you
bu::t (..) maybe like for me like I’m not confident to speak it but we are trying. Though
we are not confident but we always try.

(3)

Mr Ala: Maybe I’m also the same as Mrs Angela has said. Like me:: sometimes I’m
not confident but (..) I feel that if I spoke better English. So that I (..) like when you go
to some areas like they ask questions about this and this and this? You know? You
have to use some English that. Sometimes I feel that I have to go like this <makes
lots of hand gestures, up and down and round in a circle> (. ) must use these terms
to go down to ( . ) just go down but ( . ) sometimes like I wish I spoke better English so
that I could. You know English stu- er teachers are like that but for me: it's just the
same thing but it turns round and round and round <hands rapidly moving round>
< all laugh> Which makes the children crazy uh? < all laugh > So that's it I feel that
that would help me a lot to be able to ( . ) er make them picture it ( . ) to ( . ) like when I
question them I turn it upside down? So that they can turn the picture back ( . ) like
this.

(2)

Mrs Angela: Like I don't know but I feel that now? As I go on I feel that I wish I was a
student now like at this age when you ( . ) you realise like I wish that ( . ) I could study
again maybe I would learn more like you ( . ) at the time when you were a student
maybe like ( . ) then it wasn't clear but now that we are working I often think that ( . ) I
wish I had the chance to study again maybe I could speak English better o::r
< laughs > that's just my crazy idea again ( . ) because maybe we have come to an
age that we understand. And then you regret that ( . ) eh I think about my time at
school and what if I had gone to class or what if I had asked my teachers things at
the time. If I had been smart like these smart children who speak English uh. (2)

What about those who've studied in Australia? < looking at Mr Andrew >

(1)

Mrs Anne: I agree with what Mr Ala and Mrs Angela have both said. As Mr Ala said I
fully agree with him um ( . ) maybe I'm also not really er I don't ( . ) feel confident ( . )
using English in the ( . ) classroom ( . ) especially like Mr Ala said when you are
teaching a ( . ) a topic and then like you have to ( . ) do it in a way so that ( . ) the
students ( . ) like any questions that come up on that particular topic? Students can
answer the question. They can turn it any other ( . ) in any way to answer the
questions. Like ( . ) um ( . ) my subject is ( . ) mainly it's that particular ( . ) idea that ( . ) you
say one thing but the students must ( . ) students may see ( . ) that particular maybe
what ( . ) they will come across what you have taught in many different areas. You
must be able to give different answers on that particular topic you've taught. So ( . )
maybe it's a problem too like to complete questions with the different questions to
answer uh ( . ) so that any questions that come up on that particular topic it's uh ( . )
maybe that's sort of the problem in ( . ) the subject I have.

(13)

Mme Adrienne: I think that I use English ( . ) every day.

Mrs Angela: < laughs > But?

Mme Adrienne: Like ( . ) I don't have a problem with it. Someone who knows better
English like Fiona can correct me. Say whether my English is poor but ( . ) in saying
are you confident? I can say yes.

(2)
Mr Andrew: For me? Yes maybe as Mme Adrienne has said. I like when I am in a
what's that an environment local environment? I think that I am confident but
when it comes to public speaking or even when we have visitors? Then that is a test
for my confidence in my use of English. But I think that I believe in a saying that
when you the more you use it? The more you become familiar or confident with it.

Mr Ala: Okay let's move to C? <reads> “Students and staff do not speak English
very often outside the classroom. Why is this.”

Mrs Angela: <laughs>

Mr Andrew: Okay this is this is not a problem that we can say it's a problem for the people of Vanuatu? Since we grow up in Vanuatu in a totally different climate altogether? Er the reason why we don't use English a lot outside the classroom teachers or staff and students? It is about who you are with outside the classroom. That is a contributing factor. If you are with if you are from Ambae and you are with someone that you the two of you come from the same place then you must speak lanwis. So the activity outside the classroom also contributes to how often you speak English especially when you are outside the classroom? But if you are with a foreigner? Obviously you must speak in English. So why we don't speak a lot of this outside the classroom one reason is who you are with? That moment outside the classroom. And another thing too? Vanuatu is full of cultures and what er traditions? When we are outside class if we are drinking kava? And we are just from Vanuatu? Then if I sit down to chat with Mr Ala obviously we have to speak our language. Secrets er secrets in language is another contributing factor. If the two of us want to talk about someone? And we're from Ambae so we must use lanwis. And if we are with someone who speaks English and doesn't know Bislama? We can get him with Bislama so hiding information is another contributing factor. And if you are at a traditional activity like a marriage or something like that? Then they will mostly use the local dialects of whatever uh area or uh yes island that they are on.

Mrs Angela: Maybe it just comes back to confidence again uh? Like outside to explain why we don't speak it outside the classroom. Maybe in the classroom it is a must. Must like it is the medium we have to use. When we are outside? Like we don't think so much that

Mrs Anne: Yes I: think that what they say is true because I see that for me one thing I see er to students like I try my best. Because I know that it is a school requirement that we speak English to them at all times even inside the classroom or outside. So like I try during school time like I hardly speak Bislama or anything to the students and but something I find is when we are walking around together with the students we'll go like we walk to the stadium or we go anywhere. If I think that I'll communicate with them in English? Then this will cut the conversation with them now. I'll talk. If I speak to them? They yes no when they've just given a small answer? They stop now. Our communication can't continue so.
We just walk along like (.) quietly. But if I change and come to Bislama now the
conversation (.) will start and will go on. So (.) I think that like they said (.) that
maybe (.) it just comes back to like I’m just not confident speaking in (.) English.

Mme Adrienne: Let me add something small to what Mrs Anne has said it’s true. I
am someone who tries my best to speak in English outside. But it comes a time that
if you speak in English? Like if you speak to students who come from the same
place as you? Then I will feel bad too. They are going to say this woman is flash or
whatever. <others laugh> Yes. So there is something like this. But it doesn’t mean
that::t we are not sure we like speaking English but there is something to do with our
traditions or (.) yes like that.

Mr Ala: For me (.) like it’s another point of view but another point again is like I think
the school rules also (.) contribute to (.) to it. If the school rules said speak English
at all times? Then the children would try hard no matter whether they spoke poorly
they would just go ahead (.) but if the school rules say speak English at certain
times like this? Now they will like ah no we can just use Bislama. Like that’s my
opinion. Outside I mean outside class. Like the classroom. When we go out it’s
different but (.) within the school boundary. Mainly (.) administration and
classrooms.

Mme Adrienne: But when you say that (.) the people who consider the school rules?
They (.) when it comes to language? They don’t want to enforce English either
because they say that children have the right to speak Bislama. And in their
language. So that will be our problem.

Mr Ala: They should change the policy. Speak English and French at all times.
Because these are the two languages they say are for school.

Mr Andrew: But (.) like Vanuatu has to develop into a country so (.) our local
languages are also important (.) we must keep our traditional cultures and kastom
alive? But (.) it means that the children must somehow practise their languages to
keep this history.

Mr Ala: But I have an argument about this because. English and French? We teach
them but Bislama and lanwis? We don’t teach them. So they speak rubbish Bislama
and rubbish lanwis.

Mr Andrew: I think it’s a government project that is important because the
Government of Vanuatu is too politicised? But at a workshop we attended I think
this is what they were trying to cover. It is to make sure that every child in Vanuatu
does (.) not just speak English and French? But they need to learn the language
from the roots up to the (1) the trunk or what.

<others laugh>

F: But what are the school rules at the moment?
Mr Andrew: Speak English every day.

Mrs Angela: No I think they amen- they amended them to (.) just in school hours.

Mrs Anne: Up to half past four.

Mrs Angela: Up to half past four.

F: Ah okay.

Mrs Angela: Or something like that.

Mrs Anne: <laughs>

Mme Adrienne: But that’s what I’m saying even if that’s the- that’s the policy? It is a discussion that is under discussion because when we say it will be English only?

Some? Will still argue that we can’t. You must give them time to speak Bislama or their language.

Mr Ala: I believe that like if we say that they should speak English and French at all times? If they make a mistake and speak lanwis it’s not a problem but (.) because (.) the problem at the moment? Inside the classroom they don’t understand English.

Like reading and speaking out uh? So the more they do it the more they become better.

Mrs Anne: We (.) we talk about language (.) like the way we speak it in the classroom or like the students but (.) like this is a problem. It’s already a big problem (.) like I find in my subject. One problem you are talking about I will use (.) terms and the words in my sentences. But the simple terms that I use these simple words they just don’t understand them so I don’t know what to do about this. What it is. What it comes back to (.) does it go back to how (.) we write (.) how we say it to them? Or does it go back to (.) maybe the problem is that they don’t read or what. Because a simple word that I think it even goes as far as Year 13? You use one simple word that (.) like consequences for example. Like this word which I think they should know but (.) they won’t know what it is. They will ask what does it mean they don’t know what it means. So I don’t know. So it (.) like (.) goes to (.) goes to what kind of problem now. <laughs>

Mme Adrienne: But you see this it’s true. Because now if you take consequences?

For example as a word? If you try and explain it in Bislama how will you explain it.

The children will just be more confused. How can you explain consequence in Bislama. We think that they should understand English but yet they can’t. When you do it in Bislama? That will be worse.

Mrs Angela: But this means that what does it come down to? The way we have learnt before? Our education like that we have attended at every level? Or does it fall down to (1) like it’s true like us language teachers we will say these words. If you don’t know them. They can find them in the dictionary but (.) no they don’t want to.
They are not bothered about (.) what does this word mean? How can I use this word? Or (1) so it comes back to=

Mr Andrew: =One problem for us in Vanuatu because we have so many languages so we have so much vocab so (.) it’s a stumbling block for us. Like Fiona and all of them? The only vocab is just English vocab. So they’ve grown up since they were small with English vocab. But us in (.) Vanuatu? We have er English and French to learn at school? And then we have Bislama to learn at a young age? We have the mother tongue which we learn at a very very young age so (.) when you try to build them up you cause a hybrid that is very difficult.

Mr Ala: I have noticed something that (.) if (.) at the education level in the past? Like the old people who just finished school in Class 6. And us who now go as far as Year 10? Year 12 13? If we compare their English level with ours now? They speak better English than us. (2) The old people. (1) That’s just my observation I don’t know why it’s

(1)

Mr Andrew: I think one of the influences that causes this is that in that period of time? Bislama was not a common language for every citizen in Vanuatu. Like er (.) if you were on Ambae? You would only speak the Ambaean language. So when we jumped out from the Ambaean language (.) shell of the Ambaean language? We jumped directly into English or French. But (.) Bislama is now one of the (.) languages (.) national language which is very widespread so it is easy for young people from (.) the young population of Vanuatu to speak it. Therefore it’s hard for us to jump into English vocab or French vocab. Because Bislama is a hybrid language of English and French. So it make a big contr- like negative contribution on the impact on the use of language in Vanuatu. And if you look at the vocabulary of Bislama? It (.) it doesn’t match English vocab and French vocab. Because they just get it from the blue and put it into the language.

Mr Ala: I:: agree with Mr Andrew too about this. Our Bislama is not a good Bislama. It’s (.) it’s just a made up language. You’ll hear this year people speak in one way? They use certain words. Next year you’ll hear the what the terms or whatever? They’re different now. They’re made up somewhere and people just use them. Meaning it's no good.

Mrs Angela:   Yes like [we said?]

Mr Ala: [It contributes] to (.) to our understanding of English. You know because. Like uh. I was at Ranwadi there was a child who came in in Year 7? Uh like the school rule said speak English at all times. Then he was trying to speak English but the way he put it was people said that he said something and he lied. And then another one said eh that boy he told him he wanted to say in English that (.) he should say no he is lying. Then he said no he is giaman/ing. Like he used Bislama? He put i-n-g on the end. <Laughs>

(3)
Mme Adrienne: It’s true. Bislama plays a role in spoiling understanding in the two languages of French and (.) English. I tell you me? An example of mine until I was in Year 10 I didn’t know one word of Bislama. Not at all. The very first thing they told me was to go and get nasese[^28]? I went and got mases[^29]. I didn’t know. Okay so (.) but speaking French? We talked talked talked bad or good? Nobody corrected you. You speak it. Like inside? Teaching. You go outside it was French. It was bad or it was good but you did it. But Bislama it was like it just wasn’t there. Yes. Furthermore I only say this because you ask why old people (.) their English is much better than ours.

Mr Ala: Okay. <reads> “Do you think any other language (.) should be used in school?” (.) Do you mean in the classroom or?

F: Anywhere.

Mrs Angela: Anywhere.

Mme Adrienne: That is what is happening now.

Mr Ala: Like. I use Bislama in (.) sometimes in the classroom to explain a term that is hard for them to understand. That’s why i::t’s if I sa::y like castration. I can explain over and over in English but no. But if I say katem bol blong bulu[^30]. And then they are ah okay. <laughs>

Mr Andrew: Yes at a language policy summit which took place at Saratamata? As (.) the government is reorganising the languages that we teach in schools at the moment. One is (.) what’s that vernacular or whatever? The local languages? Then English and French. But (.) they discourage Bislama. So that’s one of (.) why? As I have already said. It has no vocabulary (.) it has no vocabulary. It’s too difficult.

Mme Adrienne: There was a (.) comment that came up that what about the children in Vila and Santo who come from so many different (.) places. How will you teach them in their mother tongue. Actually there wasn’t really any (.) um confirmed answer that was satisfactory that they (.) there is still a discussion about when (.) if your child doesn’t know (.) doesn’t know (.) your language? It’s (.) It’s your fault at home. But it seems that you will never be able (.) you will never be able to use the vernacular. It will just be Bislama in the two main towns.

Mr Andrew: I think a research found tha::t it’s proper to jump from vernacular into English and French rather than jumping from vernacular into Bislama and then into that. It’s Bislama that causes a lot of mess. And maybe one of the influences there is now too? It’s to introduce uh (.) Asian languages as well in schools because the world market at this time is an Asian market so (.) maybe in (.) a few years’ time? Other foreign languages are also likely to be introduced. That’s Asian languages.

[^28]: type of shellfish
[^29]: matches
[^30]: cut the bullock’s balls
Mr Ala: These points are important. Finished? Okay let’s move to number 2?
"Using English and French? Do you speak French? Do you wish you spoke it better?"

Mrs Angela: The answer to that is I don’t speak French. <laughs>

Mr Ala: Me? Like me::

Mrs Angela: You speak French. <laughs>

Mr Ala: I like French. But I speak a little and then I feel that if I tried I could speak better in French. It’s a language that it’s just my interest.

Mrs Anne: Maybe I’m the same. But I can understand just the simple words the phrases they use but otherwise the much harder ones I can’t or I wish that <laughs> like I’d taken French and I’d taken it more seriously maybe. Because I see that today like you go anywhere? French and English surround us everywhere or even around here you look? You try to you see the students are learning French or whatever. I regret that I suppose I’d learnt it <laughs> when I was at school but. I wish I’d learnt more. Maybe taken it more seriously.

Mme Adrienne: I speak uh French? I speak French. Like I think in terms of its grammar? I can say that I know the grammar of French well. “Do you wish to do you wish you spoke it better?” Ah: I can say that I know French because I am in this environment of ours. But I have a question. I have a question whether if I go to an environment where they speak French now? Will I keep up with them?

Because actually French is a kind of language which is alive. They change the expressions like we said about Bislama today. But if they say something I’ll still understand. But to speak to them? I wish I could go into I would always like to improve it. But at the moment I speak it’s alright. Like we’re here if someone comes some time and he speaks? I’ll understand. I’ll answer him. But maybe somewhere outside? It’s already changed. So for the question yes. I wish that I spoke better that I was in an environment where they speak it so that I could update my expressions or my words.

Mr Ala: B? Uh? Shall we go?

Mme Adrienne: Uh-uh.

Mr Ala: "Is it good for individuals to know both English and French?"
Mme Adrienne: Yes=

Mrs Anne: =Yes.

Mr Ala: [Yes.]

Mrs Angela: [Yes.] Maybe it’s (.) I don’t know but me for one like I admire Francophones uh?

Mrs Anne: M-

Mrs Angela: You come across Francophones? Like (.) us English if we Anglophones meet each other? We will speak Bislama or (.) but you see with them? I see French speakers when they meet each other? It’s (.) French only. They can just speak French. Ah I look at them and I wish that I was like that <laughs> I like it bu::t we just can’t do it. But it’s good. I think it’s important uh? Very important for (.) for us to know both languages. I think it’s not just English. It’s good for us to know both English and also French?

Mme Adrienne: Me for this question? Like I can say that (2) I think that if I know (.) I know both languages together I think this is enough of a privilege for me (.) like. I know both French and (.) English? But I know that it’s not (.) it’s not that easy. It’s easy for me because I followed the system of going to French first. When I learnt English I found it was much easier. And then it (.) somehow it happened that I know both languages I can speak both together. But I know that it’s not that (.) easy. But when we see sometimes I explain to the children? I will tell them clearly that (.) it is something that you can have like we say it’s a (.) personal privilege for some individuals. If you know both languages. We say this because sometimes people argue. That there are jobs that (.) French it’s (.) like if you speak French? There are not many opportunities for work. Some people see it like this. Or they say that we are in (.) a world that is dominated by English. I say this is (.) this is okay. It’s right but I see it like it’s an (.) individual thing that you hold that is a privilege for you. You try and think about it like this.

<all looking down at question list, whispering>

Mr Andrew: In terms of the issue of using English and French for individuals and for Vanuatu. As a country? Uh my opinion? Is that er prior to Independence (.) straight after Independence in the eighties and nineties? Maybe (.) er individual ni-Vans (.) wanted to know both English and French. But as time has gone on? Near to the two thousands? I think that (.) Vanuatu has become more dominated by English. So (.) it’s (.) I don’t know why? But that’s why this language policy is trying to emphasise more on French for every citizen to know French. But again? This means that the government must do its part to ensure that the interest to learn French continues to flow. Otherwise it just flows up? There are no job opportunities? There are no universities for the children to go to. It will be a total waste again. But for Vanuatu as a whole? I think that so far (.) uh the world is dominantly ruled by English? So (.) er
for an individual? It can be a privilege to actually learn French. But for the country as a whole? It should be more about English? And Asia. You know because in terms of marketing? You speak Asian. In terms of communication? We talk English.

(3)

F: So when you say a privilege? Like many of you have talked about a privilege or I like the way that French speakers speak or something like that. But is there any purpose for (. ) someone to know both languages or is it (. ) does it just show that you have skills in language or does it have any (. ) function? Or material benefit or whatever.

Mr Andrew: Maybe just one. Whatever job you are actually engaged in? As a ni-Van? Then that should give you the interest to learn both? But for the country as a whole? At the moment? We can already see the trends that are happening? French is er (. ) gliding off while English continues to climb up. So I think that’s er the reason why the new language policy that I don’t think (. ) today’s government is emphasising anymore because today’s government is an English gov- er ruling power so. That policy was introduced by a French-speaking power. So

F: But do you think it’s good that in Vanuatu we have both together? Or is it just something from history that we should let go of now

Mr Andrew: Maybe as an individual? It’s okay. But as a country? It’s not really important to have two languages it’s (. ) more important to have more languages coming in. Those languages to do with marketing especially. So not just French and English but we should learn other languages as well. But for individuals? Whichever language you have it should be a privilege.

Mme Adrienne: Let me say that French is actually like. We (. ) it depends (. ) as he says it depends on jobs. Yes job opportunities. But again that is about you as an individual. Like the question here. Uh <reads> “is it good that Vanuatu uses both English and French?” Still it comes back to the question that it’s up to you. Which one because (. ) our system allows this? If you want to go to French? You go to French. You want to go to English? You go to English. But if the government doesn’t want to change this system then it’s up to them.

(1)

Mr Ala: I think Mme Adrienne that like some of the criteria for jobs? You must know both languages. Like this too comes to one (. ) area tha::t if you know both languages you have a chance to get a job now. (1) Like some advertisements appear that say you must (. ) be a good er English speaker and French. Like it’s in our system already. So now it comes to something that (. ) French too is important in these areas. To find a job. If you only know English? You won’t be able to get that job which (. ) the advertisement is for. I think that most advertisements now (. ) like know a little bit of (. ) know English and know a little bit of French. And understand. (5) And because we are (. ) already a country like this? If a Frenchman comes? When we speak English? We can’t communicate now. Because of (. ) this privilege because we don’t have the ability uh.
Mr Andrew: I think that one of the biggest problems too with the use of both English and French in the country? Is the expats' interest to learn Bislama. When a Frenchman first arrives in Vanuatu? The first thing he wants to learn is Bislama. So that's why it has declined the interest in the country like for individuals to learn to speak French or English. Because again Bislama is a like when the Peace Corps come they are all English speakers but they arrive in Vanuatu? They have a two week workshop and they generally use Bislama. So instead of coming to develop English in the rural areas? It's Bislama. Maybe for their communication towards the locals it's good but to uphold the communication skills of the locals in terms of English?

Mr Ala: I think it's good for us to know both. I remember once I was in Santo there was a woman from Caledonia. She came to the airport? She didn't speak English? She didn't speak Bislama. So then? Old Ezekiel was at the airport. So he tried his best to speak Eng- er French to her. So I remember one phrase when she had put her bag in and he asked c'est tout? Then the woman said oui. Okay then it was like the woman felt that I understood that small event I felt that old Ezekiel did well there by saying c'est tout. <laughs> So it helped him a little there it helped him to er=

Mme Adrienne: =To communicate.

Mr Ala: Yeah to communicate. Like it's important to communicate uh?

Mrs Angela: No but as Mr Ala was saying that I was thinking again about us in Vanuatu? We shouldn't wipe it out but we should encourage it because you look at the tourists. We talk about tourism uh. It's a big- one of our biggest sources of revenue in Vanuatu. But like if we bring tourists to different areas? And there's nobody who speaks French then how. Like it's good that at least some can? Like I keep saying I think Fiona knows that I've said that one my children must school French. Suppose we have a visitor who comes to the house who speaks French? At least I'll have somebody who understands. It's no use them coming like we've already said c'est tout and then they come back again? You won't know what to say next. Like I think it's good. It's not that it's bad. It's good to know both uh? So we say. Tourists come? Many tourists come to Vanuatu so it's good that we=

Mr Ala: =Er something else is like I find that people who school French? They speak better English than us who school English.

Mr Andrew: What's the reason for this.

31 Is that everything?
32 Yes
Mme Adrienne: I think the reason is just because of the grammar.

Mrs Angela: Just the grammar.

Mme Adrienne: The grammar of French is quite hard. It is hard in itself. English has grammar but its grammar is like if you hear it then it’s clear. French is like if you have a rule you have a hundred exceptions which makes it hard. So maybe you know (.) like the reason why you say they speak (. ) er better? Maybe that’s because English grammar is simple. In French it’s hard.

Mrs Angela: So once they grasp it in French? Like they (. ) it’s hard but once they’ve got it? Like when they come to see the easy one? No because they know the hard one so that’s why it’s easy to switch. (1) But us like for us to sit down with the one we want ah ( .) who cares? I don’t want to learn it. Like we have that mentality of (.) why do we want an extra one? Who cares. So it means that we don’t know it.

Mr Andrew: This is maybe ( .) a classic example from (. ) last weekend? At our graduation there was one boy in Year 11. Simon.

Mrs Angela: M- m.

Mr Andrew: He completed Year 11 at Melsisi as a Francophone and then he switched to English for Year 11. And then he managed to get through in the English subjects in (. ) English.

Mrs Angela: It’s true. I had one who I taught (.) he did Year 7 to 10 in French? And then he came to Year 11 12 in English? But (. ) when he wrote? He was very careful with all his grammar and tenses. And like his spelling. He sat with his dictionary and was very careful. When he wrote? Like. Sometimes you would read his stories you wouldn’t believe that a Francophone had really written it. He even wrote better than the way we Anglophones write.

Mr Ala: I think that for ( .) why Francophones learn (. ) they speak better English than us? Because they learn it at an age when they are mature. They learn English. They learn a good English they speak a good English. Us because we start in kindy and come up? Like we mix Bislama and English (. ) we mix it the whole time that we’re growing up? So that (. ) that (. ) what? It should be like ( .) proper English like that? We can’t speak (. ) er good English straightaway uh? We take a little like this and like this. But when you learn it like (. ) at an age when you’re mature? Like you teach it and you learn it? You (. ) like Francophones. That’s just my opinion. It’s not everyone. But some.

Mr Andrew: So with (. ) these trends that we see students learning better when they switch from er French to English. Like that also contributes to why a lot more ni- Vans speak English?
Mr Ala: So it means that we can use French (.) in order to speak better English. We can speak French? But it comes into English.

Mrs Angela: [Yes.]

Mme Adrienne: [Yes xx] what we are saying? If we make a change? Our primary schools? If they made it so that they start in French up to Class 4? Then they come back to English? This helps them. Later on in their life they will still know it. They will understand. Even if they can’t speak it. Then you bring them back to English. One present problem we have here is that we have a kind of dual system where there is French (.) and then (.) English. If there was a way for us to (.) put the two together if we don’t actually want to lose one? Because however hard you try (.) you say (.) you say that French will be dropped? It started already at Independence. That man Joe who? Carlot?

Mrs Angela: Carlot.

Mme Adrienne: He protested about it. That they would never drop it. It’s an identity for the country. So if the government thinks carefully? It should make it so that (.) for us to come now and say that it’s a privilege or it’s an individual privilege then. We find a way. I think we should start with primary? We start with primary? Then we switch to come back to English and then go and go for good. If we want to keep that identity. But there are still many questions that would arise with this idea I’ve said. Where would the Francophone er primary teachers come from to teach Classes 1 2 and 3? Yes there are lots of questions like this. Actually it’s good. If you want to help our children? We start them off? And then we switch them back to English. When they learn it they will find it easier. To study more languages. Like when they come back to English. (5) Again like you see we are going round with this? We will never end this discussion. We can’t find the answer. The government needs to find the answer for (.) a system a policy which it can put to the people. But us? If we just talk about it. We won’t find an answer.

Mrs Angela: It depends on (.) who comes to power. Who is in charge of the government. For the day.

Mrs Anne: Yeah but.

Mrs Angela: Even (.) because you see? When one comes in. Like last time it was Charlot? He was like you could just tell that he wanted to lift up French. Now we have er who’s that coming in who is English? You’ll see that he’ll relax the idea again. But it would be good if they came up with one. For the government to agree on one and then we do that.

(2)

Mr Andrew: I remember when we <addresses Mme Adrienne> went to a workshop for the language policy summit thing at Saratamata? That woman Madeleine Lesines?

Mme Adrienne: M-m.
Mr Andrew: She said that in terms of communication? It’s bet- people learn better when they jump out from the blue? To learn something a language.

Mme Adrienne: What do they call it immersion.

Mr Andrew: It means that they emerge from er that’s why they want to introduce the vernacular at the start? Because it’s better because it doesn’t have any related vocab to French and English? Therefore when they come to learn French it will be easy. And then from French when they go to learn English it will be easy. But when they jump from vernacular into English? Bislama is also here. Bislama English it’s like Bislama is dominated by English. So a lot of students will get muddled up with it=

Mr Ala: Bislama.

Mr Andrew: So it means that it’s better to jump from the blue and learn one language that you can grab better.

Mme Adrienne: They call this system immersion. Like you take one out? When you finish with French and go to [English]

Mrs Angela: [English] (.) Because French and English their vocabulary is totally separate. So that’s why they say that’s why students learn better because not knowing the vocab from English? When they introduce it they get interested to learn.

(3)

Mr Ala: <quietly> Should we move? Before dirty Bislama takes over?

<all laugh>

F: Okay I think we should go to 4 A. <reads> “Should there by one type of school for everybody? Or should we keep Anglophone and Francophone separate schools.”

Like should we maintain the system we have now? Or do you think we should go to this system where we start in primary all children go to one? So if you go for this system where we join them? My main question is how would this work.

Mme Adrienne: You remember our graph at the workshop Mr Andrew? Our graph actually had vernacular? French?

Mr Andrew: French.

Mme Adrienne: And then a little bit of English went in. In Class 4 and 5. And then. They can choose somewhere around Year 9 whether they go to English or French. It was like that? That was the graph from all the teachers. Because when we presented like all the discussions like how many policies would you have. But the teachers were thinking about the classroom.

Mrs Anne: Okay.
Mme Adrienne: Because they are debating on and on? When it came to the teachers they looked for their answer in the classroom.

Mrs Anne: Yes. <quietly talking to Mrs Angela in background>

Mr Andrew: I think that for me it is proper to run separate Anglophone and Francophone schools too because if you want to become a French teacher? Then you have to accelerate on the French stream. But if you want to use it as a communication to develop your communication skills in the two languages then it is proper to be in one school that contains both.

F: I think these two who went to Saratamata they've practised this already but it's like a main argument that the students also had an opinion on. That is it good for us to be like we are now where <addresses Mrs Angela> you say okay one of my children will school English but another one will school French. Is it good that we have this system? Where one goes this way and the other one goes that way? Or would it be better if all of us were in the same system? Like it doesn't have an easy answer.

Mrs Anne: M-m.

Mrs Angela: True.

Mr Ala: But if you force people it won't really work?

Mrs Angela: Give them an opportunity. If they are interested.

F: One question I have on this is that like we started off the discussion talking about question one whether the students are good at English? Using it at school. And we were talking about Year 10 Year 12 and upwards. So my questions is if we start off in French? And we go up to Year 9 or something and then you switch? Will it be possible for everyone to switch? To English. Will they catch up with English or not. Because we've talked about Simon in Year 11. Yes. If one comes in then he has to speak English because his friends are English speaking. So it makes it easy for one to switch. But this is a genuine question. I don't know but do you think it's possible that the students get used to French? And the teachers have been teaching in French? So for Science. You've already said that there is a Science vocabulary which is hard for them in English. So imagine that they come from primary in Year 7 Year 8. They know the terms for Science or Agriculture in French? Then if you are the first ones to teach them in English. Do you think it will be hard or (. would it be possible for you the first ones to (. you would also need to know French. Because you would have to relate back to the vocabulary from Year 8 or. Like Mr Ala used the example before of castration but now he will go inside the class and be stuck again because they know castration in French? So then do
you have to go back to Bislama again? Because he <points to Mr Ala> doesn't know
the word for castration in French.

Mrs Angela: Okay yes.

F: So it means how would you make (.) the bridge (.) to go to

Mrs Angela: True.

Mr Ala: Phew.

<all laugh>

Mme Adrienne: It's (.) it's a question that is hard for us to say. We can say that you
(.) you are saying that Simon is like just one person. What about like the whole
system.

F: M-m.

Mr Ala: I think that like (.) like if we switch then we should switch in yea::r er in Year
6. Before they go to 7. Because when you go to 7 we have the basics for everything
like in English.

Mme Adrienne: Yes.

Mr Ala: Tha::t we teach uh? When we come in halfway? That's the problem. But if
you come in like Year 7? Like for us in English? Secondary starts in Year 7 like all
the terms we use from Year 7? We use them for the rest of (.) uh up to er university
uh. We use these same terms all the time. But from primary school up to here?
They learn (.) the (.) er separate er subjects? So they come to Year 7? Now we
separate the subjects. Like the main subjects in schools. If we bridge it here then (.)
it will be much

(1)

F: So what is the main reason why you want to join them together in one system.
What's the main purpose of it?

Mrs Angela: What's the purpose. <laughs>

F: Why do we want to combine them?

Mme Adrienne: The very first reason? Because like it's an identity for us? To know
both languages. But (.) some? Like you can say now we can see that (.) English is
(.) it's (.) which one is spoken more in the world? It's English. But it will be hard for
Vanuatu to leave French. So what we are trying to do now is we are trying to fulfil
this but you see that (.) if you fulfil this you will (.) you will understand French but
actually you come back to English. When you come to Year 7 and go go go to
continue your studies at university? Then it seems that we are totally leaving out
French. But if you really want your children to go back and do their education in
French? Then that's a question mark. If there is just one school that would be okay.
That offers that chance for children. There you are I said we would talk round this without finding an answer.

Mr Ala: Like. Sorry but uh (.) for (.) this can we go back to our first question. Like (.) to get children speaking good English. (2) So they have good understanding. But how to put it in words? To say it in good English? For this we are in the classroom. But if we try like this suggestion? Will they. We (.) I don’t know.

Mrs Anne: Maybe we should also say like we are looking at some examples that we’ve seen who (.) when they switch French to English they perform well uh? So (.) it’s (.) we don’t know whether this is only for individual students or maybe for the whole group. But it’s something that they should maybe (.) before they roll this out like they should test it on a small group. To see whether it works or not. But I think the idea has come from (.) us seeing some students we have? And like past students we’ve seen (.) students who start off with French and come to English? They do much better than (.) those who just (.) you go to English then it will be difficult to go to French.

Mr Andrew: Yes I think it’s an idea that cannot happen overnight. It needs (.) it’s an important thing for us to put the two languages into one school. But it needs to take time while we need to train (.) the resources (.) make the resources for it? Then we get what we need. But I think that it’s proper to put the two together. In one school. Then we can run like Arts and Science streams at (.) senior secondary level. Because (.) why do I say this? Because (.) if we look at the world? Maybe the only country in the world that runs some schools as French schools and other schools as English schools is Vanuatu. So to get on in the world (.) er civilisation in the world in terms of (.) er communication? For the two to become one is proper.

F: But if we come back to like (.) the purpose of school? Like we go for these two languages that is our focus. But (.) if we focus so much on these two languages will (.) the standard of education go down? Or (.) like if I give an example. Mrs Angela said that (.) in her family? One child must speak French. If a tourist comes to the house? Then this child can communicate with them. So does this mean like (.) our priority? We just go for these languages (.) never mind whether our children understand everything at school as long as when the tourists come it will be alright?

Mrs Angela: <laughs loudly>

F: <laughs> Like we joke about it but you know (.) sometimes we focus on language? But do you think there is an effect on the quality of education? Or not?

Mr Andrew: Yes maybe for every (.) at the beginning of everything in life? There is always a stumbling block. But as time goes on we tend to digest it more and then we hope in the future that it will turn out to be alright.
Mr Ala: Yes that is something too? Like in schools? Children's understanding. The most important thing in the classroom? Is children's understanding. When we take them and they don't understand? The problem even goes to the villages. Or the communities everywhere. There is too much trouble making and things like that (.) because their understanding? Is no good.

Mr Andrew: The problem here is that if children's understanding is no good? It means that the mother and father's understanding is no good. The chief's understanding is no good. The pastor's understanding is no good. And our understanding as teachers is also no good. So (.) whatever mistakes children make? They are everybody's (.) mistake. (3) Yes for er this issue? Like for the time being I think that separation into two languages is (.) still okay. But to put one system in place like the policy that Vanuatu is thinking about (.) in the long run I think that this will benefit us. If students can do well in Arts and Science courses? I think that in terms of language we can do it as well.

(3)

Mme Adrienne: It's the government. Actually it (.) it should be the decision of the government. But we tend to think that whoever comes as Minister of Education wants to enforce his own ideas? I don't think that's really good. So it's up to the government. To say where the straight path is that will provide a service that is good for (.) er the country's citizens. We can keep arguing that no English will (.) it will be like this. We abolish French or whatever? Yes if the government comes to the level of the people and explains it well to them? You know people will understand. It's up to the government.

F: Okay I see that time is going. Let's finish here. Thank you very much.
Appendix XV – Interview with Collège de Faranako Teacher Group (Original)

Date: 02-11-11

Location: On the grass outside

Participants: Mr Felix, Mr Fred, Mlle Felicia

Notes: I hadn’t had a chance to arrange my visit in advance. When I arrived, the teachers were in an awareness meeting about the new national curriculum. I spoke to one of them briefly and arranged to meet three of the four teachers who had been present during the first period of fieldwork once the meeting had finished.

It was quite late when we started. It was too dark inside because the generator hadn’t been switched on, so we sat outside. However, it quickly grew dark, and by the end of the interview, the teachers were reading the questions by torchlight. I therefore joined in with some questions more quickly than I would have liked to, rather than waiting until the end.

The three teachers took about 15 minutes reading through the questions at the beginning, writing notes, and sometimes consulting with each other, although I tried to stop them discussing their answers until the recorder was switched on. They explained that this was the way Francophones approached a task – to think carefully first before starting.

1 Mr Felix: Okei. Bae mi mi stat. Long fas kwestin? Taem mi stap long Montmartre?
2 Olsem long (.) long fas kwestin hem i se <reads from question> “est-ce que vous trouvez que c’est facile ou difficile d’utiliser le français pour enseigner toutes les matières.” Okei. Long mi? Hem i orea. Okei hem i isi long mi. Afta blong seken wan
3 i se <reads from question> “croyez-vous que les étudiants trouvent facile ou difficile de l’utiliser en classe.” Okei mi mi mekem tu skul nomo? Mi stap long Montmartre
4 fastaem? Ol styuden oli luk se (.) hem i (.) isi. Be long ples ia samtaem mi toktok
5 Franis mi luk ol pikinini oli (.) <laughs> sam oli stap ae i bigbigwan. Mi (.) mi ting se
6 Franis hem i had lelebet long olgeta long (.) long long aelan.

10 (2)

11 Mr Fred: Hem i (.) hem i tru hem i tru. Mi mi stap long Lycée? Long Lycée yu toktok
12 Français hem i (1) i orea. Be taem mi kambak long aelan? Mi toktok Français gogo
13 bae (.) yu luk se (.) i go fas? Naoia bae mi kambak long Bislama nao. Mi toktok
14 Bislama ia.

15 (5)

16 Mlle Felicia: Lo::ng mi? Mi mi kam mi stap long ples ia tri yia? Hem i fes skul tu mi
18 olsem yu toktok oli andastanem yu. Bae yu toktok oli andastanem be wan samting
nomo? Olgeta oli no manage blong bae oli:: traem blong toktok long olsem (.)
ansarem bak yu bakegen long French. Olsem mi mi luk long ples ia be (.) long ol
narafala skull/s olsem Monsieur i talem finis. Long Montmartre from mi go mekem (.)
wem ia praktikel blong mi long Montmartre? Mi luk se lanwis ia hem i:: (.) yu
toktok oli ansarem yu hariap nomo.

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: Be long ples ia oli tekem (.) olsem oli stap hesitate oli fraet o oli olsem
wanem. Timides blong ansarem yu. So yu yu mas (.) yu mas faenem evri evri wei o
kona yu faenem blong yu save putum samting i kamaot. O samtaem yu yet yu stap
givimbak ol ansa blong ol wanem ia (.) kwestin blong yu bakegen. Mekem se:::
olsem (.) lanwis hem i is- hem i stre. Yumi yusum blong yumi save talem wan (.)
pasem wan (.) olsem givim wan samting uh? Be hem i lelebet difficile tu (.) olsem
difficult tu olsem long level blong ol tu from (.) hem i wan lanwis tu olsem hem i jes
lanem. Ating bae i stap toktok long hem i ting se bae yumi jikim hem o wan samting
olsem ia. Be:: olsem yumi stap traem blong encourage/m hem blong bae i:: (.) hem i
toktok gud lanwis. Yes. (3) Afta? (1) Yumi muv nao?

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mr Fred: Yes?

Mlle Felicia: Long (.) B (/bi/). <reads from question> “B (/be/). Est-ce que vous
utilisez le français avec assurance?” Et (.) afta? Oli askem bakegen se <reads from
question> “est-ce que vous aimeriez le parler mieux.” Olsem blong mi bae mi talem
olsem ia se (.) taem mi toktok olsem taem mi tijim wan samting olsem wan sabjek
olsem ia normalement mi stap long French uh? Be olsem yu assurer? Yu samtaem
yu yu really wantem se samting ia hem i mas (.) done. Olsem ol objectives blong yu
blong (.) tija i mas (.) yu wantem se bae yu mas (.) yes bae i mas done uh? Be
hemia nao taem yu (.) mi mi wantem se bae mi mas (.) tok tok tok tok gud mo
lanwis ia? Be problem hem i long level blong ol pikinini we yumi tekem oli kam long
ol defdefren ples tu. Mekem se (.) samtaem bae i go fasfas smol. Samtaem yumi
swap nao go long narafala lanwis blong traem (.) go insaied ia blong mekem se (.)
communication i isi smol?

Mr Fred: Long (.) long (.) long ples ia? I gat (.) yumi tijim ol defdefрен ej blong
pikinini? So long ples ia? Blong assure/em yu? Yu assure/em yu wetem ol pikinini?
So yu mas folem (.) level blong hem? Yu bae yu no yusum wan (.) wan (.) wod/s we
hem i had blong pikinini ia. Sapos pikinini oli stap daon ia? So yu mas yusum wod/s
ia we yu luk se hem i (.) simple blong hem i andastanem. And then hemia long
narafala klas we hem i go antap? Yu (.) yu seftem yu go antap. Hem i (.) tufala i no
sem mak ia. So long ples ia yu mas (.) mekem ol (.) ol wei/s blong yusum ol (.) ol
wod/s blong yu.

(4)

Mr Felix: Okei blong mi? Yes bae mi talem ansa blong kwestin hem i yes? Fas wan.
Blong seeken wan? Yes mi wantem se mi toktok gud mo olsem (.) blong mi toktok
wetem ol styuden hemia mi save toktok olsem long Franis olsem. O wetem wan
colleague blong mi mi save toktok. Olsem mi toktok Franis. Be sapos mi toktok wetem (.) wan stre Franis man? Bae vocabulaire blong mi bae (.) hemia nao bae 
mitufala no save gat niu wan. Sapos mi save toktok olsem wan Franis man (.) bae mi laëkem. (4) Okei. Bae yumi go long nekis kwestin. (2) Okei. <translates from
question> Ol styuden wetem ol (.) tija?

Mlle Felicia: Tija?

Mr Felix: Oli no stap toktok tumas Franis aot saed long klas.

Mlle Felicia: From wanem.

bakegen? Hem i se mi stap talem wanem. So (.) blong (.) mi no tekem tumas taem 

Mr Fred: Hem i (.) hem i wan (1) bae mi talem se olsem wanem? Wan (.) wan (.) wan problem we hem i stap finis blong lanwis uh? Sapos mi wan tija blong ples ia? 
Then pikinini we hem i kam long ples ia blong (.) bae mi toktok Franis wetem hem? 
Bae hem i girap i stanap i lukluk mi bakegen bae i toktok (.) bae i toktok long lanwis 
blong mitufala nao? Bae i no ansarem long (.) long Franis we mi mi wantem.

Mlle Felicia: M-m.

Mr Fred: So long ples ia i mekem se (.) taem mi sanem hem? Bae mi toktok lanwis 
blong mi nao. Olsem lanwis blong mitufala. Bae mi no sanem hem long (.) Franis.

(2)

Mr Felix: Ating wan samting olsem fulap blong ol styuden ia? Taem oli stap kam 
antap long praemeri? Sapos i se oli stap lanem gud blong oli toktok Franis finis? 
Ating taem oli kam antap long mifala ating bae mifala i faenem i isi blong (.) 
communicate wetem olgeta long Franis. Olsem naoia ya luk narasaed long 
praemeri? Oli traem blong oli jenisim. Naoia sapos yu go narasaed long praemeri yu 
harem evri pikinini oli toktok

(1)

Mlle Felicia: Franis.

Mr Felix: French nomo. Oli toktok Franis wetem tija? Evri samting long (.) long 
French. Ating olgeta we mifala i stap tekem olgeta naoia? From oli stap kam antap? 
Oli no gat hemia olsem (.) wan blong mifala i talem tudei se (.) ating (.) oli no (.) oli 
no statem gud. Be sapos i se oli statem gud? Bae oli kam antap ating bae hem i isi 
long olgeta.

Mr Fred: Hem i (.) hem i (.) wan samting tu bae yumi gobak long hom. Blong 
wanwan. Pikinini. So long hom blong wanwan pikinini? Papa wetem mama tufala i 
toktok lanwis ia.

Mr Fred: So naoia oli traem bes blong olgeta blong oli mekem? Ating bae i kam gud antap mo long (. ) secondary. (7)

Mr Felix: Okei?

Mr Fred: M- m.

Mr Felix: Bae yumi go long nekis kwestin? (3) Hem i::

Mr Fred: D.

Mr Felix: D uh?

Mr Fred: Uh-uh.

Mr Felix: Okei. <translates from question> Yu ting se bae yumi yusum ol narafala lanwis olsem Inglis? Bislama? O lanwis blong Ambae? (2) Okei. (2) Mi long tingting blong mi se sapos se hem i se bae yumi (. ) mekem uh (. ) teaching sapos yumi tij long Franis? Then yumi mas traem blong emphasise se (1) yumi toktok er Franis nomo blong helpem pikinini blong hem i improve/ m (. ) Franis blong hem. Okei.

Lo::ng samtaem olsem ol pikinini oli defdefren? Olsem (. ) eksampol sapos mi givim wan lesen blong science? Afta mi talem wan samting we i stap long narafala kaontri? Pikinini oli no save but then (. ) i gud blong bae mi givim nem blong hem long Bislama tu blong hem i=

Mr Fred: =Yes

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: M-m.

Mr Felix: Hemia tingting blong mi.

Mr Fred: I gat? I gat sam (. ) olsem yes ol eksampol ia nem uh? Samfala nem ia we i no gat long Bislama? And then bae i no gat long (. ) long French? I min se i blong ples ia. So olsem ia? Bae yu givim nem ia long lanwis blong (. ) blong ples ia nao. So (. ) i min se yumi save yusum (. ) evri (. ) wan impoten samting? Yu yu wantem se pikinini i save.

Mr Felix: M-m.
Mr Fred: So yu traem bes blong yu blong pik- i go insaed long (. ) bren blong hem. 
So yu stap lukaotem ol wei/ s blong yu mekem se nem blong samting ia i mas go 
long bren blong hem. Be sapos yu talem long Français? And then pikinini hem i se 
(.) no nem ia? Mi no (.) taem yu talem long Bislama be taem Bislama i no gat? Bae 
yu talem long lanwis nao.

F: M-m.

Mr Fred: M-m.

(2)

Mlle Felicia: Mi long mi? Ating ol tingting ia i (. ) mi tu mi gat sem tingting olsem 
tufala colleague tufala i talem. Olsem mi gat sem (. ) mi nomo save wanem bae mi 
talem mo be mi ting se poen ia nao olsem tufala i talem finis.

Mr Felix: <laughs> Okei? Bae yumi go long

Mlle Felicia: Deux?

Mr Felix: Seken wan. <translates from question> Yusum Frantis? Ating hem i minim 
yusum Frantis o Inglis uh?

Mr Fred: M-m.

F: M-m.

Mr Felix: Hemia nao.

F: M-m. Yusum (. ) no yusum tufala tugeta.

Mr Felix: Okei.

F: I no one or the other hem i=

Mr Felix: =Franis mo [Inglis]

F: [Français] et Anglais.

Mr Felix: Okei.

Mlle Felicia: Wetem. M-m.

(2)

Mr Felix: Er <translates from question> yu toktok (. ) Inglis? (1) Smol.

Mlle Felicia: <laughs>

Mr Felix: Mi save smol Inglis. Bae mi er sapos wan waetman i kam ating bae mi 
save

Mlle Felicia: <laughs>

F: <laughs> Sapos wan [i kam?]
Mr Felix: [Ating bae] mi save (.) ating bae mi manage. <laughs>

Mlle Felicia: Bae i mekem taet taet.

Mr Felix: Okei bae:: yu save (.) yu (.) yes. <translates from question> Yu laekem blong toktok mo? Yes.

(1)

Mr Fred: Mi
F: Be from wanem. Yu no jes talem yes nomo. Olsem wanem nao purpose blong Inglis blong yufala?

Sapos i gat wan advaes a long Ostrelia long Ministri blong Edyukesen mi go luk hem? Sapos mi toktok gud Inglis ating bae i andastanem wanem concerne blong mi. Be sapos mi no toktok gud Inglis hemia nao bae. <laughs>

(2)

Mr Fred: Lo::ng (.) long ples ia hem i concern/em ol (.) ol religion tu. I gat samfala religion we oli stap long Inglis nomo. So taem (.) taem olsem ia sapos mi mi skul Francophone and then (.) religion blong mi hem i stap yusum Inglis nomo?

F: M-m.

Mr Fred: So (.) mi mas toktok Inglis. From taem mi go insaed long jioj blong mi? Bae mi toktok Inglis ia. Bae mi no toktok French.

F: Be hem i experience blong yu long vilej blong yu?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Hemia wanem (.) Anglican?

Mr Fred: No blong mi hem i SDA.

F: Okei. Oli yusum Inglis nomo long [vilej?]?

Mr Fred: [Inglis] nomo.

F: Oli no yusum lanwis long vilej?

Mr Fred: Um oli yusum lanwis? Be from

(1)

Mlle Felicia: [Baeb-]
Mr Felix: [Baebol.]

Mr Fred: Baebol nao hem i::

F: Inglis nomo okei.

Mr Fred: Inglis nomo. (2) So taem we yumi go tokbaot? Bae i yusum ol wod/s?

Inglis nomo nao.

F: M-m.

(2)

Mlle Felicia: Okei mi? (3) Yes?

<all laugh>

Mlle Felicia: Mi laekem toktok Inglis? Mi intres tumas long lanwis ia? From mi tekem lanwis ia. Wan lanwis we mi tijim tu long (.) long klas? Mo (.) mi wantem (.) so mi wantem er (.) toktok mo long hem i gat sam (.) i gat sam stadi blong mi mo mo mo long lanwis ia yet. Mi stap intres tumas blong mi save gat wan mo (.) save go skul bakegen blong lanem sam samting bakegen about uh lanwis ia. Uh-uh. From Inglis hem i wan samting we olsem (.) tru long olsem ol (.) yu save lanem tru long ol magazine? Ol kaen olsem ol reading books o wan samting. Olsem ia? Be hem i wan (.) hem i wan (.) olsem wan lanwis we (.) bae mi talem se (.) most olsem (.) population blong wol ia oli tok lanwis ia. So hem i wan lanwis we hem i flow raon fo-fala kona blong wol. Blong earth. So mi ting se (.) mi long mi mi laekem tumas Inglis? Mi laekem tumas blong mi toktok long hem. Hemia nao mi stap yusum long ol taem blong klas blong Inglis nomo be (.) samtaem taem aot saed olsem ia? Bae mi foldaon long wan (.) wan fren o (.) mi stap traem blong mi toktok. Mi stap traehad olsem ia from mi laekem. (4) Yes.


Mr Felix: Bislama olsem ol (.) hem i wan dérivé blong Inglis=

F: =Yes.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Fred: Yu (.) yusum ol wod/s long Bislama? Hem i blong Inglis nomo. Be (.) French? Hem i lelebet (.) bae yumi talem se i had blong (1) blong ol man uh?

Mlle Felicia: French i expensive tumas blong olsem <laughs>


(1)
Mlle Felicia: Okei.

Mr Fred: So long ples ia hem i show/em stre se no (.). French hem i had ia. (1) So pikinini (.). pikinini we hem i lanem Bislama? Hem i no go yet long (.). blong skul Inglis? Yu toktok long Inglis long hem? Bae hem i andastanem. (2) So long ples ia (.). evri man Vanuatu bae oli se oli laekem toktok Inglis. Iven hem i skul French be bae i laekem toktok Inglis.

(5)

Mr Felix: Okei? Yumi muv i go long nekis kwestin? (1) <Translates from question> Hem i gud blong ol individuel? Oli save toktok Franis mo Inglis? (2) Mi ting se yes? Hem i gud blong oli save (.). wanwan individual i mas toktok Franis mo Inglis. From (.). yumi long Vanuatu i se (.). er oli approve/m (.). tu (.). lanwis blong teaching hem i (.). [Inglis]

Mlle Felicia: [Inglis?]

Mr Felix: Mo (.). Franis. Okei blong yu wan tija? Sapos i se (.). er olsem blong wan tija i gud blong (.). yu save tugeta. Sapos oli putum yu yu go long wan Inglis skul be (.). bae yu save manage. Blong yu (.). sapos oli talem se yu go (.). yu go tijim er (.). French long wan Inglis skul? Be teaching blong yu yu mas mekem long Inglis? O sapos i se oli sanem er (.). wan Francophone?

Mr Fred: M-m.

Mr Felix: Bae i go tij long wan (.). olsem i go tijim Anglais long wan Inglis skul be (.). hem i.

Mr Fred: Yes.

Mr Felix: Nao olsem bae hem i vice versa.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.


Mlle Felicia: M-m.

Mr Fred: So long ples ia mi ting se Vauanu i mas (.). olsem yu (.). yu mas toktok olsem hem i talem. From oli fasem hem i stap long (.). konstityusen ia? Tufa lanwis ia. So man Vanuatu i mas (.). hem i mas kam (.). bilingual. Be hemia naoia i kam kasem naoia i no bilingual ia. Vanuatu i no bilingual ia. Wanwan person nomo oli bilingual. Hamas nomo. Ating bae yumi talem se (.). ating mebi ten percent nomo. Be hemia naenti percent? Nogat.

F: Be yu talem se konstityusen i talem se (.). evri man i mas bilingual?
Mr Felix: No.

F: No oli talem se Inglis French tufala lanwis ia.

Mr Felix: Yes tufala lanwis [blong edyukesen.]

Mr Fred: [Yes tufala lanwis we] bae oli mas yusum.

F: So hem i min se narawan i save yusum French nomo?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Narawan i save yusum Inglis nomo.

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mr Fred: Yes. Yu mas andastanem. Long konstityusen i se (. ) French wetem Inglis be yu mas andastanem. Yu Anglophone yu mas andastanem (. ) Français.

F: Hem i talem long konstityusen?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Okei?

Mr Fred: And then hemia long (. ) long Francophone? I mas Anglophone. That’s why hemia i stap (. ) i stap continue.

(1)

(2)

Mr Felix: I gat wan colleague blong mifala? Wan Francophone olsem yumi stap tokbaot ol bi -( ) ol man we oli bilingue? I gat er wan tija blong Agriculture i stap lo::ng

Mlle Felicia: Malapoa College.

Mr Fred: Malapoa.

Mr Felix: Malapoa College. Naoia oli tekem hem i go long CDU? Hem i wan Francophone.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Felix: Hem i tij long (. ) hem i go (. ) stap long Malapoa College? Hem i go tijim Agriculture? Long Inglis. Be hem i wan Francophone. Hemia nao i gud se yumi gat=

Mr Fred: =Kaen man ia tu yes.


Mlle Felicia: Narafala wan ia tu? We hem i stap long PM’s ofis ia.
Mr Fred: Yes. And then daerekta blong samting ia? Hemia ol man ia nao ol bilingual ia nao.

F: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: M-m.

Mr Fred: Be wan (.) wan samting we yumi wantem? Vanuatu naoia. Naoia we oli stap tokbaot naoia. Hemia we oli wantem se Vanuatu i mas bilingual ia. So system ia we hem i stap talem hemia hemia. Oli wantem evriwan oli mas (.) Inglis yu toktok sem mak wetem French. I sem mak nomo. So long ples ia nao bae yumi talem se no. Yumi kam bilingual nao.

F: Okei. Ating hemia i stap touch long nekis kwestin ia nao. Wanem nao olsem benefit blong (.) long saed blong wan (.) hol kaontri.

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: I no blong wanwan man nomo. Olsem wanem nao benefit blong tufala lanwis ia.

(1)

Mr Fred: Hem i (1) bigwan ia? Mebi hem i communication. Communication. From samtaem? Sapos mi mi toktok Inglis nomo? And then French man i toktok wetem mi? Naoia bae mi fas nao? And then sapos hemia we i toktok French nomo? Sapos er wan Inglis man i toktok wetem hem? Bae i fas nao. And then hao nao bae i wok?

Bae yumi talem se divelopmen blong kaontri bae i (.) bae i go. O bae yumi talem wanem. Ikonomi? So long ples ia i min se (.) yu mas save tugeta. From olsem kaontri blong Vanuatu hem i (.) hem i kamaot long (.) condo- condo-

Mr Felix: Condominium.

Mr Fred: Condominium?

Mlle Felicia: Condominium.

Mr Fred: Condominium hem i Inglis wetem French gavman we tufala i (1) so taem tufala i statem? Taem tufala i statem? Tufala i statem wetem ol wok ia. So taem ol wok ia oli stap French? Inglis. So once yu wantem se ol wok ia oli mas i go on (.) ol divelopmen i mas go on? Yumi mas save tufala lanwis ia nomo. Evri man oli mas save. From sapos no? Yumi mekem narawan hem i ded? And then narawan hem i go antap. Be Vanuatu hem i no wantem olsem ia. Hem i wantem se tugeta i go antap.

(5)

Mr Felix: Okei? Yumi touch long kwestin C finis uh?

Mr Fred: M-m.

Mr Felix: Yumi go long namba 3?

Mlle Felicia: M-m.
Mr Felix: Okei.

F: <to Mlle Felicia> Yu traem tos. <light fading>

Mr Felix: <reads from question> “Est-ce que les Français?” Okei. <translates from question> Oi Francophone ? O ol Anglophone oli gat mo opportunité blong go stadi long (. ) oversea. (2) Okei. Mi luk se hem i ol Anglophone. From oli gat Fiji klosap? Uh (. ) [Ostrelia]

Mr Fred: [Ostrelia ?]

Mr Felix: Mo New Zealand?

Mlle Felicia: New Zealand.

Mr Felix: Solomon.

Mr Fred: Solomon.

Mlle Felicia: Solomon.

Mr Felix: Mifala i gat e::r

Mlle Felicia: New Caledonia?

Mr Felix: New Caledonia nomo i stap klosap long mifala we gavman i faenem i jip blong i sanem mifala i go ia.

(3)


(3)

Mlle Felicia: Yes mi tu mi gat sem aedia nomo. Yumi muv on go daon long

Mr Felix: Kwestin B? Uh?

Mlle Felicia: Uh-uh.
Mr Felix: <translates from question> Ol Francophone o ol Anglophone oli gat mo opportunité blong faenem wan wok. (3) Mi luk se fas (.i) bifo ating (.i) hem i (.i) bae mi talem se ol Anglophone.

Mr Fred: M-m?

Mr Felix: Be naoia? Bae mi save talem se i sem mak.

Mr Fred: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

(2)

Mr Felix: From uh fulap olsem (.i) fulap blong mifala ol Francophone hemia mifala i kick off long Francophone finis? Fulap oli stap oli jes stap go mekem Foundation long USP ia. Ale oli jes stap complete/m mekem fulap blong olgeta oli (1) olsem fulap blong ol tutor. Fulap blong ol tutor long USP? Long USP? Hemia sam blong ol fren blong mi we mifala i skul hemia ol Francophone. Pierre? Joel? Hem i ol tutor blong ol=


(3)

Mr Felix: O yu luk olsem wanem Mr Fred?

Mr Fred: Blong mi hem i olsem nao.

Mlle Felicia: Yes mi tu mi olsem ia. Mi luk se tugeta tugeta.

Mr Fred: Fastaem. Fastaem. Hem i fastaem hem i ol Anglophone oli

F: Be ol grup nao we yu talem se oli skul long USP? I min se oli skul long Inglis tu?

(1)

Mr Fred: Hemia

F: Yu talem se ol Francophone. Naoia oli gat equal opportunity

Mr Felix: M-m.

F: Be i min se oli mas tekem Inglis tu blong tekem equal opportunity ia.

Mr Fred: Yes?

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Fred: Yes. Yes.

F: Be wan Francophone we hem i save Franis nomo hem i?
Mlle Felicia: Hem i [xx]

Mr Felix: [Olsem] wan Francophone we hem i mekem Franis nomo.

F: Uh-uh. Hem i gat ol equal opportunity wetem wan Anglophone we hem i save Inglis nomo? O::

Mr Fred: U::m

F: O mas tekem Inglisfastaem.

(1)

Mr Fred: Hem i=

Mr Felix: =No hem i gat sem

Mr Fred: M-m.

Mr Felix: Sem opportunité.

Mr Fred: Hemia we hem i toktok French nomo? Hem i gat sem opportunité.

Mlle Felicia: Opportunité olsem narawan.

Mr Felix: M-m.

(5)

Mr Felix: Okei. Yumi muv? Nekis kwestin hem i (. ) wanem?

Mlle Felicia: <reads from question> "Est-ce que les Francophones."


Mlle Felicia: =Be mifala i faithful olsem blong attend/em ol klas/es blong (. ) Inglis kasem en blong olsem (. ) edyukesen blong yu o wanem.

Mr Felix: So mi ting se mifala i lanem gud mo Inglis

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Felix: Than ol Anglophone oli lanem French. Be ating sapos bae yumi stap lukluk olsem long ol tan aot blong hem bae yu luk se (. ) wanem? Ating ol Anglophone olgeta ating bae oli lanem hao blong oli toktok nomo be long saed blong writing mo reading? Bae oli no divelopem hemia tumas.

Mr Fred: Long
Mr Felix: Sapos hem i gud sapos olgeta tu oli mekem olsem blong mifala.

Mlle Felicia: Mifala long=

Mr Felix: =Mifala i lan blong raetem mo mifala i lan blong toktok long hem.

(1)


Mlle Felicia: Ansa i kambak [long yu nogat]


(6)

Mr Felix: Okei?

Mlle Felicia: D (/de/). D (/di/). D- (/d/) <laughs>

Mr Felix: D?

Mlle Felicia: M-m.


Mlle Felicia: [Presbyterian]

Mr Felix: [Ol narafala jioj] oli kam. Presbyterian? (.) [Anglican]?

Mr Fred: [Anglican]
Mr Felix: Ol SDA olgeta oli kam wetem Inglis. So i mekem se (.) hemia nao Inglis i bigwan. Franis i smol.

(4)


Mr Felix: M-m.

Mr Fred: That's why mi talem se no bae olsem nao.

(7)


Mr Fred: Hem i Inglis.

Mlle Felicia: Yes. Olsem mi mi talem long fas ples finis. Inglis hem i the most popular language olsem long wol uh? Fulap. Fulap kaontri long wol oli yusum (.) lanwis ia olsem se hem i wan ofisol lanwis. Blong ol.

Mr Fred: M-m. Bae yumi talem se long (.) olsem klosap long Pasifik ia? Sapos yumi kaontem long (.) karem long Pasifik nomo? Long Pasifik nomo hem i Inglis hem i bigwan.

Mlle Felicia: Yes ating (.) yes hemia i tru.

Mr Fred: Inglis hem i bigwan.

F: Okei bae yumi mekem se las kwestin nomo 4 A. Mi kanselem las tu nomo from yumi kavremap finis.

Mlle Felicia: <reads from question> “A votre”

Mr Felix: Okei. Bae yu traem talem bak kwestin hemia ia? Se yu:: yu minim olsem wanem.


Mr Felix: Inglis o

F: Skul ia longwe skul ia longwe. Yumi evriwan yumi kam tugeta.

Mr Fred: M-m.
F: Be hem i min se sapos yu jusum seken option ia? Mi wantem askem se hao nao bae i wok aot. Yu minim wanem. Bae i min se long Klas 1 i go antap? Bae yumi yusum Inglis French wantaem? O yumi lego Inglis yumi French nomo i go antap? O yumi French long praemer Inglis long secondary? O (.) so taem yu talem se bae yu combine/m system.

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Naoia bae yu mas combine/m lanwis tu.

Mr Fred: Yes. Yes.


Mlle Felicia: Mi long tingting blong mi mi ting se (.) hem i wan view blong mi nomo uh? Sapos wan i se i oppose/m bae i save oppose/m. Sapos yumi stap lukluk?

Tudei yufala i tokbaot (.) mi mi go lisin smol nomo afa mi kam aot saed bakegen long wan (.) olsem wan toktok we oli go tru long dei tudei about er (.) new curriculum blong (.) er yes blong Vanuatu ia. Be olsem taem oli stap talem wod ia common. Olsem blong yumi kam (.) olsem wan? Be yumi mas common olsem long evri level ia. Olsem long lanwis? Long lanwis especially from sapos we yumi stap tokbaot er (.) sapos yumi no tokbaot common hem i min se yumi stil separate yet.

Bae i stil gat ol Anglophone skul yet saed afta Francophone long saed. Be sapos yu stap lukluk gud long ol eksam? Ol eksam especially ol eksam blong (.) ol wanem ia Yia 10 olsem ia we yumi raeter nomo long Vanuatu hemia i min se oli common finis. From se ol sem samting nomo ol sem kwestin nomo. Be lanwis nomo hem i separate/m uh?

F: M-m.
Mlle Felicia: Be i gat sam eria yet we yumi stil (.) olsem olsem ia yet be. Olsem hem i wan issue we olsem we bae yumi mas tokbaot olsem plante plante blong faenemaot wan (.) olsem wan wei wan solution blong traem bringim ol samting i kam common we yumi save wokbaot wetem samting ia i go kasem en blong (.). olsem aim o vision we yumi stap. Yumi stap er (.) olsem yumi stap drim from. Hem i wan vision o hem i wan samting we yumi (.) stap wantem blong Vanuatu i go long ples ia nao olsem ol pikinini blong tumora oli go long ples ia. So mi ting se (.) hemia nao hem i wan impoten poen blong oli mas discuss long hem fulap fulap fulap blong harem ol tingting blong ol man blong oli save mekem ol samting ia.

Mr Felix: Okei.

Mlle Felicia: Yes. Tangkiu.

Mr Felix: Mi long tingting blong mi? (2) Mi luk se blong talem naoia se bae yumi mekem wan (.) common wan? Mi luk se yumi no (.) sapos yumi statem naoia bae yumi mekem salad. <all laugh> So hem i gud se yumi mekem ol (.) olsem hemia nao. Wan curriculum nomo be yumi tijim long tu defren lanwis. Yumi lego choice. Yu wantem go long Inglis? Yu go. Yu wantem go long Franis?

Mr Fred: Yu go.

Mr Felix: Yu go. Be sapos i se yumi karem tugeta yumi putum long (.) hemia bae mi sua se bae oli tekem wan bae oli lego narawan.

(2)

Mlle Felicia: Ating i stap long choice tu i.

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

F: Yes mi gat tu comment nomo long (.) olsem tingting blong yu? Olsem yes mi tekem se common hem i wan impoten samting se yumi go from hemia be. Sapos yumi (.) olsem mi mi no oppose/m wei blong go antap long Yia 8 be tu praktikel kwestin nomo se. Firstly? Wem ol tija blong praemeri. Sapos yu wantem se evriwan i skul French fas wan? Kasem long Yia 8?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Bae yu trenem ol tija blong olsem (.) ol Anglophone tija we oli stap naoia? Bae yu severance pay o wanem? O bae yu re/trenem olgeta?

Mr Fred: Mi (.) mi minim se sapos yumi stat long praemeri? Bae ol Francophone tija/s nomo oli (.) lanem ol pikinini.

F: Be blong putum wan Francophone tija long wanwan klas long praemeri. Yu min se yufala nao we yufala i tijim Yia 10

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Bae yufala i godaon? Yu nao bae yu go long Klas 2?
Mr Fred: I min se (. ) hem i min se sapos evri pikinini. Bae yu statem praemeri blong yu?

F: Hemia nao.

Mr Fred: Bae yu statem long French.

F: Be hu bae tijim olgeta. Ol Francophone tija oli no naf. Yufala nao we yu get used long secondary? Bae yu godaon. Yu willing blong go long praemeri?

Mr Fred: Er <laughs>

<all laugh>

F: From mi stap luk se long praemeri naoia? Yumi gat foti percent nomo o teti percent oli Francophone.

Mr Fred: Wanem ia blong <laughs>

F: So sapos yumi wantem se yumi spr=

Mr Fred: =Yes.

F: Mi talem nomo se hao nao bae yumi implement/em from olsem we yu yu talem i no gat tumas bilingue long kaontri ia

Mr Fred: Yes. Hem nao.

Mr Fred: =Yes. Hem i had lelebet ia.

F: Hemia nao.

Mr Fred: Uh-uh.

Mlle Felicia: O sapos oli trenem sam? Bae i no

Mr Fred: No.

Mr Felix: Bae i stil had wok from [xx]

Mlle Felicia: [xx]

Mr Fred: [xx] hemia we hem i stap talem ia. Se bae sapos olsem ia bae i (. ) bae i (. ) hemia we yumi stap tokbaot ia? Yu mas mekem smolsmol i go go go go we (. ) yumi bae yumi aot. Hemia we blong taem yumi aot long hem? And then hemia we oli tren long hemia? Oli mas (. ) oli jes karemaot nao. Be sapos naoia? Long taem naoia? Yumi no save mekem. Yumi no save mekem.
Mr Felix: Wan tingting blong gat tu tu hem i gud blong yumi save open up i go long wol. Yumi no go long wan saed nomo. Okei? Yumi open up i go long olgeta we oli (1) toktok Inglis? Yumi open up i go long olgeta we oli toktok Franis tu. O:: olsem hem i stap tokbaot hemia be olsem tuidei oli stap talem se bae Japanese i kam insaed? Nao i gud tu blong

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Felix: Fulap yumi stap tekem fulap Chinese i kam naoia? Communication i sem mak nomo yumi go toktok long olgeta. Olgeta (.) i fas. <all laugh>

Mlle Felicia: Fas fas?

F: Okei seken poen blong mi long saed blong aedia ia se (.) okei naoia yumi stap luk i gat fulap pikinini ia we oli skul French fas wan?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Afta oli faenem se i isi blong muv i go long Inglis.

Mr Fred: Yes.

Mr Felix: Yes.

F: So yumi stap talem evri taem se oh hem i isi nomo. Yumi French fas wan ale go long Inglis.

Mr Fred: [Yes.]

Mr Felix: [Yes.]

F: Bae oli pikimap. Be (.) hemia wan tingting blong mi nomo se sapos evri pikinini long Vanuatu? I toktok French fastaem i go kasem long Yia 8?

Mr Fred: M-m.

F: Tija whoever i tijim Yia 9 i go insaed se ale yumi Inglis nao. Bae oli faenem se i isi blong switch. Sapos evri pikinini long klas?

Mr Fred: Uh (.) mi mi tijim wan (.) wan pikinini we hem i (.) hem i aot long (.) taem mifala i stap long Navutiriki. Hem i aot long Francophone? And then hem i go (.) long Inglis. Hem i aot long Yia 10? And then hem i mekem Yia 11 hem i Inglis. Hem i toktok Inglis hem i isi nomo.

F: Be sapos yufala evriwan French? Bae yufala evriwan i save muv tugeta i go long Inglis? O bae i had nao.

F: Yutufala i agri? Yu kasem mining blong mi? Olsem mi tu mi no save be (. ) yumi tokbaot ability. Olsem yes hem i possible blong wan Francophone i pikimap Inglis. Be sapos evri pikinini long klas oli comfortable long French? Be naoia tija nomo i jes <claps hands> switch nomo. Yumi evriwan yumi jes

Mr Fred: Kam long

Mlle Felicia: Ating bae oli struggle long Inglis ia.


Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Naoia yu jenisim lanwis blong hem? Yu se yumi evriwan yumi Inglis nao. Yu ting se bae i isi blong jes (. ) switch nomo?

Mr Felix: No.

Mlle Felicia: No bae i no

Mr Felix: Bae i no isi blong switch.

Mr Fred: Um.

Mr Felix: Hem i se sapos i se (. ) olsem yu mekem kasem long 8ième finis ale 8ième? Olsem yu tekem long primaire?

Mr Fred: Yes.

Mr Felix: Uh? Primaire go kasem long 8ième? Yu mekem long

Mlle Felicia: French.

Mr Felix: Long long Français. Uh?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Wan hem i save switch.

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Be mi askem se sapos olgeta teti faef insaed? Oli kam tugeta long praemeri i go antap? Taem oli kasem Yia 8?

Mr Fred: And then hem i=

F: =Mi no save nao se hol grup ia nao oli save switch. Overnight. O (. ) be taem wan pikinini nomo yes hem i mas switch from.

Mlle Felicia: No bae i no
F: From hem wan nomo.

Mlle Felicia: Mi mi ting se bae i no isi blong=

Mr Felix: =Sapos yu se long [Yia]

Mlle Felicia: [Switch] i go long=

Mr Felix: =Yes. From fulap we oli switch ia oli no switch early. Oli switch late. (1)

Mr Fred: Ating bae (.) mi ting se hem i isi. Blong mi hem i isi. Sapos we evri pikinini
hem ia we hem i kam sem mak nomo i kam kam kam kam (,) be i harem Inglis
smol? Then oli kam kasem long Yia 8? Se evri wan oli go long Yia 9. Blong
Anglophone. Evriwan. Muv i go long Yia 9. Mi ting se hem i isi nomo. Be ol Inglis tija
(,) i no Francophone tija i tijim. Be no hem i (,) pure Inglis hem i tijim. Hemia bae i isi
nomo.

Mlle Felicia: Ah-la

Mr Felix: No olsem we mi talem long yu tudei ia. Se ating long beginning bae hem i
wan salad. <all laugh>

Mr Fred: Hemia nao. Bae (,) bae i go mo bae i stret. (1) Be hemia hemia? Hem i isi
nomo.

F: Okei.

Mr Fred: Pikinini (,) evri pikinini i save mekem. Be hemia nomo. Blong Anglophone
blong i switch i kam long Francophone (,) hemia i no save mekem.

Mr Felix: Olsem se. Sapos i se yumi mekem wan nomo? Be isi wan yumi stat
French.

Mr Fred: Yes.

Mr Felix: Yumi switch i go Inglis. Yumi no save go Inglis switch i go French.

Mr Fred: M-m.

F: Okei yumi (,) sidaon krangke long tudak ia mi luk se bae yumi finis long ples ia
nomo. Tangkiu.
Date: 02-11-11

Location: On the grass outside

Participants: Mr Felix, Mr Fred, Mlle Felicia

Notes: I hadn’t had a chance to arrange my visit in advance. When I arrived, the teachers were in an awareness meeting about the new national curriculum. I spoke to one of them briefly and arranged to meet three of the four teachers who had been present during the first period of fieldwork once the meeting had finished.

It was quite late when we started. It was too dark inside because the generator hadn’t been switched on, so we sat outside. However, it quickly grew dark, and by the end of the interview, the teachers were reading the questions by torchlight. I therefore joined in with some questions more quickly than I would have liked to, rather than waiting until the end.

The three teachers took about 15 minutes reading through the questions at the beginning, writing notes, and sometimes consulting with each other, although I tried to stop them discussing their answers until the recorder was switched on. They explained that this was the way Francophones approached a task – to think carefully first before starting.

Mr Felix: Okay. I will start. For the first question? When I was at Montmartre? Like
for the (.) first question <reads from question> “est-ce que vous trouvez que c’est facile ou difficile d’utiliser le français pour enseigner toutes les matières.” Okay. For me? It’s alright. Okay it’s easy for me. And then for the second one <reads from question> “croyez-vous que les étudiants trouvent facile ou difficile de l’utiliser en classe.” Okay I’ve only been at two schools? I was at Montmartre first? The students seemed like (.) it was (.) easy. But here sometimes I speak French I see the children (.) <laughs> some just sit there wide-eyed. I think French is a bit hard for them on (.) on on the islands.

Mr Fred: It’s (.) It’s true it’s true. I was at Lycée? At Lycée you speak French it’s (1) it’s alright. But now I’ve come back to the island? I go ahead in French (.) you’ll see that (.) it doesn’t work? I’ll come back to Bislama now. I speak Bislama.

Mlle Felicia: Fo::r me? I’ve been here for three years? This is the first school I’ve just (.) started teaching? In a secondary skul? And? Like (.) with French? It’s alright like you talk and they understand you. You talk and they understand but just one
thing? They don’t manage to try to speak to like answer you back again in French. Like I’ve seen this here at other schools like Monsieur has said already. At Montmartre because I did my what’s that my practical at Montmartre? I saw that language was you spoke and they just answered you straightaway.

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: But here they make it like they hesitate or they’re afraid or they’re kind of. Timid to answer you. So you must you must find every way or corner you can to get something out. Or sometimes you give them back all the answers to your questions again. So the language is easy it’s fine. We use it so that we can say a like give something uh? But it’s a bit difficult too like difficult too like at their level too because it’s a language too that they are just learning. Maybe to speak in it they think that we’ll make fun of them or something like that. But like we try to encourage them to speak the language well. Yes.

(3) And then? (1) Let’s move now?

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mr Fred: Yes?

Mlle Felicia: For B (bi/). <reads from question> “B. Est-ce que vous utilisez le français avec assurance?” Et And then? They ask <reads from question> “est-ce que vous aimeriez le parler mieux.” Like for me I can say that when I speak like when I’m teaching something like a subject like normally I use French uh? But like to make sure? Sometimes you really want something to be done. Like your objectives as a teacher must you want to make sure yes it must be done uh? But then when you I want to talk talk talk in this language properly?

But the problem is at the level of the children who come from many different places. So sometimes it will go a bit wrong. Sometimes we swap to another language to try and go in to make the communication a bit easier?

Mr Fred: For this? There are we teach many different ages of children? So on this? To have confidence in yourself? You must have confidence in yourself with the children? So you must follow their level? You can’t use some words that are hard for the children. If the children are down here? So you must use words that you think are simple for them to understand. And then those in the other classes a bit higher up? You shift it up. It’s the two are not the same. So with this you have to do different things in using your words.

(4)

Mr Felix: Okay for me? Yes I can say that the answer to this question is yes? The first one. For the second one? Yes I wish that I spoke better like to speak with students that’s I can speak French like that. Or I can speak with one of my colleagues. Like I speak French. But if I spoke with a real French man? My vocabulary would that’s it now we wouldn’t have any new ones. If I could speak like a French man I’d like that. (4) Okay. Let’s go to the next question. (2) Okay.

<translates from question> Students and teachers?
Mr Felix: They don't speak much French outside class.

Mlle Felicia: Why.


Mr Fred: It's (. . .) it's a (1) how can I explain it? A ( . . .) a problem that we have with language uh? If I am a teacher from around here? Then a child who comes from this area ( . . .) if I speak French to him? He will get up stand there and just look at me again and (. . .) he will reply in our language? He won't answer (. . .) in French like I want him to.

Mlle Felicia: M-m.

Mr Fred: So this means that (. . .) when I send him? I will speak my language. Like our language. I won't send him in (. . .) French.

(2)

Mr Felix: Maybe something like many of the students? When they come up from primary? If they had already learnt to speak French well? Maybe when they came up to us we would find it easy to (. . .) communicate with them in French. Like now if you see the other side in primary? They are trying to change it. If you go over there to primary you will hear all the children speaking

(1)

Mlle Felicia: French.

Mr Felix: French only. They speak French with the teacher? Everything in (. . .) in French. I think the ones that we are teaching now? They are coming up? They don't have this like (. . .) somebody said today that (. . .) maybe (. . .) they don't (. . .) they don't start well. But if they started well? They would come up and maybe it would be easy for them.

Mr Fred: It's (. . .) it's (. . .) something too we should go back to the home. Of each individual. Child. So at each child’s home? Papa and mama they speak language.

F: M-m.

Mr Fred: They don't speak French. (1) So when they send him to go get something? They don't tell him in French? So here? When he comes back here? When he comes outside from class? He thinks about his home. So for you (. . .) to say something in French? Then the child doesn't get it. (1) So we can say that it depends a lot on the relations (. . .) the parents and with primary down there.
Mr Fred: So now they are trying their best to do this? I think it will get better at secondary.

Mr Felix: Okay?

Mr Fred: M-m.

Mr Felix: Let's go to the next question? (3) Which i::a

Mr Fred: D.

Mr Felix: D uh?

Mr Fred: Uh-uh.

Mr Felix: Okay. <translates from question> Do you think that we should use other languages like English? Bislama? Or the language from Ambae? (2) Okay. (2) In my opinion it's if it says that we (. ) do uh (. ) teaching if we teach in French? Then we must try our best to emphasise that (. ) we speak er only French to help the children to improve (. ) their French. (. ) Okay. Bu::t sometimes like the children are all different? Like (. ) for example if I am giving a science lesson? And then I talk about something from a different country? The children won't understand and then (. ) it's good for me to give its name in Bislama too so that they=

Mr Fred: =Yes

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: M-m.

Mr Felix: That's my opinion.

Mr Fred: There are? There are some (. ) like yes examples of names uh? Some names that don't exist in Bislama? And then if they don't exist (. ) in French? It means that they are from here. So then? You give the name in the language from (. ) from here. So (. ) it means that we can use (. ) every (. ) Something important? You want the children to understand.

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mr Fred: So you try your best so that chil- so that it goes into (. ) their brains. So you keep looking for ways to make the names of things go into their brains. But if you say it in French? And then the children say (. ) no that name? I don't (. ) when you say it in Bislama but when Bislama doesn't work? Then you say it in lanwis now.
Mlle Felicia: For me? These ideas (. .) me too I have the same ideas as my two colleagues have said. Like I have the same (. .) I don’t know what else I can say apart from this point that they have already said.

Mr Felix: <laughs> Okay? Let’s go to

Mlle Felicia: Two?

Mr Felix: The second one. <translates from question> Using French? Maybe it means using French or English uh?

Mr Fred: M-m.

F: M-m.

Mr Felix: That’s right.

F: M-m. Using (. .) no using the two together.

Mr Felix: Okay.

F: It’s not one or the other it’s=

Mr Felix: =French and [English]

F: [French] and English.

Mr Felix: Okay.

Mlle Felicia: And. M-m.

(2)

Mr Felix: Er <translates from question> so you speak (. .) English? (1) A little.

Mlle Felicia: <laughs>

Mr Felix: I know a little English. I would er suppose a foreigner came I think I could

Mlle Felicia: <laughs>

Mr Felix: I know a little English. I would er suppose a foreigner came I think I could

Mlle Felicia: <laughs>

F: <laughs> If one [came?] If one

Mr Felix: [I think] I could (. .) I think I would manage. <laughs>

Mlle Felicia: It would be a strain.

Mr Felix: Okay you:: could (. .) you (. .) yes. <translates from question> Would you like to speak it more? Yes.

(1)

Mr Fred: I

F: But why. Don’t just say yes. Like what is the purpose of English for you?
Mr Felix: Okay. (3) I will say (.) like (5) like. One is for tourists? And sometimes if (.) you need something you often go to advisors? Australia sends them here? These people don't learn Bislama before they come. So sometimes we go? You have to speak English to them. (.) That's one (.) if I speak English I think I wi::ll if I talk to them? I go and say something. If there is an advisor from Australia at the Ministry of Education and I go to see him? If I speak good English maybe he'll understand my concern. But if I don't speak English that’s it now.<laughs>

Mr Fred: O::n (.) this it concerns (.) religions too. There are some religions which are just in English. So when (.) like if I school Francophone and then (.) my religion only uses English?

Mr Fred: So (.) I must speak English. Because when I go into my church? I will speak English. I won’t speak French.

F: Is that your experience in your village?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: What’s that (.) Anglican?

Mr Fred: No I’m SDA.

F: Okay. So they only use English in the [village?]

Mr Fred: [just English].

F: They don’t use the language of the village?

Mr Fred: Um they use lanwis? But because

(1)

Mlle Felicia: [Bib-]

Mr Felix: [The Bible]

Mr Fred: The Bible i::s

F: Just in English okay.

Mr Fred: Just English. (2) So when we talk about it? It uses these words? It’s just English.

F: M-m.

(2)

Mlle Felicia: Okay me? (3) Yes?
Mlle Felicia: I like speaking English? I’m really interested in this language? Because I take language. It’s one of the languages that I teach (.) in class? And (.) I would like (.) so I would like er (.) to speak it more to have some (.) to do some further studies in this language still. I am really interested in having another (.) being able to study again to learn some more things about the language. Uh-uh. Because English is something that like (.) through like (.) you can learn it through magazines? Kinds of like reading books or something. Like that? But it’s a (.) it’s a (.) like a language that (.) I can say that (.) most like (.) of the world’s population speaks this language. So it’s a language that flows around the four corners of the world. Of earth. So I think that (.) for me I really like English? I really like speaking it. I use it all the time in my English class but (.) sometimes outside? I will come across (.) a friend or (.) I will try to speak. I will try hard because I like it. (4) Yes.

Mr Fred: It’s (.) it’s (.) it’s easy. English is easy. (2) Here? Here whether children school French? Or they school English? (1) It’s easy. English is easy. Why?

Mr Felix: Bislama like the (.) it’s a derivate of English=

Mr Fred: =Yes.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Fred: You (.) use the words in Bislama? They’re just from English. But (.) French? That’s a bit (.) we could say that it’s hard for (.) for people uh?

Mlle Felicia: French is really expensive to like <laughs>

Mr Fred: It’s (.) when I (.) I was at school (.) I was at Lycée? Er our teachers told us that (.) for every word in English? French can have four. Four words for one. Only one word in English.

(1)

Mlle Felicia: Okay.

Mr Fred: So this shows clearly that (.) French is hard. (1) So children (.) children that learn Bislama? Who don’t yet (.) learn English? If you speak English to them? They will understand. (2) So (.) everybody in Vanuatu likes speaking English. Even if they school French they will like speaking English.

(5)

Mr Felix: Okay? Let’s move to the next question? (1) <translates from question> Is it good for individuals? To be able to speak French and English? (2) I think yes? It’s good for them to know (.) individuals must speak French and English. Because (.) us in Vanuatu (.) er they have approved (.) two (.) languages of teaching which are [English]

Mlle Felicia: [Inglis?]
Mr Felix: And (.) French. Okay if you are a teacher? If (.) er like for a teacher it's
good (.) to know both. If they post you to an English school then (.) you can
manage. To (.) or if they say that you go (.) you go to teach er (.) French in an
English school? But you must do your teaching in English? Or if they post er (.) a
Francophone?

Mr Fred: M-m.

Mr Felix: To go teach in a (.) like he goes to teach English in an English school then
(.) he.

Mr Fred: Yes.

Mr Felix: It will be vice versa.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Fred: It's (.) on this? On this we should say that this person (.) this person is a
bilingual. This person. If we use these? So I speak French and I speak English just
the same. These people are (.) but Vanuatu isn't bilingual. Vanuatu is not bilingual.
There are just some people who are bilingual. If they speak French? The same as
when they speak English. That's bilingual.

Mlle Felicia: M-m.

Mr Fred: So here I think that Vanuatu must (.) like you (.) you have to speak as they
direct. Because they put it in (.) the constitution? The two languages. So a ni-
Vanuatu must (.) he must become (.) bilingual. But this now it's not bilingual.
Vanuatu isn't bilingual. Only a few individuals are bilingual. Just a few. We can say
maybe (.) maybe just ten percent. But the other ninety percent? No.

F: But you say that the constitution say that (.) everyone must be bilingual?

Mr Felix: No.

F: No it says English French these two languages.

Mr Felix: Yes the two languages [of education.]

Mr Fred: [Yes the two languages which] they must use.

F: So it means that one can just use French?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: The other one can just use English.

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mr Fred: Yes. You have to understand. The constitution says (.) French and English
but you have to understand. If you are Anglophone you have to understand (.)
French.

F: It says that in the constitution?
Mr Fred: Yes.

(1)

F: Okay?

Mr Fred: And then those in (.) in Francophone? They must Anglophone. That's why this (.) this continues.

(2)

Mr Felix: We had a colleague? A Francophone like we're talking about bi- (.) people who are bilingual? There was er an Agriculture teacher at Malapoa College.

Mlle Felicia: Malapoa College.

Mr Fred: Malapoa.

Mr Felix: Malapoa College. Then they took him to CDU? He was a Francophone.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Felix: He was teaching at (.) he went to (.) Malapoa College? He was teaching Agriculture? In English. But he was a Francophone. It's good if we have=

Mr Fred: =People like that yes.

Mr Felix: You know both languages. If you go (.) and you find an English speaker. You speak English to him. If you find a French speaker you speak French to him.

Mlle Felicia: Another one too? Who works in the PM's office.

Mr Fred: Yes. And then the director of that thing? These are all bilinguals.

F: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: M-m.

Mr Fred: But one (.) one thing we want? Vanuatu now. What they are talking about at the moment. They want Vanuatu to be bilingual. So the system we have that says this and this. They want everyone to (.) you speak English the same as you speak French. Just the same. So here they will say no. We become bilingual now.

F: Okay. I think this is touching on the next question now. What are like the benefits for (.) in terms of the (.) whole country.

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Not just for individuals. Like what is the benefit of these two languages.

(1)

Mr Fred: It's (1) the main one? Maybe it's communication. Communication. Because sometimes? If I only speak English? And then a French man speaks to me? I'll
struggle now? And then suppose someone who only speaks French? If er an
English man speaks to him? There'll be a problem. And then how will it work? We
can say that the country's development will (. ) will go on. Or what do we say.
Economy? So here it means that (. ) you must know both. Because the country of
Vanuatu is (. ) it has come from a (. ) condo- condo-
Mr Felix: Condominium.
Mr Fred: Condominium?
Mlle Felicia: Condominium.
Mr Fred: The condominium of the English and the French government together (1)
so when they started it? When they started it? The two started the work. So this
work exists in French? And English. So when you want this work to go on (. ) these
developments to go on? We must know both these languages. Everybody must
know them. If not? If we let the other one die? And then the other one goes up.
Vanuatu doesn't want that. It wants both to go up.
(5)
Mr Felix: Okay? We've touched on question C already uh?
Mr Fred: M-m.
Mr Felix: Let's go to number 3?
Mlle Felicia: M-m.
Mr Felix: Okay.
F: <to Mlle Felicia> Shine the torch. <light fading>
Mr Felix: <reads from question> “Est-ce que les Français?” Okay. <translates from
question> Do Francophones? Or Anglophones have more opportunities to study (. )
overseas. (2) Okay. I think that it's Anglophones. Because they have Fiji nearby?
Uh (. ) [Australia]
Mr Fred: [Australia?]  
Mr Felix: And New Zealand?
Mlle Felicia: New Zealand.
Mr Felix: Solomon.
Mr Fred: Solomon.
Mlle Felicia: Solomon.
Mr Felix: We have e::r
Mlle Felicia: New Caledonia?
Mr Felix: Just New Caledonia nearby where the government finds it cheap to send us to.

(3)

Mr Fred: Maybe it's (1) it's (.) if you look at people in Vanuatu? What ni-Vanuatu really like is (.) English. (.) They really like English. Um (.) I don't know why. But in the population of Vanuatu they like English. And then? When they like English? So here they are trying many things to find an easy way for (..) English first before (.) it's for. That's why it seems that (. ) many Anglophones go out to go to (. ) other countries. Many. But in terms of Francophones? Just a few. But why just a few? Because there is just a small number of (. ) Francophones. Just a small number. But if we say again that the two are the same? The government must find a way for it to be easy with (. ) the two must be the same. But now? Now not yet? It's like that now. We see that Anglophones have good (. ) access for them to go to (. ) different countries. But those Angl- er (. ) Francophones they just have Caledonia.

(3)

Mlle Felicia: Yes I just have the same idea. Let's move down to

Mr Felix: Question B? Uh?

Mlle Felicia: Uh-uh.

Mr Felix: <translates from question> Do Francophones or Anglophones have more opportunities to find work. (3) I think that first (. ) before maybe (. ) it was (. ) I can say that it was Anglophones.

Mr Fred: M-m?

Mr Felix: But now? I can say it's the same.

Mr Fred: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

(2)

Mr Felix: Because uh many like (. ) many of us Francophones those of us who kicked off as Francophones? Many just went and did foundation courses at USP. Then they completed them so many of them are (. ) like many of the tutors? Many of the USP tutors? Pierre? Joel? At USP? Those are some of my friends we were together at Francophone school. Those are all the tutors=

Mlle Felicia: =One from Tanna. Think about that one who teaches science I think? Yes. Francophones.

(3)

Mr Felix: Or what do you think Mr Fred?

Mr Fred: For me it's like that.
Mlle Felicia: Yes me too I agree. I think that both are the same.

Mr Fred: First. First. It was originally Anglophones.

F: But the group who you say went to USP? You mean that they studied in English too?

(1)

Mr Fred: That's right

F: You say that Francophones. Now they have equal opportunities.

Mr Felix: M-m.

F: But do you mean that they have to learn English too in order to have these equal opportunities.

Mr Fred: Yes?

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Fred: Yes. Yes.

F: But a Francophone who only knows French is he?

Mlle Felicia: He is [xx]

Mr Felix: [Like] a Francophone who only learns French.

F: Uh-uh. Does he have equal opportunities with an Anglophone who only knows English? O::r

Mr Fred: U::m

F: Or does he need English first.

(1)

Mr Fred: He=

Mr Felix: =No he has the same

Mr Fred: M-m.

Mr Felix: Same opportunity.

Mr Fred: Someone who only speaks French? He has the same opportunity.

Mlle Felicia: Opportunity as the other one.

Mr Felix: M-m.

(5)
Mr Felix: Okay. Let's move? What's the next question?

Mlle Felicia: <reads from question> "Est-ce que les Francophones."

Mr Felix: <translates from question> Do Francophones? Or Anglophones? Learn French or English. Okay. I think that we Francophones learn English well. (2) Grammar? Spelling? Of English we do it. But I don't know whether (1) Anglophones do the same thing as us or not. Like for us (.) Francophones? They force English on us so that (.) we continue with English. We=

Mlle Felicia: =But we are faithful like in attending English classes (.) up to the end of (.) your education or whatever.

Mr Felix: So I think we learn better English

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Felix: Than Anglophones learn French. But maybe if we look at like the outcome you will see (.) what? Maybe Anglophones learn just how to speak but in terms of writing and reading? They don't develop that much.

Mr Fred: For

Mr Felix: If that was good if they did it like us too.

Mlle Felicia: Us in=

Mr Felix: =We learn to write and we learn to speak it.

(1)

Mr Fred: It's (.) it's like we come back again. I've already said. Um Anglophones?

Mr Felix: For Anglophones to learn French it's hard. It's hard. That's why you see that (.) it's not (.) it's not really (.) pushed. Like to know everything. For us Francophones? To learn (.) English? That's just easy. That's why children they? You speak English in class? They answer you in English. They can answer you in English. But in terms of (.) Anglophones? If you give them French? Really sorry <others laugh>. It's so so hard. (1) I've been at Angolovo College? I taught French? I felt like (.) it wasn't possible <others laugh>. Because when I spoke? For

Mlle Felicia: The answer to come back [to you nothing]

Mr Fred: [For them to respond] to me? Nothing? We carried on but only Bislama could work. (1) It was easy to like (.) you say Bonjour?

Mr Felix: The first thing I said Bonjour? I think there were two or three that replied. But the other ones? Shh? <mimes zipping his mouth closed>. (xx) completely. (1) Then I say (.) but you say good morning to Francophone students? They say good morning now. But because it's a come (.) it comes too from (.) like I said (.) Bislama. Bislama now makes English easy for Francophones. Francophone students.

(6)

Mr Felix: Okay?
Mlle Felicia: D (/də/). D (/di/). D- (/d/).<laughs>

Mr Felix: D?

Mlle Felicia: M-m.

Mr Felix: Okay. In your opinion are there many people who speak French? Or English long Vanuatu. Uh many people speak English? It just follows the missionaries from the past. Okay. The churches which spread the two languages. The Catholic Church? It came with French? And then?

Mlle Felicia: Presbyterian

Mr Felix: [Other churches] came. Presbyterian? [Anglican?]

Mr Fred: Anglican.

Mr Felix: SDA all of those came with English. So it means that now English is big. French is small.

Mr Fred: Um. He says that because us like you say Francophone? I speak English too? But Anglophones can't speak French. So this is why we say no many people speak English. They speak English. Because Francophones also speak English. But for Anglophones to speak French? No.

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mr Fred: That's why I say no it's like that.

Mr Felix: Okay? U::h question E? In your opinion are there many people who speak French? Or English in the world. I think it's English.

Mr Fred: It's English.

Mlle Felicia: Yes. Like I said already. English is the most popular language like in the world uh? Many. Many countries in the world use these languages like as an official language. Of theirs.

Mr Fred: M-m. We can say that in like nearby in the Pacific? If we count in take it just in the Pacific it's English that's the biggest.

Mlle Felicia: Yes I think yes that's true.

Mr Fred: English is the main one.

F: Okay let's make this the last question 4 A. Cancel the last two because we've already covered them.

Mlle Felicia: <reads from question> “A votre”
Mr Felix: Okay. Can you say this question again? What do you mean.

F: Okay so now we have some schools that are Anglophone? Some schools are Francophone. So if you are a parent? You can make a choice. You can send one child there and another child over there. That’s one option. But another option for this is that we no longer have

Mr Felix: English or

F: Schools over here and schools over there. We all come together.

Mr Fred: M-m.

F: But this means that if you choose this second option? I want to ask how it would work. What do you mean. Does it mean that from Class 1 upwards? Would we use English and French together? Or would we leave out English and just use French as we go up? Or would we have French in primary and English at secondary? Or so when you say that we should combine the system.

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Now you have to combine the languages too.

Mr Fred: Yes. Yes.

F: Would you. How would it work. That’s the question. (2) That doesn’t have an answer to it. It’s something that the government is arguing about. So it’s just your opinion.

Mr Fred: Like I said again. For Vanuatu the government wants it to be bilingual. But it’s not bilingual. But we want it to be bilingual. So to start to become bilingual? We must start down. With the little ones. Starting with the little ones? They should learn French first. Because French is hard. Bislama is there already. It’s there already. To give them English. So they should learn it coming coming coming. (.) maybe. I’ve heard them say until Class 4 uh? Class 4 uh? Class 4 and the just go if you want to go to English uh? Class 4 but then I say no. Not yet. For me not yet. (2) It must reach some place around maybe Year 8? Year 8 or Year 9. Year 8 or Year 9? And then at this point it can swing to to English. At this point so they won’t forget French? And then he can speak it and write it. Because when he goes to English? Ah that will be easy. Everything will be easy if they go to Year 10 in English? It will be easy. So at this point at this point? At this point we can do it. It must start at the bottom but it can happen they should learn French first. For them to come come come come I think to Year 8. In Year 8 now it will. But if not? If we say no. (.) start them together at the same time. If they learn them at the bottom with er what. French and English? The children will learn English better than French.

Mlle Felicia: In my opinion I think that this is just my view uh? If someone wants to oppose it they can oppose it. If we look? Today you talked about I went to listen for a bit and then I came out again but one like one discussion that went on today about er a new curriculum for er yes for Vanuatu. They were talking
about the word common. Like for us to become like one? But we must be
common like at every level. Like in language? In language especially because if we
talk about er if we don't talk about common it means that we are still separate
yet. There is still an Anglophone school side and a Francophone side. But if you
look carefully at the exams? The exams especially exams for what's that Year 10
like which we write in Vanuatu this means that they are common already. Because
it's just the same things just the same questions. But it's just the language that is
separate uh?

F: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: But there are some areas yet that we still like it's not yet but. Like it's
an issue that we must discuss like a lot to find a way a solution to try and make
these things common so that we can go with these things and reach the end like
the aim or vision we have. We er like we are dreaming of this. It's a vision or it's
something that we want Vanuatu to get to like for the children of tomorrow to get
to. So I think that that's an important point they must discuss a lot a lot to hear
everybody's opinions in order to do these things.

Mr Felix: Okay.

Mlle Felicia: Yes. Thank you.

Mr Felix: In my opinion? (2) I think that to say that we should have a common
one? I think we shouldn't if we start this now we will make salad. <all laugh> So
it's good if we have like that's it. Just one curriculum but we teach it in two
different languages. We leave the choice. If you want to go to English? You go. If
you want to go to French?

Mr Fred: You go.

Mr Felix: You go. But if we take them and put them together then I am sure that
they will learn one and they will ignore the other one.

(2)

Mlle Felicia: I think it's about choice too.

Mr Felix: M-m.

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

F: Yes I've just got two comments on like on this idea? Like yes I understand that
common is an important thing to go for but. If we like I'm not opposing this way of
going up to Year 8 but just two practical questions. Firstly? Where are the primary
teachers. If you want everyone to school French first? Up to Year 8?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Would you train the teachers like the Anglophone teachers that are there now?
Would you give out severance pay or what? Or would you retrain them?
Mr Fred: I mean if we started in primary? Then just the Francophone teachers would teach the children.

F: But to put a Francophone teacher in every primary classroom. Do you mean that those of you who teach Year 10

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Would you go down? Would you go to Class 2?

(1)

Mr Fred: It means it means that if every child. When you start your primary?

F: That's it.

Mr Fred: You would start in French.

F: But who would teach them. There aren't enough Francophone teachers. You've got used to secondary? Would you go down. Would you be willing to go to primary?

Mr Fred: Er <laughs>

<all laugh>

F: Because I think at primary at the moment? We have just forty percent or thirty percent that are Francophone.

Mr Fred: What would <laughs>

F: So if we wanted to spr=

Mr Fred: =Yes.

F: I'm just saying how would we implement it because like you've said that there aren't many bilinguals in the country

Mr Fred: Yes. That's right.

F: So if you consider the primary teachers who are now in Anglophone? What would you do with them? Would you promote them to Year 13? Or would you release them and they would just go back to the village. And who would take their place?

Mr Fred: =Yes. It's quite hard.

F: That's it.

Mr Fred: Uh-uh.

Mlle Felicia: What if they trained some? Wouldn't

Mr Fred: No.

Mr Felix: It would still be hard because [xx]
Mlle Felicia: [xx]

Mr Fred: [xx] what she says. If like (. ) if (. ) what we're talking about? You must do it slowly up up up until (. ) are all out. So when we are all out? And then they train them for this? They must (. ) then they can carry this out. But right now? At this time? We couldn’t do it. We couldn’t do it.

Mr Felix: Another thought to have is that it’s good for us to open up to the world. We don’t just go to one side. Okay? We open up and go to those who (1) speak English? We open up and go to those who speak French too. O::r we’re talking about that but like today they said that Japanese would come in? Now it’s good to

Mlle Felicia: Yes.

Mr Felix: There are many we have many Chinese coming now? Communication is the same if we go and talk to them. They (. ) it doesn’t work. <all laugh>

Mlle Felicia: Total fail?

F: Okay my second point about this idea is (. ) okay we see many children who school French first?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: And then they find it easy to move to English.

Mr Fred: Yes.

Mr Felix: Yes.

F: So we keep saying that oh it’s easy. We do French first okay and then go to English.

Mr Fred: [Yes.]

Mr Felix: [Yes.]

F: They will pick it up. But (. ) this is just my feeling but if every child in Vanuatu?

Speaks French first up to Year 8?

Mr Felix: M-m.

F: Whoever teaches Year 9 goes in and says okay we do English now. Would they find it easy to switch. If every child in the class?

Mr Fred: Uh (. ) I taught a (. ) a child who (. ) he came out from (. ) when we were at Navutiriki. He came out from Francophone? And then he went to (. ) English. He came out of Year 10? And then he did Year 11 in English. He spoke English and found it easy.

F: But if you all did French? Would you all be able to move together to English? Or would it be hard.
Mr Fred: Um. It depends. It depends on (.) maybe on choice too. What we are
talking about. To (.) but it's easy. Every Francophone student I say again. Every
Francophone student whatever level they are at. At the level of Year 8 Year
whatever. When they move to Anglophone? There's no (.) there's no (.) there are no
difficulties. None.

F: Do you two agree? Do you get my meaning? Like me too I don't know (.) we're
not talking about ability. Like yes it's possible for a Francophone to pick up English.
But if every child in the class is comfortable in French? But now the teacher just
<claps hands> switches. We all just

Mr Fred: Come to

Mlle Felicia: They might struggle in English.

They would learn it. Like now as a foreign language. But suddenly in. Like last
term? French? Maths was just in French nomo. And then suddenly you go inside?
There are some children who struggle a bit with Maths? You know at the moment (.)
some are already struggling when you teach them in French.

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: Now if you changed the language? You say okay we all do English now. Do you
think it would be easy to (.) just switch?

Mr Felix: No.

Mlle Felicia: No it wouldn't

Mr Felix: It wouldn't be easy to switch.

Mr Fred: Um.

Mr Felix: Suppose (.) like you did up to Year 8 okay Year 8? Like you take them in
primary?

Mr Fred: Yes.

Mr Felix: Uh? Primary to Year 8? You do it in

Mlle Felicia: French.

Mr Felix: In French. Uh?

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: One can switch.

Mr Fred: Yes.

F: But I'm asking whether if there are thirty five in the class? They come together
from primary upwards? When they reach Year 8?
F: I don’t know whether the whole group could switch. Overnight. Or (.) but when it’s just one child yes he has to switch because

Mlle Felicia: No it would

F: Because he is the only one.

Mlle Felicia: I think that it wouldn’t be easy to=

Mr Felix: If you say in [Year]

Mlle Felicia: [Switch] to=

Mr Felix: Yes. Because many who switch they don’t switch early. They switch late. (1) So that you

Mr Fred: Maybe (.) I think it’s easy. For me it’s easy. If every child that came up was the same they come come come come (.) but they hear a bit of English? Then they come to Year 8? For everyone to go to Year 9. Anglophone. Everyone. Moves to Year 9. I think it would be easy. But English teachers (.) not with Francophone teachers teaching them. But no if (.) pure English teachers teach them. That would be easy.

Mlle Felicia: Ah-la

Mr Felix: No like I said today. I think at the beginning it would be a salad. <All laugh>

Mr Fred: That’s it. It (.) as it went on it would be better. (1) But that? It would be easy.

F: Okay.

Mr Fred: Children (.) all children can do it. But that’s it. For Anglophones to switch to Francophone (.) that won’t work.

Mr Felix: Like. If we do one only? But the easy one we start with French.

Mr Fred: Yes.

Mr Felix: We switch to English. We can’t go from English and switch to French.

Mr Fred: M-m.

F: Okay we’re (.) sitting in the dark here I think we should finish here. Thank you.
Appendix XVI – Interview with the Angolovo College Principal (AP) (Original)

Date: 04-11-11
Location: Principal's office

F: So fes pat hem i long saed blong skul lanwis(.) long ples ia. So Inglis long ples ia. So naoia yu luk se level blong Inglis insaed long ol klas/es hem i naf? O:: yu luk se i gat problem long saed blong Inglis naoia wetem ol tija o:: ol styuden o::

(1)

AP: Yes ating (1) wanem we hem i(.) olsem personal opinion blong mi?

F: M-m.

AP: Hem i:: ating bae mi sav se talem se standard blong Inglis hem i drop. I drop and er(.) hem i supposed to be improved but somehow hem i stap decline.

F: M-m.

AP: From er(.) tija hem i tend to speak long ol styuden long(.) Bislama?(.) and er communication most of the time hem i stap long(.) Bislama?

F: Iven insaed long ol classes?=


F: Be hem i kamaot long wanem oli yusum Bislama from oli luk se level blong ol styuden i no naf? O:: level blong ol tija i no naf? Oli no confident o=

AP: =Um(.) sometimes oli luk se styuden hem i no hem i no andastanem(.) er explanation blong olgeta long Inglis? So oli traem blong kambak blong yusum(.) Bislama?(.) Blong hem i andastan. But at the same time styuden hem i affected from taem hem i no save naoia hem i no save express/em hem long(.) from wanem we hem i harem hem i wan Bislama i kamaot long ol tija.

F: M-m.

AP: Blong hem i Inglis(.) toktok Inglis i go long olsem expression ia bakegen? I faenem i had.

F: M-m.
AP: Be ating wan samting tu i no gat naf praktis. Praktis blong toktok so wan i traem be i mekem wan mistake i fil se no. Mi ia mi no naf blong toktok Inglis so Bislama o lanwis blong mi i kam.

F: Okei afta aot saed long klas? Hem i wan samting we yumi tokbaot (,) hamas taem finis=

AP: =Yes ating uh (,) olsem insaed long klasrum hem i gud lelebet (,) long sense that most of e:;r (,) communication hem i stap long Inglis but aot saed ia nao olsem (,) supposed to be wan praktikel ples we pipol oli practise/im Inglis?

AP: But hem i no olsem? And these people. Communication between teacher student and student student (,) teacher to teacher hem i (,) jes nao hem i come to be more in Bislama than in English.

F: M-m. Be yu yu wis se yu save gobak long?

AP: Mi wis tumas sapos we i save gobak long Inglis? So that at least pipol oli save express/em olgeta. O oli save andastanem? O sapos oli ridim wan buk o wanem but at least oli andastan. But sapos oli continue blong olsem saatem oli save rid? Be (,) blong toktok blong express/em olgeta nao hem i (,) i nogat.

F: So long wis blong yu hem i (,) Monday to Friday? Or Monday to Sunday? Or

AP: Just Monday to [Sunday.]

F: [Everywhere?] (,) Dormitory? Chapel?

AP: Everywhere.

F: Evri ples Inglis nomo.

AP: Yeah.

F: Afta sapos oli brekem rul ia bae oli panis ia? Yu harem se hem i pat blong hemia?

AP: Hem i no really ating bae panis hem i no really bae i make sense? I mean blong panisim man from lanwis. Ating (,) hem i base tumas wetem ol staf blong lid by example (,) so once hem i start/em off (,) bae yumi panisim pikinini from lanwis? Most of the time bae hem i no wok.

F: M-m.

AP: From i mas uh trenem o tijim ol tija fastaem? Olgeta oli mas fluent bifo yumi kambak long (,) adresem uh issue blong lanwis blong pikinini. Bae yumi stat wetem ol tija.

F: So yu luk se i gat eni ples insaed long skul blong Bislama (,) o vernacular (,) o French i sud kam antap mo? O

<both laugh>


AP: E::r (2) once in a while. Sometimes i jes slip my mind (. ) taem blong emphasis/em French. But er most of the time mi emphasise long Inglis. (1) Ating hem i supposed to be (. ) both sides.

F: M-m. Be long saed blong yu (. ) olsem yu yu save French? O no.

AP: Ating mi wan tu we mi stap skip/im klas blong French.

F: <laughs>

AP: <laughs> (1) Um mi andastanem. Smol. Blong man i toktok mi andastanem be (. ) blong mi mi toktok olsem mi faenem i had. Jes sam basic wan mi save.

F: M-m. Be yu wis se yu save French? O=

AP: =Yes at this time mi wis se mi save but

F: Blong wanem? Hem i wan useful lanwis blong yu? O=

AP: =I jes for communication and mi laek hao oli (. ) ol Francophone oli (. ) communicate (. ) [xx]

F: [blong communicate] wetem (. ) olsem principal blong Faranako for example?

AP: Yeah.

F: O ol Franis man we oli kam.

AP: Sapos wan (. ) wan Franis man i kam o:: olsem (. ) at least taem man i toktok o yu faenem wan turis we hem i Francophone be at least yu save.

F: Be hem i ever hapen long laef blong yu? We yu faenem wan waetman i kam we hem i no save Inglis=

AP: =Yes.

F: Yu fas long communication nao? Mas faenem nara man.
AP: No most of the time bae mi andastanem (. ) be taem mi fas tumas bae mi Inglis i
go be most of the time bae oli andastan.

(1)

F: Okei. [Be hemia]

AP: [Basically] (. ) man i toktok (. ) bae mi harem save. Be blong ansa ia nao?

F: M- m.

AP: I had lelebet.

F: Okei. Be olsem hem i wan intres blong mi. From wanem yumi evriwan yumi
wantem (. ) Inglis wetem French? Osem wan i no naf. Hem i blong ol wanwan taem
nomo (. ) wan waetman i kam o

AP: Hem i (. ) hem i wan dual system we hem i stap (. ) bifo i kam so:: yumi jes come
in and (. ) fall into that system that we have Francophone and we have Anglophone.

F: M- m.

AP: So (. ) yumi stap go separate wei/ s Anglophone oli go ia? Er Anglophone
Francophone oli go. So olsem wan system we i stap? Yumi jes come in. Pipol jes
come in and flow with the rest of the (1) but dis taem? Oli traem blong (. ) mekem i
kam. Dis yia mi trial/em wan Yia 11?

F: M- m.

AP: Hem i go (. ) er long Yia 11 long (. ) Francophone i kambak long Anglophone.
Hem i wo- olsem long saed blong kambak i wok.

F: M- m.

AP: And already wan i stap askem finis blong hem i sanem wan blong hem.

F: Ah tru? Okei.

AP: So i gat intres long ol peren/s nao.

F: Bae hem i kamaot long Melsisi bakegen?

AP: Er hem i stap long Yia 10 but sapos hem i pas i go wea be oli wantem se hem i
kam mekem Yia 11.

F: Okei. Be yu save eniwan we oli start off long Anglophone? Afta oli pas i go- eh i
no pas be oli switch i go long Francophone?

(1)

AP: Ating mi save wan? Wan but only mostly long USP level. I mean out there.

F: Okei. Oli skul Inglis afta oli
AP: Skul French? Afta=
F: =Ah no.
AP: Oli switch i go long Inglis.
F: Ating i gat fulap eksampol blong (.) direction ia be yu no save wan we hem i stap long Angolovo College afta i decide no. Olsem (.) Yia 7 finis? Inglis? Bae i jenis i go long French.
AP: Mm mi no aware long eniwan we hem i olsem. (1) I gat oli jenis i kam=
F: =Yes evriwan mi l
AP: Ples ia blong go ating nogat nomo. Probably not enough emphasis o samting olsem.
F: Mi no save. From mi harem tumas nomo se (.) evriwan we i aot long French i kam long Inglis oli successful (.) oli harem se i isi blong lanem Inglis?
AP: Yes.
F: Be long defren direction?
AP: Ating blong Inglis i go long French hem i had tumas blong
F: From
(1)
AP: Mi no save ating (.) basic pat blong hem daon ia (.) oli no (.) grab/em? Gud? So i had long olgeta antap ia. But French? Hem i faenem i isi (.) but Inglis bae i faenem i had. In general ating picture i stap olsem nao.
F: So yu I mean yu harem ol samting long curriculum ia <laughs and points to pile of new curriculum statement on AP's desk> oli hipap long ples ia be (.) long saed blong system ia yu yu luk se i gud se yumi maintain/em tufalal system ia?
AP: Anglophone Francophone? O yu wis se yumi save combine/em (.) yu no mo nid blong talem se okei pikinini blong yu bae i skul (.) er (.) Inglis. Yu no nid blong jus. Yu jes skul ia nao. Yu luk se which one hem i bes.
AP: Um. (2) Ating hem i dipen olsem bae (.) yumi sud allow/em ol (.) ol peren-s blong jus.
F: M-m.
AP: Which one nao (.) but er (.) blong yu fosem pikinini se which (.) olsem (.) main aedia biaen hem i gud (.) but man hem i kamaot hem i (.) but bae yumi no (.) evri pikinini bae i no go skul long France o long New Caledonia we bae French hem i kam useful long olgeta?
F: M-m.
AP: Most bae oli kam probably Ostrelia Fiji (.) they need English.
F: So yu min se i mo gud se yu lego tufala system nomo.

AP: Ating hem i mo gud yumi livim i stap olsem bae oli jus.

F: M-m.


F: Be yu yu luk se i gud se=

A: =Olsem i gat gud saed blong hem we (.) olsem sapos oli se okei (.) yu stat lanem
French gogo (.) yu switch. Wanem we oli traem blong mekem naoia? Hem i gud
olsem gud saed blong hem i stap? But mi no ting se hem i necessary tumas blong
evriwan i mekem.

F: Okei.

AP: Yeah.

F: So olsem se naoia mi luk se fulap Anglophone oli save Inglis nomo.

AP: Yeah.

F: O olsem yu yu talem se yes mi save smol be (.) be fulap Francophone oli (.)
tekem Inglis. Mi no save sam nogat (.) be yu luk se i oraet sapos sam oli jes Inglis
nomo?

AP: Yeah.

F: Narasaed oli jes French nomo i oraet. I no nid blong yumi evriwan yumi=

AP: =Yumi no nid blong (.) hol gav- I mean evri pip- (.) gavman i putum polisi se
yumi kam hemia nomo.

F: M-m. Be long kaontri? Yu luk se i gud se yumi gat Inglis French tugeta? O::
actually long kaontri tu yumi no really nidim tufala.

AP: U::m no hem i gat nid blong hem? Olse::m

F: Long saed blong

AP: Ating gud saed blong hem olsem bilingual. Eniwan we hem i approach/em yu
wan yu save go long hem o yu (.) at least Inglis o French yu save approach/em
hem. Ating that’s the only purpose we::

F: Be hem i stap long wanwan man nomo.

AP: Yeah.

F: Be long hol kaontri olsem se sapos yumi no gat French? O yumi no gat Inglis bae
i (.) hem i kosem problem long kaontri o

AP: Mi no ting.
F: Olsem sapos yumi compare long Solomon o long PNG?

AP: Olgeta oli gat wan lanwis oli stil

F: M-m.

AP: So hem i orae. Fiji hem i jes gat wan lanwis (.). Inglis nomo be hem i (1) doing well?

F: So yu harem olsem se (.) olsem ol document oli talem se yes sapos yumi gat tufala tugeta i gat (.) sam benefit blong hem be (.) mi no save taem mi askem ol man oli stap gobak long histri nomo se

AP: Er benefit? Ating benefit we gavman hem i traem blong (.) mekem hemia nao olsem (1) um (1) wetem situation blong yumi? Long long Vanuatu i gat (.) i gat ol um (1) yumi gat communication olsem close relations wetem ol Francophone (.)

kaontri/s. So:: sometimes ol taem we i gat ol dialogue between ol kaontri/s ia long saed blong (.) bisnis ol samting olsem? And u::m ating oli faenem se bae i mo isi sapos we:: yumi gat ol Francophone speaker (.) oli save toktok wetem ol Francophone blong communication hem i isi.

F: Okei (1) m-m. Okei so naia? Ol (.) ol man we oli sapos yumi lego system ia olsem ol Anglophone i stap? Ol Francophone i stap. Which one nao hem i gat bes opportunity blo::ng further stadi.


F: Yu talem se oli push. Yu min taem oli combine/em system ia?

AP: No ols-

F: Yu talem se oli push.

AP: That's why oli combine/em.

F: Okei.

AP: Oli traem blong combine/em Fra- French and English? Tugeta long ol pikinin i kam antap?

F: M-m.

AP: So that ol pikinin blong olgeta oli save gat that sem opportunity we (.) Inglis i gat.

F: Okei so yu luk se (.) be yu yu agri se naia i no really fair (.) olsem yu talem Anglophone oli gat mo opportunity=
F: So hem i no really fair blong ol=


F: M-m.

AP: So they just (.,:) since Indipendens i kam oli bin faet from equality ia.

F: Be from wanem ol Anglophone oli gat mo opportunity. Long saed blong tertiary or further stadi/s.

AP: From ol olsem yunivesiti bae yu faenem mo long Anglophone (.) i gat New Zealand Ostrelia Fiji PNG they are all Anglophones.

F: So sapos yumi pusum French insaed long skul? Bae hem i help aot? O hem i minim se ol Francophone oli save go long=

AP: =So () ol Francophone oli gat () er New Caledonia nomo () i gat Tahiti i bin stap () and then France. Finis ia nao.

F: Be sapos yumi putum se evri pikinini hem i save French fas wan? Inglis? Bae hem i mekem se naoia oli save go long yunivesiti? Bae sem yunivesiti i [stap nomo].

AP: [Sem yunivesiti] () naoia bae olgeta tu oli gat opportunity ia (,) blong oli go long yunivesiti we () ol Anglophone styuden oli stap gat access long hem.

F: So yu minim so (,) blong increase/im equal opportunity i min se evriwan oli mas yunivesiti long Anglophone nomo.


F: M-m.

AP: Blong i kam as far as tufala i equal so oli gat access long evri (,) further stadi/s?

F: Mo afta ol Anglophone oli save go long New Caledonia tu be <laughs>


F: Hemia nao.

AP: But the large group (,) oli left behind.

F: M-m.
AP: Which is not fair. So (.) that’s why oli traem blong create/em samting so that (.)
evriwan oli go long wan system? Evriwan oli gat that same opportunity long evri
institution we i stap.

F: Sapos oli mekem se system ia we Inglis i stat long (.) er wanem yia mi no save
Klas 4? O Klas 7 i go antap? Yu luk se bae hem i affect/em level blong Inglis nao?
O
AP: Wari i stap long ples ia nao. Sapos yumi se okei oli lanem French fastaem?
Inglis i kam antap ia. Then standard blong Inglis bae hem i affected.
F: Uh-uh. From yumi start off long interview yumi tokbaot level i no naf finis. So
sapos i go long wan wei we=
AP: =Hemia fear blong ol Anglophone nao. Standard blong Angl- er Fren- Inglis
speaking? Bae hem i drop from bae oli grab antap be foundation blong hem daon
ia? I no gat.
F: [xx]
AP:[xx ] jiam antap ia yumi ting se okei pusum i go.
F: M-m.
AP: So:: ating bae standard i go daon. Mo tu ating oli traem blong promotem mo
pipol oli go long Francophone (. saed.
F: Be (1) okei.
AP: Mi no andastanem why oli traem blong (.) mekem that (.) evriwan oli save
toktok tugeta.
F: M-m.
AP: From (.) sapos yu toktok French nomo? O toktok Inglis nomo? You’ll still survive
you still communicate.
(3)
F: Okei. So naoia olsem se long Vanuatu yu luk se Inglis hem i (. dominarte lelebet.
AP: Inglis hem i dominate.
F: I gat more speakers blong Inglis than=
AP: =More speakers. More (.) I mean yeah in terms of population wise? I gat mo
Anglophone speakers.
F: Be hem i sem mak long hol wol yu luk se (. Inglis hem i dominate yet? O=
AP: =Yeah. Ating Inglis hem i still dominate.
F: So hem i min se ol Anglophone oli gat mo opportunity blong ol job tu?

AP: Yes.

F: O hem i jenis nao? From mi askem sam oli talem

AP: No

F: Se no i defren nao be

AP: No olsem (1) uh at the moment? Wanem we i stap? Olsem blong karem wan job? Oli lukaotem mostly somebody who is bilingual.

F: M-m.

AP: So taem yu bilingual yu gat mo janis. Bitim yu we yu wan lanwis nomo.

F: By bilingual yu minim

AP: It means that you can talk both language.

F: Be yu minim Inglis (.). French nomo.

AP: Inglis French.

F: Olsem yu yu bilingual finis yu no iven skul yet be (.). yu save Lanwis wetem [Bislama]

AP: [Yeah yeah]

F: Hemia bilingual finis=

AP: =Bilingual means English and French.

F: Okei. So sapos hemia olsem (.). personal opinion blong yu? Se i no really necessary blong evri man oli Inglis French.

AP: Yes that’s personally mi ting se

F: So yu ting se hemia i stap afektem (.). wei we yu stap putum aot lanwis long skul. From olsem we yu talem se yu (.). sometimes yu forget blong talem French (.). o yu wis se yu talem French. Be yu talem se yu regret se yu no save French be

AP: Olsem mi jes admire/em hao oli toktok oli communicate (1) but e::r (.). ating

F: Be long skul yu luk se (.). Inglis nao yu mas focus long hem.

AP: Yes jes Inglis nomo.

F: M-m. (2) Okei. Ating yumi stap jamjam olbaot be yumi kavremap evri topic finis. I oraet. Mi luk se hemia nomo. <checks notes> Yes. Bae yumi finis long ples ia nomo. Tangkiu tumas.
Appendix xvi – Interview with the Angolovo College Principal (AP)  
(Translation)

Date: 04-11-11

Location: Principal’s office

F: So the first part is about the school language (.) here. So English here. So do you think now that the level of English in the classes is enough? O::r do you think there is any problem in terms of English at the moment with the teachers o::r the students o::r

(1)

AP: Yes I think (1) what (.) like my personal opinion is?

F: M-m.

AP: I::t’s I can maybe say that the standard of English has dropped. It’s dropped and er (.) it is supposed to be improved but somehow it is declining.

F: M-m.

AP: Because er (.) the teachers tend to speak to the students in (.) Bislama? (.) and er communication most of the time is in (.) Bislama?

F: Even inside the classes?

AP: =Sometimes even inside the class. So it means students are unable to (.) um express themselves (.) confidently and (.) flow how their expression should flow? When they try to come back to English. Because I think it’s just too much Bislama inside the (.) classroom.

F: But where does this come from do they use Bislama because they see that the level of the students is not enough? O::r the level of the teachers isn’t enough? They are not confident or=

AP: =Um (.) sometimes they see that the students do not they don’t understand (.) er their explanation in English? So they try and come back and use (.) Bislama? (.) So that they understand. But at the same time the students are affected because when they don’t understand now they can’t express themselves (.) because what they hear is Bislama coming out of the teachers.

F: M-m.

AP: For them to English (.) to speak in English and use these expressions again? They find it hard.
F: M-m.

AP: But maybe another thing is they don’t have enough practice. Practice speaking so they try but they make a mistake and feel that no. I’m not good enough at speaking English so Bislama or my language comes out.

F: Okay and then outside class? It’s something that we have talked about (. ) so many times already=

AP: =Yes maybe uh (. ) like inside the classroom it’s okay (. ) in the sense that most of the e::r (. ) communication is in English but outside now that’s (. ) supposed to be a practical place where people practise English?

F: M-m.

AP: But it’s not like that? And these people. Communication between teacher student and student student (. ) teacher to teacher it’s (. ) it’s now just come to be more in Bislama than in English.

F: M-m. But you wish you could go back to?

AP: I really wish that it could go back to English? So that at least people can express themselves. Or they can understand? Or if they read a book or whatever but at least they understand. But if they continue to like sometimes they can read? But (. ) to speak or express themselves now it (. ) they can’t.

F: So your wish is (. ) Monday to Friday? Or Monday to Sunday? Or

AP: Just Monday to [Sunday.]

F: [Everywhere?] (. ) Dormitory? Chapel?

AP: Everywhere.

F: Everywhere just English.

AP: Yeah.

F: And then if they break this rule will they be punished? Do you think this is part of it?

AP: It’s not really maybe punishment doesn’t really make sense? I mean to punish someone for language. I think (. ) it’s really based on staff leading by example (. ) so once it starts off (. ) if we punish the children for language? Most of the time it won’t work.

F: M-m.

AP: Because we have to train the teachers first? They must be fluent before we come back to (. ) address the uh issue of the children’s language. We must start with the teachers.
F: So do you think there is a place in school for Bislama (.) or the vernacular (.) or
should French come up more? Or

AP: Um in terms of Bislama or vernacular? I think there is time for it? Er especially
when we communicate with parents? Or we communicate with outsiders who
come? Or we go out? To Lolowai or surrounding villages? I think that’s the time to
speak lanwis. Or Bislama. But (.) within the college (.) personally I think that it’s
supposed to be the language of instruction here. The language of instruction should
be English. And French. But French is like there’s no noise from it.

<both laugh>

F: I see that the school rules say French. Like French or English. But when you go
to chapel do you ever announce that you must speak English or French? Or every
time is it just English. (1) Do you ever emphasise French? Or

AP: E::r (2) once in a while. Sometimes it just slips my mind (.) to emphasise
French. But er most of the time I emphasise English. (1) I think it’s supposed to be
( .) both sides.

F: M-m. But for yourself (.) I mean do you speak French? Or not.

AP: I think I’m also one that would skip French classes.

F: <laughs>

AP: <laughs> (1) Um I can understand. A little. If people speak I can understand but
(.) I find it hard to speak it. I just know some basic ones.

F: M-m. But do you wish you knew French? Or=

AP: =Yes at this time I wish I knew it but

F: For what? Is it a useful language for you? Or=

AP: =Just for communication and I like the way the (.) Francophones (.)
communicate (.) [xx]

F: [to communicate] with (. ) like the principal of Faranako for
every example?

AP: Yeah.

F: Or Frenchmen that come.

AP: If a (. ) a Frenchman comes o::r like (.) at least when he speaks or if you find a
tourist who is Francophone then at least you can.

F: But has that ever happened in your life? Where you’ve come across a foreigner
here who doesn’t speak English=

AP: =Yes.

F: And are you stuck for communication? Do you have to find someone else.
AP: No most of the time I will understand (.) but when I get stuck then I’ll use
English but most of the time I will understand.

F: Okay. [But this]

AP: [Basically] (.) when people speak (.) I will understand. But to answer?

F: M-m.

AP: It’s quite hard.

F: Okay. But like this is one thing that interests me. Why does everyone want (.)
English and French? Like one isn’t enough. Is it just for the occasional time (.) when
a foreigner comes or

AP: It’s (.) it’s a dual system that has been here (.) since the past so:: we just come
in and (.) fall into that system that we have Francophone and we have Anglophone.

F: M-m.

AP: So (.) we go separate ways Anglophones go here? Er Anglophones
Francophones they go there. So it’s like the system that is here. We just come in.
People just come in and flow with the rest (1) but at the moment? They are trying to
( .) make it happen. This year I am trialling one Year 11?

F: M-m.

AP: He went ( .) er to Year 11 in ( .) Francophone and then came back to
Anglophone. It wo- like it terms of coming back it works.

F: M-m.

AP: And already one is asking if he can send one of theirs.

F: Ah true? Okay.

AP: So there is interest amongst the parents.

F: Will this one come from Melsisi again?

AP: Er he is in Year 10 but if he passes to go wherever then they want him to come
and do Year 11.

F: Okay. But do you know anyone who started off in Anglophone? And then they
passed to go- eh not passed but they switched to Francophone?

F: Okay. They’ve schooled English and then they
AP: Schooled French? And then=
F: =Ah no.
AP: They switch to English.
F: I think there are many examples in (.) that direction but do you know any who
have been at Angolovo College and then decided no. Like (.) after Year 7? English?
They change to French.
AP: Mm I'm not aware of anyone who's done that. (1) There are those who change
to come here=
F: =Yes all the ones I've seen have gone from French to English.
AP: To go from here I don't think there are any. Probably not enough emphasis or
something like that.
F: I don't know. Because I hear a lot that (. ) everyone who comes from French to
English is successful (. ) they find it easy to learn English?
AP: Yes.
F: But in the other direction?
AP: I think for English to go to French it's really hard to
F: Because
(1)
AP: I don't know many (. ) in the basic part lower down (. ) they don't (. ) grab it?
Well? So it's hard for them up there. But French? They find it easy (. ) but English
will find it hard. In general I think the picture is like that.
F: So you I mean you've heard about this curriculum <laughs and points to pile of
new curriculum statement on AP's desk> there's a heap of them here but (. ) in
terms of the system do you think it's good to maintain two systems? Anglophone
Francophone? Or do you wish we could combine them (. ) so we no longer need to
say okay your son will school (. ) er (. ) English. You don't need to choose. You just
go to school. Which do you think is best.
AP: Um. (2) It maybe depends like (. ) we should allow (. ) parents to choose.
F: M-m.
AP: Which one (. ) but er (. ) forcing children which (. ) like (. ) the main idea behind it
is good (. ) but people who come out (. ) but we can't (. ) every child will not go and
study in France or in New Caledonia where French will be useful for them?
F: M-m.
AP: Most will probably go to Australia Fiji (. ) they need English.
F: So you mean it's better to just leave the two systems.

AP: I think it's better to leave them alone like they can choose.

F: M-m.

AP: In yeah. That's my opinion.

F: But do you think it's good that=

A: =Like it's got good sides (.) like if they say okay (.) you start learning French and then (.) you switch. What they are trying to do now? It's good like it has its good sides? But I don't think that it's really necessary for everyone to do it.

F: Okay.

AP: Yeah.

F: So like now I see many Anglophones who just know English.

AP: Yeah.

F: Or like you said that yes I know a little but (.) but many Francophones (.) learn English. I don't know some don't (.) but do you think it's okay if some just English only?

AP: Yeah.

F: And on the other side some just French is that okay. There's no need for all of us to=

AP: =We don't need (.) the whole gov- I mean all peop- (.) the government has made this policy that we become like this.

F: M-m. But for the country? Do you think it's good that we have English and French together? Or actually in the country too we don't really need both.

AP: U::m no there is a need for it? Li::ke

F: In terms of

AP: I think the good side is like being bilingual. If anyone approaches you you can go to him or you (.) at least with English or French you can approach them. Maybe that's the only purpose th::t

F: But that just rests with individuals.

AP: Yeah.

F: But for the whole country like suppose we didn't have French? Or we didn't have English would (.) that cause a problem for the country or

AP: I don't think so.
F: Like if you compare with the Solomons or PNG?

AP: They have one language and they are still

F: M-m.

AP: So they are okay. Fiji just has one language (.) just English but it is (1) doing well?

F: So do you feel that (.) like the documents say that yes if we have the two together there is (.) some benefit from this but (.) I don’t know when I ask people they just go back to history

AP: Er benefit? I think the benefit the government is trying to (.) reach now is like (1) um (1) with our situation? In Vanuatu there are (.) there are um (.) we have communication like close relations with Francophone (.) countries. So:: sometimes when they have dialogue between these countries in terms of (.) business or something else? And u::m I think they find that it’ s easier i::f we have Francophone speakers (.) they can speak with the Francophones to make communication easy.

F: Okay (1) m-m. Okay so now? The (.) people who suppose we leave these systems alone like we have Anglophones? We have Francophones. Which one has the best opportunity fo::r further study.

AP: I think Anglophones have the best opportunities. Why Francophones are trying to push this? There’s just one reason. The main purpose behind it. It is for them to have equal opportunity? Our children in Vanuatu who are Francophone to have equal opportunities with the Anglophones. That’s the only main thinking behind it.

F: You say that they are pushing. You mean combining the systems?

AP: No like-

F: You say they are pushing.

AP: That’s why they want to combine them.

F: Okay.

AP: They are trying to combine Fra- French and English? Together for the children as they come up?

F: M-m.

AP: So that their children can have that same opportunity that (.) English has.

F: Okay so you think that (.) you agree that at the moment it’s not really fair (.) like you say that Anglophones have more opportunity= AP: =Yeah.

F: So it’s not really fair for=
AP: It's not fair for like the children? For our children but (.) on the other hand? Like I've seen the statistics there are more schools that are? Anglophone.

F: M-m.

AP: So they just (.) since Independence until now they have been fighting for equality.

F: But why do Anglophones have greater opportunity. In terms of tertiary or further studies.

AP: Because among the universities you will find that more are Anglophone (.) there is New Zealand Australia Fiji PNG they are all Anglophones.

F: So suppose we pushed French in school? Would that help? Or would it mean that Francophones could go to=

AP: =So (.) Francophones have (.) er just New Caledonia (.) there was also Tahiti (.) and then France. That's it.

F: But if we made every child know French first? English? Would that mean that now they could go to university? The same universities will [be there].

AP: [Same universities] (.) now they would also have these opportunities (.) to go to the universities that (.) Anglophone students have access to.

F: So you mean so (.) to increase the equal opportunity it means that everyone must go to Anglophone universities.

AP: No it's (.) it's both? Yeah. But mostly maybe Anglophone. Like what they are trying (.) behind the scene? That's what they're trying to do. They are trying to push (.) the chances for Francophone (.) speakers?

F: M-m.

AP: To come as far as making the two equal so they have access to (.) further studies?

F: And then Anglophones can go to New Caledonia too but <laughs>

AP: That's it that would be hard with the language. But otherwise? They want to seek the same opportunity. They feel that (.) they go as far as Year 10? Some reach Year 11? I mean Year 13 at Lycée? But that's it. Only a few go through.

F: That's it.

AP: But the large group (.) are left behind.

F: M-m.
AP: Which is not fair. So (.) that’s why they are trying to create something so that (.)
everyone will go into one system? Everyone will have that same opportunity in
every institution.

(1)

F: If they make it this system in which English starts in (.) er which year I don’t know
Class 4? Or Class 7 upwards? Do you think this will affect the level of English? Or

AP: This is a concern. If we say okay they learn French first? English comes later.
Then the standard of English will be affected.

F: Uh-uh. Because we started off the interview saying that the level was already not
enough. So if it goes to one way which=

AP: =This is the fear that Anglophones have. The standard of Angl- er Fren- English
speaking? It will drop because they will grab it up here but the foundation down
there? It won’t be there.

F: [xx]

AP: to jump up here we think it’s okay to push it along.

F: M-m.

AP: So:: I think the standard will go down. And maybe there are also trying to
promote more people to go to the Francophone (.) side.

F: But (1) okay.

AP: I don’t understand why they are trying to (..) make it so that (..) everyone can
speak both.

F: M-m.

AP: Because (.) if you only speak French? Or only speak English? You’ll still survive
you still communicate.

(3)

F: Okay. So now like in Vanuatu do you think English (.) dominates.

AP: English dominates.

F: There are more speakers of English than=

AP: =More speakers. More (.) I mean yeah in terms of population wise? There are
more Anglophone speakers.

F: But is that the same in the whole world do you think that (..) English still
dominates? Or=

AP: =Yeah. I think English still dominates.
F: So does this mean that Anglophones also have more opportunities for jobs?

AP: Yes.

F: Or has it changed now? Because I've asked some who say

AP: No

F: That it's different now but

AP: No like (1) uh at the moment? What we have? Like to get a job? They mostly look for someone who is bilingual.

F: M-m.

AP: So when you are bilingual you have more chance. Than if you only have one language.

F: By bilingual you mean

AP: It means that you can talk both language.

F: But you mean English (.) French only.

AP: English French.

F: Like you were already bilingual before you went to school (.) you knew lanwis and [Bislama]

AP: [Yeah yeah]

F: That's already bilingual=

AP: =Bilingual means English and French.

F: Okay. So if it's is this then (.) in your personal opinion? That it's not really necessary for everyone to know English and French.

AP: Yes that's personally I think

F: So do you think that this affects (.) the way you deal with language at school. Because like you said that (.) sometimes you forget to mention French (.) or you wish that you said French. You said you regret not knowing French but

AP: Like I just admire the way they communicate (1) but e::r (.) maybe

F: But at school do you think (.) it's English that you have to focus on.

AP: Yes just English.

F: M-m. (2) Okay. I think we've been jumping around but we have covered every topic already. It's okay. I think that's it. <checks notes> Yes. Let's just finish here.

Thank you very much.
Appendix XVII – Interview with the Collège de Faranako Principal (FP)  
(Original)

Date: 02-11-11

Location: Principal's office


FP: Sapos we hem i French nomo? I minim se ol narafala sabjek bae oli folem sem level nomo. From taem yu toktok long lanwis ia nao? Yu express/em long olgeta long ol narafala sabjek oli save andastan. Be taem olsem we lanwis yu no andastan tumas finis? We hem i bae i create/em yu long evri sabjek ia. So hemia nao olsem lelebet weak blong mifala long (.) long saed blong Francophone hemia nao.

F: Okei. So hemia yu specify/em Francophone long en ia? Yu luk se=

FP: =Mi emphasise nomo long Francophone.

F: Uh-uh.

FP: From teaching tudei hemia nao mi talem finis. Taem we pikinini hem i no karem wan gudfala basic long stat blong edyukesen blong hem? Bae (.) bambae i faenem i had afa.

F: M-m.

FP: Okei ol pikinini we mifala i gat ia oli kam long ol top-up we oli long wanwan aelan. Okei wan top-up hem i wan tingting we gavman i initiate/em? Be hem i no save wanem nao i nid blong mekem. I no gat wan program? I no gat wan orée we bae mifala i mekem. Oli jes sakem i kam long college? Mifala i traem blong mekem
program blong college. So yu luk ol pikinini mifala i tekem olgeta long wan ples we
(.) mifala tu i kwestinim mifala se (.) mifala i stap bae yumi go tru olsem wanem
wetem ol styuden. Hem i had ia.

F: So yu luk se level i godaon since long taem ia nomo?

FP: No i jes stat long Indipendens. Taem olsem Franis hem i bin lego mifala? Hem i
gud yet smol. Be taem mifala i stap kam bak olsem. Franis hem i lego mifala i no
gat wan niufala (.) curriculum blong mekem se yumi go yumi save come up. Be
mifala i récupe nomo. Ol curriculum hem i no blong mifala hem i kam long Europe
ia. So naoia olsem situation we i stap mifala i stap luk se naoia i stap kam. I drop.
Okei bae mi talem long yu wan samting from naoia taem ol pikinini oli go kasem Yia
minim se mifala i no mekem gud. Pikinini we hem i traem had nomo? Bambae i go.
Okei yumi no compare/em. Compare/em long ol aelan blong yumi. Olsem mifala we
i long college long aelan hem i had tumas blong helpem hem. Be long taon?
Eksampol Lycée Montmartre? Hemia ol qualified pikinini.

F: Yu luk se standard longwe hem i oraet yet=

FP: =Standard i hae. I gat defren stand- defrens between ol collège o ol lycée we oli
stap long main taon? Compare/em long olgeta long

F: M-m.

FP: Wan eksampol mi givim. Long Yia 12 long las yia? Long eksas olgeta long
tufala klas long Lycée long taon oli prepare/em? Yu faenem se long Melsisi oli
présent/em ating twante pikinini. Twante faef. Tu nomo i win.

F: Mm?

FP: Teti seven long (.). Teti seven o teti faef long St Michel? Fo nomo. Long
pikinini se bambae hem i problem blong ol pikinini. Samtaem hem i problem tu
blong ol tija. Sam tija oli no qualify blong tijim level ia. Yu luk? Hem i gat tu problem
ia. Soit hem i problem blong ol pikinini we oli no andastan gud? Soit hem i problem
blong ol tija we oli no prépare/em gud klas? O i no kasem level ia blong hem i tijim.
Hemia tu hem i wan samting. Ol ressources humaines i no gat.

F: M-m.

FP: Human resource. I no gat. I no gat naf. So hemia nao olsem bambae yu luk ol
defrens between ol (.) ol skul long taon? From olsem oli gat access. Ol tija oli gat
access blong ol narafala samting blong karem kos blong (.) blong helpem olgeta mo
long narafala samting blong lanem long ol pikinini mo long risej blong olgeta. Long
eksam oli helpem olgeta. Be daon i no gat internet o email o olsem wanem.

F: Hemia nao.

FP: That’s why i gat defrens. Big defrens between olgeta long aelan plus.
F: M-m. So yumi long aelan? Olsem yumi gat sam wei we yumi save helpem olgeta long saed blong lanwis. Be ating yumitu i bin storian smol long hem finis long beginning blong yia ia se (.) olsem ul styuden oli no really toktok French tumas aot saed long klasrum. We hem i olsem fastaem hem i olsem. So yu luk se from wanem oli nomo yusum French aot saed? Ol tija tu samtaem oli nomo yusum tumas.


F: So yu wis se yu save putumbak wan rul we hem i Franis nomo aot saed long klasrum?


F: So yu olsem yu talem se long yia ia ya putum rul ia? O no. Hem i long taem bifo.


F: So i minim se yu kambak long wan situation we (.) long ideal situation yumi wis se yumi save mekem olsem.
FP: Yes mi wis se
F: Be reality blong hem?
FP: I no.
F: I had.
FP: I had.
F: So min se yumi no save putum rul we yumi no save enforce/em.
FP: Olsem blong mekem solution i kam gud? Yumi sud putum i go talem olsem (.)
wan tingting nomo. Yumi talem se pikinini hem i toktok French? Hem i French. I no
narafa lanwis. So hemia olsem mifala evriwan i sud wok tugeta wetem hemia
blong mekem se mifala i achieve/im wanem nao mifala i wantem long en blong dei.
Be taem we principal nomo i stap traem blong hemia olgeta i no mekem be bambae
yumi mekem olsem wanem? Hem i had.
F: Be yu ting se i gat ples blong ol narafa lanwis/es insaed long skul? O yu
wantem French nomo. O i gat ples blong Bislama insaed o Inglis?
FP: I gat (.) i gat sam sabjek we yu nidim (.) from explanation hem i had lelebet long
French. Olsem mi talem hem i wan lanwis we hem i had lelebet long ol pikinini? So i
gat sam (.) sam sabjek we i allow/em blong smol taem blong oli eksplenem long (.)
se eria hem i talem olsem. Okei pikinini i andastan. Se ah okei long French oli talem
olsem. So i gat sabjek we (.) Bislama hem i go insaed smol. Okei eksampol bae mi
talem se wan tija blong (.) blong Inglis bae i kam tijim Inglis? Long wan olsem wan
Francophone skul. Bae hem i go tij long Bislama. Afta bambae hem i jes talem long
Inglis hem i olsem. Pronunciation blong hem hem i olsem ia. Hem i olsem. Mi ting
se wan gudfala samting. Mi mi bin karem wan experience blong wan Pis Kop. Hem i
bin wok long Melsisi ia. Olsem ol pikinini oli bin karem gud Inglis. From hem i
ekxplen long Bislama and then hem i (.) oli save. From Bislama hem i lelebet. Sam
wod i lelebet finis we:: i olsem Inglis.
F: Be long saed blong Sciences Sociales? O Agriculture o
FP: Yes.
F: I gat ples blong Bislama insaed.
FP: Yes. Yumi talem Science. I gat sam yumi save faenem insaed. Long Sciences
Sociales yu save faenem insaed. I gat sam eria we pikinini i no save andastan.
Okei. Long program olsem we yumi gat? Yumi tokbaot (.) yumi no tokbaot Vanuatu
o Pasifik? Yumi tokbaot fulap nara ples tu ia.
F: M-m.
FP: So blong mekem olsem se oli save andastanem se wanem ia hemia? Eksampol
mi givim yu wan samting wan frontière. Long Franis oli talem ol limit blong kaontri.
Be taem yu talem frontière finis oli se be hemia wanem?
F: Yes from yumi no gat long ples ia.


F: M-m.

FP: Taem yumi talem ol bigfala continent? Hemia nao.

F: Be hemia yu stap sapotem eni kaen lanwis nomo as long as

FP: Yes. Hemia nao pikinini i andastan hemia so yu taem yu go pas long wan wod we pikinini i no save i min se Bislama yu save yusum insaed. Sapos samtaem yumi gat blong (. ) blong mekem nomo se pikinini i andastan mo.

F: M-m. (2) Okei. So hemia? Yumi kam long Inglis wetem French bakegen from yu save yumi gat tufala lanwis so. Olsem long experience blong yu? Taem yu stap skul? Yu harem se yu stap lanem Inglis? Yu kasem Inglis gud long skul o (. ) hemia wan samting we yufala i focus long French nomo.

FP: Okei Fiona long (. ) long bifo? Olsem mifala i no gat (. ) i gat Inglis long skul. Be olsem hemia i no olsem (. ) hem i no go long nomol program olsem blong yumi tudei. Olsem gavman hem i (. ) hem i putum i go long nasonal program blong yumi mas fosem pikinini i mas lanem. Bifo no oli no fosem tumas pikinini from (1) [(xx)]

F:

[(xx)]

FP: So (. ) mi mi regret. Olsem tudei mi wan we mi regret from samtaem mi no pat blong cours (. ) cours blong Inglis. Be tudei mi mi regret from taem mi kam long position ia samtaem ol document blong gavman hem i long Inglis be (. ) mi oli kam and then mi mekem effort blong mi andastan wanem long (. ) long tingting blong mi.

F: Be yu harem se i had naoia blong toktok.

FP: Naoia i had blong mi toktok long hem.

F: Okei.

FP: Be yu toktok long mi? Mi andastan smol be olsem ia nao i had. Be tudei olsem yumi talem se bae yumi go long nasonal program blong yumi. Blong mekem ol pikinini blong yumi oli kam gud wan bilingual. Be tudei bae yu go long ofis olbaot ia we yu luk ol bigman we oli stap? Bae yu faenem ol Francophone bilingual. Tudei olgeta we oli stap draft/em buk ia? <points to curriculum statement on desk> Ol Francophone evriwan. Oli bilingual. So olgeta nao oli machine blong (. ) blong niu curriculum blong gavman ia.

F: Be hemia taem yu talem bilingual long Vanuatu? Yu minim wanem wetem hem.

FP: Frantis Inglis.
F: So hemia yu no minim ol (.) olsem yu yu bilingual finis. Olsem yu toktok lanwis blong yu wetem Bislama.

FP: Yes.

F: Be hem tu i bilingual be=


F: Hemia nao yufala i multilingual finis bifo yu iven kasem long skul. So taem mi harem wod ia bilingual mi sapraes. Olsem i no yu nomo. Be long Vanuatu. From yumi stap toktbaot Inglis French bilingual be. Olsem yumi evriwan yumi bilingual finis.

FP: No be hemia nao sam blong yumi olsem (.) sam blong yumi ol Anglophone we oli skul ia oli no bilingual. From oli taem i had Franis ia olsem ia nao. Ah Franis ia yumi no midim. Yu luk. Be olsem yumi tokbaot hemia olsem yumi talem se tufala lanwis ia nao be. Yumi no tal- yumi no lukluk bak long hemia we Bislama. Lanwis. Hem i min se (yumi midim tija blong) narafala lanwis finis yumi bilingual finis. Be olsem yu jes talem gud hemia nao olsem mifala i base nomo hemia long lukluk long wanem we tufala main lanwis we hem i blong tijim. Taem yu yusum tufala evriwan ia? I min se bae hem nao i qualify long (1) hem i save tufala lanwis.

F: Yumi stap go from tufala lanwis nomo.


F: Okei.
FP: O taem yumi go long wok be (.) wanem pepa i kam long Franis mi save. Hemia i kam long Fran- er long Inglis mi save. Hemia nao gavman i nidim tufala.

F: M-m. So yu luk se evri man long Vanuatu i gud se oli save tufala lanwis ia?

FP: Hemia nao olgeta we oli kam oli touch/em lelebet long ples ia oli wantem se. Ol pikanini we bambae oli kam ia (.) bambae oli kam bilingual long tufala lanwis.

F: Be from wanem? Wanem nao benefit blong hemia? Olsem blong karem tufala wantaem.

FP: Hemia nao tu mi no save ansarem yu stret nomo from (.) gavman ating i gat wan tingting blong mekem se tufala pikanini olsem (.) pikanini we i lanem tufala lanwis bambae i faenem isi samting. Long laef blong hem.

(2)

F: Be hem i no tingting blong yu. (1) Yu luk se yu survive wetem French nomo yu orae.

FP: Olsem naoia olsem bae mi talem olsem ia. Mi mi stap go from evening be mi mi laekem ol pikanini blong mi oli kam olsem nao.

F: Uh.

FP: Yes hemia nao.

F: So pikanini blong yu oli skul (.) Inglis? No French.

FP: French.

F: Evriwan French.

FP: French. Be no problem oli tufala i (.) oli kasem evriwan from long (.) mi fas boe blong mi hem i go kasem Yia 14? So mi no gat problem wetem hem.

F: Hem i toktok Inglis tu?


F: Okei so yu nao yu wis we yu

FP: Mi wis blong mekem se evri pikanini olsem tingting we gavman i putum? Blong oli kam olsem.

F: Be yu luk se wanem nao advantage blong hem. Olsem yumi stap tokbaot yes mi harem gud. O mi praod from mi gat tufala lanwis ia be (.) i gat eni purpose blong hem? O blong (.) praod nomo.

FP: No olsem bae yumi talem se i gat purpose? We hem i olsem long saed blong wok? Mo bae yumi praod/em se yumi only wan kaontri olsem. Be praod bae i no go tumas. Be from hemia taem yumi travel long long (.) go long oversea? Long wanem kaontri yumi no gat eni problem from yu sakem French i kam? Yu sakem Inglis i
kam? Hem i wan avantage blong yumi blong yumi go long (.) yumi go long narafala ples.

F: Hemia blong yumi evriwan? Olsem hamas man blong bae i go aot long

FP: Olsem.

F: O yumi prépare/em evri man nomo.

FP: Tokbaot man ia from taem we wan délégation blong gavman i go oversea?

Then oli lukaotem ol man we oli bilingual. Sapos we minista hem i (.) hem i

Anglophone? Hem i no save go long Fransis wetem ol Francophone man. Hem i mas

karem wan bilingual man blong hem i direct/em hem long evri ting. O:: ol speech


we hem i helpem man blong gavman? Bae hem i wan samting tu hem i mekem

olsem individual wan we yu travel long narafala kaontri? Bambae yu no faenem i had. I isi long yu.

F: So yumi stap tokbaot se (.) sapos wan man i save tufala lanwis. Sapos hem i

bilingual long tufala lanwis. Hem nao i save karem wan job o hem nao i save go

overseas. Be taem yumi no tingbaot wanwan man. Yumi tingbaot hol kaontri? I gat

benefit long Vanuatu? Olsem hol kaontri hem i gat tufala lanwis long hem.

FP: Okei. Bambae hemia nao olsem bambae taem we yumi compare/em lelebet

long ol narafala kaontri olsem yufala long England? Yufala i nidim Inglis nomo. (2)

Be mifala ating (.) mifala i praod/em ia nao olsem hemia long only kaontri long

Pasifik? Mifala i toktok tufala lanwis. Be blong praod/em mifala olsem yu talem finis

olsem ia mi no save be. Ating hemia blong (.) bae mi talem se blong hol kaontri from

bambae fluja we i kam bae yumi no save.

F: M-m. Be long saed blong mebi long (.) ikonomi o sam-. Olsem yu luk se i gat

benefit long

FP: Yes mi ting se hem i gud. Mi ting se hem i long (.) long ikonomi bae i gud long

hem from ol samting we yumi kam karem i kam oversea we i stap long Inglis

bambae yu no faenem i had long yu from. Yu yu karem lanwis ia finis. O we i kam

long wan narafala lanwis? Bae yu. Okei. Long saed long naoa we yumi go long

seken cycle? Yu luk yu faenem (.) yumi tijim Japanese. Be naoa tudai? Sam

styuden blong yumi naoa oli stap long China oli stap long Japan.

F: M-m.

FP: Olsem hem i wan uh samting blong tourisme. Olsem blong yumi talem. Hem i

wan lanwis olsem man we i kam aot saed yumi save hemia nao ol guide blong

yumi. Blong helpem kaontri long (.) long saed blong tourisme. Taem we i kam tok

olsem (.) ol Chinese i kam oli tok lanwis? Hao nao bae yumi ansarem olgeta.

F: So sapos for example yumi decide tudai se (.) no. Mebi hem i expensive tumas?

Yumi gat tufala lanwis. Yumi lego wan nomo. Bae yumi Inglis nomo. O yumi French

nomo. Bae hem nao i stap create/em ol problem blong kaontri o no.
FP: Yes Fiona bae mi no save talem from taem we mi lukluk long buk ia? <points to new national curriculum statement on desk> Tufala lanwis ia oli maintain.

F: M-m.

FP: So blong yu katemaot wan mi no ting.

F: Okei.

FP: Bambae i no possible. Ating bae i tekem taem. Be long taem (.) bae mi talem long yu nomo blong taem (.) Vanuatu i jis kasem indipendens oli wantem katemaot French.

F: M-m. Afta ol man oli maj from.

FP: Be oli maj from.


F: Okei yumi stap tokbaot hemia be (.) uh mi luk long hemia <points to curriculum statement> olsem oli tokbaot (.) oli no really decide/em ansa blong lanwis yet. Oli no save se bae yumi continue se bae yumi gat Anglophone longwe? Francophone longwe. Bae yumi folem sem content nomo? O bae yumi joenem tufala system mekem se yumi evriwan yumi skul wan (.) i gat wan type skul nomo. Yu luk se which wan hem i bes ansa.


F: Mi no ting se olgeta oli decide yet se bae oli jenis long wanem yia. But yes oli putum sam proposal long hem.

FP: Yes Fiona wan trial hemia i stap. I gat tu long Banks tu long Pentecost (.) yumi long Penama yumi no gat. No sore long Penama long Ambae. So hemia nao mi talem se yumi no save. Bae system ia bae i wok.
F: Hemia nao yu luk se bae i possible blong joenem=

FP: =Bae mi talem long yu Fiona se yu luk naioa. System we i stap bae i longtaem. From bambae oli mekem wan trial? Mi no save ating bae i gat sam jenis insaed. So mi no save se bae oli wantem karem pikinini blong go kasem long wanem level. Afta wanem lanwis. Hemia oli no tokbaot hemia ia. Be samting we mifala i tokbaot hem i bae yu faenem long ples ia se bambae pikinini i go ia? Be oli mekem tu branch. Franis Inglis. Be nomo taem oli go kasem Yia 13? Hem i sem program.

F: Yes from naoia yumi go kasem Yia 10 nomo afta


F: Be hem i possible blong yumi ol man Vanuatu nemo be narawan i lanem evri sabjek blong hem long Inglis? Narawan i lanem evri sabjek blong hem long French? Be i no Anglophone Francophone hem i ni-Vanuatu? Be i gat sam we oli lanem long Inglis sam oli lanem long French. Hem i possible?


F: Be sapos yumi (.) yumi kambak long fas kwestin we yumi stap tokbaot se level blong French i no naf? Yu ting se sapos yumi ademap Inglis i go insaed wetem French bae i mekem se (.) i (.) go worse nao o

FP: Hemia yumi no save.

F: Oli no ready blong lanem Biology o wanem long French? Naoia yumi wantem se yumi yusum French Inglis tugeta insaed long Biology? Bae i mekem se i (.) harder?

FP: No mi ting se bae i oraet. From blong Francophone blong go long Inglis i no problem long olgeta. Inglis blong go long Francophone nao bambae oli faenem. Be sapos oli putum tugeta i kam wan ples we (.) blong yumi lanem long tufala lanwis that's why mi talem long yu se oli stap traem ol tija blong mekem se i toktok sem lanwis insaed long tufala. Tufala pikinini ia. Blong putum tingting long tugeta i wan nomo. So tija i save nao se bambae hem i handle/em ol pikinini. So mi ting se sapos we olsem ia bae i oraet be ol Francophone blong oli andastanem Inglis bae i no gat problem.

F: Be hemia nao mi luk se (.) olsem hemia i jes tingting nomo be se sapos ol Anglophone? Oli faenem i had blong olsem accommodate/em French i go insaed?

F: Hem i no olsem wan ideal wei olsem yumi wantem se Inglis nomo be (.) yu luk se naoia? Wei we tufala lanwis i stap wok tugeta olsem. Inglis i M-m. So yu luk se French. Olsem ol Francophone olsem yumi no really wantem kolem ol Francophone be. Ol man we oli skul French? Yu luk se oli stap defend/em lanwis blong oli ia. Oli faet from French i stap insaed.

FP: Mi no ting. Hem i tru olsem sam eria olsem sam skull we naoia yumi save talem long taon. I gat sam eria we sam sam uh organisation blong Frantis oli involve plante wetem Frantis oli wantem se oli mas (.) yu save Frantis tu i stap biaenem mifala from mane biaen long hemia blong (.) maintain/em lanwis blong hemia ia. Be mi luk olsem bambae i (1) wan dei be ating bambae longtaem be bambae i (.) sapos kaontri hem i stap go we pikinini oli stap perform gud long French? Long go pas long Inglis mi ting se bae i no gat wan problem. Olsem long Calédonie. Long Calédonie wan Inglis man bae i go bae i had long hem. From system?

F: Yes.

FP: Francophone.


FP: No. Naoia? Ministri blong Edyukesen i stap traem mekem wan samting olsem naoia i pusum (.) i openem wan narafala (.) Yia 12 blong rattrapage. We yumi kolem long Frantis. Rattrapage blong olgeta we oli (.) oli fail long eksam blong Yia 12? Hem i create/em wan senta bakegen long USP naoia. Blong oli karem ol kos insaed long French wetem Inglis wantaem. Blong traem mekem oli karem bak? Oli sit/im bak eksam? Then continue blong go long USP sapos oli wantem.

F: Okei.

FP: So long saed blong mifala long gavman? Olsem naoia Minista we i stap hem i Francophone. So naoia? Bae yu luk olgeta (.) pikinini we bambae oli go kasem en long Yia 14 we oli gudfala mak? Be oli go karem skolasip long Philippine. Philippine

F: Blong ol Francophone bilingual.

FP: Bilingual.

F: Be olgeta we oli toktok French nomo yu luk se i had lelebet blong=

FP: =No bae i had.

F: Blong go aot saed.

FP: Bae i had.

F: Be i gat eni naoia we oli stap go long New Caledonia?

FP: Hemia nao mi stap (.) program hem i stap be problem hemia nao se i

F: Oh yes yu talem finis.

FP: Level hem i no (.) tumas olgeta we oli mekem effort nomo oli stap. Olgeta we oli go pleplei tumas oli go luk defren laef stael blong ol longwe be (.) oli kambak.

F: So naoia olsem situation we i stap naoia yu luk se ol Anglophone oli gat advantage long saed blong skolasip? O sapos no ol Francophone oli mas bilingual fastaem. Oli jenis i go long Inglis blong stadi.

FP: Okei long saed blong samting ia long level blong yumi long skul? Yumi gat plante nao long ol Anglophone.

F: M-m.


F: M-m. I gat Tahiti o no. Hem i nomo (.) French Poly=


So naoia pikinini we hem i skul French i go long Yia 14 ia? Be oli selected i go long ol narafula Anglophone skul ia. So oli wantem kasem wan samting long laef blong olgeta? So mi ting se Inglis we oli lanem ia hem i helpem olgeta plante.

F: Okei. Long saed blong ol job hem i sem mak?

FP: Sem mak.

F: Yu Anglophone yu save kasem job hariap? French i no nidim?


Be sapos we i gat wan Francophone o bae oli talem nomo las wan sapos yu kam o yu toktok Franis o yu toktok Inglis? Hem i gud tu blong yu save aplae. So i minim se
bae fas priority hem i Inglis? Be narafala lanwis tu i save wok. French o narafala
Bislama oli kam. Be bambae Fransis bae i seken lanwis blong yu blong (1) so mi ting
se hem i(.) be majorité blong yumi tudei we oli wok long samting oli olgeta Fra-
er Anglophone oli kasem mo job bitim mifala.

F: Be stil yu(.) sapos yu gat pikinini bakegen bae yu putum hem long
Francophone?
FP: Okei. Naoia bambae yu luk. Fiona naoia plante peren/s wan i go skul long
Francophone narafala wan i
F: Hemia nao.
FP: Naoia system ia i hapen plante. Ol yangfala génération tudei. Oli wantem se
hemia i skul longwe hemia i skul longwe.
F: So yu luk se hemia i gud?
FP: Hemia mi ting se hem i gud.
F: From(.) bae i helpem hol famle ia?
FP: No olsem from bambae yutufala ino faenem(.) olsem blong yufala i faenem i isi
blong(.) toktok(.) famle blong(.) sapos we narawan i no kasem be narawan se
yumi save kaontem blong hem yu luk. So mi ting se hemia nao peren/s. View blong
olgeta ia nao.
(2)
F: Okei. Be naoia yu luk se Angloph- i gat mo Anglophone yet long Vanuatu than
Francophone? Hemia i stap yet long ples ia.
FP: Yes. I gat plante(.) plante Anglophone skul/s. Olgeta oli sam ples long eighteen
F: Be long hol wol? Yu luk se i sem mak. Olsem Anglophone i stap dominate=
FP: =Bae yumi talem olsem from ol lanwis we yumi toktok plante long wol hem i
Inglis. Fas lanwis. Fransis ating hem i kam long namba tu o namba tri.
F: So i min se taem yu kambak long ol Francophone skul yu stap promote/em Inglis
blong helpem ol pikinini long(.) olsem long saed blong opportunity blong ol long
wol? O yu stap focus long French yet. From hem i main lanwis long ples ia.
FP: Long olsem mi olsem(.) blong ples ia? No mi karem tugeta. Mi nao wantem
mekem se(.) olsem mi talem se bilingual tufala lanwis we konstityyen ino tokbaot? Mi
wantem se Fransis we yumi stap toktok long hem plante ia? Yu karem Inglis long
sem level. Yu traem yusum hemia blong tufala tul blong yu. Blong helpem yu long
hem.
F: Be oli gat any opportunity blong yusum skul ia? Hemia Inglis klas nomo.
FP: Bambae long nekis yia bambae mi gat wan tija blong Anglophone i tijim Inglis.
F: Uh?

FP: Hemia. <smiles>

F: Yu luk se yu harem gud from. <laughs>

FP: Hemia nao mi harem se.

F: Okei.

FP: Blong i traem. Bae mi givim narafala (.) sam sabjek blong hem sapos i fil blong hem i tijim then bambae i tijim.

F: Okei.

FP: Woman blong hem i stap talem finis se man blong hem bae i kam nekis yia.

F: Okei. So i mekem se Inglis bae i go antap? Ale French i go antap long sem taem.

FP: Hemia nao. Mi wantem se tufala level ia i go. From mi wantem promote/em ol pikinini blong oli go. Taem oli go kasem wan level blong oli finisim Yia 10? Then oli go long Yia 11 Yia 12? I no wan problem blong hem.

F: M-m.

FP: So pikinini hem i mas andastan se mi mi (.) i mas gat wan vision se mi wan wanem. Mi wantem kam olsem. Mi toktok plante long olgeta be

F: M-m.

FP: Be sam ating bae oli oraet.


FP: Ol buk ia? Vanuatu gavman hem i no mekem. Ol donor aot saed oli mekem. <F laughs>

F: Okei so Vanuatu i no wari long


F: Be yu luk se blong maintain/em tufala system i mekem se i harder o

FP: Yes.
F: From yu talem se i no naf blong divelopem be

FP: I no naf.

F: Sapos i gat wan system nomo bae i (.) bae i help aot o no.

FP: Bae mi no save talem long yu. Be from hemia nao. Mi mi no gavman. Bae mi no save talem long gavman se gavman bae i mas karem wan system ia. From ating sapos we gavman i serem gud mane blong kaontri mi ting se bae i sud oraet. Be bae yu harem plante taem tumas corruption. Sam samting ia naounnecessary yumi spend/em mane long hem. Ol kot kes blong samting yumi waste/em mane long hem. Yu luk. Hem i se gavman hem i no control/em gud funds blong hem. Be sapos hem i control/em gud finance mi no ting se bae mifala i kasem problem long hem.

F: Okei.

FP: Long ples ia nao oli stap wet long ol donor blong oli givim mane. Sapos i serem gud mane. I folem wanem planning blong gavman we oli sud mekem ol expenses hemia nomo i no gat narafala tingting. Mi ting se bambae i oraet. Be naoia? Yu luk mifala noia olsem bae yu faenem se yu wantem mek wanem yu mek wanem ia. Be tumas doti. Gavman i traem wan project. I no finisim. Be i lego i go blong karem narawan i kam.

F: Hemia nao mi luk se nekis yia bae i go bak long Yia 7 bae oli go long secondary.

FP: Yes oli sarem evri top-up. Oli talem plante se bae mifala i folem be afa?


Sapos we wan gavman we hem i stable we hem i mekem gud samting? Mi ting se bae kaontri bae i go gud nomo. Be hem i stap long gavman blong mifala nao. Blong mekem gud wok.

F: <laughs> Yes i tru. (2) Okei. Ating bae mi nomo tekem up taem blong yu.

Tangkiu tumas bakegen.

FP: Tangkiu tumas Fiona.
Appendix xvii – Interview with the Collège de Faranako Principal (FP)
(Translation)

Date: 02-11-11
Location: Principal's office

F: Okay so my first question is about the school language here. So that's French here. Do you think that the level of French? At school here? What is it like. Is it (.) enough for the teachers to teach their subjects? Or (.) for the students to learn? In French? Or do you think there is now a problem with French in school.

FP: Yes Fiona. Because er (.) a language like French? It's not an easy language. Like firstly we can say this. So when we come? If we want to get the students to a good level? We must go back to primary. The level when they start. Kindy onwards. But today we find that some students who (.) we have in Year 10? Their level isn't very good. We can say that the average ones can go on. But some of them find it hard. The teaching like the language? French is a language which is hard.

F: M-m. So do you think this is a problem that is directly about language? Or actually has the level in every subject gone down. Like in Year 10? Is there a problem like with Maths? Or no is it just with French.

FP: If it was just French? It would mean that the other subjects would just follow the same. Because when you speak in the language? You express things in the other subjects and they can understand. But when when you don't understand much of the language? That will create problems for you in every subject. So that is like a kind of weakness for us (.) for us Francophones.

F: Okay. So you just specified Francophones at the end there? Do you think that=

FP: =I emphasise just Francophones.

F: Uh-uh.

FP: Because teaching today is like I've said. When the children don't have good basics at the start of their education? They (.) they will then find it hard.

F: M-m.

FP: Okay the children that we have who come from top-ups on the different islands. Okay top-up is an idea that the government initiated? But it doesn't know what it needs to do for it. It has no programme? There's no introduction that we can make. They just throw them into the college? We are trying to do our college programme. So you see we take these children from a place that (.) we are also questioning ourselves about (.) how we will be able to get through with these students. It's hard.
F: So do you think the level has gone down since this time?

FP: No it just started at Independence. When like the French left us? It was still quite good. But when we came back. When the French left us we had no new (.). curriculum that would enable us to come up. We just took it over. The curriculum is not ours it comes from Europe. So now like the situation we have we’ve seen it happening. It's dropped. Okay I can tell you that now when children go as far as Year 13 Year 14? When they go to pre-university in Noumea? They come back. You see. It means that we are not doing well. Only the children that try hard? They can go. Okay we’re not comparing. Comparing the islands. Like for us at a college on the island it’s really hard to help them. But in the town? For example Lycée or Montmartre? Those are the qualified children.

F: You think the standard there is alright still=

FP: The standard is high. There are different stand- a difference between the schools or lycées in the main town? Compared to

F: M-m.

FP: I’ll give you an example. In Year 12 last year? In the exam everybody in two classes at Lycée in the town studied for it? You find that at Melsisi they entered maybe twenty children. Twenty five. Only two passed.

F: Mm?

FP: Thirty seven at (.). thirty seven or thirty five at St Michel? Only four. At Collège? Seventy five something like that. Only five. So you see? Okay. I don’t know with these children whether it’s a problem with the children. Sometimes it’s a problem with the teachers too. Some teachers are not qualified to teach at this level. You see? There are two problems. Either it’s a problem with the children who don’t understand well? Or it’s a problem with the teachers who don’t prepare good classes? Or they haven’t reached that level of teaching. That is also something. We don’t have the human resources.

F: M-m.

FP: Human resources. They’re not there. There aren’t enough. So there you will see the difference between the (.). schools in the town? Because they have access. The teachers have access to other things to develop their courses (.). to help them and for other things to teach the children and for their research. In the exams it helps them. But down here there is no internet or email or whatever.

F: That’s right.

FP: That’s why there is a difference. A big difference between them on the islands and.

F: M-m. So for us on the islands? Like we have some ways that we can help them in terms of language. But I think you and I have talked about this a bit already at the beginning of this year that (.). like um students don’t really speak French much
outside the classroom. While they did before they did. So why do you think they no
longer use French outside? And teachers too sometimes don’t use it much.

FP: That’s it. The main problem is the language. The three languages that are in the
country’s constitution. Mainly? When a child goes to a French school or a (. ) sch- a
what’s that. A school for that it should maintain its language of teaching now. But us
teachers too some of the weaknesses are with us too. That’s it when we speak
Bislama to them? Then the children adopt this. So we don’t force them in what to
do. The mother tongue comes. Like the traditional language? It goes and mixes up
with French. You hear when they talk to you? You feel (. ) you find it unpleasant. The
expression of the language is poor. They just ask you if they can do something and
you don’t understand but (. ) it’s something that we are learning in school but it
doesn’t go inside their heads.

F: So do you wish you could put back a French-only rule outside the classroom?

FP: Us here? We introduced the rule that when the children come inside the school
area? They should speak French or English. Because now we are like one- the only
country in the Pacific that’s (. ) bilingual. The only country in the Pacific. Out of us in
the Pacific that’s it. So (. ) I think that when like (. ) if a child makes an effort to (. ) he
want to get things in his future. I think that he should take an interest himself. But
today we find language. There are already three languages in the country’s
constitution. Which means we use them. And? The traditional language that each
individual has.

F: So you like you say that you made this rule this year? Or no. That was in the
past.

FP: No. I no longer have it because when we try to have it and we punish them? But
the children don’t understand. It means that you don’t do it like that. Okay something
else is like? Me I am the head of the school but it needs the cooperation of
teachers. I tell them that (. ) the children are under all of us. You see something
that’s wrong? You correct it. But no they don’t do it. So I’ll talk and talk but I keep
talking? But someone else is causing a problem on the other side. So I can’t control
them. That’s now the main (. ) one of our weaknesses as teachers. The supporting
of the running of the school which is to (. ) we suggest an idea for us to work towards
but it doesn’t work. That’s why the children’s weaknesses they’ll come and they’ll
question. Yes they’ll question us. We must question ourselves first. Before we
criticise the children. Whether we show a good example to them or not. But what
can we say.

F: So it means that you come back to a situation which (. ) in an ideal situation we
wish we could do it like that.

FP: Yes I wish that

F: But the reality?

FP: It can’t.

F: It’s hard.
FP: It's hard.

F: So you mean we can't have a rule that we can't enforce.

FP: Like to find a good solution? We should put it like to say (...) one thing only. We say that the children speak French? It's French. It's not another language. So then like we should all work together with it to make it so that we achieve what we want at the end of the day. But when just the principal is trying to do it they don't do it but how can we do it? It's hard.

F: But do you think there is place for other languages in the school? Or do you want French only. Or is there place for Bislama here or English?

FP: There are (...) there are some subjects that you need it (...) because explanation is quite hard in French. Like I said it's a language that is quite hard for the children? So there are some (...) some subjects where it's allowed for a small time for them to explain in (...) that this area they say it like this. Okay the children understand. That ah okay in French they say it like this. So there are some subjects that (...) Bislama goes inside a little. Okay an example I can give is a teacher (...) of English might come to teach English? Like in a Francophone school. She might teach in Bislama. And then she would just say that in English it's like this. Its pronunciation is like this. It's like that. I think that's a good thing. I had an experience of a Peace Corps. She worked at Melsisi. Like the children learnt good English. Because she explained in Bislama and then (...) they understood. Because Bislama is a bit. There are some words already that are like English.

F: But in terms of Social Science? Or Agriculture or

FP: Yes.

F: Is there a place for Bislama there.

FP: Yes. If we say Science. We will find some. You can find some in Social Science. There are some areas that children can't understand. Okay. In the programme we have? We talk about (...) we don't talk about Vanuatu or the Pacific? We talk about many other places too.

F: M-m.

FP: So get them to understand what these things are? An example I can give is frontière\(^{33}\). In French it's what they call the limit of a country. But when you say frontière they are like what's that?

F: Yes because we don't have the same here.

FP: Okay. I will say to them look. Because Vanuatu is small islands. The sea divides us. But in big countries like in Europe? That's where France is? There? They are divided by something else. Something that means you can't cross it. That's what they call frontières. You see the children are there. They look and see. Yes. We are not the same.

\(^{33}\) border
F: M-m.

FP: When you talk about the big continent? It’s like that.

F: But then do you support any kind of language as long as

FP: Yes. Then the children understand it so you (.) when you go past a word that
the children don’t know it means that you have to use Bislama. Sometimes we have
to (.) to make sure that children understand.

F: M-m. (2) Okay. So on this? We come to English and French again because you
know we have these two languages so. Like in your experience? When you were at
school? You learnt English? Did you do well in English or (.) was it something that
you just focused on French.

FP: Okay Fiona in (.) in the past? Like we didn’t have (.) there was English at
school. But it wasn’t like (.) it wasn’t in the normal programme like we have today.
Like the government (.) has put it into the national programme to force children to
learn it. In the past they didn’t really force it (1) [(xx)]

F:

[(xx)]

FP: So (.) I regret this. Like today I’m one who regrets that I didn’t always take part
in lessons (.) English lessons. But today I regret this because now I’m in this
position sometimes government documents are in English but (.) they come and
then I have to make an effort to understand them (.) on my own.

F: But do you think it’s hard now to speak it.

FP: Now it’s hard for me to speak it.

F: Okay.

FP: If you spoke to me? I would understand a little but like it would be hard. But
today like we say that we will go to a national programme. To make our children
become good bilinguals. But today if you go into the offices all about where the
directors are? You will find Francophone bilinguals. Those who are drafting this
book? <points to curriculum statement on desk> They are all Francophones. They
are bilingual. So they are now the machines of (.) of the government’s new
curriculum.

F: But when you say bilingual in Vanuatu? What do you mean by it?

FP: French English.

F: So you don’t mean (.) like you are already bilingual. Like you speak your
language and Bislama.

FP: Yes.

F: But that is also bilingual but=
FP: I don’t know if that is bilingual like you know your own two languages? You speak Bislama. You speak French.

F: That’s it you’re already multilingual before you start school. So when I hear the word bilingual I’m surprised. Like it’s not just you. But in Vanuatu. We talk about English French bilingualism but. Like we are all bilingual already.

FP: No but that’s some of us like (.) some of us Anglophones who go to school they are not bilingual. Because they find French hard. Ah we don’t need French. You look. But for bilingual we talk about this we say these two languages but. We don’t say- we don’t look back to Bislama. Language. It means (we need teachers for) other languages already we are already bilingual. But like you’ve just explained that now but we base it only on what are the two main languages for teaching. When you use both of these? It means that this now qualifies him (1) he knows both languages.

F: We go for these two languages.

FP: We go for these two languages. Because Bislama is a (.) just a language of communication. It doesn’t have a way of writing. When we write it we write according to our own idea of the grammar. We just write our vocabulary. Whatever you. You want to know whatever you write it. But it doesn’t have a proper vocabulary for us to talk about or for us to look at. No. These words you write them however you like. Bislama is a language for communication. We use it because. If you go to Santo? There’s another language. So if you speak Bislama you can communicate with someone from Santo someone from Ambae. But we don’t count this. We talk about bilingualism in just the two main languages of teaching.

F: And then? Your own language? Like your mother tongue? Is that the same? Is that down there=

FP: =It’s down there. It’s down there. We don’t talk about that because that is something that is like. It’s normal. Bislama is like for communication with our other friends. But when like I meet someone from my island? Like we will speak our language. That’s the identity of an island. So I’m from that island I’m talking about that? I’ve got that because it’s an identity for me. So everyone. When we talk about (.) we talk about these two languages because then it’s like becoming bilingual in the two main languages of teaching.

F: Okay.

FP: Or when we go to work but (.). a document comes in Fre- er in English I can understand. That’s why the government needs both.

F: M-m. So do you think it’s good for everyone in Vanuatu to know these two languages?

FP: That’s it those people who were here they touched on this a little they want. All children (.) to become bilingual in the two languages.
F: But why? What is the benefit of this? Like of having both together at the same time.

FP: That's it I can't really give you a straight answer because (.) I think the government has the idea to make both children like (.) if children learn both languages they will find things easy. In their lives.

(2)

F: But is that not what you think. (1) Do you feel that you survive with just French and you're alright.

FP: Well now I can say. I'm going towards the evening now but I would like my children to be like that.

F: Uh.

FP: Yes that's it.

F: So have your children schooled (.) English? No French.

FP: French.

F: All of them French.

FP: French. But there's no problem for either of them (.) they've learnt both because (.) my first son went as far as Year 14? So I have no problem with him.

F: He speaks English too?

FP: Speaks English. The second one was at (.) Montmartre. And when he finished he went to CNS. CNS is an English thing? So he did the same.

F: Okay so you wish that you

FP: I would like all children to be like the government have said? For them to be like that.

F: But what do you think is the advantage of this. Like we talk about feeling good. Or being proud of having these two languages but (.) is there any purpose? Or to (.) just feel proud.

FP: No like we can say it has a purpose? Like in terms of work? And we can be proud that we are the only country like this. But pride doesn't go too far. But because with this when we travel to (.) go overseas? In whatever country we won't have any problem because you throw some French? You throw some English? It's an advantage for us when we go (.) we go to other places.

F: Is that for all of us? Like not many people will go out to

FP: Like.

F: Or should we prepare everyone.
FP: We talk about people like when a government delegation goes overseas? Then they look for people who are bilingual. If there is a minister who is (.) who is Anglophone? He can't go to France with all the Francophone people. He must take a bilingual person for him to guide him in everything. O::r his speeches? He will make them. He will translate them. So you see it's something that helps people in the government? And it's something that enables individuals to travel to other countries? So you won't find it hard. It will be easy for you.

F: So we are talking about (.) if a person knows both languages. If he is bilingual in these two languages. Then he can get a job or he can go overseas. But if we don’t think about individual people. If we think about the whole country? Is there a benefit for Vanuatu? Like the whole country having both languages.

FP: Okay. On this like if we compare a bit with other countries like you in England? You just need English. (2) But we (.) we are proud of being the only country in the Pacific? That we speak two languages. But being proud as we said before like I don’t know. Maybe it’s (.) I can say that we don’t know what the future will be for the country.

F: M-m. But in terms of maybe (.) the economy or some-. Like do you think there are benefits of

FP: Yes I think that’s good. I think that for (.) the economy it’s good because you won’t find things that we get from overseas that are in English hard. You have the language already. Or that come in another language? You can. Okay. In terms of now as we go into the second cycle? You will find (.) us teaching Japanese. Today?

F: M-m. Like it’s to do with tourism. We can say. It’s a language for when people come from outside we can have guides. To help the country (.) in terms of tourism. When they come (.) the Chinese come speaking their language? How we will answer them.

F: So if for example we decide today that (.) no. Maybe it’s too expensive? Having these two languages. We get rid of one. We use just English. Or just French. Would that create problems for the country or not.

FP: Yes Fiona I can’t answer that because when I look at this book? <points to new national curriculum statement on desk> They are maintaining the two languages.

F: M-m.

FP: So I don’t think you can cut one out.

F: Okay.

FP: It wouldn’t be possible. It would maybe take time. But when (.) let me tell you that when (.) Vanuatu was just reaching independence they wanted to cut out French.
F: M-m. And then they protested.

FP: They protested about it.

F: M-m. So that’s what I’m asking if it just something to do with individuals’ thinking. Like their pride? Because they feel that being Francophone is something good. Or does it have like a material use?

FP: Okay. Fiona. I can say something? Between ourselves? Like now you see us. A Francophone and an Anglophone? They don’t go together. Something now that we are trying to do so you forget this idea. We become man Vanuatu. If you say that we speak Bislama then we speak Bislama. If we speak English we speak English. But you should no longer say no I’m Francophone we are Anglophone. That’s the idea now that we are creating. So I think that to cut out one of these two languages would take a long time long time. So I can say that beginning with the time we reached independence? They wanted to cut it out. But the demonstration happened so they put it back. Walter put it back. But their idea was to have (.) one language.

F: Okay so we’ve talked about this (.) uh I’ve looked at this <points to curriculum statement> like they’ve discussed it but (.) they haven’t really decided the answer about language yet. They don’t know whether we will continue having Anglophones over there? Francophones over there. Where we would just follow the same content? Or whether to join the two systems so that we all school (.) there’s just one type of school. Which do you think is the best answer.

FP: Okay the plan that the government has suggested now? The children come straight to (.) they are doing some trials at some schools already. Their results will come out at the end of this year. Okay they teach the children in kindy? Up to Class 2. In French. After Class 2 they swing to English. Okay to continue up to Year 8 to see their exam results. Okay. Class 2 or Class 4 I don’t think so. Maybe Class 2.

F: I don’t think they’ve decided yet which year to change in. But yes they’ve put some proposals forward.

FP: Yes Fiona that’s one trial. There are two in the Banks two on Pentecost (.) we don’t have any in Penama. No sorry not Penama on Ambae. So that’s what I’m saying we don’t know. Whether this system will work.

F: That’s it do you think it’s possible to join them=

FP: =I can tell you Fiona that now. This system will take a long time. Because they will do a trial? I don’t know maybe there will be some changes. So I don’t know which level they want the children to get to. And then which language. They haven’t talked about this. But something we’ve talked about you will find that when the children go through? They will make two branches. French English. But as they go up to Year 13? It will be the same programme.

F: Yes because at the moment we only go up to Year 10 and then

FP: Yes that’s it. We say that we are ni-Vanuatu. That’s all. The system of Anglophones and Francophones or even suppose I teach in the Francophone and
you teach in the Anglophone? In the English language? But we don’t talk about it
like ah you teach English no. It’s an opportunity for all of us you one (.) two
languages now. So the system that the government is saying now? When you go
around I no longer want to hear Francophone Anglophone. When this happens you
see one go here one go there. No. You just say I am Man Vanuatu.

F: But is it possible that we can be man Vanuatu but some learn all their subjects in
English? Others learn all their subjects in French? It’s not Anglophone Francophone
it’s ni-Vanuatu? But some learn in English and some learn in French. Is that
possible?

FP: Okay something else. They want to try having some teachers who learn both
languages. To teach in English. And at the same time to teach in French. But the
same subject. That’s what they are doing they’ve just done this at Malapoa34 it will
be three years. Three years rather than two. So now? This new curriculum is trying
to teach these young people already.

F: But if we (.) we come back to the first question we discussed about the level of
French not being enough? Do you think if we add English in there with French
would it make it (.) it (.) go worse now or

FP: That we don’t know.

F: They are not ready to learn Biology or whatever in French? And now we want to
use French and English together in Biology? Won’t that make it (.) harder?

FP: No I think that would be okay. Because for a Francophone to go to English
there’s no problem. For English to go to Francophone now they will find it. But if
they put them together in one place where (.) we learn in both languages that’s why
I say they are trying to get the teachers to speak the same language to both. Both
groups of children. To instil this thinking that the two become one. So teachers know
how to handle the children. So I think that if it was like that it would be okay for
Francophones to understand English it wouldn’t be a problem.

F: But then it seems that (.) like this is just my idea but if Anglophones? They find it
hard to like accommodate French? And then? Francophones learn English well? It
seems that French will go down. Because both will focus on English. French will

FP: If you look now. Today? Many of us who speak French they use (.) a lot of
French. When they speak it’s not a good French. Many now are using a lot of
English. I think if we keep doing this maybe one day French will just be for
communication. I think about what we’ve said about your question? I think that it will
be a long time. To understand this. If you understand? English so that. There is no
need to go back to French. We work in English only. So what you say I think it will
come true but a long time in the future.

F: It’s not like an ideal way like what we want but (.) if you look at the moment? At
the way that the two languages work together. English is

34 The Vanuatu Institute of Teacher Education is located in the same area as Malapoa (an
Anglophone secondary school)
FP: English is like a bit higher because some Francophones are trying to find a way to go towards that.

F: M-m. So do you think French. Francophones like we don’t really want to call them Francophones but. People who school French? Do you think they are defending their language. Are they fighting to keep French.

FP: I don’t think so. It’s true in some areas like some schools that we can mention in the town. There are some areas where some some uh French organisations that are heavily involved with French and that want people to (. ) know French too are behind us because they have money behind them (. ) to maintain their language. But I think like (1) one day maybe it will be a long time but (. ) if the country gets to a time that children perform well in French? If it surpasses English I think that won’t be a problem. Like in Caledonia. If an English speaker goes to Caledonia it will be hard for him. Because the system?

F: Yes.

FP: Is Francophone.

F: Just French. Okay. But do you think like (. ) as principal. Do you think the government is doing anything to try and encourage Francophone schools to like raise the level of French again or is it something from outside. Like you’ve said the French government supports this.

FP: No. At the moment? The Ministry of Education is trying to do something like they are pushing (. ) opening another (. ) Year 12 for rattrapage35. That’s what we call it in French. Rattrapage for those who (. ) who fail the Year 12 exams? They’ve created a centre at USP. So they can take courses there in French and English at the same time. So that they can come back? They can sit the exam again? Then continue to USP if they want to.

F: Okay.

FP: So for us from the government? Like at the moment the Minister who is there is Francophone. So now? If you look at all (. ) the children who get to the end of Year 14 with good marks? But they obtain scholarships to the Philippines. The Philippines is an Anglophone university. I think for those in the Francophone system to go they have no problem. They are suitable.

F: For Francophone bilinguals.

FP: Bilingual.

F: But those who only speak French do you think it’s hard for=

FP: =No it’s hard.

F: To go outside.

35 Remedial or ‘catch up’ classes
FP: It's hard.

F: But are there any going to New Caledonia at the moment?

FP: That's what I'm (.) the programme is there but the problem is that

F: Oh yes you said earlier.

FP: The level is not (.) very good only those who make an effort stay there. Those

who go and play around too much they go and see a different lifestyle over there but

( . ) they come back.

F: So now with like the situation that we have do you think that Anglophones have

an advantage in terms of scholarships? Or if not do Francophones have to be

bilingual first. They have to change to English to study.

FP: Okay for this at the level of our universities? There are many that are

Anglophone.

F: M-m.

FP: So in our Anglophone system at the moment we have many universities across

the Pacific. More than us Francophones. We just have Caledonia.

F: M-m. Is there Tahiti or not. Is that no longer ( . ) French Poly=

FP: =Tahiti. Tahiti doesn't have much. Caledonia is better ( . ) it's more developed

than Tahiti. So that's it. If there aren't any others then that's it now. So now children

who school French up to Year 14? But they are selected to go to other Anglophone

institutions. So they want to achieve something in their lives? So I think that the

English they learn helps them a lot.

F: Okay. So in terms of jobs is it the same?

FP: The same.

F: If you are Anglophone you can find a job easily? French is not needed?

FP: Yes. No it's like that. Like I've said. At the moment the posts that are offered

today in terms of jobs? They are mainly offered to Anglophones. But if you have a

Francophone or they might say for the last ones that whether you speak French or

you speak English? It's also good for you to apply. So it means that the first priority

is English? But the other language can also work. French or Bislama comes in. But

French will be the second language for you to (1) so I think that it's ( . ) the majority of

us today who are working are Fra- er Anglophones they get more jobs than us.

F: But still ( . ) if you had more children would you still put them in Francophone?

FP: Okay. Now you will see. Fiona now many parents enrol one in Francophone

another one in

F: That's right.
FP: This system happens a lot these days. The young generation today. They want this one to school over here that one to school over there.

F: So do you think this is good.

FP: I think this is good.

F: Because (.) it will help the whole family?

FP: No like because the two of you won’t find (.) like so that you find it easy to (.) speak (.) the family to (.) suppose one hasn’t got it but the other one has we can count on him you see. So I think that this is what parents. This is their thinking.

F: Okay. But at the moment do you think Angloph- there are more Anglophones in Vanuatu than Francophones? Is that still the case here.

FP: Yes. There are many (.) many Anglophone schools. They have somewhere around eighteen secondary schools? We have eight. You see? Ten different. So that is a big difference.

F: And in the whole world? Do you think it’s the same. Like do Anglophones dominate=

FP: =We can say that because the language that we speak most in the world is English. The first language. French maybe comes number two or number three.

F: So does that mean that when you come back to Francophone schools you promote English to help children with (.) like in terms of their opportunities in the world? Or do you still focus on French. Because it’s the main language here.

FP: Like me (.) here? No I take them together. I am someone who wants to make it so that (.) like I’ve said bilingualism in the two languages that the constitution talks about? I would like the French that we speak a lot here? For you learn English to the same level. You try and use them as your two tools. To help you.

F: But are there any opportunities to use it at school? Just in English class.

FP: Next year I will have an Anglophone teacher teaching English.

F: Uh?

FP: That’s right. <smiles>

F: You look pleased about that. <laughs>

FP: That’s it I feel.

F: Okay.

FP: To try it. I will give him (.) some other subjects if he feels he can teach them.

F: Okay.
FP: His wife has already said that her husband is coming next year.

F: Okay. So to make English improve? And for French to improve at the same time.

FP: That's it. I want both levels to go. Because I want to promote the children to go. When they reach the level of finishing Year 10? And then they go to Year 11 Year 12? They won't have a problem.

F: M-m.

FP: So the children must understand that I (. ) there must be this vision of I want to be whatever. I want to become like this. I talk to them a lot but

F: M-m.

FP: But some will maybe be okay.

F: Okay. Maybe my last question is about money. Like we haven't talked about (. ) like we've just talked about ideas in this situation. But do you think there is any cost of this? Like of us maintaining both languages or having (. ) like all training must be done twice or for this? <points to curriculum statement> You have a French copy on your desk and an English copy on your desk. Like this takes money to. Are there any problems with this?

FP: These books? The Vanuatu government doesn't make them. Outside donors make them. <F laughs>

F: Okay so Vanuatu doesn't worry about

FP: No like we try and help but let me try and give an example. There are about nine hundred teachers. The education budget? Is three billion five hundred million? Three billion. Three billion. But for our salaries we eat up half of this already. We eat up two (. ) two billion. How can the government develop on one point five? It's not enough. So it needs help.

F: But do you think that maintaining two systems makes this harder or

FP: Yes.

F: Because you say it's not enough to develop but

FP: It's not enough.

F: If there was only one system would it (. ) would it help or not.

FP: I can't tell you. But that's it. I'm not the government. I can't tell the government that it should have one system. Maybe if the government spent the country's money well then it should be okay. But you will hear a lot about corruption. Some unnecessary things that we spend money on. Court cases for things that we are wasting money on. You look. The government doesn't control its funds properly. But if it controlled its finances well I don't think that we would have a problem with it.

F: Okay.
FP: They just wait for the donors to give them money. If they spent the money well.
If they followed whatever planning the government should make and their expenses without any other ideas. I think it would be alright. But now? You see we like you find that you want to do whatever you want to do something. But there’s too much mess. The government tries one project. It doesn’t finish it. But it abandons it to bring another one in.

F: That’s it I’ve heard that next year they will go back to having Year 7 going to secondary.

FP: Yes they are closing all the top-ups. They keep telling us that we have to follow this but then? The government hasn’t done its work. Like we talk about money. How will it develop if it doesn’t spend its money properly. The country’s money. We’re hanging rope round the necks of the parents. (2) So that’s it we don’t have a stable government that considers what the nation needs. We should focus on this? And forget about that. But their planning is poor. If there was a stable government that did good things? I think that the country would improve. But it depends on our government. Doing their jobs well.

F: <laughs> Yes it’s true. (2) Okay. I shouldn’t take up any more of your time. Thank you very much again.

FP: Thank you very much Fiona.
Appendix XVIII – Interview with the Director of Policy and Planning (DPP)
(Original)

Date: 23-02-11
Location: Ministry of Education

Notes: The interview took place at the start of the first period of fieldwork, as I was waiting to travel to Ambae. We made several appointments but had to cancel them, because the director was called away, and because I was assured on three occasions that I would be flying to Ambae. I then found myself sitting next to him at a VanEGRA presentation, but still couldn’t find a time to meet. Finally, on the day I actually did fly to Ambae, the director’s secretary rang me at 7.30am to say that the director would meet me at 8.00am.

He arrived late so I had to wait a long time outside. As we walked to his office, he explained that he had had to go back home because of a family emergency and then traffic problems due to an accident. He had already started talking about the Education Language Policy team and the technical advisor in charge, before I had a chance to ask if I could start the recording. He was fine with that and just carried on talking.

The interview presented an opportunity to ask about a range of very general issues to do with language policy.

1 DPP: Yes hem bae i finis nao.
2 F: Yes hem i se se bae hem i go bak long nekis wik o afta nekis wik?
3 DPP: Hem i stap long ples ia klosap tu yia/s nao. Tu yia/s. Be i no finisim lanwis polisi yet. Oli no iven gat draft blong lanwis polisi.
4 F: Mi luk draft i kamaot finis be::
5 DPP: =No:: hemia ol consultation blong ol nomo.
6 F: Ah.
7 DPP: Oli go raon. Oli wokem consultation?
8 F: Uh-uh.
9 DPP: Mo oli putum tugeta wanem we oli consult long hem. But hem (. ) hem i no polisi ia.
F: M-m.

DPP: Oli nid blong yusum hemia blong putum polisi tugeta.

F: M-m. Yes mi luk document ia oli putum se hem i olsem las final proposal blong mifala. I gat wan we hem i vernacular Inglis Franis. Narawan we hem i vernacular Franis Inglis. Naoia hem i talem se bae oli putum tufala tugeta ia nao. Ale minista i save jes jusum se bae i hemia o hemia.

DPP: No (. ) krangke. Oli should not mekem hemia.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yeah from we hem i (. ) yu save taem we yu (. ) consult from lanwis polisi olsem ia. Yu yu sud luk long plante defren samting wantaem. Yes yu sud luk long which wan blong olgeta ia hem i gud blong kaontri. From every day rides on the language policy. Our culture our identity (. ) evri ting ia i stap long lanwis polisi.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yu no save jes come up with wan lanwis polisi and say this is just an education one. There’s no such thing as an educational language policy.

F: M-m.

DPP: Uh yu karem lanwis polisi (. ) that’s for life (. ) eh so yu yusum lanwis polisi hem i kam olsem blong promotem kalja blong ol pipol (. ) blong promotem identity blong ol pipol (. ) blong promotem olgeta storian evri ting blong ol pipol. O:: yu yusum wan nara lanwis we:: hem i gat nating t do wetem ol pipol.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yeah. So:: (. ) the issue blo::ng hemia (. ) basically first and foremost (. ) oli neva askem kwestin ia why (. ) I mean from wanem yu mas karem ol lanwis polisi.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yeah and secondly taem we yu karem and the issue of uh (. ) what are we trying to do with this language policy. Hem i to do with just basically (. ) uh:: blong wan tul blong understanding (. ) so sapos hem i jes wan tul blong bringim understanding (. ) bringim ol knowledge ol samting olsem? Then (. ) any language will do.

F: M-m.

DPP: But yeah I mean. And then taem yu bringim wanem in (. ) then that’s another thing. So:: the issue is (. ) wanem nao yu really wantem mekem wetem lanwis polisi (. ) What’s it for.

F: M-m.

DPP: From lanwis polisi hem i stap finis. Hemia we er blong wan nasonal lanwis polisi hem i stap.
DPP: Um hemia we oli wokem (.) hemia aot saed long lanwis polisi.

F: M-m.

DPP: So (.) the issue of er contradiction (.) the issue of you know (.) wan blong nasonal wan i talem wan defren samting and then afta yu karem hemia blong edyukesen i talem wan nara samting.

F: M-m.

DPP: No. Hem i no common sense.

F: Be afta. Hu nao i putum se olsem tim ia i stap wok long samting ia? Olsem man ia i no jes kam nomo. Wan man i talem long hem i kam.

DPP: Yes (.) er (1) um (.) basically olgeta ia we oli stap long tim (.) er hem nao i kam oli jusum ol pipol blong olgeta i stap insaed. Be:: the issue is (.) taem we yu lukluk long ol samting ia (.) i gat ol preparation wok blong hemia because lanwis polisi bae i affect/em evri ting long edyukesen. (1) So the question of why the language policy which one you should choose. All of these things must be guided by some certain kind of criteria (.) we hem i sud stap (.) jes blong go toktok watem ol pipol (.) well it's not good enough. From fulap blong ol pipol ia oli stap ia oli no gat eni aedia about (.) er (.) yu no about lanwis in terms of hao yu lanem lanwis (.) yu know (.) ol samting olsem. They just don't have that er (.) blong yu go consult watem ol. It's like eh yu know yu karem wan (.) ah (.) yu karem wan mathematician yu go consult long olgeta ol issue to do watem mathematics.

F: M-m.

DPP: You know.

F: Yes. Olgeta ia oli faenem se oli no save (.) givim wan choice too.

DPP: No:: nogat (.) sapos yu kam talem ol options then yu mas putum ol (.) ol (.) options we yu karem ol research findings we:: either oli sapotem options ia o oli no sapotem options ia ol samting olsem. Yu save. Yu no save jes kam talem se options wan tu tri hemia. Yu choose.

F: M-m.

DPP: It's like. You know. It's. I mean the whole idea biaen long hem in terms of logical.

F: M-m.

DPP: You know. E::r i::t's it's like er:: yu wantem mekem wan samting olsem er:: blong mun ah? Roket i go long mun ah? Hao blong go long mun yu go talem long pipol.
DPP: It's:: uh the issue of having language policy hem i gud be:: the issue of hao blong adresem. Hao blong go about/em. Uh:: lukluk blong mekem decision. What's the international language for example.

DPP: Er wanem nao hem i lanwis blong commerce.

DPP: Where are you going to get the people to (.) like for example like er:: I mean why nao yumi sud putum Inglis fas wan ia for example (.) why should we put English uh:: to be one of our languages (.) from wanem?

DPP: O from wanem French? I mean these are (.) long mi? O for example like vernacular (.) from wanem vernacular?

DPP: These are (.) ol critical baseline questions we yumi sud ansarem.

DPP: Uh (.) sud lukaotem ansa blong hem. Be those things aren't. Jes gohed nomo and then go tok long ol pipol ia oh we need a language policy. These are the options nao wanem nao tingting blong yu.

DPP: I mean. Blong mi the whole process is to start off with is inappropriate.

DPP: [(xx) i stap finis] (.) blong mi? Bilif blong mi the way we mi mi lukum? Is that taem we yu luk long ol kwestin we mi stap askem ia? Yu save. Sam long ol kwestin we mi askem ia? Basically we nao yu wantem se yu karem yumi i go long hem? Why should everybody talk fluently in both English and French. (1) I mean wan kwestin we oli stap talem is this that er (.) so that yu save karem wok. I mean (.) I mean <very high intonation> honestly (.) I mean honestly (.) I was (.) yu traem tingbaot olgeta pipol we (.) how many how many long evri styuden/s ia bae oli karem janis blong go wok long overseas.

F: M-m.
DPP: How many? What percentage are you talking about. The main issue here is that pikinini i mas lan gud.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yu save. I mean blong mi that’s the baseline. So basically the language only becomes a tool (.) so long mi (.) the language is not (.) olsem basically (.) it’s not supposed to be the main one. Eh? The main one that’s going to drive is why you use that language. I mean me basically. Mi mi go for vernacular for starting off and do a good job long vernacular.

(1)

F: M-m.

DPP: Olsem. French and er English no. Olsem. Tufala ia i should come later. Afta yu gat gud strong er (.) I mean the argument that (1) the argument that uh:: you need blong kam early so that er:: oli save lanem Franis early o lanem Inglis early I mean. What for? I mean <laughs> I mean honestly. I mean <high intonation> what for? Because hem i no really contribute a lot long learning blong ol pikinini.

F: M-m. Be hemia wan tingting nomo i stap se (.) ol man oli ting se yumi no gud long Inglis yumi mas start/em off early.

DPP: Yes I mean (.) be sapos hem i lanem gud lanwis blong hem? Bambae hem i mekem i isi blong hem i lanem gud Inglis i lanem gud Franis i lanem Chinese or Japanese or whatever. Er:: I mean sapos yumi stap lukluk in terms long ol mi mi ting se wan long ol issue wan nation kaontri lanwis (,) it should become one of the options. I mean firstly they are closer to us (,) and secondly they are coming up a lot. But that’s not the issue. The issue is:: yumi wantem pikinini whatever language oli lan naoia (,) they learn well. Me basically? Ol pipol oli talem se oh you’ve got over a hundred different languages and then hem i difficult. I mean you look at the other examples around the world. Defren ples/es oli stap faet from survival blong lanwis blong olgeta. You know. Oli stap faet long hem. Vanuatu don’t even care. Oli wantem survival blong Franis and Inglis lanwis. Olsem long mi I mean that’s (.) olsem long mi that’s absurd uh? Olsem hem i krangke.

F: M-m.

DPP: Hem i krangke. Hem i krangke. From long mi. The whole issue is learning. Sapos yu save (.) create/em wan gud environment and gud tingting blong learning blong i promotem gud learning and all researchers oli faenemaot se you do that basically by starting off gud long lanwis blong yu. Then long mi that’s the way you should go.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yu save. And whether you then branch off i go long Inglis o branch off i go long French hem i no wan (.) long mi it’s not an issue. Because yumi fulap pikinini long ples ia? Oli multilinguals finis.
F: Yes oli tokbaot bilingual be:

DPP: Yes.

F: Oli bilingual finis=

DPP: =Yes yumi tokbaot bilingual we:: basically <laughs> ol pikinini ol plante blong olgeta oli tok tu tri defren lanwis/es finis.

F: Okei.

DPP: So:: I mean long mi the way we mi lukum it's the issue of (.) yumi adoptem wanem lanwis we yumi adoptem. Mek sua se that yumi mekem gud job long hem so olgeta pikinini oli karem gud samting we oli save lan from with good understanding (.) and also good reading. Yu save (.) mainly yu stap harem se yu harem save yu tok save. Be the issue blong raetem gud? No:: hemia oli no stap tingting long hem yet. But long mi (.) sapos yu really wantem ol (.) mas raetem olgeta (.) oli mas raetem gud lanwis we oli lan long hem.

F: M-m.

DPP: So blong mi the issue blong putum two or three different languages blong oli lanem fo (.) long early stage. Olgeta (.) er even though oli stap talem se no olgeta pikinini oli smol oli save lanem olgeta defren lanwis/es ia yes hem i tru. But in terms of writing?

F: M-m.

DPP: Long mi it's not like that. Yu save. Long mi hem i no olsem. So:: mi mi ting se long olgeta i mas mek sua se at least oli gud long raeting. Mas gud long raeting.

Wan blong olgeta lanwis/es blong ol we oli skul long hem.

F: M-m.

DPP: Sapos oli no gud long hem then?

F: Yes.

DPP: I mean what's the use blong mi stap tok French mi stap tok Inglis. And then afta mi go long vilej/es oli no tok Inglis. And mi stap long ia we klosap evri ting is in Bislama.

F: M-m.


F: M-m.

DPP: Be:: so. Wanem we mi stap basically talem is. Lanwis polisi. Whatever lanwis mifala i adoptem ol pikinini oli mas gud long hem. So that olgeta oli save communicate. Oli save lan and then olgeta oli save express/em olgeta long hem.
But er the issue of (. ) er (. ) karem sam politikol argument ova long lanwis er (1) I mean no. Even just talem (. ) no yu mas lanem lanwis ia for the sake of learning it (. ) yumi no nid it.

F: M-m. Hemia nao.

DPP: M-m.

F: Be wanem tingting blong yu long saed blong Bislama insaed long edyukesen. Olsem yu talem vernacular be::

DPP: Bislama:: (. ) Bislama long mi Bislama actually hem i (. ) olsem pipol oli stap talem. Hem i dipen nao long wanem yumi minim long term blong yumi (. ) wanem yumi minim by vernacular. Olsem blong mi Bislama i no vernacular. Er (3) hem i wan nasonal lanwis ye::s be:: er blong mi vernacular lanwis hem i lanwis we yu actually yu save yu karem papa blong yu (. ) olgeta bifo long yu (. ) go long hem. Because long mi (. ) hem i show/em se hem i dip. I dip insaed long kalja.

F: M-m.

DPP: Insaed long wod/s hao oli yusum ol wod/s. Hao oli express/em olgeta. Hem i actually the way of how they grew up the way how they live the way how they yu save (. ) basically the language and language the way oli express/em (olgeta long hem) is basically (. ) tells us about who they are. Well er (. ) that's their identity. Yes (. ) be sapos yumi tekem se as er (. ) ingrained in our language is our culture?

F: M-m.

DPP: Er:: (. ) is that the risk yumi mas tekem?

F: M-m.

DPP: So basically mi stap talem se pipol mo kalja changes with time. Okei. It's true. Culture changes with time. But the reality is that that (. ) do you want to have all those important aspects lo kalja? Do you want them changed?

F: M-m.

DPP: You you want them thrown out the window? And sapos yu stap tingting olsem se these things oli develop over thousands of years. (1) Uh (1) blong mi blong mi jes throw/em away.

F: M-m.

DPP: I mean is that good common sense thinking. I mean yumi no tokbaot er you know deep thinking just tokbaot common sense thinking. Er I mean is that okay blong mi? Blong mi er (. ) mi stap uh all these things we ol bubu blong mi ol great bubu blong mi (. ) bifo long hem (. ) and they are nothing.

F: M-m.

DPP: What's the risal blong mi. If I throw them away I've thrown myself away.
DPP: So blong mi create/em another me? Bae i tekem how many more thousands of years. And hem i likely se global er vilej oli stap talem?

DPP: Yumi likely nidim wan uh. <laughs> So that's er (.) so blong mi issue blong lanwis hem i er (.) like (.) politically hem i sensitive long ples ia.

DPP: Hem i sensitive but mi mi ting se the real questions we mifala i really nid blong askem uh:: (.) was not done in the consultation.

DPP: That's er (.) basically what you're asking me. Mi (.) uh:: (.) yumi really wantem preserve. Yumi wantem gat wan samting we ol grand/grandchildren blong mi hem i save talem se yes mi wan manples.

DPP: But in the next er (.) thirty forty years time? What does that mean. Taem hem i talem se hem i man ples. Hem i wan (.) blong mi these are the kind of things we hem i no really adresem.

DPP: Olgeta i no really adresem. And er hem i sad.

DPP: Yes and especially by the rate we bae mifala i save lusum ol lanwis/es blong mifala sam oli (.) i tru se yumi karem hundred defren lanwis/es but the reality is that sam long ol lanwis/es oli spoken by a few handfuls of people.

DPP: Er so:: so sapos edyukesen hem i no plem role. A key role blong traem blong kipim sam long olgeta ia (.) yumi stap tokbaot heritage ia (.) yumi stap tokbaot kipim yu know what is valuable to us and our value. I think yumi stap throw/em away the most valuable thing here.

DPP: You know.

F: Yes i tru ia.
DPP: It's er (.) be anyway. Yumi stap go on about hemia but nao issue ia about lanwis mi ting se sometimes (2) yumi mekem too much unnecessary fuss over long hem. Mifala i should be simple. Understanding se language is basically a way of (.) promoting our own culture our own identity and also promoting better learning. You know er in school so:: mifala i sud lukluk long ol hemia ia and decide rather than yusum ol narafala.

F: M-m.

DPP: So (1) yestedei yumi stap long presentation?36 <quietly> Everybody is struggling. The whole question is that okay (.) because uh yumi no karem ol gud teaching (.) mebi yumi no karem ol gud syllabus o samting olsem. But that's only one side of the story.

F: M-m.

DPP: But I mean the other side of the story olgeta pikinini. Are they literate in who they are?

F: M-m.

DPP: Sapos olgeta oli no hemia (.) oli stil kipim blong olgeta o oli lus?

F: M-m.

DPP: These are the other side of the story we long mi oli just as valuable. So sapos edyukesen i no adresseol issue ia hu (.) huia?

F: M-m.

DPP: Hu bae i adresse?

F: M-m.

DPP: Se (.) yestedei yumi stap sidaon (.) ol narasaed ia oli aot saed. <Laughs>

F: <laughs> Yes you tried to ask questions.

DPP: Aot saed long presentation so (.) not possible (.) bae i no possible. Blong mi askem.

F: Yes (.) Uh-uh.

DPP: But it's one of those things uh. Hem i no problem blong mi. Problem blong mi is:: mi always think aot saed long. And uh:: (.) and the thing is. Mi mi always wantem go down to the root (.) you know. Mi no wantem deal wetem ol branches (.) ol samting ia. No. Blong mi that's (.) er:: (.) blong mi that's not what education should be looking at.

F: M-m.

36 VANEGRA test results
DPP: Blong mi education should be looking at root things and then yumi adresem long ples ia. Because once yumi adresem hemia hem i sud adresem every other one. Hem i sud adresem stamba adresem er (.) ol branches ol fruits or whatever. I mean those long mi oli jes ol product blong ol stamba (.) the roots of the tree.

F: M-m.

DPP: So long mi that's why yesterday. That's the reason why mi askem ol kwestin ia. Yumi save se for everything yumi mekem karemaot wan assessment (.) the assessment must be valid.

F: M-m.

DPP: It's not only valid long content we oli lanem. It must also be valid in terms of where are the kids at. So you are going to assess them on something where (.) basically (.) olgeta pikinini (.) because of their culture and their ways olgeta oli stap long wan defren base. And then yu putum wan er assessment we (.) so long mi these are the kind of questions mi stap wantem askem. Because long mi that's what validity (.) in what we do. But we are poor <laughs> long ol lanwis/es. Be yestedei hem i givim yumi wan microscopic view uh (.) so hem i pinpoint/em (1) which is good. Hem i gud but=

F: =M-m hem i wansaed nomo.

DPP: Yes long mi hem i impoten se oli save lanwis be evriwan i save. Yu save gud lanwis but sapos (.) thinking ability blong yu. (1) Hem i no up long level we yumi ekspektem.

F: Yes.

DPP: Then the whole question of (.) <laughs> sapos for example yu really wantem se cultures to talk to communicate on that level on that upper level rather than that deep level then (.) jes blong harem nomo. Blong toktok that's enough. Be (.) um (.) be:: yumi no wantem hemia. Yumi wantem se lanwis hem i helpem yumi blong create/em wanem we yumi kolem not only active thinking but er thinking that er is below and beyond the things you see outside. Beyond what the eye sees. You think beyond that (.) long mi. Sam pipol. Mi mi stap long taem. Mi g tru wetem ol pikinini we oli tijim olgeta we oli gud long lanwis. But they are not good at thinking.

F: Yes.

DPP: Oli uh (.) for me the critical point here is that how to create good thinkers?

F: M-m.

DPP: Deep thinkers. You know (.) and blong mi that's not enough. No yu should go (.) taem we yu come up wetem wan samting we thinking hem i mekem you should be able to make the right decision. You know the right choice. Uh folem ol gud tingting. You know all deep thinking. I no gud blong karem ol tingting nomo and then afta yu mekem samting else. Eh er it's er. Wanem we mi stap traem blong express/em is this the issue of languages er. Hem i deeper than just er (.) ol issues
ia nao. Mi ting se blong mifala long ples ia long Vanuatu because mifala i (.) for the
first time we are just lukluk long ol curriculum blong mifala. Mi ting se hem i most
probably appropriate time blong mifala i karem deeper thinking.

DPP: Er long olgeta issues olsem so that yumi save lay/em wan foundation we (.)
bae i tekem taem be yumi develop/em hem.

DPP: Yes. From fulap divelopmen mane we blong mifala i kam from somewhere
else. Basically ol samting we mifala i stap mekem (.) Vanuatu i stap pem ol teachers
nomo.

DPP: Be in terms blong ol divelopmen blong ol edyukesen. Money comes from
somewhere else.

DPP: M-m so (.) we have to make good bring more value out of that.

DPP: Be::

F: Be sapos yu tingbaot wanem we (.) yes hemia wan niufala polisi nomo we ol man
oli stap faet from o wanem be olsem (.) sapos yumi luk se wanem nao i stap finis.
Ating yu yu principal fastaem long (.) Malapoa?

DPP: Malapoa yes.

F: Olsem hemia wan eksampol se:: taem yu stap longwe i gat ol polisi insaed long
skul long taem ia? We yu talem se Inglis nomo o:: i gat eni=

DPP: =No:: nogat.

F: Rul o?

DPP: Nogat. No. Actually mi nao mi mek se French i kam antap long ol skul/s. Long
English-speaking schools. From long fastaem (.) French oli tekem kasem Yia 10.

F: M-m.

DPP: But taem mi stap long Malapoa mi wok wetem grup blong ol tija/s. Mi
negotiate wetem SPBEA uh long Fiji blong mifala i introduce/um uh French. From
we hem i stap insaed long konstityusen blong yumi hem i talem se either English or
French. But (.) long mi. Hem i wan heritage we yumi karem i kam. So (.) mi:: mi luk
olsem long taem blong we mifala between French and English. Mifala i mifala i
agensem each other. I mean basically that was it before.

F: M-m.
DPP: So taem we mi kam stap long wan position we mi ting se mi save mekem samting long hem. Uh so mi girap mi mekem hemia nao. Mi mekem uh:: mi mekem hemia uh.

<Phone rings. He answers and says he will call the person back because he's in a meeting>

DPP: Independence. Oli always stap askem ol samting mi stap les long olgeta. <F laughs> But er yes. That's the issue so mi wok wetem ol tija we oli tijim French.

Mifala i wok wetem SPBEA. Come up wetem wan syllabus (.) blong tijim. Karem approval blong SPBEA and then mifala i stat tijim.

F: Okei.

DPP: From mi mi luk olsem sapos yu stap tij nomo. Yu no gat wan er pis pepa wan samting we yu er aim long hem long wan level. Bae ol pikinini ol English-speaking skul oli no tekem French serious nating.

F: M-m.

DPP: So:: and also mi ting se (.) blong introduce/um uh French just long Yia 7 8 9 10? And then after yu stop long ples ia. Er long mi hem i no naf. Blong ol pikinini oli catch up so sapos yumi lengthen/em taem? Then olgeta oli save catch up. So hemia nao that's why mi that's why olgeta oli stap offer/em nao i go kasem Yia 13.

F: Okei.

DPP: Yeah hemia nao from ol effort long that taem.

F: Okei hemia long wanem yia.

DPP: Naentin seventi uh:: eit?

F: Uh?


F: Okei.

DPP: So yes (.) so that's how mifala i introduce/m uh French. Blong ol English-speaking schools.

F: Yes.

DPP: Hemia long Malapoa nomo.

F: Okei.

DPP: But because eni ting Malapoa i mekem ol nara skul/s [oli mekem.]
F: [Oli mekem.] Yes mi luk se Angolovo College yes oli offer/em kasem long Yia (.) naoia oli go long Form 7 mekem se oli offer/em long Form 7 tu.

DPP: Yes.

F: SPBEA yes.

DPP: Yes. Hol aedia long hem is olsem. Mi tekem se mifala i stap pem lip-service long hem nomo.

F: M-m.

DPP: Oli talem se:: (.) language is olsem ia. Be:: the reality is that oli no mekem eni ting long hemia. So that's the reason why mi mi pusum hemia.

F: Okei.

DPP: Naoia? Taem mi lukum ol pikinini we oli start/em off long that taem? I gat fiu nomo. I gat fiu pikinini nomo so mi yusum that tingting se (.) wanem we:: yumi bin karem we i become wan pat blong laef blong yumi. Because long colonial taem? Yumi karem Inglis yumi karem French. So:: hem i wan samting we yumi karem i kam. Yumi no sud tekem away evri ting. I gat sam gud samting. And er those good things mifala i mas kipim. Mifala i mas kipim from we:: mi talem long olgeta se tingting hem i olsem se yu karem wanem we hem i blong yu i stap. Hem i er form/em base. And then afta yu luk around. Wanem we yu karem i defren long hem you look around elsewhere. And olgeta we yu karem elsewhere yu karem hemia i kam blong complement/em wanem we yu yu gat.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yeah? So wetem er global vilej uh phenomenon kaen samting olsem hem i impoten.

F: M-m.

DPP: So:: that's the reason why. So (.) naoia fulap oli stap talem se mi stap agensem French. Be olgeta ia oli we oli stap luk antap nomo.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yeah sapos mi agensem French? Bae mi no mekem hemia. So:: the reason why French hem i spread plante long ol Inglis skul/s i go kasem Yia 13? That's why mi mi mekem taem mi stap long Malapoa.

F: Ah okei.

DPP: Mi mi no agensem French (.) agensem lanwis. Be from tingting blong mi se oli mas gud long wan lanwis fastaem.

F: Yes.
DPP: And then after oil spread I go long nara lanwis. So long mi that kaen tingting i no jenisim mi yet.

F: Okei.

DPP: Hem i no jenis yet.

F: Uh-uh.

F: Kwestin blong mi yumi tokbaot ol polisi long skul olsem hemia tufala lanwis/is blong edyukesen.

DPP: Yeah.

F: Be ol nara wan we oli stap insaed long skul. Bislama wetem ol vernacular.

DPP: Yeah.

F: I gat eni polisi long secondary=

DPP: =Yeah well basically? Oli no stap allow/em long ol English speaking skul oli no stap allow/em Bislama long skul. And yumi save se hemia wan uh (.) wan (%) wan tingting blong bifo we hem i stap.

F: M-

DPP: Nao hol aedia biaen long hemia we olsem long taem blong mi we mi mi stap uh. Stap putum hemia i stap in place for few reasons. One is this that (%) fulap blong ol pikinini we oli kam long skul (%) oli no stap tok Inglis long haos.

F: M-

DPP: So wea nao opportunity blong olgeta i practise/im Inglis? And yumi save se sapos yu no tok long wan lanwis? Jes talem se yu save? I mean (%) that’s I mean. Bae i ded. Yu save? Yu wantem karem fluency long hem yu wantem karem se yu embed/em mo long yu blong helpem yu blong raetem evri ting ia? Hem i kam tru long tingting. Most long ol samting oli kam tru long speaking. So sapos olgeta pikinini ia oli nid blong go long further edyukesen blong olgeta? Olgeta oli nidim wan lanwis we olgeta oli no able blong olgeta raet nomo long hem be oli mas fluent we oli toktok long hem tu. From sapos oli no gud blong toktok long hem? Hemia i no gat guarantee we bambae olgeta i fluent tu long raeting. Blong hem.

F: Yes.

DPP: So from reason ia nao mifala i mekem se uh:: Inglis long skul? Yu mas tok long hem. From we (%) basically it’s the only time we olgeta i gat blong tok long hem.

F: M-m.

DPP: And taem we oli gohed long Bislama? Hem i go aot long skul boundary finis.

F: Yes.
DPP: Bislama nomo i continue long hem. So the issue blong hem i:: bildim up hem long lanwis we hem i eksam long hem we hem i raetem. So hem i wan issue we mi stap argue wetem USP long hem long bifo. From USP oli talem se (.) mifala i no lukum reason why yufala i no tijim Bislama. Tijim Bislama. We hem i stre. Mi mi no agensem hemia. But. Oli contradict/im olgeta. From we oli toktok gohed finis? Oli mekem ol eksam blong olgeta se yu mas gud long Inglis bifo yu go long USP.

F: M-m.


F: M-m.

DPP: So:: long mi? I really:: olsem putum mi long. This is how mi stap ting long that taem ia. Mi stil gat tingting olsem (.) is this. Bae mi mi wan e::r (.) giaman man? Sapos mi talem long ol pikinini se yu have a future (.) long edyuksesen blong yu save go on long further schooling blong yu. But mi no prepare/em hem mi no putum hem long ol samting we hem i nid blong go. So naoia yu luk long ol yunivesiti yu mas pasem certain level blong lanwis bifo yu go in. Sapos yu no pasem yu no go in. And that long USP hem i very unfair long ol pikinini.

F: M-m.

DPP: Why? Because oli save se institution blong yumi and olgeta oli stap long ples blong yumi? And Bislama i promotem oli promotem be evri eksam blong olgeta evri samting blong olgeta? Everything is in English.

F: M-m.

DPP: So I mean so long mi? I mean (.) what are you telling people.

F: Mm.

DPP: That. Be mi mi agri wetem olgeta in the sense that in terms of learning a language? Sapos yu lanem wan lanwis gud and sapos yu tijim gud Bislama? Then olgeta bae oli save. It's true. But how far?

(1)

F: Yes.

DPP: I mean. Just as far as USP? (1) USP hem i wiling blong mekem se (.) Bislama hem i kam er lanwis blong assessment blong olgeta? But (1) is that all? Olsem wanem long ol nara institutions?
F: Yeah.

DPP: Long ol nara yunivesiti/s. Elsewhere. Olsem wanem blong yu go aot into the
global village.

F: M-m.

DPP: Being part as a (.) thinker as an educationist or as a (.) you know. You (.) you
become part long ol samting we i stap hapen raon. Apart from just (.) yumi long ples
ia.

F: M-m.

DPP: So. Mi mi no disagree. Er:: blong yusum Bislama olsem. But taem we hem i
kam to its limitation. Of limiting kids. Just to where they are at. Rather than allowing
them you know olsem oli talem uh uh no limit uh?

F: M-m.

DPP: to the world?

F: Yes.

DPP: Long mi? Er that is a problem. Long mi that’s a problem. That’s the reason
why long that taem mi mi putum strong. Se since this is the only opportunity we ol
pikinini oli save lanem Inglis and oli save speak long Inglis. And the opportunity to
get out into the world? Or to go further? Hem i actually in English.

F: M-m. So actually yu nao yu olsem principal yu putum polisi i stap o=

DPP: =No.

F: Samting i kam long ministri=

DPP: =No.

F: O olsem=

DPP: No::? Long that taem polisi blong tok long lanwis ia hem i stap long taem finis.

F: M-m.

DPP: Hem i:: long bifo finis. Taem mi stap styuden yet.

F: Yes.

DPP: Be long that taem? Long that taem they are smart. Olsem. Mi ting back during
the British time. Oli letem mifala blong tok long Bisla- (.) long lanwis.

F: M-m.

DPP: Oli stopem Bislama. Be oli letem mifala blong toktok lanwis. Wetem Inglis. (1)
Hemia nao. And uh that’s (.) not just only logical. (1) Uh:: Hemia ia hem i research
proven too. (1) Se yu gud long lanwis blong yu <laughs> bae i helpem yu. (1) So
maybe that could be one of the reason why yu lukum olgeta bifo (. ) we oli kamaot stre long vilej i kam long skul? Oli tok better English than fulap blong olgeta naoia we olgeta oli skul gud (. ) Yu traem karem sam long olgeta nao hu go long skul. I mean. (1) Sam blong olgeta yu tok long olgeta oli rather tok long mi long Bislama than tok long Inglis. (1) Be taem we yu luk long ol olfala? (1) Long olfala blong bifo? Uh (. ) oli tok gud Inglis.

DPP: Oli tok gud Inglis. Be olgeta ia? Oli kamaot stre long lanwis blong olgeta? Stret long. And mi ting se hem i sem mak long French tu. Ah:: we naoia olsem (. ) i tru long saed blong save i kam antap plante be (. ) in terms long lanwis? Mi luk olsem se i drop plante.

DPP: Mi luk se i drop plante i drop plante. Mi no agensem Bislama at all. Or eni lanwis blong yumi yusum as (. ) er medium of instruction. Be:: mi mi ting se sam long ol decision we yumi mekem like for example bae i really openem up wol blong hem? O bae i limit/im wol blong hem.

DPP: Yu save? Be sapos yumi save mekem sam samting we i openem up wol? Wol blong olgeta? Then.

DPP: At this moment? English (. ) is the international language.

DPP: And hem i lanwis blong ikonomi. Yu save? So:: so blo::ng that few we olgeta oli gat janis blong oli mekem? Mi ting se yumi sud givim opportunity long. (1) But jes blo::ng er tijim ol lanwis? And then at the end of it (. ) you're limiting the kids?

DPP: Yes hem i dipen long principal wetem komyuniti be mi mi ting se bigfala problem is this that skul/s olgeta oli no mekem naf awareness. And olgeta oli no mekem naf effort. Blong talem long ol pikinini the reason why you do something.

DPP: Okei. Long mi? Oli tekem for granted. And sam oli iven talem mas tok Inglis nomo. But ol pikinini? I think subconsciously oli se why? Why we should tok long Inglis?
F: M-m.

DPP: Mi ting se ol er skul/s? And er mebi Ministri blong Edyukesen tu? Mifala i no stap mekem naf effort. Blong ta- blong eksplenem long. From long mi? Once wan pikinini o peren/s oli kasem gud reason why you are doing something. Oli ting se hem i wan natural samting nomo we hem i foldaon we i gat goodness long olgeta (). insaed long hem? Bae oli mekem.

F: Yes.


F: M-m.

DPP: Be mi kipim hemia we i bifo. Yu save tok long lanwis blong yu. Olsem mifala long bifo. Long British Secondary School? Yu tok long lanwis blong yu. The only time we oli stopem blong yu no tok long lanwis blong yu i sapos yu gat ol nara fren we oli stap klosap long yu we olgeta oli gat defren lanwis.

F: Yes.

DPP: Yes. Hem i jes common sense. From nogud yu stap tokbaot long samting ol pikinini i se yu stap tokbaot ol samting nogud about ol.

F: Yes i tru.

DPP: Yes. Be (.) I mean oli folem common sense. And that is olsem. So mi kipim. I see no reason why blong jenisim wan samting we hem i wok. And hem i gud. Be just because we are in the year (.) yumi go ova long millennium finis yumi stap long new millennium so we need to change some of these things. No. Olsem oli stap talem se i have to be up with the times you know. I mean blong mi these are not these kind of arguments you know. I mean tekem (.) yumi tekem overboard you know. Be long bifo? The reason why mi kipim olgeta is from hemia. Be long lukluk long mi taem mi stap long skull? Is that skull i neva eksplen. Yumi no eksplenem long olgeta why. I mean. Mi ting se they have a right to know why.

F: Yes i tru.

DPP: Then sapos olgeta oli no save (.) long mi? Mi stap waste/m uh taem blong yumi from we bae pikinini sapos subconsciously? Hem i no lukum risen why yumi mekem? Then long mi? Automatically? Bae hem i no karem that drive and that motivation blong hem i lanem. Yu save blong hem i become pat long hem.

F: M-m.

DPP: Er plante taem yumi stap ting se uh mi mi tok olsem olsem olsem? Hem that’s what’s going to motivate you. Long mi mi ting se that’s not always the good way of motivation. Mi ting se the best way of motivation is from within. And for that to happen? Hem i mas karem understanding. Long why i mekem samting. Sapos hem
i no harem? Long mi hem i wan problem. So it’s er (.) that’s how mi lukum ol samting long skul. So yu luk long skul hem i quite strict. Long pipol hem i strict. But mi always talem long olgeta why mi mekem samting. Because let’s face it these are our clients. Yumi talem <laughs> long olgeta se you come in here this is what you’re going to get long skul. This is what I am going to make you get at school. So (. ) hem i wan heavy responsibility blong mekem sua se they get that. So mi girap mi (.) uh teachers. When teachers play up? I let them know. And mi karem olgeta mi tok long olgeta. Mi talem long olgeta se yu come in here this is what you’re going to get long skul. This is what I am going to make you get at school. So (.) hem i wan heavy responsibility blong mekem hemia bae yumitu no save fulfil/im hemia. And yumitu stap long ples ia from pikinini. So sapos yumitu no mekem hemia? Bae yumitu fail/em olgeta. And sapos yumitu fail/em olgeta? Then mebi yumitu i no sud stap long ples ia. Because sapos yu ting long hem long nara wei? It’s like this. The kid? Hem i nomo (.) hem i no gat that kind high thinking yet. So therefore evri ting about hem ia? Hem i trastem yu. Hem i kam long skul trusting you. Having faith in you. You know. That yes yu mekem hemia. But sapos hem i kam long skul and you don’t do your best? You know. You’ve not only let somebody down? But you’ve let the country down. You’ve let the island down. You’ve let the province down. And taem we yu ting olsem ia? It becomes a really heavy responsibility. Very heavy. That’s why mi get sometimes very unhappy we mi save se teachers are not there. Olgeta oli no mekem gud lesson plans blong ol. Olgeta oli no tekem the time to find out the kids. So that becomes a problem to me. So oli ting se mi stap kros? No. The reason why mi fil that tired is because (.) mi always ting that’s the right thing. You know? I can really see that kid. I see that kid’s family. I see the kid’s village. Province. And then ultimately mi lukum kaontri. So if I don’t invest properly in that kid? I’ve actually let all of those ones down. And sapos mi letem olgeta ia daon? Then I should (.) I mean to be honest I mean <laughs>. I should not be there. I should er. But this is the sem kaen tingting ia we mi karem long ol lanwis/es. Long ol skul. Long rul/s long ol skul/s. And also (.) problem nao is to do wetem developmen blong ol yang pipol. The problem is a lot of people don’t know. Er olgeta oli no save the human development. And because they don’t know that they. Like a small kid. Bae hem i mo (.) sapos yu yu mekem wan samting a little bit heavy for him to respond. A physical samting but the more the kid grows up? The more they respond to what they think. To what’s inside them. So taem we yu no tekem hemia into consideration yu apply/em sem kaen samting we yu apply/em long ol smol pikinini? You must expect a clash. You must expect rebellion. Yu ekspektem hemia. So mi stap lukum hemia. Wan samting blong ol skul/s? Is that they don’t see that. Like to me. A bigger kid? You give him as much responsibility as you can. Let them run with it? And you are there to guide? To facilitate? You know you coach. You monitor. You don’t do that to the little kid. Not the little kid. So that’s why taem mi lukum ol rul/s o samting long skul? And how they apply it in school? Some of these things oli become mo hindrance. Er to the development of the individual. So no wonder when they go home they still sit there and they expect you give me this. You do this for me. Why because you treat them like that at school. You know oli kam long skul you don’t give them the opportunity to rule. You don’t give them the opportunity to do something. Everything you decide for them. It’s one of the problem of schools. We mi stap lukum long ol skul/s. So that’s why mi (.) I run school differently. Mi stap long Epi? Teach the kids who run the farm? They run everything they have. They are the ones who do it. They come up and they tell me oh we need to do this.
Olgeta we oli lukaotem fam oli oh fens blong mifala i no go long ples ia. And then.

I'm like okay so what are you going to do about it? Yufala nao committee blong.

What are you going to do about it. Oh we're going to do this. When? Oh we're going
to do that this time. No yu no save mekem long taem ia from hemia taem blong skul.

So when are you going to do it? Oh we'll do it at this time. So okay. So mi mi
facilitate/em nomo. Mi guide/em nomo. And mi givim olgeta mane. And then I make
sure they make money out of what they do. So olgeta oli (.) they look into it. So they
make (_) so sam long olgeta pikinini ia? They are directors now. Sam long ol pikinini
ia are running big things in the government. But it's a different way of approaching
er a school. You know. And the teachers are encouraging. Teachers. Anybody
come up with a good idea. Anything. School will support you. You just have to take
the lead. We will support you. Taem yu mekem olsem ia you see the rich potential
that er (_) that exists in a school. Mi mi lukum skul/s as a (_) the potential in a
school? Is enormous. I mean you've got these teachers with a lot of talents. With a
lot of know-hows. You know the problem is however these teachers make the best
out of it. Sapos yu mekem hemia? Oh the sky olsem mi stap talem the sky.

(1)

F: The sky's the limit.

DPP: Yeah the sky is the limit.

F: Yes be yu luk se hem i depend plante long wanwan tija o wanwan principal.

Olsem yu nao yu stap talem se okei hemia wei blong mi.

DPP: Yes.

F: Be ol narawan i stap oli gat guidance long hem.

DPP: Yes be yu mas. Olsem long mi? Yu mas wetem ol tija/s. Olsem yu mas talem
long olgeta olsem tingting long ol miting/s. You know this is how mi tingting. And
these are the reasons why mi tingting olsem. Nao yu olsem wanem.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yu gat eni other tingting? Yu save and then oli sakem. From we sapos yu no
karem ol pipol we oli helpem yu blong implement/em? You're in trouble.

F: Be hemia olsem se principal i save mekem wetem ol tija/s blong hem.

DPP: Yes.

B: Afta i gat eni structure in place we olsem yufala long ministri yu stap mekem
wetem ol principals. Mi luk se hemia nao wan break long system ia.

DPP: Yes. Long bifo mifala i gat. Be (_) New Zealand nao i stap fund/em. Long
(Economy AP) program blong olgeta long bifo.

F: Okei.

DPP: Yeah be afta? I no olgeta be mifala nao i katem.
F: Uh?

DPP: Yes. I katem about five (.) five or six years ago. We mifala nomo i katem. Mi tu mi no aware long hem be mi mi stap wok long olgeta program ia. And program ia hem i actually from tingting osele (.). se principal nao? Hem nao i save either allow/em samting blong hapen? O hem i blokem. So the key person long eni skul/s is the head teacher or the principal. So tingting we i stap is that we focus on that one. From we blong focus long ol narawan hem i no really isi. Hem i expensive.

F: M-m.

DPP: And also tingting se you focus on that one because hem nao bae hem i focus long ol narawan so therefore ol talent ol save and olgeta skills ol samting ia? Hem i apply/em longwe and then afta bae hem i mekem i better from we this issue blong ol man ples i ranem ol samting oli mekem ol samting. So that was the reason. Um mifala i wok wetem New Zealand naoia? For about ten years long hemia. Be unfortunately taem oli katem (.). uh osele argument blong mi wetem er olgeta long that taem is this. Ten years is not enough blong yu bildimap base. Long kaontri. Be ol pipol we oli stap long ol samting ia olgeta nao oli stap long ol decisions. Long ol key decisions. Osele Roy Obed. Jean-Marie Virelana we i stap long Teachers College ia. You just name them. Fulap long ol key players we oli led by ol principals we oli go tru long ol samting ia we mifala i wokem. And that was the way we hem i set up hem i set up blong in such a way that the local capacity yu givim hem opportunity blong hem i dvelopem hem hem wan. Yu save. From we tingting i bin stap bifo se this kaen ia we yumi kam yumi se okei. This is the way it's done. And then yumi go tru long hem mi lukum se i no wok.

F: M-m.

DPP: So mifala i jenism i luk the other way around. Blong yu talem long hem se come on. You are in. You are in this position now. What can you do? And then? Wanem nao yu karem difficulties long hem. Wanem nao yu nidim help long hem. Then. We'll help you. So that's the program hem i set up osele. Yes hem i set up osele. So yu (.). mifala i mekem fiu samting. Wan? Is this that yu givim uh olgeta fas er the opportunity blong oli bildimap confidence blong olgeta. Yu save. Not the opportunity blong oli bildimap confidence blong somebody else. And then when that somebody else hem i no stap? And then hem i go rong.

F: Yes.

DPP: So there was quite a lot of thinking ongoing. So um the program we hem i set up i osele. So yu lukum olgeta osele. Ol pipol we oli lidim naoia osele nao. Ol principals we oli stap naoia we oli lidim ol big skul/s. Wetem olgeta long ol jioj/es we ol jioj/es i stap pulum olgeta i gobak blong lukaotem ol educational (.). blong ol jioj/es? Hemia olgeta we oli involve long program ia.

F: Okei.

DPP: Be naoia that's some years ago. And sore tumas long nekis phase blong hem we mifala i bin mekem i no bin wok aot is from program hem i stop is the next phase
is that mifala i start/em off. Mekem wanem we mifala i kolem ol mentoring principals. Olsem ol key principals. And mifala i setemap olgeta long ol provins. So yu? It doesn't matter whether English or French skul i stap klosap long yu sapos yu French Inglis (.) French skul speaking er principal be evri skul we i stap klosap long yu? Yu nao yu responsible.

F: Yes.

DPP: Blong olgeta. Blong helpem olgeta long administration ol issues olsem. And er mi mi sad nomo blong talem se mifala i no bin go on mo. Mekem hemia hem i wok gud. From we sapos program hem i stil go on and hemia hem i wok gud? Oh mi talem long yu. You'll have people at the spot we olgeta i save respond. Oli save respond long nid. And that's the best way blong lan. Blong olgeta pipol we oli stap long ol positions ia. Ol principals. Then mifala i start/em off blong wok wetem olgeta blong praemeri.

F: Yes.

DPP: So program blong hem hem i set up. Blong wok wetem praemeri wetem (.) lesson learnt long wanem we mifala i bin no wokem stre long hemia blong ol principals. So i sapos blong go long praemeri. Be program ia i cut off. So i stop/em hemia. So naija wetem VEM program we mifala i gat? Hemia we oli stap talem se management blong ol skul and ol training ol samting long skul long ol finance ol samting olsem ia. Sapos mifala i bin continue long program ia? Bae ol samting ia bae oli ready taem mifala i go long program ia. Be naija? The way we hem i approach naija? Hem i no sem mak. So the way we mi mi stap lukum. Sapos mifala i no continue blong karem input. Bae=

F: =M-m.

DPP: Bae (.) from we mifala i no lan. From olgeta samting we ol principals oli bin go tru long hem. So mi sore blong talem nomo se those principals naija oli stap. Once olgeta oli stat blong retire and get out of the way? Oli finis and get out of the way? We don't have another (.) another batch of er people.

F: Yes.

DPP: But the whole idea behind the training is (_) you (_) you know yourself. If you don't know yourself long sam eria mifala i putum sam samting blong helpem yu blong yu (direct yourself) yu wan. From tingting se sapos somebody else i talem se yu no gud long hemia? Normally hem i no isi blong person i jenis. But sapos an individual hem i luk save se yes. Ah. Samting we mi sud mekem be mi no mekem. From mi no really save hao blong mekem. Then long ples ia nao then hem i mekem. Okei mi nidim help along ples ia. So yumi come in blong helpem hem. So hem i wok along the idea se a person change from within? And the best person to change him or her is himself. So hemia naija mifala i wok along and mi mas talem se hem i wok.

F: Yes.
DPP: Be mi luk se hem i wok. Long wei we mi lukum. So yu lukum olsem. <lowers voice and points across the quadrangle> Naoia hem i wan daerekta. Hem i wok long ples ia. Yu luk hem? Hem i wan long olgeta we hem i no training. It's just a few long ol principals we oli stap long ol big schools? We olgeta oli go tru long ol training ia.

F: Okei. Be i gat sam blong ol document=

DPP: =Yes yes yes.

F: O ol directives we oli stap go longwe blong talem long ol principal. Olsem even though ol training i no stap gohed yet be i gat sam guidance we i stap go out long ol skull/s.

DPP: Yes mifala i kam up wetem ol handbooks. Uh and mifala i cautious long ol handbooks be mifala i produce/um. Ol handbooks we i givimaat long olgeta. And ol handbooks ia oli go long ol eria/s ia we olgeta principal i faenem difficulty long hem?
And wetem sam samples er blong ol samting blong hao yu wokem. Be iven wetem hemia mi faenem se a lot of principals oli stil faenem difficulty wetem. So this idea or wanem we mifala i setemap? And sapos mifala i bin go on long ples ia.

AND mifala i bin go on long ples ia? Bae hemia bae olsem. Olsem mi still (.) hemas yia nao. Mi still fil (.) fil se basically mifala i no mekem wanem we mifala i build up gogo gogo taem we mifala i just about ready blong mifala i stap long ples ia. Mi stap long plan blong mekem and then afta they se nogat nomo. Mekem mi sore from this issue of er cascading a lot of training? Mifala i olsem basically mifala i stap start/em off. Mifala i stap blong bildim base. And then afta olgeta ia nao bae ol cascade/em i godaon long ol narawan? And then afta bae i go into ol tija/s. So olgeta tija/s basically bae olgeta i karem ol training ia bifo hem i (.) so sapos hem i kam to be a head teacher. O hem i kam to be a department head? And then afta deputy principal and then afta principal? All of these things would be part of long laef blong ol pikin- ol tija/s taem oli go tru long skull. So taem we yu karem wan somebody yu mekem hem principal? Yu no save talem se that person must have no training. Hem i karem wan life training tru long process taem we hem i stap tij.

F: Yes.

DPP: Sapos mifala i bin go long ples ia? Bae hemia bae olsem. Olsem mi still (.)
hamas yia nao. Mi still fil (.) fil se basically mifala i no mekem wanem we mifala i build up gogo gogo taem we mifala i just about ready blong mifala i stap long ples ia. Mi stap long plan blong mekem and then afta they se nogat nomo. Mekem mi sore from this issue of er cascading a lot of training? Mifala i olsem basically mifala i stap start/em off. Mifala i stap blong bildim base. And then afta olgeta ia nao bae ol cascade/em i godaon long ol narawan? And then afta bae i go into ol tija/s. So olgeta tija/s basically bae olgeta i karem ol training ia bifo hem i (.) so sapos hem i kam to be a head teacher. O hem i kam to be a department head? And then afta deputy principal and then afta principal? All of these things would be part of long laef blong ol pikin- ol tija/s taem oli go tru long skull. So taem we yu karem wan somebody yu mekem hem principal? Yu no save talem se that person must have no training. Hem i karem wan life training tru long process taem we hem i stap tij.

F: Yes.

DPP: So that was (.) that was (.) so mifala i wantem mekem se the training actually i kam samting olsem. You don't do it because yu karem yu blong tu wik/s and then afta givim mi this training. No. You go through this training for however many years.
So yu mekem se hem i pat blong yu. So taem we yu kam wan principal.

F: Yes.

DPP: Yu kam wan principal. (1) Mi stil karem (.) it's okay but mi stil karem a lot of reservation about oh when you become a principal then we'll give you a crash course on how we (.) one month. Or two month. Mi still that one. That's okay provided yu karem for life.
F: Be yu luk se i gat (.) i gat wan copy blong guidelines ia we yu ting se mi save karem?

DPP: Yeah.

F: O bae mi askem long sekretari blong yu.

DPP: No mi gat sam long ol. Mi karem sam blong ol outdated handbooks ia.

F: I oraet.

DPP: Mi mi finis long hem longtaem finis.

F: Olsem blong luksave nomo.

DPP: Yes. <walks over to bookshelf> Yu wantem French o Inglis?

F: Tufala tugeta bae i gud. <laughs>

DPP: Mi no save se mi gat Inglis.

F: Sapos wan nomo i oraet.

DPP: Sapos no?

F: Sapos yu gat wan long tufala saed i oraet nomo from bae mi save luk se=

DPP: =No hemia.

F: Mi stap wokbaot karem ol document ia. Ah tangkiu tumas. Hemia naentin naenti eit uh?

DPP: Yes.

F: Hem i latest one o=

DPP: =Latest one ia nao. From mi mi finis long hem longtaem finis.

F: Oh hem i gud ia.

DPP: Ol samting ia mifala i wokem taem mi mi stap principal yet.

F: M-m yes. Hemia i gud from olsem (.) hem i wan smol pat nomo be mi harem wan i talem se narafala training i stap pat blong hem. Be hemia olsem at least mi save luk nao se wanem nao (.) wanem nao i stap long pepa long fored blong olgeta.

DPP: Yeah. Be olsem problem blong mi is this that (.) olsem (.) iven wanem we mifala i stap wokem naoia? Problem blong mi is that mi mi stap minim that ol nomol tingting biaen long risen/s why we do things? Mifala i no stap tingting gud long hem. Olsem. Long mi? Yumi lan from what we have seen. What has happened. You know. So hemia ia i sud givim yumi wei blong lukluk. Then afta yumi yusum hemia ia olsem bases blong yumi go long ol big programmes blong yumi olsem. From once yumi go long ol big programmes and go out basically for just doing the activity.
It’s olsem sore blong talem be mi ting se sometimes it’s a waste of money. A waste of time. Waste of energy. We at the end of the day people don’t actually change.

F: Yes.

DPP: Yu save. So therefore yumi tokbaot continuity be yumi giaman. Continuity will never be.

F: M-m.

DPP: And yumi save. Yeah so. Be mi ating (.) min wan samting we i stap long mi about anything to do with work and school or anything is that people have the potential. Yu save. And because olgeta oli karem potential the key to unlocking this potential and improving on this potential is blong andastanem olgeta and how best to do with the environment we i stap.

F: M-m.

DPP: That. Sapos yumi no consider/em ol samting olsem?

F: Yes.

DPP: Bae. <phone rings but he doesn’t answer> And mi ting se mifala i no stap tekem nat taem blong sidaon. Work it out. Discuss/em. Debate/em. Ah mi disagree wetem yu. <laughs> Mi disagree wetem yu. These are the kind of things uh? And (.) uh mifala i stap busy long run here. Run there. Run here. It’s busy busy busy. And normally it is too much busyness. Sometimes for the sake of just doing an activity.

F: Yes.

DPP: Mi stap talem from we plante taem mi no stap slip gud long naet from ol samting olsem. From we long skul? Olsem mi get yus long hem. Mi get yus long skul. Blong skul mi always lukum is this programme working. Wanem nao ol saens long hem i se i tru se ol samting ia naoia i stap show/em long mi se i olsem o no. Sapos hemia i stap go olsem ia nao. Wanem nao mi mas interfere. Wanem nao mi mas blong mek sua (.) yu save. So ol samting ia so. Evri taem we mi stap mekem ol training wetem ol principal mi always stap talem long olgeta se the major work blong ol principals is the thinking part.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yu save. Yu mas lukluk long ol options. Yu mas (.) sapos yu no karem information long hem you find the information. That’s why taem mi stap long skul when mi mi no gat information ia? I’d do something. I’d make a small research. Find out about it. So mi no save sidaon se uh but there’s no research exists. No I mean I’ve been equipped with that. Yu save. So even though we don’t know the details of the stage. Know the particular details? But a lot of something you don’t need that. You need all you need is that the general (.) it’s pointing in the right direction and then yu save mekem decision.

F: M-m.
DPP: Accordingly. And ol saens oli stap around us. If only we can er talem se okei
that saens means this. Yu save. O sapos nomo but hem i wan bigfala issue uh.
Hem i wan big issue olsem mifala i mekem ol gud programme we i stap go on. Ol
gud wan. Be long mi? The real issue olsem as far as I am concerned the real issue
is this that it’s are you actually helping those individuals to perform at the maximum
ability that they are able to. Yeah. Because only when you reach that then yu save
talem se yes. Hem i save do/im samting. Yes. But sapos hem i no kasem that level
and that stage of thinking. Hem i save karem this skill. Hem i save karem that skill.
But it’s only limited to that way of thinking we hem i gat. Because sapos nomo?
Finis ia nao.

<phone rings again but he doesn’t answer>

F: Yes. Mi harem se mi stap (.) mi mi save sidaon ful dei storian wetem yu be=
DPP: =No be=
F: =No be mi harem se mi tekem up tumas taem blong yu. Mi luk phone blong yu ol
man oli wantem toktok wetem yu.
DPP: <He answers phone, speaks briefly and hangs up again.>

F: I oraet bae mi nomo disturb/em yu. Bae yumi finis long ples ia.
DPP: Samting ia i stap bifo finis. Afta yumi stap waste/em taem blong yumi blong
traem hemia.

F: Yes. Olsem taem mi mekem olsem risej blong mi finis bae mi olsem sanem ol
copy i kam long ples ia.
DPP: Yes be long mi? Issue blong lanwis?
F: M-m?

DPP: I olsem. At this stage? We have already developed ourselves long tufala
lanwis the way we are. Mi no (.) long wei blong mi? Mi no biliv se wan niu wei bae
hem i really helpem yumi. Long wei we mi mi lukum is this that wanem we mifala i
gat nacia? Sapos mifala i mekem smol minor adjustment long hem bae hem i help.
Like for example olgeta English speaking schools? Yu introduce/um French blong
ples we hem i appropriate blong learning blong ol pikinini whatever that level may
be. And then afta karem gudfala teaching blong olgeta ia? Then that will. So it
doesn’t have to just be French. It can be another language as well. Sem samting
wetem (.) sapos hem i wan French speaking school? Oli sud continue wetem. And
then afta yumi introduce/um Inglis long appropriate ples blong hem. Mi stap talem olsem from we the place we yu introduce/um tufala? For the sake of long edyuksen hem i gud blong yu introduce/um tufala long sem level. But for the sake long tufala defren lanwis/es ia nao? I don't think that both have to be at the same level. Yeah. So long ples ia mi ting se ol samting we mifala i really nid blong faenemaot be mi save se bae mifala i no mekem. Be mi stap talem long yu tingting blong mi. Yeah. And then Bislama? We need to find about where Bislama comes in. But mi no save jenisim tingting blong mi se (..) vernacular (..) must come in.

F: Yes.

DPP: And hem i mas kam in. Mi no wari whether i cost/em mifala o what is not an issue. Mi long mi value in terms of that one hem i more important than what money you can spend on it. <laughs> Olsem. That's how mi tekem.

F: Uh-uh.

DPP: Money will never be olsem (..) sapos somebody i kam talem long mi naoia se (.). Ooh! Eh! Bae i sas! We are already wasting so much money anyway. Doing unnecessary things in this country. Yu save? Long mi mi no save substitute/um the value that er like the value that we have. That will build up my grandfathers and those before oli karem from bifo and oli kam. Through time olgeta oli kam up i se these are the values that are important. Yu save. Oli bin kam up wetem oli bin maintain/em oli bin kipim. And bae yumi stupid sapos yumi go aot i mekem wan rabis samting we bae i throw all those things down the drain. just because mi talem olsem se ah be hem i expensive. O because yu karem ol handred defren lanwis/es i no isi blong mekem. Mi ting se blong mi that is (.) well put it this way. It's irrelevant argument when it comes to the real value. Yu save the real value. So sapos ol vernacular oli left out? Er basically blong talem olsem se Vanuatu has shot itself. It has killed itself. So maybe they should change the name. Vanuatu my land. They should change the name to something else. Sapos vernacular hem i no blong hem.

We had to finish at this point and turn the recording off, although he was still talking as we left the building.
Appendix xviii – Interview with the Director of Policy and Planning (DPP)
(Translation)

Date: 23-02-11
Location: Ministry of Education

Notes: The interview took place at the start of the first period of fieldwork, as I was waiting to travel to Ambae. We made several appointments but had to cancel them, because the director was called away, and because I was assured on three occasions that I would be flying to Ambae. I then found myself sitting next to him at a VanEGRA presentation, but still couldn’t find a time to meet. Finally, on the day I actually did fly to Ambae, the director’s secretary rang me at 7.30am to say that the director would meet me at 8.00am.

He arrived late so I had to wait a long time outside. As we walked to his office, he explained that he had had to go back home because of a family emergency and then traffic problems due to an accident. He had already started talking about the Education Language Policy team and the technical advisor in charge, before I had a chance to ask if I could start the recording. He was fine with that and just carried on talking.

The interview presented an opportunity to ask about a range of very general issues to do with language policy.

1 DPP: Yes he’s about to finish now.
2 F: Yes he said he’s going back next week or the week after?
3 DPP: He’s been here almost two years now. Two years. But he hasn’t finished the language policy yet. They don’t even have a draft of a language policy.
4 F: I’ve seen a draft has come out but:
5 DPP: No it hasn’t
6 F: Be he’s given me a copy. It says final draft but=
7 DPP: =No::: that’s just their consultations.
8 F: Ah.
9 DPP: They’ve been round. They held consultations?
10 F: Uh-uh.
11 DPP: And they’ve put together what they’ve consulted about. But that (,) that’s not a policy.
DPP: They need to use that to put a policy together.

F: M-m. Yes I saw the document they put that it's like our last final proposal. There is one which is vernacular English French. The other one which is vernacular French English. Now it says that they will put the two together. Okay the ministers can just choose whether it's this one or that one.

DPP: No (.) it's crazy. They should not do that.

DPP: Yeah because it's (.) you know that when you (.) consult about language policy like that. You should look at many different things at the same time. Yes you should consider which one of them is good for the country. Because every day rides on the language policy. Our culture our identity (.) everything depends on that language policy.

DPP: You can't just come up with a language policy and say this is just an education one. There's no such thing as an educational language policy.

DPP: Uh you keep language policy (.) that's for life (.) eh so you use the language policy it becomes like to promote people's culture (.) to promote people's identity (.) to promote all their stories and everything. O::r you use another language that has nothing to do with the people.

DPP: Yeah. So:: (.) the issue wi::th it (.) basically first and foremost (.) they never asked the question why (.) I mean why you must have language policies.

DPP: Yeah and secondly when you have them and the issue of uh (.) what are we trying to do with this language policy. It's to do with just basically (.) uh:: a tool for understanding (.) so suppose it's just a tool to bring understanding (.) bring knowledge things like that? Then (.) any language will do.

DPP: But yeah I mean. And then when you bring whatever in (.) then that's another thing. So:: the issue is (.) what do you really want to do with a language policy (.) What's it for.

DPP: Because there is already a language policy. The one which er for there is a national language policy.
DPP: Um the one they are doing (.) that's outside the language policy.

DPP: So (.) the issue of er contradiction (.) the issue of you know (.) one for the national one it says one thing and then you take this one for education it says something else.

DPP: No. That's not common sense.

F: But then. Who decided that like this team would work on this thing? Like this man didn't just appear. Someone told him to come.

DPP: Yes (.) er (1) um (.) basically those people who are in the team (.) er he came and they chose the people to be included. But the issue is (.) when you look at everything (.) there was this preparation work because the language policy will affect everything in education. (1) So the question of why the language policy which one you should choose. All of these things must be guided by some certain kind of criteria (.) which should be there (.) just to go and speak with the people (.) well it's not good enough. Because many of these people they're there they don't have any idea about (.) you know about language in terms of how you learn languages (.) you know (.) things like this. They just don't have that er (.) for you to go and consult with them. It's like eh you know you take an (.) ah (.) you take a mathematician you go and consult with them about issues to do with mathematics.

F: M-m.

DPP: You know.

F: Yes. They found that they were unable (.) to give a choice either.

DPP: No: they didn't (.) if you come and say these options then you must give (.) some (.) options that you take research findings that either they support these options or they don't support these options or something like that. You know. You can't just come and say that the options are one two three that's it. You choose.

F: M-m.

DPP: It's like. You know. It's. I mean the whole idea behind it in terms of logical.
DPP: It's:: uh the issue of having language policy is good bu::t the issue of how to
address it. How to go about it. Uh:: factors to make a decision. What's the
international language for example.

F: M-m.

DPP: Er what is the language of commerce.

F: M-m.

DPP: Where are you going to get the people to (.). like for example like er:: I mean
why we should put English first for example (.). why should we put English uh:: to be
one of our languages (.). for what reason?

F: M-m.

DPP: Or why French? I mean these are (.). for me? Or for example like vernacular (.).
why vernacular?

F: M-m.

DPP: These are (.). the critical baseline questions that we should answer.

F: M-m.

DPP: Uh (.). should look for the answers to. Be those things aren't. Just go ahead
and then go tell the people oh we need a language policy. These are the options
now what do you think.

F: M-m.

DPP: I mean. For me the whole process is to start off with is inappropriate.

F: M-m. But do you think they should combine the two (.). make it a bilingual
system? O::r do you feel that [(xx) there already]

F: M-m.

DPP: [(xx) (xx) (xx) (xx) for me? My belief the way I see
it? Is that when you consider these questions that I am asking? You know. Some of
these questions that I'm asking? Basically where do you want to take us to? Why
should everybody talk fluently in both English and French. (1) I mean one question
that they keep saying is this that er (.). so that you can get work. I mean (.). I mean
<high intonation> honestly (.). I mean honestly (.). I was (.). you try and think
about the people who (.). how many how many of all these students will have the
chance to go and work overseas.

F: M-m.
DPP: How many? What percentage are you talking about. The main issue here is that children must learn well.

F: M-m.

DPP: You know. I mean for me that’s the baseline. So basically the language only becomes a tool (.) so for me (.) the language is not (.) like basically (.) it’s not supposed to be the main one. Eh? The main one that’s going to drive is why you use that language. I mean me basically. I go for vernacular for starting off and do a good job in the vernacular.

(1)

F: M-m.

DPP: Like. French and er English no. Like. These two should come later. When you have good strong er (.) I mean the argument that (1) the argument that uh:: you need to come early so that er:: they can learn French early or learn English early I mean. What for? I mean <laughs> I mean honestly. I mean <high intonation> what for? Because that doesn’t really contribute a lot to children’s learning.

F: M-m. Be that’s one opinion that’s there that (.) people think that we are not good at English so we must start it off early.

DPP: Yes I mean (.) but suppose he learns his language well? Then it will make it easy for him to learn good English to learn good French to learn Chinese or Japanese or whatever. Er:: I mean suppose we think in terms of I think that one of the issues a national country language (.) it should become one of the options. I mean firstly they are closer to us (.) and secondly they are coming up a lot. But that’s not the issue. The issue is:: we want children whatever language they learn (.) they learn well. Me basically? People say that oh you’ve got over a hundred different languages and then it’s difficult. I mean you look at the other examples around the world. Different places are fighting for the survival of their languages. You know. They are fighting about it. Vanuatu don’t even care. They want the survival of French and English languages. Like for me I mean that’s (.) like for me that’s absurd uh? Like it’s crazy.

F: M-m.

DPP: It’s crazy. It’s crazy. Because for me. The whole issue is learning. If you can (.) create a good environment and good thinking about learning to promote good learning and all researchers have found that you do that basically by starting off well in your language. Then for me that’s the way you should go.

F: M-m.

DPP: You know. And whether you then branch off and go to English or branch off and go to French that’s not (.) for me it’s not an issue. Because we many children here? They are multilingual already.

F: Yes they talk about bilingual bu::t
DPP: Yes.

F: They are bilingual already=

DPP: Yes we talk about bilingual when basically <laughs> children many of them speak two three different languages already.

F: Okay.

DPP: So:: I mean for me the way I see it it's the issue of (. ) we adopt whichever language we adopt. Make sure that we do a good job with it so children get good things that they can learn from with good understanding (. ) and also good reading. You know (. ) mainly you hear that you understand you speak. But the issue of writing well? No:: that they don't think about yet. But for me (. ) if you really want them (. ) must write them (. ) they must write well in the language that they learn in.

F: M-m.

DPP: So for me the issue of putting two or three different languages for them to learn (. ) at the early stage. They (. ) er even though they say no small children can learn all these different languages yes that's true. But in terms of writing?

F: M-m.

DPP: For me it's not like that. You know. For me it's not like that. So:: I think that for they must make sure that at least they are good at writing. Must be good at writing. One of the languages that they study in.

F: M-m.

DPP: If they are not good in it then?

F: Yes.

DPP: I mean what's the use of I speak French I speak English. And then I go to the villages they don't speak English. And I'm here where almost everything is in Bislama.

F: M-m.


F: M-m.

DPP: But::: so. What I'm basically saying is. Language policy. Whatever language we adopt children must be good at it. So that they can communicate. They can learn and then they can express themselves in it. But er the issue of (. ) er (. ) having some political argument over language er (1) I mean no. Even just saying (. ) no you must learn this language for the sake of learning it (. ) we don't need it.

F: M-m. That's it.
F: But what do you think about Bislama in education. Like you've said vernacular
bu::t
DPP: Bislama:: (.) Bislama for me Bislama actually it's (.) like people say. It depends
on what we mean by this term we use (.) what we mean by vernacular. Like for me
Bislama is not a vernacular. Er (3) it’s a national language ye::s bu::t er for me
vernacular language it’s a language that you actually you can you take from your
father (.) those before you (.) go to them. Because for me (.) it shows that it's deep.
It's deep inside the culture.

F: M-m.
DPP: Inside the words how people use the words. How they express themselves.
It’s actually the way of how they grew up the way how they live the way how they
you know (.) basically the language and language the way they express themselves
in it is basically (.) tells us about who they are. Well er (.) that's their identity. Yes (.)
but if we take it that er (.) ingrained in our language is our culture?

F: M-m.
DPP: Er:: (.) is that the risk we m
must take?
F: M-m.
DPP: So basically I keep saying people and culture change with time. Okay. It's
ture. Culture changes with time. But the reality is that that (.) do you want to have all
those important aspects of culture? Do you want them changed?

F: M-m.
DPP: You you want them thrown out the window? And if you think like this it means
that these that things develop over thousands of years. (1) Uh (1) for me for me just
throw it away.

F: M-m.
DPP: I mean is that good common sense thinking. I mean we're not talking about er
you know deep thinking just talking about common sense thinking. Er I mean is that
okay for me? For me er (.) I keep uh all these things that my grandparents my great
grandparents (.) before them (.) and they are nothing.

F: M-m.
DPP: What's the result for me. If I throw them away I've thrown myself away.

F: M-m.
DPP: So for me to create another me? It will take how many more thousands of
years. And it's likely that the global er village they keep saying?
DPP: We likely need a uh. <laughs> So that's er (. ) so for me the issue of language it's er (. ) like (. ) politically it's sensitive here.

F: M-m.

DPP: It's sensitive but I think that the real questions we really need to ask uh:: ( .) was not done in the consultation.

F: M-m.

DPP: So that's (. ) that's how I see it.

F: M-m.

DPP: That's er (. ) basically what you're asking me. I (. ) uh:: (. ) we really want to preserve. We have something that my grand-grandchild can say that yes I'm from here.

F: M-m.

DPP: But in the next er (. ) thirty forty years time? What does that mean. When he says that he is from here. He is (. ) for me these are the kind of things that he has not really addressed.

F: M-m.

DPP: They have not really addressed this. And er that is sad.

F: M-m.

DPP: Yes and especially by the rate that we can lose our languages some will (. ) it's true that we have a hundred different languages but the reality is that some of these languages are spoken by a few handfuls of people.

F: M-m.

DPP: Er so:: so if education doesn't pay a role. A key role in trying to keep some of these (. ) we talk about this heritage (. ) we talk about keeping you know what is valuable to us and our value. I think we are throwing away the most valuable thing here.

F: M-m.

DPP: You know.

F: Yes it's true.

DPP: It's er (. ) but anyway. We keep going on about this but now the issue about language I think that sometimes (2) we make too much unnecessary fuss over it. We should be simple. Understanding that language is basically a way of (. ) promoting our own culture our own identity and also promoting better learning. You know er in school so:: we should look at these things and decide rather than using the other things.
So yesterday we were at the presentation? (Everybody is struggling). The whole question is that okay because uh we don’t have good teaching maybe we don’t have good syllabus or something like that. But that’s only one side of the story.

DPP: But I mean the other side of the story the children. Are they literate in who they are?

DPP: If they are not are they still keeping this or are they losing it?

DPP: These are the other side of the story which for me are just as valuable. So if education doesn’t address these issues then who who?

DPP: Who will address them?

DPP: But yesterday we were sitting there these other things were outside. <laughs>

F: <laughs> Yes you tried to ask questions.

DPP: Outside the presentation so not possible it’s not possible. For me to ask.

F: Yes Uh-uh.

DPP: But it’s one of those things uh. This is not my problem. My problem is I always think outside of. And the thing is I always want to go down to the root you know. I don’t want to deal with the branches things like this. No. For me that’s er blong mi that’s not what education should be looking at.

F: M-m.

DPP: For me education should be looking at root things and then we address this. Because once we address these we should address every other one. We should address the roots address the branches fruits or whatever. I mean those for me they are just the products of the roots the roots of the tree.

F: M-m.

---
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DPP: So for me that's why yesterday. That's the reason why I asked those questions. We know that for everything we do conduct an assessment, the assessment must be valid.

F: M-m.

DPP: It's not only valid in the content they are learning. It must also be valid in terms of where are the kids at. So you are going to assess them on something where basically because of their culture and their ways they are at a different base. And then you create an assessment that so for me these are the kind of questions I want to ask. Because for me that's what validity in what we do. But we are poor at languages. But yesterday she gave us a microscopic view uh so she pinpointed which is good. It's good but=

F: =M-m it's just one side.

DPP: Yes for me it is important that they know language but everyone knows. You know language well but if your thinking ability is not up to the level that we expect.

F: Yes.

DPP: Then the whole question of suppose for example you really want cultures to talk to communicate on that level over that deep level then just to understand. To speak that's enough. But um but we don't want that. We want language to help us create what we call not only active thinking but er thinking that is below and beyond the things you see outside. Beyond what the eye sees. You think beyond that for me. Some people. I was at school at the time. I went through with children who were taught and were good at language. But they are not good at thinking.

F: Yes.

DPP: Oli uh for me the critical point here is that how to create good thinkers?

F: M-m.

DPP: Deep thinkers. You know and for me that's not enough. No you should go when you come up with something from that thinking you should be able to make the right decision. You know the right choice. Uh follow good ideas. You know all deep thinking. It's no good just taking the ideas and then you do something else. Eh er it's er. What I'm trying to express is this the issue of languages er. It's deeper than just er these issues. I think that for us here in Vanuatu because we for the first time we are just looking at our curricula. I think that it is most probably the appropriate time for us to promote deeper thinking.

F: M-m.

DPP: Er on these issues like so that we can lay a foundation which will work when we develop them.

F: M-m.
DPP: Yes. Because much of the development money we have comes from somewhere else. Basically the things we are doing (.) Vanuatu is just paying the teachers.

F: Uh-uh.

DPP: But in terms of the development of education. Money comes from somewhere else.

F: M-m.

DPP: M-m so (.) we have to make good bring more value out of that.

F: M-m.

DPP: Bu::t

F: But if you consider what (.) yes this is just a new policy that people are arguing about or whatever but like (.) if we look at what we have already. I think you were principal first at (.) Malapoa?

DPP: Malapoa yes.

F: So that’s an example tha::t when you were there did you have policies in the school at that time? That you said it should be English only o::r were there any=

DPP: =No:: there weren’t.

F: Rules or?

DPP: No. No. Actually I was the one who developed French in schools. In English-speaking schools. Because at first (.) they took French until Year 10.

F: M-m.

DPP: But when I was at Malapoa I worked with a group of teachers. I negotiated with SPBEA uh in Fiji for us to introduce uh French. Because it says in our constitution that either English or French. But (.) for me. It is a heritage that we have brought here. So (. ) I:: I think about the past when we were between French and English. We were against each other. I mean basically that was it before.

F: M-m.

DPP: So when I took on a position where I thought I could do something with it. Uh so I went and did that. I did uh:: I did that uh.

<phone rings. He answers and says he will call the person back because he’s in a meeting>

DPP: Independence. They always keep asking things I’m tired of them. <F laughs>

But er yes. That’s the issue so I worked with the teachers who taught French. We worked with. Came up with a syllabus (.) to teach. Got approval from SPBEA and then we started teaching it.
DPP: Because I think if you just teach. You don't have a er piece of paper something that you er aim for at a level. The children at English-speaking schools won't take French seriously at all.

DPP: So:: and also I think that (. ) to introduce uh French just in Year 7 8 9 10? And then after you stop there. Er for me that’s not enough. For children to catch up so if we lengthen the time? Then they can catch up. So that’s it that’s why I that’s why they offer it now up to Year 13.

F: Okay.

DPP: Yeah that’s it because of the efforts during that time.

F: Okay which year was that.

DPP: Nineteen seventy uh:: eight?

F: Uh?

DPP: It was no the time (. ) eh uh seventy eight? Around er around seventy er eighty ninety. No I came to Malapoa in nineteen ninety (. ) two. Ninety two ninety four. In ninety four I was at Malapoa. So somewhere in the nineties somewhere around ninety (. ) six ninety seven ninety eight. Around that time.

F: Okay.

DPP: So yes (. ) so that’s how we introduced uh French. For English-speaking schools.

F: Yes.

DPP: That was just at Malapoa.

F: Okay.

DPP: But because anything Malapoa does the other schools [do.]

F: [Do.] Yes I see that Angolovo College yes they offer it up to Year (. ) now that they go up to Form 7 so they offer it at Form 7 too.

DPP: Yes.

F: SPBEA yes.

DPP: Yes. The whole idea of it is this. I think that we were just paying lip-service to it.

F: M-m.
They say that language is like this. But the reality is that they weren’t doing anything with it. So that’s the reason why I pushed that.

Now? When I see children who started off at that time? There were just a few. There were just a few children so I used that idea that we have brought that has become a part of our lives. Because from the colonial time? We’ve got English we’ve got French. So it’s something that we have brought forward. We shouldn’t take everything away. There are some good things. And er those good things we must keep. We must keep them because I told them that the idea is like you keep what is yours already. That er forms the base. And then you look around.

To get things other than that you look around elsewhere. And those things that you get elsewhere you take them to complement what you already have.

Yeah? So with the er global village uh the phenomenon like that it’s important.

So that’s the reason why. So now many have said that I am against French. But these people are just looking up here.

Yeah if I was against French? I wouldn’t have done this. So the reason why French has really spread in English schools up to Year 13? That’s why I did it when I was at Malapoa.

Yeah okay.

I am not against French against the language. But in my opinion they must be good at one language first.

And then they can expand to other languages. So for me that kind of idea I haven’t changed it yet.

It hasn’t changed yet.

Uh-uh.

My question is we are talking about school policies like the two languages of education.

Yeah.

But other ones inside the schools. Bislama and the vernaculars.

Yeah.
F: Are there policies at secondary school?

DPP: Yeah well basically? They are not allowed at English speaking schools they don't allow Bislama at school. And we know that this is an idea from the past that's still here.

F: M-m.

DPP: Now the whole idea behind it like at the time when I was there uh. We put that in place for few reasons. One is this that many of the children that come to school they don't speak English at home.

F: M-m.

DPP: So where is the opportunity for them to practise English? And we know that if you don't speak a language? Just say that you know it? I mean that's I mean. I will die. You know? You want to have fluency in it you want to have it so that it is embedded more in you to help you to write everything? It comes through in thinking. Most things come through in speaking. So if these children need to go to further education? They need a language that they can't just write in but they must also be fluent when they speak it. Because if they are not good at speaking it? There is no guarantee that they will be fluent either in writing. In it.

F: Yes.

DPP: So for this reason we made it that English at school? You speak it. Because basically it's the only time that they have to speak it.

F: M-m.

DPP: And when they go ahead in Bislama? They already are outside the boundary.

F: Yes.

DPP: They just continue in Bislama. So the issue is building them up in the language that they will write their exams in. So that is an issue that I have kept arguing with USP in the past. Because USP says we see no reason why you don't teach Bislama. Teach Bislama. Which is fine. I am not against that. But. They contradict themselves. Because when they've gone on about this? They make their exams so that you must be good at English before you go to USP.

F: M-m.

DPP: You know. I mean for me you say one thing but you do a different thing. And that's hypocritical. Like so. I have argued a lot with them about it. And they say no. If you are good at writing it. It will help. But we know. And we know that if you cannot speak in a language the issue of you writing it well? That is not really easy either. Unless you grow up with it. It becomes part of the life that you grow up with. So if you don't teach a language well so that you write it well? How will you translate this to go to a different language to write well in it? It is not easy.

F: M-m.
DPP: So:: for me? It really:: makes me. This is how I was thinking at that time. I still
think like this (.) which is this. I will be e::r (.) a liar? If I tell the children you have a
future (.) in your education you can go on to further schooling. But I don't prepare
them I don't give them the things that they need to go. So now you see for the
universities you must pass a certain level in language before you go in. If you don't
pass it you can't go in. And that from USP is very unfair to the children.

F: M-m.

DPP: Why? Because they know that it is our institution and they are located in our
place? And Bislama is promoted they promote it but all their exams everything?
Everything is in English.

F: M-m.

DPP: So I mean so for me? I mean (.) what are you telling people.

F: Mm.

DPP: That. But I agree with them in the sense that in terms of learning a language?
If you learn a language well and if you teach Bislama well? Then they will know. It's
true. But how far?

(1)

F: Yes.

DPP: I mean. Just as far as USP? (1) Is USP willing to make (.) Bislama a language
of assessment? But (1) is that all? What about all the other institutions?

F: Yeah.

DPP: At other universities. Elsewhere. How will you go out into the global village.

F: M-m.

DPP: Being part as a (.) thinker as an educationist or as a (.) you know. You (.) you
become part of things that happen around you. Apart from just (.) us here.

F: M-m.

DPP: So. I don't disagree. Er:: with using Bislama like this. But when it comes to its
limitation. Of limiting kids. Just to where they are at. Rather than allowing them you
know like they say uh uh no limit uh?

F: M-m.

DPP: to the world?

F: Yes.

DPP: For me? Er that is a problem. For me that's a problem. That's the reason why
at that time I made it clear. That since this is the only opportunity that children have
to learn English and to speak in English. And the opportunity to get out into the
world? Or to go further? This is actually in English.

F: M-m. So actually you as the principal you put this policy in place or=

DPP: =No.

F: Something came from the ministry=

DPP: =No.

F: Or like=

DPP: No::? At that time the policy to speak in this language had been there for a
long time already.

F: M-m.

DPP: It wa::s done in the past already. When I was still a student.

F: Yes.

DPP: But at that time? At that time they are smart. Like. I think back during the
British time. They let us speak in Bisla- (.) in lanwis.

F: M-m.

DPP: They stopped Bislama. But they let us speak lanwis. With English. (1) That’s
it. And uh that’s (.) not just only logical. (1) Uh::: That is research proven too. (1) That
if you are good in your language <laughs> that will help you. (1) So maybe that
could be one of the reason why you see people before (.) who came straight from
the village to school? They speak better English than many of those now who do
well at school (.) you try and take some of those who go to school now. I mean. (1)
Some of them you speak to them they would rather talk to me in Bislama than
speak in English. (1) But when you look at the old people? (1) Old people from
before? Uh (.) they speak good English.

F: M-m.

DPP: They speak good English. But these people? They came straight from their
language? Straight to. And I think that it’s the same in French too. Ah::: that now like
( .) it’s true in terms of knowledge it’s come up a lot but ( .) in terms of language? I
see that it’s dropped a lot.

F: M-m.

DPP: I see that it’s dropped a lot it’s dropped a lot. I am not against Bislama at all.
Or us using any language as ( .) or medium of instruction. Bu::t I think that some of
the decisions that are made for example will this really open up the world for
them? Or will it limit the world for them.

F: M-m.
DPP: You know? But if we can do something that will open up the world? World for them? Then.

F: M-m.

DPP: At this moment? English (.) is the international language.

F: M-m.

DPP: And it is the language of economy. You know? So:: so fo::r that few who have the chance to make it? I think that we should give them the opportunity to. (1) But just to:: er teach languages? And then at the end of it (. ) you’re limiting the kids?

F: M-m.

DPP: I think that this is a grave mistake.

F: But do you think every secondary school follows the same approach or? Does it like depend on the principal o::r

DPP: Yes it depends on the principal and the community but I think that the main problem is this that schools don’t make enough awareness. And they don’t make enough effort. To tell the children the reason why you do something.

F: Yes.

DPP: Okay. To me? They take it for granted. And some they even say speak English only. But the children? I think subconsciously they say why? Why should we speak in English?

F: M-m.

DPP: I think that er schools? And er maybe the Ministry of Education too? We don’t make enough effort. To te- to explain to them. Because for me? Once a child or his parents understand the reason why you are doing something. They will think that it is just a natural thing that falls down and that it is good for them? They will do it.

F: Yes.

DPP: So. I spent time. Telling the children why you must speak English. Because inside me? I would rather that I told them that you speak your language. <laughs> Like. Basically? That. But I can’t say that in school.

F: M-m.

DPP: But I kept it like before. You can speak your language. Like us before. At the British Secondary School? You speak your language. The only time that they stopped you speaking your language was if there were other friends nearby who had a different language.

F: Yes.
DPP: Yes. That is just common sense. Because otherwise you might be talking about something and other children might say you’re saying something bad about them.

F: Yes that’s true.

DPP: Yes. But (.) I mean they followed common sense. And that was like that. So I kept it. I see no reason to change something that works. And it’s good. But just because we are in the year (.) we have already passed the millennium we are in the new millennium so we need to change some of these things. No. Like they keep saying that we have to be up with the times you know. I mean for me these are not these kind of arguments you know. I mean taking (.) we take them overboard you know. But before? The reason why I kept them is because of that. But in my experience when I was at school? Is that the school never explained. We never explain why to them. I mean. I think they have a right to know why.

F: Yes it’s true.

DPP: Then if they don’t know (.) for me? I am wasting uh our time because if the children subconsciously? They don’t see the reason why we do it? Then for me? Automatically? They won’t have that drive and that motivation to learn. You know for it to become part of them.

F: M-m.

DPP: Er often we think that uh I say this and this and this? That’s what’s going to motivate you. For me I think that that’s not always the good way of motivation. I think that the best way of motivation is from within. And for that to happen? There must be understanding. Of why they do things. If they don’t get it? For me that is a problem. So it’s er (.) that’s how I see things at school. So you see that at school it’s quite strict. For people it is strict. But I always tell them why I am doing something.

Because let’s face it these are our clients. We tell <laughs> them that you come in here this is what you’re going to get at school. This is what I am going to make you get at school. So (.) it is a heavy responsibility to make sure that they get that. So I get up I (.) uh teachers. When teachers play up? I let them know. And I take them and I reprimand them. I tell them that if you do this we will not be able to fulfil that. And you and I are here because of the children. So if we don’t do this? We will fail them. And if we fail them? Then maybe we should not be here. Because if you think about it in another way? It’s like this. The kid? He doesn’t (.) he does not have that kind of high thinking yet. So therefore everything around him? He trusts you. He comes to school trusting you. Having faith in you. You know. That yes you know. You can help him. But if he comes to school and you don’t do your best? You know. You’ve not only let somebody down? But you’ve let the country down. You’ve let the village down. You’ve let the island down. You’ve let the province down. And when you think like that? It becomes a really heavy responsibility. Very heavy. That’s why I sometimes get very unhappy when I know that teachers are not there. When they don’t make their lesson plans carefully. When they don’t take the time to find out about the kids. So that becomes a problem to me. So they think that I’m cross? No.

The reason why I feel that tired is because (.) I always think that’s the right thing.
You know? I can really see that kid. I see that kid's family. I see the kid's village. That kid's island. Province. And then ultimately I see the country. So if I don't invest properly in that kid? I've actually let all of those ones down. And if I let all of them down? Then I should. I mean to be honest I mean <laughs>. I should not be there. I should er. But this is the same kind of idea that I have about languages. At schools. About school rules. And also the problem is to do with the development of young people. The problem is a lot of people don't know. Er they don't know about human development. And because they don't know that they. Like a small kid. He will if you do something a little bit heavy for him to respond. A physical thing but the more the kid grows up? The more they respond to what they think. To what's inside them. So when you don't take that into consideration you apply the same kind of thing that you apply to small children? You must expect a clash. You must expect rebellion. You expect that. So I look at that. An issue with schools? Is that they don't see that. Like to me. A bigger kid? You give him as much responsibility as you can. Let them run with it? And you are there to guide? To facilitate? You know you coach. You monitor. You don't do that to the little kid. Not the little kid. So that's why when I see rules or something at school? And how they apply it in school? Some of these things they become more of a hindrance. Er to the development of the individual. So no wonder when they go home they still sit there and they expect you give me this. You do this for me. Why because you treat them like that at school. You know they come to school you don't give them the opportunity to rule. You don't give them the opportunity to do something. Everything you decide for them. It's one of the problems of schools. That I see at schools. So that's why I run school differently. When I was at Epi? Teaching the kids who run the farm? They run everything they have. They are the ones who do it. They come up and they tell me oh we need to do this. The ones who look after the farm they say oh our fence shouldn't be here. And then I'm like okay so what are you going to do about it? You are the committee for it. What are you going to do about it. Oh we're going to do this. When? Oh we're going to do that this time. No you can't do it at that time because that is the time for school. So when are you going to do it? Oh we'll do it at this time. So okay. So I just facilitate them. I just guide them. And I give them money. And then I make sure they make money out of what they do. So they look into it. So they make so some of those children? They are directors now. Some of those children are running big things in the government. But it's a different way of approaching er a school. You know. And the teachers are encouraging. Teachers. Anybody come up with a good idea. Anything. School will support you. You just have to take the lead. We will support you. When you do it like that you see the rich potential that er that exists in a school. I see schools as a the potential in a school? Is enormous. I mean you've got these teachers with a lot of talents. With a lot of know-hows. You know the problem is however these teachers make the best out of it. If you do that? Oh the sky like I keep saying the sky.

(1)

F: The sky's the limit.

DPP: Yeah the sky is the limit.
F: Yes but you see that it depends a lot on individual teachers or individual principals. Like you keep saying okay that was my way.

DPP: Yes.

F: But the other ones do they have guidance.

DPP: Yes but you must. Like for me? You must with teachers. Like you must tell them these kind of things in meetings. You know this is how I think. And these are the reasons why I think this. Now you do it like this.

F: M-m.

DPP: Do you have any other ideas? You know and then they give them. Because if you don’t have the people to help you implement it? You’re in trouble.

F: But it’s like the principal can do it with his teachers.

DPP: Yes.

F: And then is there any structure in place that you at the Ministry have with the principals. I feel that this is a break in the system.

DPP: Yes. Before we had one. But (.) New Zealand was funding it. In their (Economy AP) program before.

F: Okay.

DPP: Yeah but after that? It wasn’t them but us who cut it.

F: Uh?

DPP: Yes. It was cut about five (.) five or six years ago. We were the ones who cut it. I was also not aware of it but I was working on these programmes. And this program was actually from the idea (.) that a principal? He is the one who can either allow something to happen? Or to prevent it. So the key person in any school is the head teacher or the principal. So the idea at the time was that we focus on that one. Because focusing on other people is not very easy. It is expensive.

F: M-m.

DPP: And also the idea that you focus on that one because he will then focus on the others so therefore the talents the knowledge and the skills these things? He can apply them over there and then he can do something better because this issue of local people running things and doing things. So that was the reason. Um we were working with New Zealand? For about ten years on it. But unfortunately when they cut it (.) uh like my argument with the others at that time is this. Ten years is not enough to build up a base. For the country. But the people who were in these roles they made the decisions. The key decisions. Like Roy Obed. Jean-Marie Virelana who was at the Teachers College. You just name them. Many of the key players who were led by the principals who went through these things we had made. And that was the way it was set up it was set up in such a way that the local capacity you
give someone the opportunity to develop himself. You know. Because the idea that
had been there before was this kind of we come and we say okay. This is the way
it’s done. And then we go through with it I saw it didn’t work.

DPP: So we changed it to look the other way around. To say to him come on. You
are in. You are in this position now. What can you do? And then? What difficulties
are you having with it. What do you need help with. Then. We’ll help you. So that’s
the programme it was set up like that. Yes it was set up like that. So you (.) we did a
few things. One? Is this that you give people first er the opportunity for them to build
up their own confidence. You know. Not the opportunity to build the confidence of
somebody else. And then when that somebody else isn’t there? And then it goes
wrong.

DPP: So there was quite a lot of thinking ongoing. So um the programme was set
up like that. So you see those like that. People who are leaders now are like this.
The principals who are now leading the big schools. And those in the churches who
the churches have pulled in to go back and look after the institutions (.) of the
churches? Those are the ones who were involved in this programme.

DPP: But now that’s some years ago. And sadly its next phase that we had made
that didn’t work out because the programme stopped is the next phase that we
started off. Creating what we called mentoring principals. Like the key principals.
And we set it up in each province. So you? It doesn’t matter whether an English or
French school is nearby whether you are French English (.) French school speaking
er principal but every school that is near you? You now are responsible.

DPP: For them. To help them with administration and issues like that. And er I am
sad to say that we did not go on further. To make that work well. Because if the
programme was still going on and had worked well? Oh I’m telling you. You’d have
people at the spot who can respond. They could respond to need. And that’s the
best way to learn. For the people who are in these positions. Principals. Then we
could start to work with those in primary.

DPP: So a programme for this was set up. To work with primary with (.) the lessons
learnt from what we had not got right with the principals. So it should have gone to
primary. But the programme was cut off. So it stopped. So now with the VERM
program we have? Where they keep saying school management and training
everything at schools with the finance and these things. If we had continued with
that programme? Then all these things would have been ready to go on to this
programme. But now? The way it is approached now? It is not the same. So the
way I see it. If we don’t continue to have input. Then=
DPP: Then (.) because we haven’t learnt. From the things that the principals have been through. So I’m sorry to say that those principals who are there now. Once they start to retire and get out of the way? When they leave and get out of the way? We don’t have another (.) another batch of er people.

DPP: But the whole idea behind the training is (.) you (.) you know yourself. If you don’t know yourself in some areas we put something there to help you to (direct yourself) on your own. Because the idea is that if somebody else tells you that you are not good at something? Normally it is not easy for a person to change. But if an individual recognises that yes. Ah. There is something that I should do but I’m not doing. Because I don’t really know how to do it. Then in this area then he does it. Okay I need help with this. So we come in to help him. So it works along the idea that a person changes from within? And the best person to change him or her is himself. So that’s how we worked along and I must say that it worked. It worked well. It took time.

DPP: But I think it worked. The way I saw it. So you see. <lowers voice and points across the quadrangle> Now he is a director. He works here. You see him? He is one of those who has no training. It’s just a few of the principals who are at the big schools? Who have been through this training.

F: Okay. Are there any documents=

DPP: =Yes yes yes.

F: Or directives that go out to tell principals. Like even though the training no longer goes ahead but is there any guidance that goes out to schools.

DPP: Yes we came up with handbooks. Uh and we were cautious about handbooks but we produced them. The handbooks that we gave out to them. And these handbooks dealt with the areas that principals were finding difficulty with? And with some samples er of things of how you do it. But even with this I find that a lot of principals still find difficulty with it. So this idea or whatever that we set up? And if we had gone on from there onwards to reach that good monitoring and mentoring and coaching?

F: Yes.

DPP: If we had reached that? Then it would have been like that. Like I still (.) it’s been how many years now. I still feel (.) feel that basically we haven’t done what we were building up on and on until we were just about ready for us to be at this place. I was still on the plan to do it and then they just said no. So I’m annoyed about this issue of er cascading a lot of training? We like basically we started it off. We built the base. And then these people are cascading it downwards to these other ones?

And then it will go into the teachers. So the teachers basically if they had had the
training before (. ) so to become a head teacher. Or to become a department head? And then deputy principal and then after principal? All of these things would be part of long life of child- teachers as they go through school. So when you take somebody and make him principal? You can't say that that person has no training. He has had life training through the process when he has been teaching.

F: Yes.

DPP: So that was (. ) that was (. ) so we wanted to make it so that the training actually became something like that. You don’t do it because you take you for two weeks and then after give me this training. No. You go through this training for however many years. So you make it so that it is part of you. So when you become a principal.

F: Yes.

DPP: You become a principal. (1) I still have (. ) it's okay but I still have a lot of reservation about oh when you become a principal then we'll give you a crash course on how we (. ) one month. Or two month. I'm still that one. That's okay provided you take it for life.

F: But do you think there is (. ) a copy of these guidelines that you think I could take?

DPP: Yeah.

F: Or I could ask your secretary.

DPP: No I have some. I have some of the old outdated handbooks.

F: That's okay.

DPP: I've finished with them a long time ago.

F: Like just to look at.

DPP: Yes. <walks over to bookshelf> Do you want French or English?

F: Both together would be good. <laughs>

DPP: I don't know if I have English.

F: If there's only one that's alright.

DPP: If not?

F: If you only have one side that's okay because I can see=

DPP: =No here it is.

F: I'm walking around taking all these documents. Ah thank you very much. This is Nineteen ninety eight uh?

DPP: Yes.
F: Is this the latest one or=

DPP: =That’s the latest one there. Because I finished with this a long time ago.

F: Oh this is good.

DPP: I was doing these things while I was still principal.

F: M-m yes. This is good because(.) this is just a small part but I’ve heard someone say there is some other training. But this means at least I can see what(.) what is on the paper in front of them.

DPP: Yeah. But like the problem for me is this that(.) even what we are doing now? The problem for me is that I mean that the normal thinking behind the reasons why we do things? We don’t think carefully about them. Like. For me? We learn from what we have seen. What has happened. You know. So this should give us a way to see. Then we use this as bases for us to go to our big programmes. Because once we go to the big programmes and go out basically for just doing the activity. It’s like sad to say but I think that sometimes it’s a waste of money. A waste of time. Waste of energy. We at the end of the day people don’t actually change.

F: M-m.

DPP: That. If we don’t consider things like this?

F: M-m.

DPP: Then. <phone rings but he doesn’t answer> And I think that we don’t take enough time to sit down. Work it out. Discuss it. Debate it. Ah I disagree with you. <laughs> I disagree with you. These are the kind of things uh? And(.) uh we are busy running here. We run there. Run here. It’s busy busy busy. And normally it is too much busyness. Sometimes for the sake of just doing an activity.

F: M-m.
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DPP: I say this because I often don’t sleep well at night because of these things. Because at school? Like I got used to it. I got used to school. At school I was always considering is this programme working. What is the science that says it’s true that these things show me that it’s like this or not. If it’s this then this will happen now.
What must I do to intervene. What must I do to make sure (.) you know. So these
things so. Every time I did training with principals I always told them that the major
work for principals is the thinking part.

F: M-m.

DPP: You know. You must look at the options. You must (.) if you have no
information on it you find the information. That's why when I was at school when I
had no information? I'd do something. I'd make a small research. Find out about it.

So I couldn't sit down and say uh but there's no research exists. No I mean I've
been equipped with that. You know. So even though we don't know the details of
each stage. Know the particular details? For a lot of things you don't need that. You
need all you need is the general (.) it's pointing in the right direction and then you
can make a decision.

F: M-m.

DPP: Accordingly. And there is science around us. If only we can er say okay that
science means this. You know. Or if not but it's a big issue uh. It is a big issue like
we made good programmes that still go on. Good ones. But for me? The real issue
like as far as I am concerned the real issue is this that it's are you actually helping
those individuals to perform at the maximum ability that they are able to. Yeah.

Because only when you reach that then can you say yes. He can do something.

Yes. But if he hasn't reached that level and that stage of thinking. He can have this
skill. He can have that skill. But it's only limited to that way of thinking that he has.

Because if not? That's it now.

<phone rings again but he doesn't answer>

F: Yes. I feel that I (.) I could stay here all day storying with you but=

DPP: =No but=

F: =No but I feel I am taking up too much of your time. I see your phone people
want to speak to you.

DPP: <he answers phone, speaks briefly and hangs up again>

F: It's okay I won't disturb you further. Let's finish here.

DPP: No but I like it. The reason why I spend a lot of time with people who are doing
some work? Research? It's because I want ideas. Where are they going. So out of
everything? I always think this because a lot of local people? They don't think it is
really important for us to capture these ideas and things that will happen. Maybe
one day somebody will pick up a book like this. Will look through. Huh! Ah okay. Oh!

F: Yes it's true.

DPP: Something that was here already. And then we are wasting our time trying
that.

F: Yes. When I have finished this research I will send a copy here.
DPP: Yes but for me? The issue of language?

F: M-m?

DPP: It's like. At this stage? We have already developed ourselves in two languages the way we are. I don’t (.) in my opinion? I don’t believe that a new way will really help us. The way I see it is this that what we have now? If we make small minor adjustments to it this will help. Like for example English speaking schools? You introduce French at the stage that it is appropriate for children to learn whatever that level may be. And then when they have good teaching? Then that will. So it doesn’t have to just be French. It can be another language as well. The same with (.) if it’s a French speaking school? They should continue with it. And then we introduce English at an appropriate stage for it. I say this because introducing both? For the sake of education it’s good for you to introduce both at the same level. But for the sake of two different languages? I don’t think that both have to be at the same level. Yeah. So on this I think that what we really need to find out but I know that we won’t do this. But I’m telling you what I think. Yeah. And then Bislama? We need to find out where Bislama comes in. But I can’t change my mind that (.) vernacular (.) must come in.

F: Yes.

DPP: And it must come in. I don’t care whether it costs us or what is not an issue. For me value in terms of that one is more important than what money you can spend on it. <laughs> Like. That’s how I see it.

F: Uh-uh.

DPP: Money will never be like (.) if somebody comes and tells me now that (.) Ooh! Eh! It will be expensive! We are already wasting so much money anyway. Doing unnecessary things in this country. You know? For me I cannot substitute the value that er like the value that we have. That will build up my grandfathers and those before that they bring forward from before. Through time they come up saying these are the values that are important. You know. They have come up with them they have maintained them and kept them. And we are stupid if we go out and do something terrible and throw all those things down the drain. Just because I say like ah but it’s expensive. Or because you have a hundred different languages it’s not easy to do. I think that for me that is (.) well put it this way. It’s an irrelevant argument when it comes to the real value. You know the real value. So if the vernaculars are left out? Er basically it means that Vanuatu has shot itself. It has killed itself. So maybe they should change the name. Vanuatu my land. They should change the name to something else. If the vernaculars are not in there.

We had to finish at this point and turn the recording off, although he was still talking as we left the building.
Appendix XIX – Interview with the Director of Basic Education (DBE) (Original)

Date: 27-10-11
Location: Ministry of Education

Notes: The interview was arranged on the day, so I gave the director my initial letter of request to read first (French version – although he said quickly that he read both languages). He seemed to read it very thoroughly and he nodded along as he read it.

F: Okei so fas pat hem i long saed blong tufala lanwis ia nao. Ol principal lanwis/es.
DBE: Yeah.
F: Um long saed blong yu yu ting se Inglis mo Franis? Olsem naoia insaed long ol skul/s (.) oli yusum long same way o i gat standard i sem mak nomo? Standard hem i orael. I gat eni issue wetem Inglis mo Franis insaed long skul/s.
F: M-m.
F: M-m. So wanem nao ansa long hem? I mean yumi no save karem bak ol expatriate tija naoia o=
DBE: =Yumi no save karem bak ol aot- (.) yes. Wan- (.) ansa blong hemia hem i because konstityusen hem i provide se language of instruction hem i must be in French and in English. But er context blong Vanuatu? Hem i defren. Vanuatu hem i wan multilingual kaontri. We have over hundred languages. But we have to learn only in English and French. Which hem i gud be mi ting se i gat sam samting we yumi save consider/em hem. Um ating wan samting mifala i lack long hem long
Ministri blong Edyukesen long level blong ol tija/s? Er hem i hao mifala i manage/im ol tija/s. But at the same time hao mifala i lack in-service training blong ol tija/s. Um from my point of view? Mifala i gat sam training about (.) training i go long ol tija/s. Be i no gat training especially i go long lanwis. Or some kind of assignment samting olsem blong mekem (.) ol tija/s oli maintain/em ol lanwis ia. So mi stap luk se (.) ol ti- firstly ol tija/s oli nomo master/em Inglis o French lanwis. Taem we oli no master/em then oli stap tijim bad lanwis long tufala ia. Um mi ting se solution blong hemia hem i yumi sud mekem sam mo training. From yumi no save karem sam ol Inglis man i kam nemo from yumi save hemia.

F: Hemia nao.

DBE: Um blong yumi mekem se yumi lift/emap standard blong edyukesen ia. From er (.) hem i (.) hem i wan bigfala challenge. Olsem i stap bigfala challenge in the sense that taem yu karem level blong Yia 12? Tudei? Hem i (.) i lo bitim level blong Yia 10 long taem we mifala i stap skul. I minim se bifo mifala i master/em better lanwis than hemia. Okei. I save gat er (.) mi mi stap harem olsem ia. Why mifala bifo i (.) i master/em mo Inglis and French and then mifala i kipim. Er mifala i go long skul mifala i bigwan finis. Uh. We have an age of er sometimes seven eight years we go to school. We have already mastered our mother tongue.

F: M-m.

DBE: Then mifala i go long skul maybe that is the reason why mifala i harem i isi. But tudei? Pikinini? Long point of view blong mi? Taem hem i kasem three to four years? Hem i statem blong lanem lanwis blong hem? O Bislama whatever? Hem i no save gud yet. Ale i go long kindy. Ale i mekem hem i lanem wan defren lanwis uh?

F: M-m.

DBE: We i no blong hem. And er mi ting se hemia nao hem i er bigfala difficulty long hao nao long edyukesen i should be.

F: Be long taem blong yu yu lanem French from day one o yu lanem vernacular fastaem.

DBE: No. Mifala i lanem French from day one.


DBE: No.

F: O Bislama tu.

DBE: No. Hemia nao mi talem se mi mi go long skul mi master/em lanwis blong mi finis. Whereas tudei? Olsem smol kids oli go long kindy o whatever oli no master/em lanwis blong olgeta yet. So ating hemia nao yu- long Ministri i wantem se sapos yumi save introduce/um ol vernacular ia?

F: M-m.
DBE: Blong oli master/em blong helpem olgeta blong lanem Inglis mo French. Nao the big (. ) ating yu bin gat information long hemia finis long ol risej we oli faenemaot se (. ) mifala i go long skul Inglis mo French. But the use of these two language hem i very small. Long hom. Ating one percent or two percent out of the population. Then hem i stap putum yumi long wan kwestin se be why yumi go skul long Inglis mo French. From yumi nidim blong go long ol aot saed uh? Long Vanuatu.

F: M-m.

DBE: Aot saed. Nao. One of (. ) wan blong olgeta solution hem i we mi mi stap tingting long hem? Taem pikinini hem i kasem difficulty long (. ) difficulty long French mo Inglis? Yumi tend always tend to find the solution in those two language. Be yumi neva tingting further blong maybe the (. ) the solution may be in the vernacular language. Mi no save hao. Be we should find the difficulty there. Nao taem mi stap mekem uh sam risej blong mi faenemaot se most long ol lanwis long Vanuatu oli gat similar structure olsem French lanwis. Very few structure blong olgeta oli olsem Inglis lanwis. So taem bae yu harem ol pikinini oli toktok Inglis mo French? Oli yusum structure blong lanwis o blong Bislama. Oli yusum gud. But this is not the standard French or standard English. So hao nao bae yumi mekem ol pikinini oli yusum standard French mo standard English. Um narafala (. ) narafala samting long saed blong teaching blong lanwis ia? Hem i (. ) i gat yet long skul tudei. I gat yet we sam skul oli gat er very strong rul blong forbid/im ol pikinini blong oli no toktok lanwis.

F: M-m.


F: M-m.

DBE: Long mi i no. Then i no yus. I no yus blong (. ) mi prefer blong pikinini i toktok lanwis blong hem than hem i tok rabis French mo rabis Inglis.

F: Okei. Be Bislama? Sapos oli toktok Bislama long skul hem i? Hem i gud?

DBE: Um. (2) Bislama (1) hem i wan threat long Inglis lanwis. Folem opinion blong mi. Be hem i no wan threat long French. Um because taem oli tok Bislama? Then taem oli traem blong yusum Inglis oli miksimap from hem i pidgin Inglis nomo. Olsem blong mi hem i hemia mi luk fulap. Mi faenemaot se fulap long ol Inglis skul ol pikinini oli no tok Inglis aot saed long (. )iven ol tija/s. Oli no tok aot saed.


F: M-m.

DBE: Nao. Vanuatu hem i wan (. ) bae mi talem wanem (. ) influenced by (. ) um environment blong hem hem i Inglis. That is the reason why mifala long French i
pikimap. It's everywhere. Be hem i rare blong yu faenem wan (.) enviro- French
environment blong olgeta long Inglis speaking oli pikimap. That's why bae ol taem
olgeta long Inglis oli talem se i had blong olgeta i pikimap French.

F: Yes from oli no harem French tumas. Aot saed long=

DBE: =Oli no harem French tumas.

F: Be i gat eni polisi in ples naoa blong improve/um either second language or third
language. Olsem Inglis insaed long ol Anglophone skul o French insaed long ol
Anglophone skul. Tufala lanwis insaed long ol Francophone skul.

DBE: Yeah ating ol samfala staf ia oli bin wok long hem. Blong come up wetem wan
edyukesen uh lanwis polisi. Be ating ol bos oli no fil (.) confident blong mifala i go
about hemia. Mifala i go about polisi ia. Mo mebi the policy itself is er (.) mifala i
grup/um trifala lanwis ia. O tri o how many languages. Inglis French Bislama and
vernacular? I go wantaem hem i very (.) bae oli talem se hem i wan risk. Uh? From
theoretically? Wanem hem i hapen se blong yu master/em wan narafala lanwis yu
mas master/em wan first. Very. Be long wei we hao polisi hem i set up ating hem i
no (.) hem i no fil confident long hem. That is how why. Be i gat wan narafala (1) i
gat wan narafala uh (.) finding we mifala i mekem? Hem i (.) hemia mifala i gat pruf
long hem. Er long sam ples/es sam pikinini oli go skul long French. Sam peren/s oli
wantem ol pikinini blong olgeta oli go skul long Inglis. But from i no gat Inglis skul
around they have to put their oli putum pikinini blong olgeta i go long (.) French. Ale
taem oli skul i go oli bigwan smol? Kasem Klas 3 or Klas 4? We oli save live by their
own ale oli karemaot oli putum long wan Inglis skul i long wea. So mifala i
faenemaot se long ples ia taem wan pikinini i lanem Inglis longwe? Inglis blong hem
hem i better than olgeta we oli stat skul long Inglis.

F: M-m.

DBE: So=

F: =Yu ting se i from wanem. Yes mi harem fulap stori nao oli talem sem samting.
Be=

DBE: =Mi no (.) Mi ting se taem we mi stap tokbaot bilingualism hem i olssem ia nao.
Yu save tok tufala lanwis be really yu wantem kam wan olssem bilingual you have to
er fluent in one language first. Be <laughs> blong hemia blong talem se from
wanem oli go olssem ia mi no save be fulap pikinini oli olssem ia nao.

F: M-m.

DBE: Er mebi (2) from structure blong lanwis we oli lanem? Mo mebi from
environment blong lanwis oli save pikimap isi? Mo oli yusum lanwis ia long structure
blong ol narafala lanwis. Like myself. Er mi? Ol man we oli toktok gud Inglis oli
talem se taem mi raet Inglis Inglis blong mi hem i better than ol collègue blong mi
we oli skul Inglis.

F: M-m.
DBE: Er mi stap ting se uh mi mi raet Inglis? Mi yusum French structure. Lanwis blong French. Yeah so mebi hemia nao.

F: So yu ting se hem i no really possible blong ol (.) ol pikinini we oli skul Inglis fastaem ale oli muv i go long French bae oli neva kasem.

DBE: Mi ting se bae i had. Bae i had nomo from environment we i no provided long olgeta blong oli save pikimap.

F: M-m.

DBE: Whereas French i go long Inglis i no gat problem.

F: Be yu save eni eksampol blong ol Anglophone olsem oli skul Inglis nomo? Ale be oli save toktok French tu.

DBE: Yeah. I gat sam ia.

F: Okei.

DBE: And er (.) taem mi harem (.) mi stap (.) i gat wan. Hem i tok very good French. And then er mi askem hem se (.) you make me question (.) yu mekem mi mi kwestinim. From wanem ol English speaking oli stap talem se i very hard long olgeta. Hao nao yu come to (.) so hem i kam blong confirm/em wanem mi stap talem. Hem i stap yus blong wok wetem ol Franis man? So hem i expose long Franis lanwis therefore hem i pikimap. Hem i pikimap. So mi ting se environment tu hem i count uh?

F: Yes.

DBE: Environment hem i count so (1) olsem naoia uh i stap kam better. I kam better from we TV i kamaot long French. So especially ol pikinini oli pikimap French. Tru long TV mo long (.) ol skul/s ol centre schools uh? We mifala i introduce/um narafala lanwis i go long narafala.

F: M-m.

DBE: So whether i French o Inglis? Pikinini i pikimap very easily tufala lanwis. Mi ting se hem i a little commitment blong mifala nomo. Blong mekem se ol pikinini oli pikimap.

F: Okei.

DBE: Mi luk olsem sam blong mifala. Olsem wan toktok we mifala i stap talem long Vanuatu se taem yu bon French be yu no wantem save long Inglis o taem yu skul Inglis yu no wantem save long French. Be hem i wan kwestin blong attitudes. (2) Be mi ting se sapos evriwan hem i gat sem gol hem i wantem tingbaot ol pikinini i no (.) mifala i no tingbaot mifala. Olsem filing blong mi se taem mifala i stap tokbaot fuja blong pikinini? Mifala i stap base/em plante blong mifala. Uh hemia nao mi luk. Be sapos mifala i forget/em mifala. Bae mifala i tok more about pikinini mebi mifala i save=
F: =Be yu luk se ol attitude oli stap jenis naoia o no. Oli mi Francophone mi nidim.

Franis nomo o=

DBE: =Ating long (.) long ol rural eria/s (.) attitude i jenis finis. Honestly speaking mi save talem olsem ia olsem folom lukluk mo opinion. Blong ol rural eria/s? O long ol pipol we oli no skull tumas oli luk save hemia. Be i gat sam bunch blong ol very few intellectual pipol nomo i had blong. (1) Mi no save why. Be i had blong oli accept/em o oli go along. This is hao mi mi luk.

F: So taem yufala i sidon olsem lanwis polisi tim? I gat sam we oli skull French sam oli skull Inglis. Yu faenem se yufala i stap faet from=

DBE: =No.

F: Olsem [French]

DBE: [Ating long] tim i no gat problem insaed long tim. Uh evri memba blong tim oli () oli andastanem. Be olsem i gat samfala we oli () hemia nao mi talem se sam pipol oli no too sure? Samfala pipol oli no andastanem. Be sam oli jes olsem mi talem hemia. They don’t like this language.

F: Be wanem nao problem. Oli fraet se bae oli lusum opportunity blong ol sapos nara lanwis hem i kam antap mo o=

DBE: =No? Uh (2) mi ting se. No mi no ting se hemia. Mi ting se attitude ia hem i kamaot from we (2) oli save hemia nomo nao.

F: M-m.

DBE: Taem oli save hemia nomo oli ting se hemia nao. There is no other narafala wei.

F: M-m.

DBE: Mi ting se hemia hem i () hem i poen we. From my point of view.

F: M-m.

DBE: Yes. Be taem sapos yu save tu? Then bae yu luk se i yu gat hemia. Afta yu gat hemia. Be taem yu save wan? Yu gat hemia nomo nao. So i very hard. So they say () um () mi mi save mekem laef blong mi long wan lanwis nomo. I don’t need the other language. This is how.

F: M-m.

DBE: Yes.

F: So long saed blong lanwis polisi nao? Olsem hem i?

DBE: Lanwis polisi? Long purpose we mi andastanem? (2) Polisi ia hem i blong wan? Hem i blong yumi unite/em ol pipol oli become wan tugeta. Still today we say Francophone Anglophone. We speak English. We. Hemia nao lanwis polisi i wantem karemaot barrier ia. Between the two. And we take those two people and
they become one. Only one ni-Vanuatu. Hemia wan. Er second er tingting long
hem? Hem i blong er yumi reduce/um (.) yumi mekem ol skul/s long Vanuatu oli
become only one school. Tudei hem i gat tu. I gat Inglis narasaed. French
narasaed.

F: M-m.

DBE: So hao nao yumi karemaot Inglis mo French ia? But in one school pikinini oli
lan long tufala lanwis ia wantaem. This is how mi luk. Decision lanwis polisi i
wantem mekem hemia nao. Instead blong yu go ia yu go ia. Yu go long wan skul ale
yu karem tufala sem taem.

F: So hemia tingting blong yu tu? Olsem hem i no jes blong man we hem i lidim tim.
Hemia yufala evriwan yu really wantem se wan system nomo i no gat tufala saed.

DBE: Yeah. Wan system. But how we do it i gat defren wei blong hem uh? Olsem i
gat wan suggestion i bin kamaot sam yia/s i pas longtaem finis. We oli talem se i
gud blong ol praemer ol pikinini oli go skul long praemer long French. Then oli
switch i go long secondary long Inglis. Hemia i save wok tu. Hem i save wok. From
hem i master/em wan lanwis finis. Mo aedia ia hem i olsem samfala kaontri long wol
olsem samfala (.) i no kaontri (.) samfala kaontri be samfala individual/s long wol oli
go tru long hemia. Then yumi go. Yumi nid blong luk er context blong Vanuatu to fin-
to fin- blong faenem wan street strategy blong lanwis.

F: M-m.

DBE: Olsem. Mifala long Vanuatu? Mifala i no save adoptem ia system ia
immersion.

F: M-m.

DBE: I no possible. Because long haos mifala i toktok lanwis blong mifala o
Bislama. Sapos mifala i tok wan lanwis long haos okei be mifala i go immerse long
narafala lanwis uh? Se hem we mifala i tok long hemia bae mifala i go immerse long
hem. Wan (.) wan (.) wan concept we mi ting se ol man Vanuatu oli save (.) oli save
adoptem hem i hemia nao. Oli lanem wan lanwis oli build the lanwis ia blong lanem
narafala lanwis. So mifala i gat almost fo lanwis nomo. Olsem mi taem mi go
oversea mi stap talem toktok ia se mi evri dei mi tok fo lanwis. Mi tok lanwis blong
mi long haos. Bislama long rod? Inglis mo French long ofis.

F: So wanem nao fiu ja blong lanwis polisi ia? Hem (.) from mi ridim final report
blong (.) Novemba long las yia?

DBE: Yeah.

F: Be since long taem ia mi no really harem tumas.

DBE: Ating (.) long taem ia mifala i no gat DG. Blong i tekem mifala i (.) i go. (2)
Afta? Mifala i gat wan. Hem i acting nomo be taem hem i lus mifala i stap smol
nogat DG. So naoia mi ting se mifala i gat wan DG nao be naoia hem i stap long (.)
long han blong hem nao blong hem i talem wanem nao mifala i go for.
F: Okei.

DBE: Yes.

F: So hemia las information blong yu.

DBE: Yeah.

F: I jes ripot i gohed i no gat wan samting since long ripot ia nao. Hem i jes.

DBE: Yeah.

F: Wet long decision nomo.

DBE: Yeah. Yumi nidim decision making nomo.

F: Okei.

DBE: Otherwise no.

F: So yu yu stap sapotem aedia we i gat (.) yu talem se i gat fulap lanwis long praemeri so yu start off long vernacular. Afta bae oli go long French. Inglis.

DBE: Yes.

F: Insaed long praemeri.

DBE: Olsem ol proposal ia oli (.) mifala i bin consult/em ol pipol long hem. I gat we i proposed wan be (.) i gat tu. Tu insaed we ol pipol blong Vanuatu oli (.) oli traem blong maintain/em tufala be wan ia? Oli no wantem. I gat namba tri ia oli no wantem.

F: Okei.

DBE: Tri ia hem i (1) fas wan hem i introd- early introduction of English and French? Mo (.) narafala hem i yu stat off wetem ol vernacular. Mi ting se hemia wetem ol vernacular mifala i no gat problem tumas. We have so many languages but we have some major languages we i kavremap bigfala eria. Olsem Shefa Province insaed i gat (.) oli save skul long wan lanwis. Oli gat ol smolsmol wan. Be i gat sam wan?

Sam evriwan i toktok long hem.

F: M-m.

DBE: So hem i long (xx). Ol smolsmol wan ia? Be from i gat er (.) i gat tu samting in er like (2) i gat ol concept ia yumi mas consider/em tu uh?

F: M-m.

DBE: Yumi save skul long sam lanwis. Then automatically bae ol smol lanwis ia bae oli lus.

F: M-m.

F: M-m.

DBE: From fiuja blong hem anyway. But er in terms of maintaining our culture? Hem i wan very important area too.

F: M-m. Yu (.) blong wanem aelan?

DBE: Mi blong Ambae.

F: Ah tru? <laughs> Blong wanem saed West?

DBE: West Ambae.

F: West Ambae okei.

DBE: Mi save se yu stap long Is.

F: Yes hemia nao. Mi no realise/m se yu blong Ambae.

DBE: Yes.

F: Be hem i min se yu blong wan lanwis we hem i sef.

DBE: Yes. So (2) blong mi hem i very important. Blong mifala ol pikinini oli maintain/em lanwis blong olgeta. From tru long lanwis ia nao oli maintain/em culture blong olgeta.

F: M-m.

DBE: And hem i very hard (.) taem yu mekem wan kastom seremoni? Yu mas tok long lanwis. Lanwis nomo from each wod hem i gat mining blong hem. Be taem yu tok long Bislama o (.) i had blong yu express/em yu.

F: M-m. I tru yes.

DBE: Yes. So mi ting se i stap. I gat wan er Bislama nomo we evri man i tok long hem? Be majority blong ol pipol oli no convinced yet blong yumi yusum insaed long klasrum.

F: M-m.

DBE: Be mi ting se uh lanwis ia nao yumi sud divelopem. Bislama.

F: M-m.

DBE: Insaed long klasrum yumi divelopmen gud? Yumi come up wetem ol spelling. Ol grammar blong hem gud? Then we can use this one. Because hem i wan (.) wanem ia (.) vehicular language from north to south we mifala i andastanem hemia.
F: So blong yusum olsem medium of instruction o?
DBE: Yes. Yeah.
F: Blo::ng olsem praemeri? Secondary?
DBE: Yeah.
F: Evriwan.
DBE: O sapos yumi mekem blong praemeri be at least hem i kam olsem ol er lanwis blong secondary blong (1) from at the moment tudei mifala i tok Bislama? We speak bad Bislama. It’s not really Bislama. From Bislama ia hem i ol Inglis wod nomo.
F: Most the time? Oli no minim eni ting long mifala <laughs>. So i gud blong come up wetem (. ) real Bislama.
DBE: Long ples ia?
F: Olsem yumi talem se yumi nidim Inglis mo Franis. Evriwan i mas bilingual. Be from wanem.
DBE: Ating it’s er (1) Hem i kam long (2) long histri. Blong nation. (2) Bifo taem mifala i stap long condominium? Then tufala paoa i putum Inglis mo French but taem we mifala i kam long independens? We have to make a choice. Have to make a choice so mi stap tingbaot ol lida/s long taem ia. Taem blong oli raetem konstityusen? Oli discuss/em plante yes. Oli argue. Some of them say yumi lego Franis yumi yusum Inglis. Some of them say no yumi lego Inglis yumi yusum Franis. So oli bin argue plante? Be wanem hem i gud se they come (.) oli kam long wan agrimen. Blong (.) oli talem olsem ia. Oli talem se ol Franis man oli go finis. Ol Inglis pipol bae oli go. Be from yumi? Tufala lanwis ia i stap bae yumi adoptem. Olsem lanwis blong Vanuatu. So French English in Vanuatu today? Is not a language for French or English. It’s also Vanuatu language.
F: M-m.
DBE: Therefore? Mifala i maintain/em long edyuksesen system ia long konstityusen. Blong oli stap olsem language of instruction long tingting se (. ) the only two Vanuatu language we i save karem yu i go aot saed. Because ol narawan oli no save go aot saed. So mekem se mifala i maintain/em hemia.
F: Be i min se (.) olsem (.) hem i helpem yu taem yu save tufala tugeta o sapos wan nomo i naf? Yu save go aot saed wetem wan lanwis nomo.
talem. Taem yu stap wetem wan nomo? Yu no luk (.) yu no luk ol advantage blong narawan mo wanem i save mekem. Olsem for example sapos yu (.) yumi save tu lanwis? Tufala Inglis French? Yu gat mo er broad vision? You accept more easily whatever happen in the two language? Rather than have one. It's hard to accept the other one.

F: M-m.

DBE: Um. Tekem eksampol olsem blong mi? Tufala lanwis i helpem mi plante. Samtaem? Mi raet long French gogo? Mi nomo save hao blong (.) olsem mi fas nao mi no save hao blong continue? Mi switch i go long Inglis mi faenem ansa blong hem. And vice versa.


DBE: At the moment you have to employ two people for the same job. One for English one for French. For example mifala long edyukesen? Taem yu tokbaot ol inspector? Yu tokbaot tu inspector. One for English school wan blong French skul. Be sapos wan person hem i (.) i tok tufala lanwis ia? Then we reduce the post to one nomo.

F: M-m.

DBE: So bae hem i (.) bae hem i help plante blong reduce/um cost uh?

F: M-m.

DBE: So yes.

F: So hem i gud blong Vanuatu from i=

DBE: =Hem i gud blong Vanuatu.

F: Be i gud blong wanwan man tu? O hem i wan samting long scale blong kaontri nomo.

DBE: Yeah. Ating i gud blong wanwan man. Be yumi encourage/im yumi wantem promote/em. Se tufala i stap. So promotion or encouragement ia i sud kamaot long (.) um polisi ia? But in fact long (.) mi ting se long konstityusen? Hem i provided finis. Be until tudei mifala i no wok folem konstityusen. Mi minim olsem ia. Long konstityusen hem i talem se yu raet long man long lanwis we hem i comfortable long hem. In other words hem i talem se you must be bilingual finis. From sapos yu wantem raet long wan (.) er French speaker? Yu mas raet long French ia nao. Therefore yu yu mas save hemia. So mi ting se konstityusen i provide/m finis be wanem blong mekem naoia blong enforce/em wanem we (.) um konstityusen i mekem. I talem. So far i gat sam indication? Mifala i talem be blong go further blong enforce/em. Ating nogat.

DBE: No. I gat imbalance yet long sense se (2) um (2) long sense se access mo (.).
mo wanem ia? Long saed blong French i stap kam better nao. I stap improve. Better
than before. Be taem yu kamaot yu go long (. ) uh social life outside? Problem hem i
se hem i more English than in French so samtaem i had. Ol French speaking i had.
Yu no gat choice. Yu mas lanem er Inglis o yu mas kasem Inglis blong wok nao.
From most of the business. Most of the offices. I stap long Inglis lanwis uh? Be hem
i gud blong ol French speaking long sense se sapos oli go wok long institution ia?
Then institution ia hem i lucky long olgeta from oli save narafala lanwis. From mifala
i save tufala.

F: Be ol Francophone naolia oli gat janis blong oli go overseas blong stadi? O oli
mas switch i go long Inglis nao. (1) Oli gat opportunity yet blong yunivesiti.

DBE: Yes. Ating fulap blong olgeta we oli kam. Oli go long ol high levels tudei oli
masmekem olsem nomo.

F: M-m.

DBE: Oli switch i go long (. ) ol Inglis lanwis. No. I gat wan advantage we (. ) yumi gat
long Inglis lanwis. Um (. ) olsem long Pasifik? O long Vanuatu? Yumi accept/em se i
gat (. ) er own norms of English language we yumi save attain/em uh? Difficulty i
stap long French? Yumi folem ol French norms nomo. Whether yu kasem o yu no
kasem this is how French is. Um mebi bae mifala i save promote/em plante ol
Francophone kaontri/s we oli gat ol yunivesiti/s o samting ia? But sapos mifala i go
long ol French yunivesiti? We have to achieve that level. Otherwise bae. Even
though yumi save mekem? Be sapos yu no gat level ia long criteria bae yu no save
go. Whereas long Inglis i defren. You can do it. Because i gat institution we i save
accept/em yu. So naolia bae mifala i (. ) introduce/um French tu long yunivesiti long
ples ia.

F: M-m. Hemia i gohed finis? O (. ) mi harem ol nius blong olsem ol funding i stap
biling i stap gohed be::

DBE: Er bilding i stap go? Er so far we have already uh (. ) er (. ) select some
people? To come and oli putum in ples program blong evri samting. So bae hem i
go. Mi ting se hemia sapos i kam? From bae hem i combination blong ol
accreditation blong yunivesiti blong Franis we i stap long Noumea mo yunivesiti
blong Pasifik so mebi bae oli mekem i gud uh (. ) more relevant long ol ni-Van.

F: M-m. So hemia yes ating bae i mekem wan bigfala jenis. Long ol opportunity.

DBE: Yes. Be mifala tu long French hem i gud blong better tha- (. ) i stap kam gud
long sense se Vanuatu? Hem i bin askem wan er dérogation uh? Wan dérogation
long Franis gavman. Blong hem i yusum DAEU?

F: M-m.
DBE: Long skul system. We long Franis system hemia i nogat. Hemia i mekem se mifala i yusum hemia nao.

F: Okei.

DBE: So mifala i no gat baccalaureate? Be long replacement blong hem mifala i gat hemia.

F: Okei.

DBE: Mifala i gat hemia. Mo hem i no blong ol pikinini blong skul nomo? Hem i blong ol man i wok olsem mifala tu. So that’s the way that er wan agent blong ol yunivesiti blong (xx) i stap ia nao i stap deliver/em ol distance module tru long hemia. So ating hemia nao i help. Ating i very recent. That’s why mi talem se ol French speaking i stap kam gud. From i gat ol access ia nao.

F: Be insaed long Yia 11 12 13 14 naoia oli stap folem wanem curriculum. I gat curriculum blong DAEU o no. Hem i jes eksam nomo.

DBE: <laughs> Er program blong DAEU i stap long Yia 14 nomo.

F: Okei.


F: M-m.

DBE: French skul i no gat. I no gat eni program.

F: Uh? Oli no (.) olsem Melsisi i no mekem sem samting long=

DBE: =No nogat.

F: Uh okei.

DBE: I nogat. Program we oli (.) i nogat olsem sense long se ol program we oli stap folem naoia? Hem i developed by ol bigfala skul/s ia? Then oli folem. There is no real organised program.

F: Okei.

DBE: By the ministry i nogat.

F: Iven Yia 11 Yia 12.

DBE: Nogat.

F: So oli Yia 10 finis oli jes=

DBE: =Yia 10 i finis ia nao.
F: So naia oli tingbaot (.) be hu i set/em eksam blong Yia 12. Hem i wan eksam i kamaot long?

DBE: Ol skul/s nomo oli mekem.

F: Wanwan skul nomo?

DBE: Minim se sam oli coordinate/em. Be oli base/em plante long ol program we ol skul oli mekem.

F: Okei. Be hem i wan internal nasonal eksam nomo?

DBE: Wan internal nasonal wan.

F: I no samting we New Caledonia oli recognise/em.

DBE: No.

F: Okei.

DBE: So blong go long aot? Hemia nao yumi mekem DAEU ia.

F: Okei so Yia 12 long Melsisi oli sit/im sem eksam olsem ol pikinini long Yia 12 long Montmartre.

DBE: Yeah.

F: Be hem i wan we hem i nasonal wan nomo.

DBE: Yeah.


F: Okei.

DBE: Ating sam yia/s nao. Be long ples ia oli Yia 13 mo oli mas go long Yia 14 blong hemia nao.


DBE: =Olgeta oli sit/im eksam long DAEU.

F: DAEU nomo.

DBE: M-m.

F: Okei. Be Melsisi ating i go kasem Yia (.) Rensarie ol narawan oli 12 nomo uh?

DBE: Yeah. Ating hemia Yia 12 nomo.

F: I gat tri skul nomo long kaontri.
DBE: So Mi- (. ) Ministri hem i gat plante tingting? Be olsem mifala i slo blong wok long hem uh? I gat wan tingting hem i blong translatem ol program blong SPBEA?

F: SPBEA.

DBE: Ale ol French skul tu oli (. ) long hem. Uh i depend long hu Minista i kam. Blong (. ) i gat wan minista i kam se no bae mifala i mas putum (. ) karem bak baccalaureate?

F: M-m.

DBE: But uh long opinion blong mi whatever wei we bae mifala i mekem? I gud blong mifala i stat blong revise/em ol curriculum.

F: M-m.

DBE: From uh the real problem long French hem i (. ) taem ol pikinini oli kasem end of the system. Be blong go long tertiary institution i gat wan bigfala gap. That’s why i mas gat wan Yia 14. In place. So we need to revise the curriculum so (. ) blong mekem se mifala i klosem gap ia blong mekem se (. ) so hemia nao ating bae mifala i stap wok long hemia.

F: Be niu nasonal curriculum statement bae hem i no (. ) mi ting se hem i go kasem Yia 13 finis?

DBE: Ating hemia hem i for the whole system yeah. Bae i finis long Yia 13. Because uh hem i no fair tumas se wan (. ) wan medium i go kasem Yia 13 ale narafula medium bae i kasem Yia 14. Mifala i mas go sem mak nomo. Long tufala medium. So mi ting se (. ) mifala i stap traem uh sam gud muv. Um of course situation blong mifala long Vanuatu? Olsem taem yu compare/em mifala long ol narafula kaontri long wol? Mifala i unique lelebet. In terms of language uh. We have so many language for (. ) small density blong pipol uh? Taem yu compare/em mifala wetem ol um Papua New Guinea? Okei olgeta population blong olgeta i bigwan okei. Be mifala i smol. Mi ting se mifala i unique. So sapos mifala i wantem uh (. ) mifala i wantem come up wetem wan edyukesen lanwis polisi? It has to be um (. ) what (. ) how (. ) how I say that. It has to be er (4) from the Vanuatu context.

F: M-m.

DBE: Be i no blong mifala i adoptem wan narafula system from bae hemia i no wok. Situation blong mifala i (. ) hem i unique.

F: Be unique hem i gud o hem i bad.

DBE: Mi ting se hem i gud.

F: <laughs> Unique hem i wan wod ia we unique hem i gud o?

DBE: Yeah. So mi folom sense ia nao. Uh (. ) mo mifala i no mas hariap blong (. ) blong jes putum wan edyukesen lanwis polisi. Mifala i mas tekem taem blong stadi long hem. So that wanem we mifala i mekem hem i blong mifala i stret long mifala. So we need blong toktok plante long hem? Ating long ol pipol long Vanuatu taem
mifala i go long ol consultation? Rivalité ia between tufala lanwis ia bifo ia i nomo
gat eni mo. I no gat. French English nao. Olgeta oli go for tufala. But how mifala i go
for nao? Hem i wan samting. Mifala i nidim sam linguist tu from long ples ia? Mifala i
no gat linguist. Mifala i gat long USP. Be long Edyukesen itself i nogat.

(2)

F: Uh. Be yu ting se ol lanwis decision oli stop/em ol narafala samting we gavman i
wantem mekem. Olsem yu wantem se evri pikinini i skul kasem Yia 8. O yu wantem
se cost blong edyukesen i kamdao. I gat fulap samting we olsem priority blong
road map o (. ) be lanwis hem i mekem se oli more difficult?

DBE: No mi no ting. Mi no ting. Ating yumi mis- er (1) from my point of view hemia
hem i wan misinterpretation. Uh (3) wan learning? Or one knowledge? Can be given
in any language. Uh? Language hem i no wan barrier. For example. Taem mifala i
stap revise/em curriculum? Long mi you don’t have to wait for the education
language policy. To review the curriculum. You just review. Sapos hem i kam klia?
Then we can teach the curriculum in any language. Be we need that curriculum. Be
yumi no mas mekem se education language hem i wan obstacle. Taem yumi
wantem improve/um quality blong teaching in the classroom? It’s not the language.
It’s all about the training of the teachers. The quality of the book we use.

F: M-m.

Sapos polisi (. ) education language policy bae i kam bae i help/em quality ia nao.
From uh i gat fulap kwestin oli kam se be hao nao education language policy bae
hem i ( ) hem i ( ) i gat impact insaed long quality? Olsem blong mi i no gat. Blong
mi i no gat from quality hem i wan defren samting. Rather than quality. When we are
talking about quality we are talking about training teachers and how they teach.

F: Be ol teacher training materials i no mekem se i mo had? Taem yu mas mekem
narasaed long French narasaed long Inglis? Olsem naoia yu luk se i sem mak
nomo.

DBE: No taem yumi stap tokbaot blong uh yumi gat wan ( . ) common materiel? Mi
ting se long ples ia? Education language policy hem i no mekem ( . ) any threat or
any obstacle long ples ia.

F: Okei.

DBE: Without language policy you can make quality. Education language policy
hem i kam blong hem i helpem quality blong yumi go. Be sapos hem i no gat
hemia? Quality i still gat.

F: Be cost blong edyukesen?

DBE: Cost blong edyukesen? Of course bae sapos education language policy i kam
bae i reduce/um.
DBE: Instead to have two school? We should have one. Instead to have two
teachers? We should have one. Somehow mifala i sud mekem sam strategy oli kam
be (.) blong risos/es blong mifala. Be olsem long wei we strategy i stap naiia be
hem i stap long (.) hemia nao i stap long ol bigfala man blong oli decide long hem.
Because er (.) i gat tu. Uh? I gat tu wei. Education can be achieved in either
language. So long wei we i stap ia i se either yumi mekem long Inglis? Then yumi
pikimap French? O yumi mekem long French? Ale yumi pikimap Inglis. Be long
tufala wei ia? Finding blong Vanuatu mifala i faenemaot se taem yu go long French?
Afta yu go long Inglis hem i mo isi than yu stat long Inglis yu go long French. Hemia
from environment we yumi gat.

F: M-m?

DBE: So (.) be long narafala han? Taem yu stat long French blong yu go long
Inglis? Ating bae i had lelebet long ol risos/es. Like teachers and because majority
long ol skul ol tija oli Inglis. Be long narasaed? Yumi gat ol risos/es. So ol options ia
oli go long (.) ol bos finis oli stap blong decide nomo. Sapos oli wantem further
explanation o information bae mi givim long olgeta be.

F: Okei? Yumi wait and see nomo.

DBE: Yes.

F: Okei ating bae mi nomo tekem up taem blong yu from sore yumi a bit last minute
mi kam insaed.

DBE: No?

F: No hem i gud blong storian. Hem i gud blong harem ol aedia.

DBE: Yes ating wan (.) wan long olgeta difficulty we mifala i gat hemia mi talem long
yu finis. Uh (.) olsem uh mastering blong tufala lanwis ia? Especially blong ol tija
from mifala i stap lusum. So yu nidim mebi sam training o sam samting long level ia
blong olsem oli pikimap mo oli go long hem? Mo wan narafala samting mi luk se (.)
mi faenemaot se long Vanuatu ia? Mifala i no gat tumas ol vocabulary. Taem mifala
i toktok ia be ol vocabulary blong mifala i no tumas. I jes almost uh sem nomo blong
oli kam common. And hem i wan samting we mifala i nid blong improve/um long
ples ia. M-m. Otherwise? Hemia nao mi ting se problem blong mifala hemia long
level blong (xx) ia nao. Sapos tija hem i master/em lanwis. Then hem i save tijim.
But sapos tija i no master/em lanwis? Yumi no sapraes se ol risol oli no gud.

F: Wan challenge.

DBE: Yeah. Wan challenge yes.

F: Okei tangkiu tumas bakegen blong taem blong yu. Bae yumi finis long ples ia
nomo.
Appendix xix – Interview with the Director of Basic Education (DBE)  
(Translation)

Date: 27-10-11

Location: Ministry of Education

Notes: The interview was arranged on the day, so I gave the director my initial letter of request to read first (French version – although he said quickly that he read both languages). He seemed to read it very thoroughly and he nodded along as he read it.

F: Okay so the first part is about these two languages. The principal languages.

DBE: Yeah.

F: Um in your opinion do you think that English and French? Like now in schools (.) are they used in the same way is the standard the same? Is the standard alright. Are there any issues with English and French in schools.

DBE: Yeah. I think the first thing I can say about that? Like. Before for me. In the past they were Frenchmen and Englishmen that taught us. (2) But today? It's just ni-Vanuatu teaching these two languages. For me it doesn't make much sense. Uh? It doesn't make sense like this. That <laughs> Frenchmen teach the children of Frenchmen? They use the French language. Englishmen teach the children of Englishmen. They use English.

DBE: But ni-Vanuatu? They use the French or English language to teach the children of ni-Vanuatu whose languages are different. I think that is already a difficulty. (1) Er then? Like we say too that it is a foreign language? We only maintain it when we practise it. But when you don't practise it you automatically lose it. So I say this? You take the teachers who are in remote places. The only time they use English or French is inside the classroom. Outside they have no chance. And automatically they lose these two languages? Therefore they are teaching poor language to the children. That is my consideration.

F: M-m. So what's the answer to this? I mean we can't bring back all the expatriate teachers or=

DBE:=We can't bring back out- (.). One- (.). answer to this is because the constitution provides that the language of instruction must be in French and in English. But er in the context of Vanuatu? It is different. Vanuatu is a multilingual country. We have over a hundred languages. But we have to learn only in English and French. Which is good but I think that there are some things that we could
consider. Um I think one thing we lack at the Ministry of Education at the level of teachers? Er this is how we manage the teachers. But at the same time how we lack in-service training for the teachers. Um from my point of view? We have some training about (%) training that goes to the teachers. But there is no training specially about language. Or some kind of assignment something like that to do (%) for teachers to maintain these languages. So I feel that (%) the tea- firstly the teachers no longer master English or French. When they don’t master them then they teach bad language in both of them. Um I think the solution to this is we should have some more training. Because we cannot just bring over Englishmen we know that.

F: That’s right.

DBE: Um to make use lift the standard of education. Because er (%) it is (%) it is a big challenge. Like there is a big challenge in the sense that when you take the level of Year 12? Today? It is (%) a lower level than Year 10 was during the time that we were at school. It means that in the past we mastered the language better than this. Okay. There can be(%)I have heard this. Why did we in the past (%) better master English and French and then keep them. Er we went to school when we were already bigger. Uh. We had an age of er sometimes seven eight years when we went to school. We had already mastered our mother tongue.

F: M-m.

DBE: Then we went to school maybe that is the reason why we found it easy. But today? A child? From my point of view? When he is three to four years? He is starting to learn his language? Or Bislama whatever? He doesn’t know it well yet. Right he goes to kindy. He does that and he learns a different language uh?

F: M-m.

DBE: Which is not his own. And er I think that this is er a big difficulty in how education should be.

F: But in your time did you learn French from day one or did you learn in vernacular first.

DBE: No. We learnt French from day one.

F: Just French. You never used the vernacular inside the classroom.

DBE: No.

F: Or Bislama either.

DBE: No. As I said I went to school I had already mastered my language. Whereas today? Like the small kids who go to kindy or whatever they haven’t mastered their language yet. So I think that’s it you- the Ministry wants us to introduce the vernaculars?

F: M-m.
DBE: So that they master them to help them to learn English and French. Now the big (.) I think you have had the information on it already on the research where they found that (.) we go to school in English and French. But the use of these two languages is very small. At home. Maybe one percent or two percent out of the population. Then this poses us the question of why we go to school in English and French. Because we need to go outside uh? Of Vanuatu.

F: M-m.

DBE: Outside. Now. One of (.) one the solutions that we have been thinking about? When the children have difficulty in (.) difficulty in French and English? We tend always tend to find the solution in those two languages. But we never think further to maybe the (.) the solution may be in the vernacular language. I don't know how. But we should find the difficulty there. Now when I have made uh some of my own research I have found that most of the languages of Vanuatu have a similar structure to the French language. Very few of their structures are like the English language. So when you hear children speaking English and French? They use the structure of lanwis or of Bislama. They use it well. But this is not the standard French or standard English. So how can we make the children use standard French and standard English. Um another (.) another thing concerns the teaching of languages? This is (.) it still happens at school today. It still happens that some schools have er very strong rules forbidding children to speak lanwis.

F: M-m.

DBE: But they must speak English and French. That's okay. But one thing doesn’t make sense to me? When you stop children speaking English er their language at school? But you allow them to speak er rubbish English and rubbish French.

F: M-m.

DBE: To me it doesn’t. Then it’s no use. It's no use to (.) I would prefer children to speak their language than to speak rubbish French and rubbish English.

F: Okay. But Bislama? If they Bislama at school is that? Is that good?

DBE: Um. (2) Bislama (1) is a threat to the English language. In my opinion. But it is not a threat to French. Um because when they speak Bislama? Then when they try to use English they mix it up because it is just pidgin English. Like for me it's like that I see it a lot. I find that at many of the English schools the children don't speak English outside the (.) even the teachers. They don’t speak outside. Whereas at French schools? The teachers speak French. But their problem is that when they don't do this they and er (.) yes the issue of language. Teaching of language in our schools? I think that's a big challenge.

F: M-m.

DBE: Now. Vanuatu is a (.) how can I say it (.) influenced by (.) um its environment is English. That is the reason why we in French pick it up. It's everywhere. Be it is rare for you to find (.) an enviro- French environment for those who are English
speaking to pick it up. That’s why those in English will always say that it’s hard for them to pick up French.

F: Yes they don’t hear much French. Outside of=

DBE: =They don’t hear much French.

F: Are there any policies in place at the moment to improve either second language or third language. Like English in Anglophone schools or French in Anglophone schools. Both languages in Francophone schools.

DBE: Yeah some staff have been working on this. To come up with an education uh language policy. But I maybe the bosses don’t feel (.) confident about how we have gone about it. How we have gone about the policy. And maybe the policy itself is er (.) we have grouped the three languages. Or three or how many languages. English French Bislama and vernacular? To go all at the same time it is very (.) they will say that it’s a risk. Uh? Because theoretically? What happens for you to master another language you must master one first. Very. But the way that the policy is set up I think they are not (.) they don’t feel confident about it. That is how why. But there is another (1) there is another uh (.) finding we have made? That is (.) this we have proof of. Er in some places some children go to school in French. Some parents want their children to go to school in English. But because there are not enough English schools around they have to put their they put their children in (.) French. Okay as they go on in school and they’re a bit bigger? When they reach Class 3 or Class 4? And they can live by themselves okay they take them out and put them in an English school wherever that is. So we found out that at this stage when the child is learning English there? His English is better than those who started school in English.

F: M-m.

DBE: So=

F: =Why do you think that is. Yes I’ve heard many stories that say the same thing.

But=

DBE: =I don’t (.) I think that when I talk about bilingualism it’s like this. You can speak two languages but really if you want to become like a bilingual you have to er be fluent in one language first. But <laughs> on that to explain why they go like that I don’t know but many children do it like that.

F: M-m.

DBE: Er maybe (2) due to the structure of the languages they are learning? And maybe because of the language environment they can pick it up easily? And they use this language in the structure of other languages. Like myself. Er me? People who speak good English say that when I write English my English is better than my colleagues who have schooled English.

F: M-m.
DBE: Er I think that uh when I write English? I use French structure. The French language. Yeah so maybe that’s it.

F: So do you think it’s not really possible for (. ) children who school English first to then move to French will they never manage.

DBE: I think it’s hard. It’s simply hard because the environment is not provided for them for them to pick it up.

F: M-m.

DBE: Whereas for French to go to English is no problem.

F: But do you know any examples of Anglophones like this who just school English? But they can speak French too.

DBE: Yeah. There are some.

F: Okay.

DBE: And er (. ) when I hear them (. ) I (. ) there is one. He speaks very good French. And then er I asked him (. ) you make me question (. ) you make me question. Why do English speaking people keep saying that it is very hard for them. How have you come to (. ) so he confirmed what I’ve been saying. He is used to working with Frenchmen? So he is exposed to French therefore he picks it up. He picks it up. So I think that the environment also counts uh?

F: Yes.

DBE: The environment counts so (1) like now it’s getting better. It’s getting better because TV is broadcast in French. So especially children pick up French. Through the TV and at (. ) schools the centre schools uh? Where we have introduced the other language to the other group.

F: M-m.

DBE: So whether it’s French or English? Children pick both languages up very easily. I think this is a little commitment for us. To ensure that children pick them up.

F: Okay.

DBE: I think that some of us. Like one thing that we say in Vanuatu that when you are born French then you don’t want to know English or when you school English you don’t want to know French. But this is a question of attitudes. (2) But I think that if everyone has the same goal and wants to think about the children rather than (. ) us thinking about ourselves. Like my feeling is that when we talk about the future of children? We base it on ourselves. Uh that’s what I see. But suppose we forget about ourselves. If we talked more about the children maybe we could=

F: =But do you think these attitudes are changing now or not. This I’m Francophone I just need French or=
DBE: I think (.) in the rural areas (.) attitudes have already changed. Honestly speaking I can say this following my experience and opinion. For rural areas? Or for people who haven’t had much schooling they can see this. But there is a bunch of a very few intellectual people it’s hard to. (1) I don’t know why. But it’s hard for them to accept it or go along. This is how I see it.

F: So when you sit down as the language policy team? There are some who have schooled French some have schooled English. Have you found that you argue about=

DBE: =No.

F: Like [French]

DBE: [I think in the] team there’s no problem in the team. Uh every member of the team (.) understands. But like there are some who (.) that’s it I’ve said that some people are not too sure? Some people don’t understand. But some are just like I said. They don’t like this language.

F: But what is the problem. Are they afraid that they will lose their opportunities if the other language comes up more or=

DBE: =No? Uh (2) I think that. No I don’t think it’s that. I think this attitude comes from (2) that’s all they know.

F: M-m.

DBE: When that’s all they know they think like that now. There is no other alternative way.

F: M-m.

DBE: I think that that is (.) it is a point that. From my point of view.

F: M-m.

DBE: Yes. But suppose you know two? Then you will see that you have got that. And then you’ve got that. But when you know one? You only have that. So it’s very hard. So they say (.) um (.) I can live my life with one language only. I don’t need the other language. This is how.

F: M-m.

DBE: Yes.

F: So in terms of the language policy? Like is it?

DBE: Language policy? The purpose that I understand? (2) This policy is to have one? It is for us to unite everybody to become one together. Still today we say Francophone Anglophone. We speak English. We. That’s is the language policy wants to remove this barrier. Between the two. And we take those two people and they become one. Only one ni-Vanuatu. That’s one. Er the second er reason? It is
to er reduce (.) we make it so that schools in Vanuatu become only one school.

Today there are two. There is English on one side. French on the other side.

DBE: So how can we take out this English and French? In one school the children will learn in both languages at the same time. This is how I see it. This is the decision that the language policy wants to make. Instead of you going here and you going there. You go to one school and then you get them both at the same time.

F: So is that your thinking too? Like it’s not just from the man leading the team. Is that what you all really want that there is just one system instead of two sides.

DBE: Yeah. One system. But how do we do it there are different ways uh? Like there is one suggestion that was raised some years ago. Where they said that at primary all children should go to primary school in French. Then they switch and go to secondary in English. That could also work. That could work. Because they will have mastered one language already. And this idea is what some countries in the world like some (. ) not countries (. ) some countries but some individuals in the world they go through like this. Then we go. We need to look at the er context of Vanuatu to find a good strategy for language.

DBE: Like. Us in Vanuatu? We cannot adopt this system of immersion.

F: M-m.

DBE: It’s not possible. Because at home we speak our language or Bislama. Suppose we speak one language at home okay but we go and immerse ourselves in another language uh? So that we speak this one but we are immersed in that. It’s a (. ) a (. ) a concept that I think everybody in Vanuatu knows (. ) they can adopt this for this. They learn one language they build this language to learn other languages. So we have almost four languages. Like when I go overseas I often say this that me every day I speak four languages. I speak my language at home. Bislama in the street? English and French at the office.

F: So what is the future of this language policy? Is it (. ) because I’ve read the final report from (. ) last November?

DBE: Yeah.

F: But since that time I haven’t really heard much.

DBE: I think (. ) during this time we’ve had no DG. To take us (. ) onwards. (2) And then? We had one. He was just acting but when he died we had a time again without a DG. So now I think we have a DG but now it is in (. ) his hands for him to say what we will go for.

F: Okay.

DBE: Yes.
F: So that is the last information you have.

DBE: Yeah.

F: It's just that the report is out there hasn't been anything since that report. It's just.

DBE: Yeah.

F: Just wait for the decision.

DBE: Yeah. We just need some decision making.

F: Okay.

DBE: Otherwise nothing.

F: So you support the idea to have (.) you've said there are many languages in primary so you start off in the vernacular. And then they will go to French. English.

DBE: Yes.

F: In primary.

DBE: Like these proposals (.) we have consulted people on them. There was the proposed one but (.) there was another. Two were included that the people of Vanuatu (.) they tried to maintain both but one of them? They didn't want it. There was a third which they didn't want.

F: Okay.

DBE: The three were (1) the first one was introd- early introduction of English and French? And (.) the other ones you start off with the vernaculars. I think that we don't really have a problem with this one with the vernaculars. We have so many languages but we have some major languages that cover big areas. Like Shefa Province in which there are (.) they could learn in one language. They have lots of small ones. But there are some? Some that everyone speaks.

F: M-m.

DBE: So that is for (xx). These small ones? But because there is er (.) there is also something that er like (2) there are these concepts that we must also consider uh?

F: M-m.

DBE: We can learn in some languages. Then automatically the small languages will die out.

F: M-m.

DBE: So the country must decide. What to do. Do we choose some of them? Or do we maintain all of them for the sake of maintaining a culture. Because our languages are very important. I think at the level of education? We have looked carefully? At er what. At the learning uh? Of the children.
F: M-m.

DBE: Because of their future anyway. But er in terms of maintaining our culture? That is a very important area too.

F: M-m. Which (. ) island are you from?

DBE: I'm from Ambae.

F: Ah true? <laughs> From which side (. ) West?

DBE: West Ambae.

F: West Ambae okay.

DBE: I know you've been on the East.

F: Yes that's right. I hadn't realised you were from Ambae.

DBE: Yes.

F: So that means that you speak a language that is safe.

DBE: Yes. So (2) for me it is very important. For us that the children maintain their language. Because it is through language that they maintain their culture.

F: M-m.

DBE: And it is very hard (. ) when you hold a kastom ceremony? You must speak lanwis. Only lanwis because each word has its own meaning. But when you speak Bislama or (. ) it's hard for you to express yourself.

F: M-m. It's true yes.

DBE: Yes. So I think it's here. There is only one er Bislama that everyone speaks?

F: M-m.

DBE: But the majority of people are not yet convinced that we should use it in the classroom.

F: M-m.

DBE: But I think that we should develop this language. Bislama.

F: M-m.

DBE: We should develop it well in the classroom? We should come up with spellings. And it's grammar properly? Then we can use this one. Because it is a (. ) what's that (. ) vehicular language that we understand from north to south.

F: So to use it as the medium of instruction or?

DBE: Yes. Yeah.

F: Fo:.r like primary? Secondary?

DBE: Yeah.
F: All.

DBE: Or if we made it for primary then at least it would become a language for secondary for (1) because at the moment today we speak Bislama? We speak bad Bislama. It's not really Bislama. Because this Bislama is just English words. Most of the time? They don't mean anything to us <laughs>. So it's good to come up with (.) real Bislama.

F: Okay.

DBE: Yes.

F: So in terms of English and French outside of (.) like why do we need both languages.

DBE: Here?

F: Like we say that we need English and French. Everyone must be bilingual. But why.

DBE: It's maybe er (1) it comes from (2) from the history. Of the nation. (2) Before when we were in the condominium? Then the two powers introduced English and French but when we came to Independence? We have to make a choice. Have to make a choice so I think about the leaders of that time. When they wrote the constitution? They discussed it a lot yes. They argued. Some of them say we should drop French and use English. Some of them say no drop English and use French. So they argued a lot? But what is good is they come (.) they came to an agreement. They said that the French have gone already. The English will go. But us? The two languages that are here we will adopt them. As languages of Vanuatu. So French English in Vanuatu today? Is not a language for French or English. It's also Vanuatu language.

F: M-m.

DBE: Therefore? We have maintained them in the education system in the constitution. For them to be the languages of instruction with the thinking that (.) these are the only two Vanuatu languages that can take you outside. Because the other ones cannot go outside. So it means that we maintain them.

F: But it means that (.) like (.) does it help you when you know both together or is just one enough? You can go outside with just one language.

DBE: One is enough. But when you have both together it's an advantage. For (.) for you? And it will be good for you. But when you only have one that's what I've been saying. When you only have one? You don't see (.) you don't see the advantages of others or what they can do. Like for example if you (.) know two languages? Both English and French? You have er a broader vision? You accept more easily whatever happens in the two languages? But when you have one. It's hard to accept the other one.

F: M-m.
DBE: Um. Take me for example? Both languages have helped me a lot. Sometimes? I'm writing away in French? I don't know how to (..) like I get stuck I don't know how to continue? I switch to English and I find my answer there. And vice versa.

F: M-m.

DBE: Like it is (..) easy uh? Then? The two languages can make (..) it can reduce the cost of (..) of our public service.

F: M-m?

DBE: At the moment you have to employ two people for the same job. One for English one for French. For example us in Education? When you talk about inspectors? You are talking about two inspectors. One for English schools one for French schools. But suppose a person is (..) he speaks both languages? Then we reduce the post to just one.

F: M-m.

DBE: So this will (..) this will help a lot to reduce the cost uh?

F: M-m.

DBE: So yes.

F: So it's good for Vanuatu because it=

DBE: =It is good for Vanuatu.

F: But is it good for individuals too? Or is it just something on the scale of the country.

DBE: Yeah. I think it's good for individuals. But we encourage it we want to promote it. That we have both. So this promotion or encouragement must come out in (..) this um policy? But in fact in (..) I think that in the constitution? It is already provided for. But until today we haven't worked following the constitution. I mean like this. In the constitution it says that you write to someone in the language that he is comfortable in. In other words it already says that you must be bilingual. Because if you want to write to a (..) er French speaker? Then you must write in French. Therefore you must know it. So I think that the constitution already provides this but it's now how to do it to enforce what the (..) um constitution does. It says. So far there is some indication? We have said it but to go further to enforce. I don't think so.

F: But do you think that Anglophones and Francophones. Like we are still talking about the two sides. Do they have equal opportunity now in Vanuatu or is there an imbalance still.

DBE: No. There is still an imbalance in the sense that (2) um (2) in the sense of greater access (..) and whatever? For French it is getting better. It is improving. Better than before. But when you come out and go into (..) uh social life outside? The problem is that there is more in English than in French so sometimes it is hard.
For French speakers it is hard. You have no choice. You must learn English or you must acquire English for work. Because most of the business. Most of the offices. They are in the English language uh? But it is good for French speakers in the sense that if they go and work in these institutions? Then the institutions are lucky to have them because they know the other language. Because we know both.

F: But do Francophones have chances to go overseas to study? Or must they switch to English. (1) Do they still have the opportunity to go to university.

DBE: Yes. I think many of them that come. To go to these high levels today they must do that.

F: M-m.

DBE: They switch to (.) the English language. No. There is an advantage that (.) we have in the English language. Um (.) like in the Pacific? Or in Vanuatu? We accept that there are (.) er our own norms of the English language that we can attain uh? The difficulty is with French? We just follow the French norms. Whether you attain them or you don’t attain them this is how French is. Um maybe we could really promote Francophone countries that have universities or something? But if we go to French universities? We have to achieve that level. Otherwise we will. Even though we can do it? If you are not at that level on these criteria you cannot go. Whereas in English it’s different. You can do it. Because there are institutions that can accept you. So now we are (.) introducing French too at university here.

F: M-m. Is that already going ahead? Or (.) I’ve heard news that like the funding is there and the building is going ahead bu::t

DBE: Er the building is going on? Er so far we have already uh (.) er (.) selected some people? To come and put in place the programmes for everything. So it will happen. I think that if this happens? Because it will be a combination of accreditation of the French university in Noumea and the university of the Pacific so maybe they will make it good uh (.) more relevant for ni-Vans.

F: M-m. So that yes will maybe make a big change. To opportunities.

DBE: Yes. But us in French it is also good for better tha- (.) it is improving in the sense that Vanuatu? It has asked for a er dispensation uh? a dispensation from the French government. For it to use DAEU?

F: M-m.

DBE: In the school system. Which the French system doesn’t have. That means that we use this now.

F: Okay.

DBE: So we don’t have the baccalaureate? But as its replacement we have this.

F: Okay.
DBE: We have this. And it’s not just for school children? It is for people that work like us too. So that’s the way that er an agent for the universities of (xx) is there to deliver distance modules through this. So I think this will help. I think it’s very recent. That’s why I say that for French speakers it is improving. Because there is this access now.

F: But in Year 11 12 13 14 now what curriculum are they following. Is there a curriculum for DAEU or not. It’s just an exam.

DBE: <laughs> Er the DAEU programme is just in Year 14.

F: Okay.

DBE: Year 14 I think. Yes. Um 14 and 13 I don’t know. But that is a problem for the Ministry of Education. Because the English schools? They follow the er SPBEA programmes.

F: M-m.

DBE: French schools don’t have this. They don’t have any programme.

F: Uh? They don’t (.) like Melsisi doesn’t do the same thing as=

DBE:=No it doesn’t.

F: Uh okay.

DBE: There’s no. Programme that they (.) there is nothing in the sense of a programme that they all follow? It is developed by the main schools? Then they follow it. There is no real organised program.

F: Okay.

DBE: Not by the Ministry.

F: Even Year 11 Year 12.

DBE: No.

F: So when they finish Year 10 they just=

DBE: =It just finishes at Year 10.

F: So now they just consider (.) but who sets the exam for Year 12. Where does the exam come from?

DBE: The schools just do it.

F: Just individual schools?

DBE: Some coordinate. But they mainly base it on the programmes that the schools have done.

F: Okay. But it is just an internal national exam?
DBE: An internal national one.

F: It's not something that New Caledonia recognises.

DBE: No.

F: Okay.

DBE: So in order to go out? That's why we do the DAEU.

F: Okay so Year 12 at Melsisi sit the same exam as the students in Year 12 at Montmartre.

DBE: Yeah.

F: But it is an it is just a national one.

DBE: Yeah.

F: It has no meaning outside. Okay. And then Year 13? Is it the same?

DBE: Year 13? Er Montmartre is slightly different. Montmartre is trying to introduce the baccalaureate over there.

F: Okay.

DBE: I think for some years now. But there they are in Year 13 and then they must do Year 14 there.

F: Okay. But Lycée? Collège de Santo? Do they sit the same thing or=

DBE: They sit the DAEU exam.

F: Just DAEU.

DBE: M-m.

F: Okay. But Melsisi I think goes up to Year (.) Rensarie and the others just Year 12 uh?

DBE: Yeah. I think they are just Year 12.

F: There are just three schools in the country.

DBE: So Mi- (. ) the Ministry has many ideas? But like we are slow to work on them uh? There is one idea to translate the SPBEA programmes?

F: SPBEA.

DBE: So the French schools also (. ) do them. Uh it depends on which Minister comes in. As (.) there could be a minister who comes in and says no we will put (. ) bring back the baccalaureate?

F: M-m.
DBE: But uh in my opinion whatever way we do it? It’s good for us to start with revising the curricula.

F: M-m.

DBE: From uh the real problem with French is that (. ) when the children reach the end of the system. To go to a tertiary institution there is a big gap. That’s why there has to be a Year 14. In place. So we need to revise the curriculum so (. ) to make it so that we close this gap to make (. ) so that’s why we are working on this.

F: But the new national curriculum statement won’t (. ) I think that it is already going up to Year 13?

DBE: I think that is for the whole system yeah. It will finish at Year 13. Because uh it is not very fair that one (. ) one medium goes up to Year 13 while the other medium goes up to Year 14. We must be the same. In both streams. So I think that (. ) we are trying uh some good moves. Um of course our situation in Vanuatu? Like when you compare us with other countries in the world? We are a bit unique. In terms of language uh. We have so many languages for (. ) a small density of people uh?

When you compare us with um Papua New Guinea? Okay their population is big okay. But we are small. I think that we are unique. So if we want uh (. ) we want to come up with an education language policy? It has to be um (. ) what (. ) how (. ) how I say that. It has to be er (4) from the Vanuatu context.

F: M-m.

DBE: But it’s not for us to adopt another system because that won’t work. Our situation (. ) is unique.

F: But is unique good or bad.

DBE: I think it’s good.

F: <laughs> Unique is a word that is unique good or?

DBE: Yeah. So I’m following that sense now. Uh (. ) and we mustn’t rush to (. ) to just put in place an education language policy. We must take time to study it. So that what we do is for us is right for us. So we need to discuss it a lot? I think among the people of Vanuatu when we went to the consultations? This rivalry between the two languages from the past is no longer there. It’s not there. French English now. They go for both. But how we go for it? That is something. We need some linguists too because here? We have no linguists. We have at USP. But in Education itself we don’t.

F: Uh. But do you think that these language decisions are stopping the other things that the government wants to do. Like you want every child to go to school up to Year 8. Or you want the cost of education to come down. There are many things that are priorities in the road map or (. ) but is language making them more difficult?
DBE: No I don’t think so. I don’t think so. I think we are mis-er (1) from my point of view that is a misinterpretation. Uh (3) learning? Or knowledge? Can be given in any language. Uh? Language is not a barrier. For example. As we are revising the curriculum? For me you don’t have to wait for the education language policy. To review the curriculum. You just review. When it becomes clear? Then we can teach the curriculum in any language. Be we need that curriculum. But we mustn’t make the education language an obstacle. When we want to improve the quality of teaching in the classroom? It’s not the language. It’s all about the training of the teachers. The quality of the books we use.

F: M-m.

DBE: But language comes in. The language policy will come? It will improve. The quality. That is here. As we do it. Uh no. I tell you what? Yes. If the policy (.) when the education language policy comes it will help the quality. Because there are many questions coming that ask how the education language policy will (.) will (.) have an impact on quality? Like for me it won’t. For me it won’t because quality is a different thing. Rather than quality. When we are talking about quality we are talking about training teachers and how they teach.

F: But doesn’t it make it harder for teacher training materials? When you must do one side in French and the other side in English? Or do you think it’s just the same.

DBE: No when we talk about having a (.) common material? I think that on this? I don’t think the education language policy poses (.) any threat or any obstacle to this.

F: Okay.

DBE: Without language policy you can make quality. Education language policy comes to help us with quality. But if we didn’t have it? There would still be quality.

F: But the cost of education?

DBE: The cost of education? Of course if this education language policy is implemented it will reduce it.

F: M-m?

DBE: Instead of having two schools? We should have one. Instead of having two teachers? We should have one. Somehow we should make a strategy for this (.) for our resources. But in the way that we have a strategy already but it is for (.) them now it is for the leaders to decide. Because er (.) there are two. Uh? There are two ways. Education can be achieved in either language. So in the way we have either we do it in English? Then we pick up French? Or we do it in French? Then we pick up English. But of these two ways? The finding in Vanuatu we have discovered that when you go to French? And then you go to English it is easier than if you start in English and then you go to French. That is due to the environment we have.

F: M-m.
DBE: So (.) but on the other hand? When you start in French and go to English? I think it will be quite hard in terms of resources. Like teachers and because the majority of schools and teachers are English. But for the other option? We have the resources. So these options have gone to (.) the bosses already for them to decide. If they want further explanation or information I can give it to them but.

F: Okay? We will just wait and see.

DBE: Yes.

F: Okay I think I won’t take up any more of your time and sorry it was a bit last minute to come and see you.

DBE: No?

F: No it’s good to discuss this. It is good to hear these thoughts.

DBE: Yes I think one (.) one of the difficulties we have I’ve told you already. Uh (.) like uh mastering these two languages? Especially for the teachers because we are losing them. So you need maybe some training or something at that level for them to learn it more? And another thing I think that (. ) I have found that in Vanuatu? We don’t have much vocabulary. When we speak our vocabulary is limited. It’s just almost uh just the same and it becomes common. And that is something that we need to improve here. M-m. Otherwise? That’s it I think that our problem is at that level. If teachers master the language. Then they can teach in it. But if the teachers don’t master the language? We shouldn’t be surprised that the results are not good.

F: A challenge.

DBE: Yeah. A challenge yes.

F: Okay thank you very much once again for your time. Let’s finish here.
Appendix XX – Interview with the Director of Educational Services (DES)  
(Original)

Date: 27-10-11

Location: Ministry of Education

Notes: I had previously made several unsuccessful attempts to arrange this interview. However, as I left the interview with the Director of Basic Education, I was told that this director was now waiting and would see me immediately. He had been shown a copy of my letter and said that he would make time for me even though he was very busy.

F: Fes pat blong mi long saed blong lanwis hem i Inglis mo French. Tufala er principal language. So:: long saed blong yu yu luk se naoia? Level blong tufala lanwis long skul/s hem i olsem wanem. We ol tija i stap yusum insaed long klasrum hem [i gud]

DES:[hem i] decline plante.

F: Uh-uh?

DES: Hem i decline plante from (.) i gat wan niu tingting blong ol tija se oli yusum Bislama and bae i raise/em understanding blong (.). ol styuden/s long eni topic. But look at examination results it’s (.) so wanem mi stap challenge/em ol tija/s long hem se (.) what you are trying to tell me is that (.) maybe twenty or thirty years ago we i gat stringent rul/s se i mas yusum either English or French long skul (.) Uh:: understanding long taem ia competency long taem ia i lo but it’s having adverse effects on (.) uh (.) using the language increases competency of the students to understand.

F: M-m.

DES: What they read anywhere outside the school inside the school anywhere. So (.). let’s face it. Even when you (.). can of tin fis o wanem yu pem long stoa it’s in English. You have to understand. So hemia nao mi (.). the part where teachers need to understand. You need to get the student beyond

F: M-m.

DES: Language beyond the need to understand (.). what they read.

F: M-m. So yu luk se standard blong tufala lanwis i go daon? [Inglis mo] Franis tugeta

DES: [I go daon] i go daon.
F: Okei.

DES: Hemia nao EGRA i show/em(.) EGRA oli mekem long Yia 1 Yia 2 Yia 3(.) VANSTA oli do/im long Yia 4 Yia 6? Iven Yia 8 examination results yu luk the students are failing.

F: M-m. So failure ia yu putum long lanwis ia nao.

DES: Well lanwis i plem wan critical pat long one's learning. Yu save andastanem wanem yu rid? Then knowledge ia yu save apply/em.

F: So yu luk se(.) yu tokbaot praemeri mo secondary sem mak. O kasem Yia 8. Be yu luk se long secondary?

DES: Hem i sem mak.

F: Sem mak.

DES: So:: foundation hem i long praemeri i bildim up so that is why mi talem long skul/s you need to have stringent(.) rules(.) on the use of language. Inside the classroom. And outside the classroom. Yumi mas gobak long konstityusen.

F: M-m.

DES: Konstityusen hem i talem very clearly. Language of instruction in schools shall be(.) English in English-speaking schools. French in French schools. But(.) i gat(.) tufala ofisol languages of instruction in schools.

F: So yu luk se standard blong ol tija/s i go daon.

DES: Yes.


DES: [Yes. (1) Yes. (2)] Ol tija/s. Mi mi wan skultija bifo. And then I became(.) principal. And evri taem mi go bak long experience blong mi. Mi mi wan school administrator bifo. Mi gat very strong rules. And then mi lukluk bak long experience blong mi. Because I was never a very good student in language.

F: M-m?

DES: So mi yusum ol experience blong mi(.) And then mi putum ol stringent rul/s. Nao(.) French tija blong mi long that taem? The French teacher in the school I was head of long that time? The moment hem i wokbaot i go insaed long klasrum? Hem i toktok French. Hem i luk students outside andanit long walnuts wea? I mekem announcements long dining hall. In French. I encourage/im. I kam bak long being the model. Leader. A good example. Leader. Yes. So:: i mekem se(.) students(.) became fluent in French. In an Anglophone school. In the school. Even today.

F: Hemia long wanem skul?
DES: Onesua.


DES: Mi save nemem ol styuden nao (.) mi ting sam blong olgeta oli kam blong polish/im (.) er French blong olgeta long Alliance Française be (.) they were communicating between themselves (.) outside the classroom (.) in French.

F: Okei.

DES: Nao. Mi sidaon insaed long ofis. And my heart was you know overjoyed because I was hearing students. Conversing in French. Outside the classroom. Because environment i provide/em hemia.

F: M-m.

DES: Narafala samting we enter/em students in the Commonwealth essay competition?

F: Yep.

DES: Be mifala i encourage/im olgeta se:: sapos yu competent long lanwis. Inglis bae i openem up fulap do long yu. Opportunity. Aot saed long skul.

F: Okay so ol rul ia. Yu talem se yu encourage/im French long Onesua? Mais English too.

DES: English too.

F: Be afta yu:: ol narawan olsem ol vernacular o Bislama (.) yu::

DES: Mifala i gat rul se long weekends. Skul hem i provide/em for between Monday and Friday. English and French.

F: Iven aot saed long classroom.

DES: Iven aot saed long classroom.

F: Okei.

DES: Long weekends yu mas yusum vernacular blong yu blong (.) we provided opportunities for students to er gather together gather either in island groups or provincial groups? Where they are able to use er. Afta? Mifala i gat ol opportunities we ol students are able to showcase their traditional (.) kakae. Kalja (.) so i gat ol traditional events inside the school programme we i provide/em ol styuden/s wetem ol opportunity blong (.) And of course taem ol peren/s oli kam visitim ol styuden/s o (.) guardians. Yes oli mas yusum lanwis.

F: M-m. Be Bislama?

DES: Bislama is a national language. Er (.) mifala i talem long olgeta i se luk. As a national language i gat hemia we yu save yusum. Be be informed that there are some structural ways that (.) contribute to failure and incompetence.
F: So for example long Monday. Wan styuden i yusum Bislama? Bae hem i panis?

DES: Yes. Bae mifala i panisim hem.

F: Okei.

DES: Yes and mifala i traem mekem se okei (.) Bifo. Taem ol tija i faenem ol styuden i harem ol styuden i toktok Bislama? Oli sanem hem i katem gras. Be mifala i traem mekem se (.) se i gat wan positive er (.) er long use of language. Mifala i talem long hem se mebi tija i talem blong mekem wan risej long saed blong lanwis. Why nao yu) no mas toktok Bislama. So that hem i kam wetem wan assignment.

Wan pepa.

F: M-m. Be. So sapos hem i yusum vernacular long Monday bae i sem samting o::

DES: Sem samting.

F: So Monday to Friday. Bae yu panis for Bislama or vernacular (.) be long wiken Bislama vernacular Inglis French.

DES: Yes.

F: Eniwan i gohed. Be Bislama i oraet long wiken?

DES: Hem i oraet yes.

F: Okei.

DES: From hem i wan jioj institution i gat ol local pasta/s tu oli kam long (.) so mifala i talem long olgeta i stap long yu. Whether yu conduct/em service long Inglis (.) sam blong yu long French? Eh sore long Bislama. Hem i streit.

F: M-m. Okei (.) M-m. <laughs> Mi ting se yu ansarem fulap kwestin blong mi finis we oli stap long list. So:: long saed blong (.) ating yu start off yu tokbaot hao ol standard i go daon long Inglis mo French. I gat eni strategy naoia long (.) olem Ministry i come up wetem ol strategy [blong address/em hemia?]

DES: [Yes (2)] Folem (.) VANSTA (. ) Yu save VANSTA?

F: M-m.

DES: Vanuatu standardised test of achievement ia. Ale. Ol risal blong hem wetem EGRA ia plus ol narafala examination risal i kam ia? Hem i hem i wan indication we (. ) yumi mas putum sam measures in place. Lanwis polisi hem i wan we mifala i traem aot issue ia. Not as a national level be (.) long skul level.

F: M-m.

DES: I gat ol letter instruction we oli go aot long ol skul/s blong talem se ( ) hem i nao wanem konstityusen i talem. Hem i wanem we Ministry polisi level blong Ministry of Education i talem long taem i kam. Schools are expected to ensure the language of instruction is uh promoted in schools. Bislama? Hem i wan nasonal
lanwis (...) be yusum aot saed long skul taem yu go hom. Be long wokplies? Bae yu
mas andastanem ol literature. Hemia ia long polisi level be mi traem advocate/em.
Uh:: nasonal lanwis polisi? I gat sam activity long hem wetem proposal we tim oli
bin wok long hemia. It will be expensive. It will be unachievable. I gat fulap
difficulties long hem. Technical difficulties. Mifala i bin askem Richard blong (.)
me kem wan proposal. Wan proposal. Ating hemia nao i luk se bambae yumi
adoptem so (.) as director mi putum hold long hem from hem i wan activity anda
long division blong mi.

DES: Mi putum hold long hem. Awaiting the new DG taem hem i kam. Hem i kam
finis mi talem long hem activity is on hold awaiting your decision. Hem i no me kem
eni decision. Need to preview fully. So briefing ia i no mifala nomo long decision but
ol donor partners too oli need to have their say.

DES: Yu luk proposal long hem?=
F: =Mi luk proposal we hem i mi no save se i sem wan hem i email/em wan i kam
[long (.) January ating]
DES: [hemia nao (.) yes.]
F: We hem i talem se yumi maintain/em tufala system wantaem.

DES: Yu luk proposal long hem?=
F: =Mi luk proposal we hem i mi no save se i sem wan hem i email/em wan i kam
[long (.) January ating]
DES: [hemia nao (.) yes.]
F: We hem i talem se yumi maintain/em tufala system be yumi mas enforce/em (.)
third language. Hem i no osem

DES: Exactly as mi givim long tim taem oli kam ia. Yumi no er (.) reinvent the wheel.
Because that will have (.) effect on the finances and manpower and ol. Be yu luk
long system we i stap naoia and then luk hao nao yu save strengthen/em.

DES: Every literature will change sapos yu jenisim lanwis polisi ia. Yu luk se i stap
naoia? Yu strengthen/em. Mi advaesem olgeta long beginning. Be taem oli wokem
go go::? Final decision this is not what we (.) anticipated and (.) the advice that was
given was (.) not this.

F: So narawan we Gervais i putum (.) blong combine/em tufala tugeta (.) hemia i on
hold nomo.
DES: On hold.

F: M-m. Be yu yu tokbaot finances be: ating wan poen we Salabert i putum se (. ) at least (. ) olsem yu implement/em finis? Bae hem i mo:: olsem bae hem i cheaper long long-term. Blong olsem i gat wan system nomo yu luk se hem i expensive blong maintain/em tufala system o no hem i jes=

DES: =Hem i expensive long wei we okei long tufala samting. For example sapos we:: first three years (. ) everything hem i in French. Long short term hem i (. ) the number of teachers. And then (. ) you have to pay the severance because sam long olgeta bae oli mas go for training (. ) blong trenem olgeta blong kam Francophone.

F: I-m.

DES: Hemia i wan. Curriculum cost so (. ) taem yu put the cost together in short-term (. ) it is more than the (. ) recurring budget so taem yumi lukluk long hemia? It's impossible. So who has the money to be able to do this.

F: M-m.

DES: So hem i (1) hemia nao. Namba tu oli kam bak oli talem se twelve tija/s bae oli go long training. They came up with a budget (. ) budget se (. ) is this realistic? This is not on. This is a rural place. Uh and I cannot buy this. You take this product to me and I cannot buy it because (. ) it's impossible. Only for twelve teachers?

F: M-m.

DES: So:: yu luk long cost benefit analysis blong hem? The whole proposal hem i (. ) well in the end mi go talem long olgeta se hem i waste of time. It's a waste of time.

F: M-m.

DES: Uh (. ) and then (. ) that French i neva accept/em Anglophone long Vanuatu. And they maintain/em after thirty years. Ale yu wantem (. ) go bak (. ) long maintain/em status quo (. ) I mean at this time ni-Vanuatu will tell this is what we want. (1) Bae oli no accept/em.

F: Okei. So bae yumi stik wetem tufala system? Be yu luk se olsem long ideal situation (. ) i gat tu system o:: olsem long ideal situation bae i gat wan=

DES: =Bae i gat wan system. Review? I mean (. ) from wanem yu mekem? Oli mekem long VITE. And I'm passionate about it from mi mi jeaman blong VITE kaonsel long taem ia.

F: Okei.

DES: Mi talem se naoia forget about Anglophone Francophone. Think about the students. Put the students who you are talking about (. ) the students in the classroom the focus (. ) yu nomo talem se maintain/em Anglophone Francophone be putum hemia? Yu putum wan system we bae i produce/im wan same ideal student (. ) how to get there you talk about language. (1) So i gat ol common program. How you teach mathematics will never be the same (. ) taem yu tijim long French. Be yu
arrive long sem ansa (.), yes it is the same. Yumi putum wan roadmap in ples (.), how to get there is (.) yu save go long Vila by plane by truck by wanem (.) but eventually you get to the destination. Yu luk hemia and hemia (.) let’s put our cards on the table. Uh huia? TA ia Michel. Michel i kam (.) Richard i kam i wok wetem olgeta. Be they realise (.) what will happen. And then. Even now. Yu traem implement/em that curriculum. (1) So (.) harmonising everything.

DES: Putum sem stuff. How yu tijim it’s the teaching approach yu go tijim wanem long aelan long Inglis yu save tijim long Bislama (.) be still you will get there in the end.

F: M-m. Okei so lanwis nomo we hem i defren. So bae i gohed wetem wan system?

DES: =Yes.

F: So sapos yu stap long Onesua bae yu tijim Inglis. Sapos yu stap long Lycée bae yu yusum French. Be otherwise hem i sem mak nomo.

DES: Even Ministri i talem se i had blong harmonise/em. Blong gat wan curriculum (.) ah blong primary mo junior secondary. Mi talem long olgeta se wanem yufala i stap talem. (1) Mi go faenemaoat long (.) mi wan inspector (.) mi bin go long Tanna? Mi kambak mi talem long olgeta se yufala i mas andastan se samteng i stap hapen long olgeta long sam oli samwea. Uh for example mi faenemaoat? Taem mi go assess/em wan Francophone sec- junior secondary school. They were teaching Physics (.) and Biology I think? In Year 7 to 10. And Social Science they were teaching Geography and er (.) World History in Year 7 to 10. Mi askem what are you doing this for. It’s from VITE. Be er VITE is not the curriculum unit. From curriculum unit (.) hem i kamaot wetem curriculum syllabus (.) objectives. From those objectives the examination unit hem i produce/im ol prescriptions. Ol chief examiners oli yusum ol chie- ol er wanem ia ol prescriptions blong raetem ol assessments. If you are teaching something outside the examination (.) students will automatically fail. So Francophones are becoming the victim and then mi talem long daerekta long taem ia. No wonder the students from Lycée the cutting off point blong ol Anglophone long Social Science hem i top mark blong ol Francophone students. So what are you trying to (.) olgeta? They have been tight-lipped about this oli no wantem admit/em wanem we oli stap mekem. Mi talem long hem se this is ethically immoral. Wrong. I have assumption oli want to maintain French culture or whatever (.) wan Francophone inspector long taem ia i talem long mi se they raised this in one of our meetings. Look at the job market. Can you tell me. How many Francophone doctors are there in Vila Central Hospital.

DES: Or lawyers. How many? You are killing them off in that er (.) foundation. Only one or two and look at the Anglophones. Every year fifteen maybe fifteen to twenty degrees (.) annually (.) and how many Francophones? Maybe in four years five (.)
as compared to fifty or sixty in four or five years. So this is a dilemma. This is the situation we need to address.

F: Okay so you putum se (.) olesem defrens ia i kambak long curriculum nomo. Sapos ol=

DES: =Curriculum nomo.

F: Sapos ol Francophone oli folem strel curriculum blong Vanuatu bae i=

DES: =Yes.

F: Bae oli save achieve/im ol degree.

DES: Yes common sense bae i talem long yumi se if a student achieve/im let’s say A in Geography and (.) wan A long Malapoa College or Onesua yu save se tufala ia the same weighting (.) same weighting. So tu (.) tufala tu i sem mak be i no olsem.

F: Be iven sapos i gat tu we oli karem A. Narawan hem i Francophone narawan hem i Anglophone. Bae oli gat sem janis blong go long overseas? Olsem i gat New Caledonia wetem?

DES: Naoia?

F: M-m.

DES: No. (3) No. That is why they (.) olgeta oli talem finis se no:: bae yumi gat Yia 14 long ples ia. Why give them an extra year. Because the student is not competent enough. Why are the students not competent enough. Because you are giving them (.) wrong curriculum blong be able to reach that same standard olgeta evriwan.

F: Be iven sapos oli kasem sem curriculum nomo. Evri yia oli kasem Yia 13? Tufala tugeta i sem mak bae yu stil gat sem opportunity?

DES: Hemia naoa drim blong mi.

F: M-m.

DES: That is what we are doing now. Be taem oli go long New Caledonia nao oli go long New Caledonia they have to do one or two extra years before oli go long yunivesiti. (2) So it’s like three years (.) after Year 13 (.) bifo yu go yu gat janis blong go long yunivesiti. It’s a waste of time. Waste of investment. Hemia nao mi stap luk ia. Be sapos yumi putum evri bodi long same playing field? The same route same standard. And then after Year 13? Oli go long yunivesiti? Mi talem olesem. Mi mi andastanem how the French education system works. (3) Be how to get there and how to follow it? Hem i sem mak nomo. Yu do/im wan examination? Yu save go long Inglis. (1) If you have the marks? Yu save go.


DES: New Caledonia ia. So taem yu yu statem (.) hem i wan (.) wan European system we yu (.) blong go long wan yunivesiti long Frans o wea? This is how you do it. Yu kamdaon. So hem i legislated by the French parliament. Canada naola
hem i luk se no. We cannot continue to do this so noia Canada hem i jenism (.)
hem i offer/em wan international baccalaureate. Olgeta i sem mak long olsem wan-
F: =Be long Vanuatu oli no yusum IB? International baccalaureate?
(2)
DES: Long niufala program ia naoia? Hem i (. ) suggest/em bac ia. Nao mi talem
long olgeta se (. ) concept blong international baccalaureate hem i no wan kos. It is
an examination. So long any Anglophone or Francophone school? Your top five or
ten students yu sit/im olgeta long international baccalaureate. If they pass? They
can go anywhere. You can teach the national curriculum too. So mi talem long
olgeta se (2) for example. Wanem ia? Commonwealth essay competition? Um (3)
Westpac mathematic competition? Hem i wan sort of examination we hem i gat
international standard. So sapos wan styuden we hem i kasem distinction long that
examination. I min se hem i sem styuden long Ostrelia New Zealand long UK o wea
hem i kasem. Tuvalu styuden ia i stap long sem level. Mifala i andastanem se yes.
So that's the same. So mi askem ol donor. Is it true o no. Oli se yes. So fulap uh (3)
skul/s long Ostrelia and I believe in UK. They present their top students to do this
international baccalaureate. And then it is like a (. ) acceleration to international (2)
institutions. Yes. Hemia proposal we i stap naoia. Be mi harem long dis wik? Sam
tija/s long Lycée? Oli kam luk minista blong talem se no. We'll do the French
Baccalaureate. This is (. ) I told them this is aot saed wanem nao yumi traem blong
putum in place.
F: Hemia wetem syllabus blong hem tu i no eksam nomo? (2) So iven (. ) curriculum
statement i kamaot be. No.
DES: No.
F: Oli talem=
DES: =Se. This is wrong. Curriculum statement we i kamaot i talem se evri skul ia
hemia. So why do you want to do this. Even you allow it to enter the minster's table.
And even the minister to entertain it. (3) Olsem if the minister is here I will go to him
I'll say minister? You (. ) you are wrong? And you must retract any statement that
you have given your approval to this. Because. Vanuatu hem i endorse/em national
curriculum statement.
F: Be hemia i no Lycée nomo? Hem i evri=
DES: =Oli wantem pilot/em. But I say I don't want you pilot it. No what is a pilot. (2)
So any school can come out and say okay we have this road map on. We have the
national curriculum statement but we'll pilot this. What are you telling the Vanuatu
population? (3) Long Christianity (. ) there's only one road to heaven. But what you
are preaching in the pulpit is to go to heaven you can go this way. (3) Um mi mi
talem olsem ia long wan miting. This is exactly what we're doing.
(2)
F: Okei. So harmonisation i no really <laughs> (. ) i no ready yet.
DES: No olsem we have to be (.) we have to have a DG. He has to be firm to say (.)
you have to defend what your directors are doing. (2) But if you are going to do that
I'll go look for a job because my job now is not enjoyable. I'll go and look for another
job anywhere. This is exactly what you are telling the Vanuatu (.) population. (2)
You should not entertain anything (2) but to come back to the languages where (.)
<both laugh> yes.

F: Okei. Long (.) no be long saed blooming um (.) olsem yumi tok plante long saed
blong Inglis insaed long skul. French insaed long skul. Sapos yumi kamaot long
olsem i no long skul naoria. Be sapos wan individual hem i gat Inglis mo Franis? Bae
hem i ademap samting long laef blong hem?

DES: Yes.

DES: Very much. Mi mi wan strong advocate blong bilingualism. And hem i mi
always talem bambae mi always talem se look at (.) look at yourself. The (.)
Japanese volunteers. The Peace Corps volunteers. Oli kam? One week to two
weeks? Er (2) wanem ia? Um (2) wan lanwis training? Wan wika? Oli save toktok.
Competent after one week. Yumi putum tru styuden long ol Anglophone skul/s four
years. And at the end of that four year they cannot even utter a sentence in French.
That's a total failure. (3) So schools must realise this. So long sam presentations
long provincial education and education authority meetings yu - (.) mi mekem hemia.
If your schools fail to ensure that your students are competent. Competent i min se
oli save raet. Oli save toktok. And converse interchangeably long tufala lanwis ia?
Anywhere. We fail. We fail. Four years. As a human being when you have the
capacity to be able to comprehend? We fail even in four years.

F: M-m. Be from wanem yu talem se bilingualism hem i gud. (1) Olsem

(2)

DES: Fulap reasons. Wan blong yumi long job market (.) able blong converse raet
(.) andastan for example. Er hemia <points to letter on desk> hem i wan leta we i
kam long French. Lelebet French blong mi i save rid i andastanem. Hemia wan.
Namba tu? From i mekem choice. I openem up market. Both. (2) And long tu taosen
no long naentin naenti sikis I went to New Caledonia. Short (.) short stay. It struck
me. After four years of learning French and then two years or three years at
Malapoa College? Lost investment. I could not converse in French with the taxi
driver I was using. So he hate me. So it is an opportunity for us to encourage young
people. (2) Taem we yumi talem long ol styuden-s se long yu fail. I kam so naoria yu
wantem yumi (.) yumi kam wan stick man long maen blong yumi (.) you cannot
progress. But as a human being? You can do anything. You can do anything so
learning another language. Look at yourself. You are in your village. Yu save
converse wetem narafala lanwis blong narafala (.) those of your family links. It tells
you that you have the capacity to be able to learn French in four years. Be naoria
yumi tekem i kam long Via 4 long most Anglophone praemeri skul/s? (2) We have to
make it as a public policy. Yumi mas er discourage/im this ideology? That
Francophone Anglophone that's why tok- long fulap toktok blong mi bae yu harem
se Anglophone and Francophone are a system of the past. Naoia yu mas appreciate/em that tufala lanwis ia are means to new knowledge. So sapos yu save communicate in tufala lanwis ia bae i help plante. New Calédonie is just next door. You go there you converse. Yu save apply long wan skolasip to do (.) bae i openem up opportunity. So that is why i openem up discussion. Mi glad se Vanuatu gavman i tekem up wetem Chinese. Blong fund/em the Francophone university. So in our original meetings I say USP you are a mature organisation. Why haven't you provided the opportunity for Francophone. So yumi statem wetem uh (.) examinations. Examinations in French. (2) The number is small for SPBEA. Maybe our numbers are small but we are part of your family so you have to cater for us. So (.) that's (.) but my dream is that every ni-Vanuatu student who goes to secondary school should be bilingual. No question about it. Because the advantage outweighs the disadvantage.

F: M-m. Be yu luk se sapos oli stap long Vanuatu nomo. Which lanwis hem i mo useful. Hem i Inglis o French naoia.

DES: Inglis. (1) Be bambae i gud mo sapos oli toktok tufala evriwan.

F: Okei.

DES: From sista blong mi hem i skul French. Be fulap taem bae hem i toktok long mi (.) sam taem hem i yusum Inglis. Waef blong mi i wok daon ia. Be fulap blong ol (.) i no fulap be samfala ofisa blong hem we oli skul French oli go tru long VIT? Yu kam long olgeta i se yufala i transletem. And they do it poorly. Mi go long Malapoa long taem ia one of the topics of our French lesson is translation. We did translation. We translate English to French. And French to English. But taem mi luk (.) no. These people write very poor French. And they would (.) and samtaem bae yu talem long ol se wan French man i kam long New Caledonia for investment. Be oli no gat confidence ia blong go toktok wetem hem.

F: Be yu save eni Anglophone we hem i really competent long French?

DES: Yes.

F: I gat fulap eksampol blong ol Francophone we yumi stap tokbaot evri taem.

DES: Yes.

F: Be i gat sam Anglophone we oli?


F: Okei.

DES: Yes. Hemia hem i (.) and then ol ex styuden/s blong mi ia (.) we had one lady from Canada who was teaching French (.) and then these people oli naoia oli stap long wokples olbaot ia? Ah they speak fluently. Wan kasen sista blong mi we mi bin
tijim hem bifo. Hem i wok longwe long (xx). Las taem mi harem hem i stap converse in French. Mi talem se (.) I'm glad that you know. I was inserting this way to you people. It is a good example.

F: M-m. (2) Okei ating las pat nomo hem i vernacular insaed long skul. Yumi tokbaot Inglis French plante.

DES: Yes.

F: Be mi no save current situation long saed blong vernacular long praemer o=

DES: =Yes. Hem i wan samting we Ministry of Education hem i mas advocate/em planten wetem ol komyuniti. Oli mas tekem ownership blong hem. It has to start from the home. Parents must converse with their children in the local vernacular. And then ol pikinini oli go be. Increasingly. Yu go to every home and I mean (.) mifala? Mifala i smol. We come from the Shepherds. Ol smol aelan. In Port Vila alone even if the mother and father come from the same island. Yu harem each other conversing. And sometimes long komyuniti miting blong mifala yu harem ol man Makira oli stap toktok Bislama. Eh. Sense of ownership. I stat long famle and then i kam long skul. And long evri tour we mi mekem i go long skul/s mi encourage/im. Peren/s. Must converse plante in Bislama. No sore long=

F: =Lanwis.

DES: Local vernacular. Yu tokbaot ol kastom stori/s. Olsem mi taem mi smol i stap papa blong mi i stap tokbaot ol kastom stori/s. Nao? Wanem i hapen? Mi no ting se yufala i tokbaot kastom stori/s. Long ol pikinini. So (3) long. I stap long base o jenis we i stap hapen. Yumi mas raetem ol kastom stori/s. Long lanwis and then (.) so SIL hem i stap mekem wan gudfala wok. Hem i stap wok wetem ol komyuniti/s. Be hemia nao. Mi talem long olgeta se you have to take it to the next level we (.) skul/s oli mas yusum local vernacular providing opportunities for children to learn their kastom.

F: Be hemia=

DES: =Hemia i stap long national curriculum statement.


DES: Olsem risej hem i show/em olsem uh? Se pikinini hem i save gud lanwis blong hem? Hem i save lan better long. (1) So hemia hem i wanem we risej i talem be blong yu putum (.) practically hem i wan narafla samting. Yu mas enforce/em yu mas encourage/im. So that is why er skul rul/s oli mas plan/em that there is a session in the recent program we pikinini i mas gat opportunity to converse in the er?

(2)

F: Okei. Be naoria yu luk se fulap skul oli no mekem yet. Olsem oli=

DES: =No.
F: Oli stap trial/em be=

DES: =Hem i wan denja. Wan denja. And I was on Lamen Bay early this year mi
talem wanem. Mi luk tri pikanini oli stap swim long solwota oli stap toktok Bislama. Mi
go klosap long olgeta. Ol pikanini. Yufala i kam long wanem aelan. Lamen Aelan.
Papa mo mama blong wea? Lamen Aelan. Afta yu jes stap toktok Bislama? Mi
wantem harem yufala i toktok lanwis. Ale. And they were you know. Really hesitant.
So that is a big gap. A big drop long hemia. Yumi lus plante. And then they call a
meeting. Community. With all the chiefs. So I was there and so on. So the first thing
I told them is this is what is the situation. Parents go back to the village. In your
homes. Make sure you. I will be back again I will check because I will go to every
home. As fulap blong yufala i save mi. Go to your home. I have done that because
down the line you will be answerable to this.

<DES's phone rings and he answers it and speaks for 25 seconds before hanging
up>

F: No sore bae mi nomo disturb/em yu from yu save mi jes jam insaed long las minit
nomo so.

DES: No sapos yu gat eni mo?

F: No mi ting hemia nomo mi luk se yumi kavremap fulap samting.

DES: From bae hem i ring bak long haf pas leven.

F: No i stret i stret.
Notes: I had previously made several unsuccessful attempts to arrange this interview. However, as I left the interview with the Director of Basic Education, I was told that this director was now waiting and would see me immediately. He had been shown a copy of my letter and said that he would make time for me even though he was very busy.

F: My first interest about language is about English and French. The two er principal languages. So:: for you do you think that now? What is the level like in the two languages in schools? When teachers use them in the classrooms is [it good]

DES: [it’s] declined a lot.

F: Uh-uh?

DES: It has declined a lot because (.) there is a new idea amongst teachers that they use Bislama and that will raise the understanding of (.) students in any topic. But look at examination results it’s (.) so I’m challenging teachers on this saying (.) what you are trying to tell me is that (.) maybe twenty or thirty years ago when there were stringent rules that we must use either English or French at school (.) Uh:: understanding at that time competency at that time was low but it’s having adverse effects on (.) uh (.) using the language increases competency of the students to understand.

F: M-m.

DES: What they read anywhere outside the school inside the school anywhere. So (.) let’s face it. Even when you (.) a can of tinned fish or whatever you buy at the store it’s in English. You have to understand. So that’s it for me (.) the part where teachers need to understand. You need to get the student beyond

F: M-m.

DES: Language beyond the need to understand (.) what they read. F: M-m. So you think the standard of the two languages has gone down? [English and] French together

DES: [It’s gone down] it’s gone down.
F: Okay.

DES: That’s what EGRA showed. EGRA have done it in Year 1 Year 2 Year 3. VANSTA they do it in Year 4 Year 6? Even the Year 8 examination results you see the students are failing.

F: M-m. So this failure you attribute it to language.

DES: Well language plays a critical part in one’s learning. If you can understand what you read? Then you can apply this knowledge.

F: So do you think you’re talking about primary and secondary the same. Or up to Year 8. But what do you think about secondary?

DES: It’s the same.

F: The same.

DES: So:: its foundation in primary builds up so that is why I say that in schools you need to have stringent rules on the use of language. Inside the classroom. And outside the classroom. We must go back to the constitution.

F: M-m.

DES: The constitution says very clearly. The language of instruction in schools shall be English in English-speaking schools. French in French schools. But there are two official languages of instruction in schools.

F: So you think that the standard of the teachers has gone down.

DES: Yes.

F: And that the standard of learning too has gone down. So do you think that the teachers are struggling to speak English and French? Or [is it the children] only.

DES: [Yes.1] Yes. [2] The teachers. I was a school teacher before. And then I became principal. And every time I go back to my experience. I was a school administrator before. I had very strong rules. And then I would think back to my experience. Because I was never a very good student in language.

F: M-m?

DES: So I used my experience. And then I put in place stringent rules. Now my French teacher at the time? The French teacher in the school I was head of at that time? The moment he walked into the classroom? He spoke French. If he saw students outside under the walnut trees or wherever? He made announcements in the dining hall. In French. He encouraged them. It comes back to being the model. Leader. A good example. Leader. Yes. So:: it meant that students became fluent in French. In an Anglophone school. In the school. Even today.

F: Which school was that?
DES: Onesua.
F: That was Onesua. Okay.

DES: I can name those students (.) I think some of them they have been to polish (.)
their er French at Alliance Française but (.) they were communicating between
themselves (.) outside the classroom (.) in French.
F: Okay.

DES: Now. I would sit in my office. And my heart was you know overjoyed because I
was hearing students. Conversing in French. Outside the classroom. Because the
environment provided that.
F: M-m.
DES: Another thing we entered students in the Commonwealth essay competition?
F: Yep.
DES: But we encouraged them tha::t if you are competent in l
language. English will
open up many doors for you. Opportunity. Outside school.
F: Okay so these rules. You say that you encouraged French at Onesua? But
English too.
DES: English too.
F: But then you:: others such as the vernaculars or Bislama (.) you::
DES: We had the rule that at weekends. School provided for between Monday and
Friday. English and French.
F: Even outside the classroom.
DES: Even outside the classroom.
F: Okay.
DES: At weekends you must use your vernacular for (. ) we provided opportunities
for students to er gather together gather either in island groups or provincial
groups? Where they are able to use er. Then? We had opportunities where students
are able to showcase their traditional (. ) food. Culture (. ) so there were traditional
events inside the school programme that provided the students with the opportunity
to (. ) And of course when parents came to visit the students or (. ) guardians. Yes
they must use lanwis.
F: M-m. But Bislama?
DES: Bislama is a national language. Er (. ) we told them that look. As a national
language there is this that you can use. But be informed that there are some
structural ways that (. ) contribute to failure and incompetence.
F: So for example on a Monday. If a student used Bislama? Would he be punished?
DES: Yes. We would punish him.

F: Okay.

DES: Yes and we tried to make it so that okay (.) In the past. When teachers found students heard students speaking Bislama? They sent them to cut the grass. But we tried to do it so (.) that there was a positive er (.) er about the use of language. We told them that maybe teachers tell them to do some research about language. Why you shouldn’t speak Bislama. So that they had to bring an assignment. A paper.

F: M-m. But. So if they used the vernacular on Monday would it be the same thing o::r

DES: The same thing.

F: So Monday to Friday. You would be punished for Bislama or a vernacular (.) but at the weekend Bislama vernacular English French.

DES: Yes.

F: Any one can be used. But was Bislama alright at the weekend?

DES: It was alright yes.

F: Okay.

DES: Because it is a church institution local pastors would also come (.) so we told them that it is up to you. Whether you conduct the service in English (.) some of you in French? Eh sorry in Bislama. It’s no problem.

F: M-m. Okay (.) M-m. <laughs> I think you have answered lots of my questions already that are on my list. So:: concerning (.) you started off talking about how the standard had gone down in English and French. Are there any strategies at the moment at (.) like has the Ministry come up with any strategies [to address this?]?

DES: [Yes (2) ]

F: M-m.

DES: Vanuatu standardised test of achievement. That’s it. The results from that and EGRA plus the other examination results that have come out? That is that is an indication that (.) we must put some measures in place. Language policy is something that we are trying out this issue. Not as a national level but (.) at school level.

F: M-m.

DES: There are letters of instruction that go out to schools saying that (.) this is what the constitution says. This is what the Ministry the policy level of the Ministry of Education has said for a long time. Schools are expected to ensure the language of instruction is uh promoted in schools. Bislama? It is a national language (.) but use it outside of school when you go home. But in the work place? You must understand
literature. That is at the policy level but I try to advocate. Uh:: the national language policy? There is some activity on this with the proposal that the team have been working on. It will be expensive. It will be unachievable. There are lots of difficulties with it. Technical difficulties. We have asked Richard to make a proposal. A proposal. I think that one it looks like we will adopt it so as director I have put it on hold because it is an activity under my division.

DES: I put it on hold. Awaiting the new DG to come. Now that he’s here I’ve told him that the activity is on hold awaiting your decision. He hasn’t made any decision. Need to preview it fully. So on this briefing it’s not just us in the decision but donor partners too need to have their say.

DES: And then you read the document that they have produced and it’s against the guidance.

DES: You’ve seen his proposal?

F: I’ve seen a proposal that he emailed one to me [in January I think]

DES: [that’s it yes.]

DES: Which said that we will maintain two systems but we must enforce the third language. It’s not like

DES: Exactly as I said to the team when they came. We don’t er reinvent the wheel. Because that will have effect on the finances and manpower and things. But look at the system that we have now and then see how you can strengthen it.

DES: Because curriculum review is not a cheap exercise. And when you talk about language you talk about everything.

DES: Everything written will change if you change the language policy. You see what is here already? You strengthen it. I advised them at the beginning. But as they carried on and o::n? The final decision is not what we anticipated and the advice that was given was not this.

DES: On hold.
F: M-m. But you mention finances but I think one point that Salabert has made is that at least like once you've implemented it? It will be more like it will be cheaper in the long-term. To have just one system do you think that it's expensive to maintain two systems or no it's just=

DES: It is expensive in the way that okay in two things. For example if for the first three years everything is in French. In the short term it is the number of teachers. And then you have to pay the severance because some of them will have to go for training to train them to become Francophone.

F: M-m.

DES: That's one. Curriculum cost so when you put the cost together in short-term it is more than the the recurring budget so when look at it? It's impossible. So who has the money to be able to do this.

F: M-m.

DES: So that is so that's it. Secondly they've come back and said that twelve teachers will go for training. They came up with a budget a budget that is this realistic? This is not on. This is a rural place. Uh and I cannot buy this. You take this product to me and I cannot buy it because it's impossible. Only for twelve teachers?

F: M-m.

DES: So you look at the cost benefit analysis for it? The whole proposal is well in the end I went and told them it's waste of time. It's a waste of time.

F: M-m.

DES: Uh and then that the French have never accepted Anglophones in Vanuatu. And they maintain after thirty years. Okay if you want to go back to maintain the status quo I mean at this time ni-Vanuatu will say this is what we want. (1) They won't accept it.

F: Okay. So will we stick with two systems? But do you think that that is like an ideal situation having two systems or like in an ideal situation would there be one=

DES: There would be one system. Review? I mean why are you doing it? They have done it at VITE. And I'm passionate about it because I was the chairman of the VITE council at the time.

F: Okay.

DES: I told them to forget about Anglophone Francophone. Think about the students. Make the students who you are talking about the students in the classroom the focus stop talking about maintaining Anglophone Francophone but you do this? You have one system that will produce the same ideal student how to get there you talk about language. (1) So there are common programmes. How you teach mathematics will never be the same when you teach it in French. But you arrive at the same answer yes it is the same. We put one roadmap in place
how to get there is (.) you can go to Vila by plane by truck by whatever (.) but
eventually you get to the destination. Look at this and that (.) let's put our cards on
the table. Uh who? That TA Michel. Michel came (.) Richard came and worked with
them. But they realise (.) what will happen. And then. Even now. You try to
implement that curriculum. (1) So (. ) harmonising everything.

F: M-m.

DES: Put the same stuff. How you teach it it's the teaching approach you go teach
whatever on the island in English you can teach it in Bislama (.) but still you will get
there in the end.

F: M-m. Okay so it's just the language that is different. So will you go ahead with
one system? But in two languages=

DES: =Yes.

F: So if you are at Onesua you will teach in English. If you are at Lycée you will use
French. But otherwise it's just the same.

DES: Even the Ministry says it's hard to harmonise. To have one curriculum (. ) ah
for primary and junior secondary. I've told them that what you keep saying. (1) I've
found out from (. ) I was an inspector (. ) I went to Tanna? I came back and I told
them you must understand that something is happening to them somewhere. Uh for
example I discovered? When I went to assess a Francophone sec- junior secondary
school. They were teaching Physics (.) and Biology I think? In Year 7 to 10. And
Social Science they were teaching Geography and er (.) World History in Year 7 to
10. I asked what are you doing this for. It's from VITE. But er VITE is not the
curriculum unit. Because the curriculum unit (.) has come out with the curriculum
syllabus (.) objectives. From those objectives the examination unit has produced the
prescriptions. The chief examiners use the chie- the er what are those the
prescriptions to write the assessments. If you are teaching something outside the
examination (.) students will automatically fail. So Francophones are becoming the
victim and then I told the director at the time. No wonder the students from Lycée
the cut-off point for Anglophones in Social Science is the top mark of the
Francophone students. So what are you trying to (. ) them? They have been tight-
lipped about this they don't want to admit what they are doing. I told that this is
ethically immoral. Wrong. I have the assumption that they want to maintain French
culture or whatever (. ) a Francophone inspector at that time told me that they raised
this in one of our meetings. Look at the job market. Can you tell me. How many
Francophone doctors are there in Vila Central Hospital.

F: M-m.

DES: Or lawyers. How many? You are killing them off in that er (. ) foundation. Only
one or two and look at the Anglophones. Every year fifteen maybe fifteen to twenty
degrees (. ) annually (.) and how many Francophones? Maybe in four years five (. )
as compared to fifty or sixty in four or five years. So this is a dilemma. This is the
situation we need to address.
F: Okay so you think that (. ) like this difference comes back to the curriculum alone.

DES: =The curriculum alone.

F: If the Francophones follow the right curriculum for Vanuatu then they=

DES: =Yes.

F: They could achieve degrees.

DES: Yes common sense tells us that if a student achieves let’s say A in Geography and (. ) an A at Malapoa College or Onesua you know that those two have the same weighting (. ) same weighting. So the two (. ) both these two are the same but it’s not like that.

F: But even if there are two that get an A. One is Francophone the other is Anglophone. Will they have the same chance to go overseas? Like there is New Caledonia and?

DES: Now?

F: M-m.

DES: No. (3) No. That is why they (. ) they have already said no::we will have Year 14 here. Why give them an extra year. Because the student is not competent enough. Why are the students not competent enough. Because you are giving them (. ) the wrong curriculum to be able to reach that same standard as everyone else.

F: But even if they had the same curriculum. Every year up to Year 13? If the two were the same would you still have the same opportunity?

DES: That is my dream.

F: M-m.

DES: That is what we are doing now. But when they go to New Caledonia now when they go to New Caledonia they have to do one or two extra years before they go to university. (2) So it’s like three years (. ) after Year 13 (. ) before you have the chance to go to university. It’s a waste of time. Waste of investment. That’s what I see. But suppose we put everybody on the same playing field? The same route same standard. And then after Year 13? They went to university? I say it’s like this. I understand how the French education system works. (3) But how to get there and how to follow it? It’s just the same. You do an examination? You can go in English.

(1) If you have the marks? You can go.

F: But where can the Francophones go? To university. There is only New Caledonia.

DES: There’s New Caledonia. So when they started (. ) it was a (. ) a European system where you (. ) to go to a university in France or wherever? This is how you do it. It came down. So it was legislated by the French parliament. Canada then said
no. We cannot continue to do this so now Canada has changed (.) it offers an international baccalaureate. They have the same as an=
F: =But in Vanuatu they don’t use IB? International baccalaureate?
(2)
DES: In the new programme now? They have (.) suggested this bac. I have told them that (.) the concept of international baccalaureate is not a course. It is an examination. So in any Anglophone or Francophone school? Your top five or ten students you can enter them for the international baccalaureate. If they pass? They can go anywhere. You can teach the national curriculum too. So I’ve told them (2) for example. What’s that? Commonwealth essay competition? Um (3) Westpac mathematics competition? It is a sort of examination that has an international standard. So if a student achieves a distinction in that examination. It means that he is the same as a student in Australia New Zealand in the UK or wherever he goes. The two students are at the same level. We understand that yes. So that’s the same. So I’ve asked the donors. Is it true or not. They say yes. So many uh (3) schools in Australia and I believe in UK. They present their top students to do this international baccalaureate. And then it is like an (.) acceleration to international (2) institutions. Yes. That’s the proposal now. But I’ve heard this week? Some teachers at Lycée? They’ve come to see the minister to say no. We'll do the French Baccalaureate. This is (.) I told them this is outside what we are trying to put in place.
F: That’s with its syllabus too it’s not just an exam? (2) So even though (.) the curriculum statement has come out. No.
DES: No.
F: They say=
DES: =Say. This is wrong. The curriculum statement that has come out says that every school is like this. So why do you want to do this. Even you allow it to enter the minister’s table. And even the minister to entertain it. (3) Like if the minister was here I would go to him I’d say minister? You (.) you are wrong? And you must retract any statement that you have given your approval to this. Because. Vanuatu has endorsed the national curriculum statement.
F: But that’s not just Lycée? That’s every=
DES: =They want to pilot it. But I say I don’t want you pilot it. No what is a pilot. (2) So any school can come out and say okay we have this road map on. We have the national curriculum statement but we’ll pilot this. What are you telling the Vanuatu population? (3) In Christianity (.) there’s only one road to heaven. But what you are preaching in the pulpit is to go to heaven you can go this way. (3) Um I’ve said it like this in a meeting. This is exactly what we’re doing.
(2)
F: Okay. So harmonisation is not really <laughs> (.) it’s not ready yet.
DES: No like we have to be (. ) we have to have a DG. He has to be firm to say (. )
you have to defend what your directors are doing. (2) But if you are going to do that
I'll go look for a job because my job now is not enjoyable. I'll go and look for another
job anywhere. This is exactly what you are telling the Vanuatu (. ) population. (2)
You should not entertain anything (2) but to come back to the languages where (. )
<br both laugh> yes.

F: Okay. For (. ) no but in terms of um (. ) like we've talked a lot about English in
school. French in school. If we come out away from school now. Suppose an
individual has English and French? Will that add something in his life?

DES: Yes.

F: Will it help him having the two languages.

DES: Very much. I am a strong advocate of bilingualism. And it's I am always
saying I will always say look at (. ) look at yourself. Or the (. ) Japanese volunteers.
The Peace Corps volunteers. They come? One week to two weeks? Er (2) what's
that? Um (2) a language training? One week? They can speak. Competent after one
week. We put students through Anglophone schools for four years. And at the end
of that four years they cannot even utter a sentence in French. That's a total failure.
(3) So schools must realise this. So in some presentations at provincial education
and education authority meetings you- (. ) I say this. If your schools fail to ensure
that your students are competent. Competent means that they can write. They can
speak. And converse interchangeably in these two languages? Anywhere. We fail.
We fail. Four years. As a human being when you have the capacity to be able to
comprehend? We fail even in four years.

F: M-m. But why do you say that bilingualism is good. (1) Like

DES: Many reasons. Firstly for us the job market (. ) able to converse write (. )
understand for example. Er that <points to letter on desk> that's a letter that came in
French. With my small French I can read and understand. That's one. Secondly?
Because it gives a choice. It opens up the market. Both. (2) And in two thousand no
in nineteen ninety six I went to New Caledonia. Short (. ) short stay. It struck me.
After four years of learning French and then two years or three years at Malapoa
College? Lost investment. I could not converse in French with the taxi driver I was
using. So he hated me. So it is an opportunity for us to encourage young people. (2)
When we tell students that you fail. It's come so that now you want (. ) we become
stuck in our minds (. ) you cannot progress. But as a human being? You can do
anything. You can do anything so learning another language. Look at yourself. You
are in your village. You can converse in the language of others (. ) those of your
family links. It tells you that you have the capacity to be able to learn French in four
years. But now we have brought it to Year 4 in most Anglophone primary schools?
(2) We have to make it as a public policy. We must er discourage this ideology?
That Francophone Anglophone that's why spe- in much of what I say you will hear
that Anglophone and Francophone are a system of the past. Now you must
appreciate that these two languages are means to new knowledge. So if you can
communicate in these two languages it will help a lot. New Calédonie is just next
doors. You go there you converse. You can apply for a scholarship to do (.) it will
open up opportunity. So that is why it opens up discussion. I am glad that the
Vanuatu government has taken it up with the Chinese. To fund the Francophone
university. So in our original meetings I said USP you are a mature organisation.
Why haven't you provided the opportunity for Francophones. So we started with uh
( ) examinations. Examinations in French. (2) The number is small for SPBEA.
Maybe our numbers are small but we are part of your family so you have to cater for
us. So ( . ) that's ( . ) but my dream is that every ni-Vanuatu student who goes to
secondary school should be bilingual. No question about it. Because the advantage
outweighs the disadvantage.

F: M-m. But do you think that if they just stay in Vanuatu. Which language is more
useful. Is it English or French.

(1)

DES: English. (1) But it will be better if they speak both together.

F: Okay.

DES: Because my sister she schooled French. But much of the time she will speak
to me ( . ) sometimes she uses English. My wife works down there. But many of ( . )
VIT? You come to them and say you translate something. And they do it poorly. I
got to Malapoa and at the time one of the topics of our French lesson was
translation. We did translation. We translated English to French. And French to
English. But when I look ( . ) no. These people write very poor French. And they will
( . ) and sometimes you will tell them that a French man has come from New
Caledonia for investment. But they don't have the confidence to go and speak to
him.

F: But do you know any Anglophones who are really competent in French?

DES: Yes.

F: There many examples of Francophones who we always talk about.

DES: Yes.

F: But are there some Anglophones who?

DES: Yes. One of my cousin brothers. Actually he's my step brother. If he speaks
French to you you would think he had schooled French. And he speaks English.
And he ( ) has English friends you know. Because he was a student at Malapoa
College.

F: Okay.

DES: Yes. That's ( . ) and the my ex-students ( . ) we had a lady from Canada who
was teaching French ( . ) and then these people they are now working all around? Ah
they speak fluently. One of my cousin sisters who I taught before. She works over
there at (xx). Last time I heard her conversing in French. I said (,) I’m glad that you know. I was inserting this way to you people. It is a good example.

F: M-m. (2) Okay I think the last part is about the vernacular in school. We have talked a lot about English and French.

DES: Yes.

F: But I don’t know the current situation regarding the vernaculars in primary or=

DES: =Yes. That is something that the Ministry of Education must advocate a lot with the communities. They must take ownership of it. It has to start from the home. Parents must converse with their children in the local vernacular. And then the children will go but. Increasingly. You go to every home and I mean (,) us? We are small. We come from the Shepherds. These small islands. In Port Vila alone even if the mother and father come from the same island. You hear them conversing. And sometimes in our community meetings you hear people from Makira speaking Bislama. Eh. Sense of ownership. It starts in the family and then it comes to school. And on every tour I make to schools I encourage it. Parents. Must converse a lot in Bislama. No sorry in=

F: =Lanwis.

DES: Local vernacular. You tell kastom stories. Like when I was small my papa would tell kastom stories. Now? What has happened? I don’t think that you tell kastom stories. To the children. So (3) in. It’s at the base of the change that is happening. We must write kastom stories. In lanwis and then (,) so SIL is doing good work. It is working with the communities. But that’s it. I’ve told them that you have to take it to the next level where (,) schools must use the local vernacular providing opportunities for children to learn their kastom.

F: But this=

DES: =This is in the national curriculum statement.

F: But does this have something to with education too? Like is it beneficial in terms of learning too? Or just in terms of maintaining kastom.

DES: Like research has shown that uh? That a child who knows his language well? Can learnt better in it. (1) So that is what research has said but to put this in place (.,) practically is something else. You must enforce it you must encourage it. So that is why er school rules must plan that there is a session in the recent programme that children must have the opportunity to converse in the er?

(2)

F: Okay. But now it seems that many schools aren’t doing this yet. Like they=

DES: =No.

F: They are trialling it but=
DES: =It is a danger. A danger. And I was on Lamen Bay early this year I tell you. I saw three children swimming in the sea they were speaking Bislama. I went up to them. Children. Which island are you from. Lamen Island. Where are you papa and mama from? Lamen Island. But you speak Bislama? I want to hear you speak lanwis. Go on. And they were you know. Really hesitant. So that is a big gap. A big drop in this. We are losing a lot. And then they called a meeting. Community. With all the chiefs. So I was there and so on. So the first thing I told them is this is what is the situation. Parents go back to the village. In your homes. Make sure you. I will be back again I will check because I will go to every home. As many of you know me. Go to your home. I have done that because down the line you will be answerable to this.

<DES’s phone rings and he answers it and speaks for 25 seconds before hanging up>

F: No sorry I won’t disturb you further because you know I just jumped in at the last minute so.

DES: No there is anything else?

F: No I think that’s it I think we’ve covered many things.

DES: Because he will ring back at half past eleven.

F: No it's fine it’s fine.
Appendix XXI – Interview with the former Minister of Education (FME)
(Original)

Date: 16-11-11

Location: Nakamal at the former minister’s house

Notes: FME was Minister of Education for much of the time when I did the first period of fieldwork at the start of the year (although in and out with all the changes). However, by the time of the interview, he was no longer in office (and was in the opposition).

The interview was arranged through a family member of my contact. He was happy to meet me and I was told to go to his house to find him. My contact had explained a bit about my research and that I was a former teacher on Ambae. He read through my letter on arrival. We sat at one of the tables at the nakamal. A large church project was being constructed right next to the nakamal. A large church project was being constructed right next to the nakamal, so there was a lot of building noise throughout the interview.

F: So fas intres blong mi hem i long saed blong tufala lanwis ia we yumi stap yusum
olsem principal language. So Inglis wetem French.

FME: Yes.

F: So long tingting blong yu naoia yu luk se (. ) standard insaed long ol skul/s hem i
naf blong edyukesen. O yu luk se (. ) long saed blong tufala lanwis ia Inglis French?
Standard hem i olsem wanem naoia.

FME: Hem i no naf. (2) Hem i no naf mo long (. ) bifo las yia mi ting i gat tu yunivesiti
Besançon wetem Oxford University long (. ) England. Tufala i bin undertake/em wan
survey blong evaluate/em ol tija/s we oli (. ) hao oli yusum. Oli yusum?
Understanding? Wetem (. ) wanem mo er French mo Inglis. Risal we yumi (. ) hem i
kamaot hem i (. ) too average.

F: M-m.

FME: Very few nomo oli go below (. ) average. And very few we oli go below
average hem i from peren/s blong olgeta oli exp- expatriate o oli blong defren
kaontri bifo mo oli kam live long Vanuatu.

F: So hemia long saed blong ol tija/s.

FME: Hemia long saed blong ol tija/s.

F: Okei.

F: M-m.


F: So i gat sam training nao we hem i in place olsem we i kamaot long ol risal blong las yia?


F: So yu luk se naoia i gat ol problem long saed blong ol styuden. Olsem long saed blong learning blong olgeta? We hem i kamaot long lanwis problem o?

FME: Well mi mi ting se (.) mi still biliv se lanwis hem i vehicle blong save hem i vehicle blong technology so hem i mas (.) er ol tija/s oli mas maitrise gud from i gat fulap tija we <his mobile rings> oli continue blong tok long Bislama nomo. Oli sud yusum French. Whether yu stap yet or yu stap aot saed long klasrum yu sud (.) oli sud (xx) <mobile still ringing, loudly now. He looks at it while talking but doesn’t answer>. Olgeta (.) er (.) olgeta styuden. Most of the time ol tija/s oli (.) miting blong olgeta oli yusum Bislama.

F: M-m.

FME: Hemia miting blong olgeta tija/s iven long ol kaonsel bod oli yusum Bislama.

F: Yu luk se hem i sem mak long tufala saed. Anglophone Francophone?

FME: Both sides oli sem mak.

F: I no gat eni defrens naoia long skul olsem lanwis hem i French lanwis hem i Inglis be otherwise i sem mak nomo.

FME: Yeah most long ol administration blong olgeta oli yusum Bislama so (.) and mi ting se hem i no stat from naiia. Hem i stat from long very beginning finis. Hao yu
So you wish to attend long klasrum instaed long klasrum bae o yusum French nomo o Inglis nomo?

FME: Um.

F: Yu ting se i nagot ples blong vernacular o Bislama insaed.

FME: I gat ples blong vernacular o Bislama long samtaem but mi ting se taem yu stap long klasrum bae yu save se language of instruction hem i tufala ia nomo. But most of the taem ol tija/s oli yusum Bislama iven long samfala klasrum oli yusum Bislama. Taem yumi go long ol teknikol skul bae hem i more worse. Oli toktok Bislama nao.

F: M-m.

FME: So hao nao yu assist/em wan styuden we i go long wan VIT skul blong sapos hem i wantem go mo antap blong i go long yunivesiti. Bae hem i mas lanem lanwis blong i go longwe. Either French or English hem i mas lanem. Sapos yu wantem continue.

F: Be aot saed klas tu? Yu luk se i gud se oli (.) from yu save samfala skul oli putum=

FME: =Aot saed klas insaed long boundary blong skul?

F: M-m.

FME: It's a bit. During free time Satede o wanem hemia? Ol man oli save yusum lanwis o Bislama. During klas mi ting se oli sud yusum. Well tija/s i must lead by example. Most of time ol pikinini ol styuden/s oli folen wanem we tija/s blong olgeta i mekem. So sapos tija i smok o wanem bae olgeta tu i luk se (.) be hemia tu. Blong institution i improve/um standard blong lanwis er (.) i stap long han blong ol tija nao. From taem i gobak long hom i gat fulap peren/s we oli no iven go long skul. Oli no save French mo Inglis mo oli no save rid mo raet so. Mo oli no save tu wanem we ol sabjek. Plante peren/s oli trastem ol tija nomo se pikinini blong olgeta i save skul taem yu putum hem i go long klasrum.

F: Be what about=

FME: =Samtaem oli trastem blindly nomo ol tija/s.

F: Uh-uh.

FME: From oli no save rid. Oli no save ridim mak/s blong oli (.) trust ia nao. I stap long taem (.) ol peren/s oli save biliv long olgeta tija nao.

F: Be long saed blong nara (.) olsam. Sapos yu stap long Francophone? Ale Inglis nao i sud go insaed tu o yu luk se i gud se oli focus long French nomo.
FME: Wanem we hem i stap naoia praktis we oli mekem long se- taem oli enter/em um secondary skul oli introduce/um Inglis. Inglis i kam compulsory. Evri Francophone skul. And mi luk se i gat improvement mo might hem i easier. Long ol Francophone i lanem Inglis. Naoia ol test blong yunivesiti we oli stap pasem long USP. Olsem test blong Inglis LLP13 mo LLF11? MoUU114 ol Francophone oli pasem sem test ia wetem (.) i sem mak wetem ol Anglophone.

F: Be yu luk se ol Anglophone oli no kasem French.

FME: Mi no save talem from mi no wan tija. Mi neva assess/em. Be i gat samfala we oli mekem gud. Hem i dipen long wea ples pikinini i kam long hem. Sapos pikinini i kamaot long wan (.) peren/s we hem i wan Francophone hem i nomol se hem i save um better French taem hem i stap long wan Francophone skul.

F: Be taem yumi stap insaed long ol skul/s yu luk olsem yu talem se i gud se ol tija/s oli (.) i no enforce/em o oli practise/m language of instruction evri taem. Be long sem taem tu yu luk se i gud se oli promote/em tufala tugeta? O oli mas focus long wan we oli yusum insaed long klasrum.

FME: Well ating especially ol Francophones i gud blong oli yusum French. Long Inglis skul oli yusum Inglis. Blong kam wan (.) perfect bilingual i no gat er (.) hemia hem i wan talent we i no evri man i save (.) i save mekem blong i kam wan perfect bilingual. we i save tok raet and er (.) long Inglis mo French. Hemia i nomol bae i no evriwan but as long as yu gat wan better understanding. Se samtaem hem i wok mo tu from kaontri we hem i talem se hem i bilingual kaontri. Taem ol foreigner oli kam long ples ia oli. Samtaem oli kwestin se i supposed to be wan bilingual kaontri. Be i no this. From taem yu go long ol hotels for example turis for example long New Caledonia taem oli go? Be oli mas mekem best blong olgeta blong toktok Inglis.

F: M-m.

FME: Inglis hem i dominant. Long ples ia.

F: M-m. Be yu luk se hem i jenis. Over the years? Since Indipendens or no.

FME: Well i gat fulap we oli tok French tu be taem oli stap long wok? Taem oli tok Inglis yu harem olsem wan Anglophone so. Be hem i talent blong wan man. Yumi no save fosem man se i tok long wanem lanwis. Olsem kaontri i wantem se i olsem (.) iven gavman. Mo long level blong politikol will i wantem se kaontri i continue blong stap olsem wan bilingual kaontri.

F: Be hemia wanem main reason biaen long hemia? Olsem blong yumi continue tufala saed tugeta.


F: I min se yumi jes continue nomo from (.) be i no gat wan (.) mi no save purpose blong hem o wan benefit [blong hem naoia.]

F: M-m. Be hemia olsem long saed blong histri nomo. Olsem sapos yumi go forward be somehow yumi manage blong leko Inglis o yumi leko French? Bae kaontri bae i oraet yet?


F: Be hemia nao mi minim se from wanem yumi nidim tufala tugeta. Olsem Solomon i gat Inglis nomo o New Caledonia i gat French nomo. Blong olsem vehicle blong technology.

FME: No New Caledonia hem i no gat Inglis nomo. Hem i gat Inglis and French <his mobile rings again> long New Caledonia. Hem i sem mak long Vanuatu. Inglis hem i compulsory long secondary skul/s.

F: Be Solomon o PNG?


F: M-m. Be long saed blong olsem economic development? Or technology? Yu luk se yumi Vanuatu=

FME: =Economic development yumi nid blong holom taet tufala lanwis from taem yu tekem long regionally nomo? Long region blong Pasifik New Caledonia hem i wan territory we hem i economically hem i strong. Tahiti (.) we i stap. (1) Mi luk se hem i impoten blong maintain/em. Even though economically (.) in terms of trade in terms of exchange hem i impoten blong maintain/em tufala lanwis.

F: So yu luk se yumi gat advantage bitim say PNG Solomon we oli gat wan lanwis nomo. Wan international language.

FME: Ating se hem i wan asset blong (.) um yu gat wan sitisen o wan person we hem i save yusum both lanwis? Taem yu mekem comparaison wetem sam kaontri we oli olsem Vanuatu. Olsem uh Mauritius o Canada o ol international organisation. Vanuatu i no kasem level yet we ol kaontri oli stap long hem but hem i save go from
hemia sapos asset ia i stap. Hem i quality blong wan man i save yusum lanwis
monitor/em tu lanwis. Two international language.

F: M-m. So long saed blong wanwan man. Olsem yu talem finis se hem i wan talent.
Yu no save fos se evri man i bilingual. Be yu luk se sapos wan man i kasem tufala
tugeta hem i gat advantage long=

FME: =Well wis blong gavman hem i blong traem blong mekem se at least ol man
we oli wok long public administration for example o oli wok long ol ofis we hem i for
example tourism o wanam. Oli must be bilingual. I no nid blong gat wan translator
blong (.) translate wan. Yu yusum wan man blong wan wok nomo. I no nid blong
yusum tumas translesen. But hem i wan system we hem i expensive. Olsem even
though tudei yumi faenemaot se ol man we oli bilingual hemia ol Francophone
nomo.

F: M-m.

FME: =That yumi no save introduce/um se er language of instruction yumi stat long
French afa yumi jes (.) we wanem? Ol Franc-. Taem yu go fosem long ol pipol
wanem blong mekem? Be from ol Francophone oli minority. Ol Anglophone oli
majority. So taem yu putum olgeta oli no agri. Samfala oli agri? Samfala oli no agri.

F: So yu yu bin sapotem polisi ia blong evriwan i Francophone fastaem? Ale jenis i
go=

FME: =No mi no sap-. Mi bin lukaotem mi bin askem taem mi stap minista. Mi bin
askem wan expatriate we i bin kam.

F: Hemia Gervais?

FME: Gervais. Yes. Hem i bin mekem ol proposal. But Gervais taem oli go long fil?
Reaction blong ol pipol hem i totally different. Samfala tu oli wantem se yu tijim ol
man long lanwis blong olgeta? Unfortunately i no gat technology we mifala i save
tijim long lanwis. I gat most long ol technology i stap kam wetem lanwis blong
olgeta. I no better yet blong yu yusum lanwis blong olgeta blong yusum ol wod/s
exact wod we oli yusum long wan (.) wan technology we oli yusum. Oli mekem.

F: Be naoia? Status blong lanwis polisi ia hem i olsem wanem. Bae oli stat bakegen.

FME: Mi mi no save. Mi no gat any information any more. I bin progress gud. I gat
sam proposal? We oli bin kam. Se yumi save stat long dialect long ol kindergarten.
Blong mekem se long narasaed tu yumi no minim se yumi mas promotem tufala
lanwis ia long disadvantage blong (.) ol dialects? We hem i really identity blong (.)
uh ol sitisen blong Vanuatu. That’s why mifala i (.) proposal we hem i stap se yumi
stat long dialect blong ol kindergarten. Bifo yumi introduce/um uh French? Samfala
oli propose/em se Inglis yumi statem introduce/um Inglis long Klas 4? Then slowly i
go antap i gat ol sabjek we oli save tijim i go taem i go kasem Yia 10? Pikinini i save
choose? Whether i wantem continue long (.) wan sabjek we hem i choose/um long
Inglis o long French. Yes. Be i mekem se evriwan i gat at least basic uh (.) lanwis
long beginning. Taem i go choose antap se bae i folem uh French o bae i folem long
Inglis be hem i daon bae hem i save (. ) yumi gat sam basic uh (. ) knowledge finis long.

F: M-m.

FME: Wan long tufala lanwis.

F: So i min se evri pikininu bae i skul long sem system nomo. Bae yumi no gat (. ) yumi nomo gat tufala.

FME: Long proposal we i stap olsem se (. ) evriwan oli go? But bae hem i mi kwestin lelebet. Wanem personal tingting blong mi we mi bin stap se yumi sud mekem wan trial fastaem. Mekem sam pilot schools. Traem introduce/um Inglis long Yia 4 long olsem Anglophone oli introduce/um French long Yia 4 finis. O iven French long Lycée Francais oli introduce/um Inglis. Inglis bae oli save kasem isi nomo. Long level blong ol Francophone mi no ting uh Anglophone? Mi no ting se lanwis French hem i wan lanwis we hem i complicated lelebet from. Hem i very precise. (2) So proposal we hem i stap ia from wis we gavman i wantem gat ol bilingual. Yeah.

F: So mi luk se tu= FME: =Be system we Francophone oli tekem i kam iven fulap tudei oli stap long yunivesiti long ol Anglophone yunivesiti. Fulap oli stap long USP. Fulap er very fiu oli go long Fiji long. (1) Oli bin Francophone be oli decide afta oli pasem ol Inglis ol assessment ia oli decide blong go tekem (. ) um stadi/s blong olgeta long wan Anglophone yunivesiti.

F: So from wanem nao yu luk se ol Francophone oli save successful long system blong ol ale switch i go long Inglis.

FME: Ating i easier blong yu go long French then yu jes lanem Inglis. Be blong yu olsem wan Anglophone i jes lanem Franis hem i difficult lelebet. Mi talem lanwis? French lanwis hem i (. ) well yu save finis. Hem i wan lanwis we hem i difficult lelebet. I no olsem i difficult be i complicate. From oli yusum ol wod we oli really precise.

F: M-m. Be yu luk se Inglis hem i isi bitim French?

FME: Well Inglis hem i (. ) hem i international language. Whatever iven fulap oli no go long skul oli tok Inglis so oli lanem long rod oli lanem wea long vilej. Oli lanem long ples blong wok. Oli lanem long ples we oli live long hem. So Inglis hem i wan lanwis we hem i international.

F: So i min se naoia olsem long Vanuatu yu luk se Inglis (. ) yu talem finis Inglis hem i dominate lelebet.

FME: Yeah Inglis i= F: =So i min se i isi blong ol Francophone oli save pikimap Inglis from i gat exposure long hemia o=
FME: Yes. Yu tekem in terms of music in terms of wanem? Fulap samting i stap long Inglis. Ol Francophone oli save pikimap isi.

F: Be sapos i min se evri pikinini i skul French fas wan? Bae hem i sem mak?

FME: Proposal.

F: O yu luk se Inglis bae i godaon.

FME: Bae Inglis bae i neva godaon. Inglis bae i still remain. Iven long fulap ples we oli no promotem tumas Inglis be it's still alive. Tekem for example long Vietnam. Ol lanwis blong hem hem i wan ples we oli toktok plan- olsem oli bin yusum French tu. Be taem yu go long Vietnam oli tok more Inglis than French. So Inglis bae i still dominant long (. ) long evri ples. Long region blong Pasifik ating Vanuatu nomo hem i wan (. ) hem i wan independen kaontri we hem i er i gat double lanwis?

F: M- m.

FME: Otherwise long New Caledonia taem yu go long ol hotel even though oli tok French be oli tok Inglis evriwan.

F: M- m. So sapos evriwan i skul French long ples ia? Actually bae oli kasem Inglis wantaem.


F: M- m. (2) Okei.

FME: Mi mi skul long New Caledonia so=

F: =Uh okei?

FME: Hem i compulsory. Inglis hem i compulsory.

F: Yu yu bin skul secondary? O?

FME: Long secondary.


FME: And iven long olgeta teknikol skul? Inglis is still. Olsem wan sabjek.

F: Okei.

FME: Mi bin mekem accounting so Inglis hem i still wan sabjek we oli tijim.

F: Okei. So yes. Yu no save comment naoia long saed blong () current polisi we i stap naoia. Mi mi traem faenemaot be=
FME: Long polisi mi no save stretnem we i hapen. But wanem we hem i stap?

F: Be long saed blong equality long tufala stream ia. Yu luk se i gat problem yet long saed blong imbalance long (.) Anglophone Francophone.


F: Be taem i olsem se (.) taem yu insaed long tufala system finis? Nomata se choice blong yu o somehow wan nara reason bae yu stap insaed be (.) yu harem se tufala saed i gat equal opportunity naoia? O=

FME: =Long saed blong?

F: Mi no save. Taem yu kamaot (.) either long progress insaed long skull. Olsem long en blong praemeri blong go long secondary? O afta long secondary blong kasem wan [wok o yun]ivesiti?

FME: [Hem i no] (1) Hem i no balance yet long ples ia olsem. I gat ol Anglophone oli gat more accessibility. (2) Ol Francophone no. But er from we hem i system we hem i bin stap. Bifo oli bin (.) long Anglophone oli folen wan regional program. PSSC. We i continue blong stap kusem tudei. We SPBEA i stap ranem ol. Yeah. But ol Francophone oli let aot blong (.) i nomo gat since we baccalaureate. French gavman hem i tekemaot from hem i wan French diplôme. Hem i tekemaot long naentin eiti seven.

F: Okei.

FME: Then uh gavman blong Vanuatu hem i mas mekem own wan blong hem and hemia i lay down long shoulder blong olgeta tija/s nomo. Whether oli qualify o i no qualify. Hemia ol efforts nomo olgeta oli mekem. Blong traem bildimap ol samteng i kam. And that’s why olsem (.) Anglophone oli (.) Yia 13 hem i foundation. Be in reality i no foundation tu. From we long samfala kaontri hem i foundation. We oli folen sem program. Be long ples ia? USP hem i no recogniset/em.

F: Yu minim Foundation Form 7? Or USP.

FME: Yeah.

F: Foundation. Form 7.
FME: Yeah. USP hem i no recognise/em wanem we SPBEA i mekem. So oli mas go mekem foundation bakegen long USP.

F: Be i no gat eni we oli direct entry afta long Form 7?

FME: Well taem oli aot long ples ia oli go long narafala kaontri? Olsem wan samting we mi no andastanem. For example Samoa? Taem oli finis oli go stre long yunivesiti to study. But er hem i sem program. Sem program. That’s why er <mobile rings again> hem i impoten blong mifala i mekem own curriculum long ples ia?

From samfala kaontri olsem Fiji hem i do away too long hemia. From we i faenem difficulty so i mas do/im away blong mekem se taem yu mekem Form 7? Be ol styuden oli go long yunivesiti stre. That’s why mifala i kam up long review. Hemia ol objective we oli stap anda long V.E.R.M? Access mo quality. We i minim (.) review/em curriculum <mobile rings again> mo improve/um er training blong olgeta tija/s tu tufala samting ia i mas go on. Namba tri ia nao hem i blong improve/um management blong edyukesen. I stat long Ministri management i go long olgeta skul/s. Ol (.) er principal mo er narafala wan.

F: M-m. Be i min se bae i go Yia 11 12 13 bae evriwan bae i folem nasonal curriculum. Taem olsem statement i kamaot.

FME: No yet. No yet from nasonal statement nomo i kamaot. Naoia i mas go long ol details nao blong raetem? And blong raetem? Mi bin askem taem mi mi stap se (.) er USP o er UNC long Caledonia oli kam follow up? Blong assess/em. I no mas mekem wan curriculum we yu ting se ol man Vanuatu nomo oli mekem. I no gat wan region i no gat wan yunivesiti wan kaontri i recognise/em from long ples ia i no gat. Yumi mas mekem sua se ol yunivesiti/s long region o iven below region er aot saed long region oli mas recognise/em curriculum. Hem i wan issue we hem i impoten blong lukluk wetem ol yunivesiti. But wetem gavman tu. Ol gavman ia oli own/em olgeta uh certification ol diplômes we hem i blong wanwan kaontri. Bae hem i kam blong gavman tu hem i blong hem i negotiate/em.

F: Be yu luk se bae i isi blong combine/em tufala stream long saed ia. Olsem mi harem smol se sam blong ol Francophone tija oli no agri se oli wantem lego i stap wetem wanem (.) DAEU? Olsem=

FME: =(EFM)?

F: Mi no save mi harem smol nomo se ol Francophone long saed blong senior secondary oli no wantem go long wan national curriculum. Oli wantem folem DAEU?

FME: No. DAEU hem i no wan diplôme blong Vanuatu. DAEU hem i wan French diplôme. We bae (.) ating Vanuatu nomo long ol narafala kaontri. DAEU hem i wan seken janis.

F: M-m.

FME: Taem we wan man (.) hem i wan diplôme we i wok long Franis nomo.

F: Okei.
FME: Hem i allow/em olgeta we oli neva mekem baccalaureate blong olgeta? Blong oli save go long yunivesiti. Hem i wan ki blong i gat access long wan yunivesiti.

F: Okei. So yu ting se bae i wok aot long saed blong senior. Bae nasonal (.) as long as ol yunivesiti oli putum input long hem.

FME: Hem i taem blong ol Anglophone mo ol Francophone oli sidaon tugeta. England wetem Franis tufala oli livim ol man ia oli stap. Kaontri ia i stap finis long han blong man Vanuatu. Mo evri taem mifala i stap talem wan pipol wan nation be i gat lanwis i gat religions we ol samting oli kam aot saed? Oli kam divide/em pipol blong Vanuatu be i minim se afta teti yia/s i taem blong sidaon tugeta. And lukluk wanem we yumi lidim. Yumi nid blong kaontri. Tufala lanwis hem i asset blong (. ) Vanuatu ia. Hem i wan impoten asset blong kam ( .) i gat lanwis olsem. Mi ting se man Vanuatu i mas save sidaon tugeta mo oli come up wetem wan yunivesitum we hem i save helpem both sides. Olsem mi talem. Lanwis nomo hem i defrens. I gat ol naraafa sabjek we i sem mak.

F: So taem yumi go long olsem sapos curriculum i go kasem Yia 13? Yumi unify/em evri samting?

FME: Yeah wis blong mi se Yia 13 mus t be foundation. Taem mi stap.

F: Okei.

FME: But olsem mi talem i no se yumi decide/em ol samting nomo. I mas gat ol assessment. All along. Blong luk wanem wea ples olsem system blong edyukesen. Iven hemia we i stap tudei i gud blong assess/em evri pikinini long Yia 2? Whether long ples ia oli reach/em finis. Wanem we oli sapos blong reach/em long Yia 2. Bifo yu muvum olgeta i go. From mo yu muvum olgeta i gat fulap peren/s we oli no ridim tumas ol mak? Oli no ridim mak long pikinini blong olgeta blong oli save assess/em se pikinini hem i gud o olsem wanem i gat problem? Oli trastem skul oli trastem ol tija/s. But most of time oli jes sek se pikinini i go kasem Yia 5 and oli no save rid mo raet. O oli go kasem Yia 10 be jes finis ia nao. Hem i wan long ol hop we mi stap filim long ol peren/s be ol peren/s oli wantem se pikinini blong olgeta hem i successful long samting ia. So i mas gat wan program blong assessment i stap long Yia 4? Yia 2 Yia 4. Wanem we pikinini i sud reach/em i mas reach/em.

F: M-m.

FME: And sem taem tu i mas gat assessment ia blong luk se hem i problem blong pikinini o problem blong ol tija. Sapos hem i problem blong ol tija then oli mas gobak long skul. Olsem blong improve/um hemia olsem taem mi talem curriculum? Hem i nid blong assess/em evri tija tu. Which wan nao oli nid blong gobak long training. And wanem training nao bae oli givim. I no gud se yu karem olgeta nomo i go putum be problem blong olgeta i no sem mak. Ating samfala ating skills o methodology blong ol tija i no gud. So even though yumi go graduate long yunivesiti. Yu karem masters o wanem. Hem i no minim se?

F: Yu save tij.

F: M-m.

FME: Ol (.) o iven at some time peren/s i long holiday o wanem hem i save seek/im advaes o sapos tija i tijim (,) wanem ia (,) helpem pikinini long hem. So (2) mi ting se hem i edyukesen hem i evriwan ia nao.


FME: =Yes. Tufala lanwis ia i stap insaed. Blong oli reinforce/em lanwis long wanem ia (,) tija/s (,) wanem ia? (2) Vanuatu Teachers College. V.T.

F: VITE.

FME: Teachers Education. So i mas improve/um lanwis long Vanuatu. Tija i must be capable too. I mas andastanem. Taem oli karem lanwis ia.

F: Hem i min se yumi sud kam kasem wan poen we curriculum i stap finis? Assessment structure i stap finis? Teacher training i stap finis? We =

FME: =I bin gat wan timetable be mi nomo save nao se oli folem timetable ia. From i gat big mane we i go long hem. Ol aid donor oli helpem mifala. From oli save se hem i wan i save be wan gud samting. VERM hem i mi ting se hem i wan long ol bes polisi. I bin attract/em fulap donor blong oli (,) mo hem i wan unique project we ol aid donor oli go wan? Oli mekem wan pool we oli putum mane blong olgeta i go insaed. Then gavman hem i (,) hem i manage. (2) Sem taem tu olsem long saed blong access blong edyukesen i sem mak oli putum mane blong olgeta i go tugeta.

F: M-m.

hem i maths and science and i sem mak long ol lanwis. Hemia oli mas go long (.) long wanem we hem i literacy. Mo wanem we hem i science. Hem i mas stap. Hem i very important. Hem i wan kaontre we hem i master/em tu long science. Yumi nidim. Yumi nidim. Kaontre i still nidim. Tudei kaontre tu hem i depend plante long (.) not only long kaontre. Hem i depend plante long ol advisors tu aot saed. Mo samtaem mi luk se no advaes ia i no stret be from we advaes we i kam oli tekem long ol context long wan kaontre we hem i more developed long Vanuatu finis. So hem i more developed (.) o wan industrialised kaontre. Taem oli kam long Vanuatu taem oli givim advaes ol man Vanuatu (.) sometimes yu no no hemia i no stret long Vanuatu we mifala i nidim. Hem i from (.) Vanuatu i stap long wan context we hem i defren. Hem i no wan aelan. Hem i ol aelan. Hem i wan archipelago. Hem i no (.) and the issue blong lanwis. Issue blong ol kalja/s we i thousand. Ol dialects we oli mo plante. So hemia (.) mifala i diversify be hem i complicated tu.

F: M-m. Be yu luk se i gat eni (.) olsem yumi tokbaot ol positive blong holem taet Inglis mo French. Be i gat eni negative long hem tu. Olsem long saed blong yu talem quality o access o. I gat eni negative blong (2) taem yumi holem taet tufala tugeta i mekem se bae i (.) olsem compromise long quality?

FME: Well bae wan (.) i no olsem i negative but hem i wan exercise we bae i expensive. But er (.) blong in fiuja minim se tufala lanwis hem i (.) hem i impoten.

F: Yu min expensive blong combine/em tufala system o?

FME: No sapos yu combine/em bae i no expensive from bae yumi yusum sem tija nomo.

F: Uh-uh. Be naoia system we i stap naoia.

FME: System we i stap.

F: Hem i expensive.

FME: Yu mas employ/em double teachers.

F: Be hemia (.) long saed blong mane nomo hemia only problem (.) o challenge o wanem. Long quality mo access.

FME: Long blong combine/em tufala i gat challenge tu. I gat (.) afta survey fulap oli no agri so. (2) Min se oli agri blong go wetem wan expensive system we i stap.

F: So yu luk se for the time being yumi lego tufala (.) tufala i stap nomo. Hem i only way olsem yumi lego i gat Anglophone long saed ia.

FME: No yumi no save lego tufala. From taem hem i wan kaontre nomo mi ting se yu mas continue blong openem/ap debate blong faenem solution.

F: No mi minim se lego olsem tufala system i stap.

FME: Well yeah yumi ron wetem till taem we (.) gavman i decide. But er gavman i no save decide hem wan. Consultation i mas continue. (2) Sapos pipol i talem se no mifala i nidim ol man we oli bilingual? Yu mas go long olgeta. Mas faenem wan wei.
(1) Be yumi no save impose/em nomo long ol pipol. Se hem i kam long wan taem we evri samting i mas gat consultation long hem. VERM we hem i stap i gat wide consultation long hem. I sem mak long curriculum. Mifala i mekem bigfala wide consultation long hem we ol man oli express/em olgeta. And that expression blong olgeta we hem i kam? Vanuatu i nomo save neglect/em hem.

F: M-m.


F: Be ol Francophone naia oli no gat equal opportunity long ol=

FME: =I no gat ol equal opportunity long wei (.) olsem ol opportunity blong olgeta hem i long (.) long Noumea nomo.

F: M-m.

FME: But hem i no long since we mi stap mi introduce/um. Las yia mi introduce/um long ol Angl- ol Francophone UU114 we ol Inglis klosap wan degree blong Inglis finis? So blong mekem se taem oli pasem olie gat access long ol nara blong yunivesiti. From sapos yu tokbaot wan man bilingual? Wan man i finisim uh (.) i kasem wanem ia foundation blong hem? I kasem DAEU i kasem wan baccalaureate. Mi ting se hem i wan gud Francophone finis? Whether i wantem go long wan yunivesiti mi mi ting se ol basic hem i reach/em finis i stap.

F: M-m. So sapos yumi putum system ia? Olsem sam hao yumi combine/em o promotem nara lanwis long hemia ol Francophone bae oli gat mo access long yunivesiti? Be ol Anglophone ating bae oli sem mak nomo. Bae oli neva go long New Caledonia blong=

FME: =I no minim se bae i neva. Mi mi ting wanwan taem we hem bae i go. We hem i wan Anglophone be i bin go long New Caledonia.

F: Be olgeta oli gat fulap opportunity finis.

FME: Yes.

F: Oli no really nid blong ademap New Caledonia. Ol Francophone nomo oli really nidim.

FME: Yes. I no only long level ia nomo be long level blong (.) from ol Francophone olsem. Failure blong olgeta tu i bigwan. Drop out i bigwan tumas. Hem i only taem long las yia we hem i klosap naenti (.) naenti samting pesen we ol (.) oli pasem eksam. Hem i fas taem long histri. But most of time long ol yia/s i kam be from we i no gat naf assistance blong olgeta. Encadrement we mi talem i no gat. Encadre ol pikinini kasem taem we oli pasem eksam/s blong olgeta. Hemia long las yia from i gat wan gud encadrement long taem ia from i gat samfala program we oli putum i
go blong encadrer olgeta blong mekem se oli pasem. But taem yu luk gud ating
might long ol Anglophone skul long Yia 13? Ating tu handred we oli (.) o tri fo
hamas? Faef handred we oli sit/im eksam/s? While long Francophone hem i smol
nomo. (1) Kasem naoia i gat wan skul nomo hem i (.) hem i gat Yia 14. Wan skul
nomo Lycée nomo.

F: Lycée nomo.
FME: Yes.

F: Long Collège de Santo no. Hem i Yia 13 nomo.
FME: Collège de Santo hem i Yia 13 nomo.
F: Okei.
FME: Be mi talem long ples ia drop out i bigwan olsem for example long Tanna yes
hem i Yia 13. Be taem blong eksam/s? Long Yia 12 i no gat wan pikinini i pas.
Evriwan oli (.) hemia very few we oli pas (.) fo? Be oli mas kam long ples ia.
F: Okei. So hemia olsem=
FME: =Hem i to do wetem wanem ia (.) access tu? Wanem ia (.) i no access. Uh (3)
oli mas winim (VHAT) nao.
F: M-m. so i min se long Francophone system actually i gat wan benchmark o
wanem we?
FME: I stap long wan benchmark.
F: Sapos yu no kasem bae yu aot nao.
FME: Yeah.
F: From mi luk se Anglophone hem i jes (.) supply and demand nomo. Olsem sapos
jea i stap ale yu save go.
FME: Yeah. Mi no save stret be long Francophone olsem yu (.) taem yu fail/em
eksam/s be yu fail/em nao.
F: Okei.
FME: Hem i no minim se:: yu expel? No i minim se sapos peren/s i save afford
blong pem blong pikinini i repeat/em then hem i save repeat.
F: M-m be yu mas kasem wan standard bifo yu save go long nekis level.
FME: Yeah. Yu mas kasem.
F: Okei. From mi luk se long Anglophone hem i olsem se yu laenem up ol pikinini
nomo. Yu tekem (.) i gat teti jea i stap? Ale teti we oli top/em? Ale yu go.

F: Okei.

FME: Bifo yu muvum pikinini. Mi prefer se pikinini i repeat/em wan klas than yu sanem hem nomo i go wetem evri problem we=

F: =Be i min se naiia long Yia 7? Ating bae oli gobak long system ia nao we bae yu mas kasem wan benchmark.

FME: Long Yia 7 we top-up i stap fastaem? Mi totally disagree wetem hem from we () i neva gat wan curriculum we i no gat ol tija/s we oli train from. Oli karem ol tija/s blong praemeri blong. (1) Hemia mi totally disagree.

F: M-m.

FME: Mi totally disagree. Taem mi stap olsem Minista mi wantem klosem hemia ol () senta skul. Mi ting se mi () hem i wan system we hem i deteriorate/m plante.

F: M-m. Yes i gat tumas problem long saed blong Yia 9 tu taem oli kam insaed be=

FME: Uh hemia.

F: Oli stat bakegen long Yia 7 nomo.

FME: Disaster. Hem i wan disaster.

F: Be naiia bae i gobak long Yia 7 bae oli go long secondary bakegen.


F: M-m.


F: Okei.
FME: From ol authority tu olsem Montmartre wetem Onesua olgeta tu oli ful. Hem i depend long ples we population hem i bigwan. Hem i long ples ia from i gat urban drift i kam long ples ia. Bakegen long ples ia i must be more. And oli save go nomo be yu save edyuksesen tu. Fulap technology i go insaed. So oli more advantage olgeta we oli gat access.

F: Long taon.


F: M-m.

FME: Mi no biliv. Hemia taem mi stap olsem Minista mi talem long olgeta se mi no biliv. Se man i tijim Lanwis i save tijim Maths i save tijim Science. Agriculture Social Science?


F: Be ol Yia 7 nao sapos oli go stret long sec- o= Bae oli go yes.

F: Bae i no gat Yia 6 eksam bakegen uh? Oli cancel/em nao.

FME: Yes.

F: Be Yia 8 tu bae i nomo gat?

FME: Might bae i no gat eksam/s be mi mi still ting se sapos i no gat eksam/s. I mas gat wan assessment.

F: M-m. From hao nao bae oli save se hu bae i go long Malapoa. Lycée.

FME: Mas gat (.) yeah. Yu mas gat internal assessment.

F: M-m.

FME: Yu mas karem wan internal assessment. Even though yumi (.) sapos yu wantem cancel/em nasonal eksam/s long Yia 6? Um wis blong mi se access ia yumi wantem se oli go kasem Yia 10. Why Yia 10 from uh Universal Declaration blong sikstin yia/s long skul. So raon Yia 10 ia nao oli stap long skul. And mi ting se taem
Pikinini i finis long Yia 10? Sapos i no continue bae hem i go long wan teknikol skul?
Bae i help blong bringim up level blong ol teknikol skul tu long level we ol pikinini i
save go blong lanem ol wok. I no evriwan bae oli go long mo stadi/s. Be taem bae
hu i save lanem wan job long ples ia. Pikinini we i kamaot i gat sikstin yia i gat sam
aedia finis.
F: I mature enough.
FME: I wantem mekem. O sapos i gobak long vilej hem i helpful tu. Bae i save still
helpful samwea long wei we i karem naf knowledge finis sapos i kasem Yia 10? Mi
ting se hem i wan level we. (1) And er i save be wan benchmark we i stap long
Vanuatu. Se evri pikinini oli gat at least Yia 10. Iven Yia 6. So wis blong mi i bin
hemia nao. Se blong traem putum wan benchmark long Yia 10.
F: M-m.
FME: Se evri pikinini oli sud go kasem Yia 10. Whether i decide blong continue long
ol stadi/s. Go long wan teknikol? Wan (xx)? O i gobak long vilej blong lanem wan
narafula samting? At least hem i gat wan strong basic edyuksen finis. Yumi
wantem bildimap sam responsible citizen blong tumora? Then yumi mas go long
ples ia blong se at least yumi gat sam man we oli save responsible mo oli save
andastanem raet/s mo oli save andastanem tu wanem we.
(1)
F: M-m. (2) Okei? Mi luk se bae yumi save sidoon fuldei storian about. Be ating long
saed blong lanwis yumi tokbaot evri samting finis. Unless yu gat any other comment
long saed blong lanwis be (.) mi luk se hemia i=
FME: =Olsem long lanwis olsem (.) i mas gat (.) yumi no save. I mas gat politkol will
wan. Mo yu mas gat er (.) er consultation long wide (.) go long (.) go long wanem
stret we ol pipol oli wantem.
F: M-m. (2) Okei.
FME: Proposal we hem i stap mi ting se sapos i nid? Yumi save mekem pilot skul
anywhere. Olsem naoia we i stap sapos oli wantem pilot/em? Best wei blong oli
F: M-m.
FME: From bae i no (.) bae i no kosem tumas problem. (2) O yu jes tekem wan (.)
muvum wan tija nomo long Anglophone long ples we tufala i stap klosap? Muvum
wan tija nomo se yu go tij long (.) tijim Inglis fastaem long ples ia. Blong yumi luk se.
But even though oli statem Inglis long Yia 7? Olsem mi talem. Oli pasem sem
eksam/s long USP long.
F: M-m. (1) Be yu luk se hem i kamaot long evri Francophone skul long Vanuatu? O
yu tokbaot Lycée nomo.
FME: Evriwan.
F: From mi mi jes kam long wan skul long aelan? We mi luk se actually level blong lanwis. Olsem long tufala secondary skul mi luk se level blong Inglis French i sem mak nomo. Long tufala skul.

FME: Yeah be olsem mi talem. Hem i depend plante long=

F: =From mi mi expect se=

FME: =Quality=

F: =Long Francophone skul bae oli save Inglis tu be actually mi luk se standard blong French i no high tumas. Standard blong Inglis hem i sem mak nomo.

FME: Yeah.

F: Be long Anglophone skul i tru se French hem i weak.

FME: Be:: hem i problem blong olsem mi talem blong ol tija/s bakegen. Taem tija i monitor/em gud? Be taem i kam long ol (.) olsem mi tokbaot long level blong ol eksam? Sapos mi tekem wan skul olsem Montmartre. Evri yia taem (.) hem i handred pesen we hem i pasem LLP hem i handred pesen ol pikinini oli go. Long LLF11 hem i handred pesen. Mi mi jeaman blong skul long Montmartre so (1) mi save (.) i bin wan long olgeta fas skul we i bin adoptem program ia. Oli ranem long Monmartre.

F: Olgeta oli tekem LLF11 taem oli stap long Montmartre?

FME: Yeah.

F: Yu no minim se afta. Okei mi ting se oli aot finis.

FME: No oli tekem taem oli stap long Montmartre nomo.

F: Okei.

FME: Olgeta long Yia 12 oli mekem uh LLP13? Mo olgeta long Yia 13 oli mekem LLF11.

F: LLF11 okei. Hem i Montmartre nomo o Lycée tu.

FME: No Lycée tu i i mekem.

F: Collège de Santo.

FME: Senior secondary skul o- (.) Collège de Santo.

F: Evri senior secondary long French.

FME: Secondary school yes.


FME: I gat wan extra fee blong pem be (2) fulap peren/s long beginning oli no andastanem? Oli complain. Mi se hem i wan narafla do. Oli pikinini sapos yu luk
pikinini i live long ples ia? Ol yunivesiti we yumi gat long Port Vila hem i wan(.) er(.)
yunivesiti blong South Pacific we hem i Anglophone so(.) blong yu gat access? Yu mas mekem Inglis.


FME: I gat samfala oli go. Samfala oli mekem hemia. But mi prefer se oli mekem Yia 14. From taem Yia 14 tu mi introduce/um UU114.

F: M-m.

FME: Long taem yu gat UU114 i mo better(.) much better. I gat wan narafala program tu we oli kolem (xx)? We long Yia te- 14 taem yu mekem? I helpful taem yu go long wan yunivesiti. Taem yu go yu save mekem handred level o yu mekem (xx) yu save(.) i helpful tu. (2) Hemia oli stap naoia. So wanem we mi propose-em long olgeta i better from taem yu go LLF11 nomo yu go be yu mas go stap waste/em taem blong olsem(.) i mo expensive tu long USP. So i mo better yu traehad blong yu go long Yia 14? From gavman i pem UU114?

F: Okei.

FME: Taem yu karem UU114 hem i wan advantage finis. Naoia yunivesiti i save askem(.) i save accept/em yu taem yu mekem hemia i min se wan level blong Inglis blong yu? I gud so oli save tekem yu finis.

F: Okei.

FME: Long beginning fulap oli no(.) agri mo oli no(.) andastanem. Be hem i dabol opportunity we hem i stap.

F: M-m.

FME: From taem yu winim hemia either yu save go long New Caledonia o yu save go long (2) USP? Not USP nomo be yu save apply long wan narafala yunivesiti.

F: M-m.


F: So yu luk se ol Francophone we oli kamaot long(.) eni wan we i tekem Yia 13 be oli no tekem opportunity blong LLF11 nao hem i wan disadvantage nao. Blong karem ol qualification long French nomo.

FME: Yeah from yu gat wan choice nomo nao. Sapos choice ia i no open?
737 F: M-m.
738 FME: Yu mas winim ki blong hem.
739 F: Uh-uh.
740 FME: We sapos yu no win i min se yu fas i stap.
741 F: Be Anglophone? Oli no gat equivalent long French be oli oraet yet olsem.
742 FME: Oli oraet ia from opportunity i bigwan blong ol. Long ples ia from sapos oli fail/em Yia 13 blong olgeta oli save go stap mekem wanem ia (.) ol seken janis blong olgeta. Long USP. (2) Mo tu oli save mekem wan foundation long USP. I stap long ples ia nomo.
743 F: So mi luk se hem i main central dilemma nao blong hol edyukesen se (.) yumi wantem se yumi holem taet French. From hem i pat blong heritage hem i pat blong histri. Olsem yumi no save lego. Mi save. Be long sem taem tu mi luk se Inglis hem i main do we hem i givim access long (.) olsem Anglophone oli no nidim French.
744 FME: M-m.
745 F: So i min se somehow?
746 FME: Be long fil blong profession? Fulap oli nidim naoia. Oli jes realise/em be=
747 F: =Oli nidim French?
748 FME: Yeah. For example hemia we oli wok long ol trade. Hao nao bae oli mekem trade wetem New Caledonia.
749 F: M-m. (3) Be New Caledonia nomo. Olsem.
750 FME: Yeah? I gat New Caledonia nomo be.
751 F: Bigfala wol i stap be=
752 FME: =Yes be bigfala nara wol tu i stap.
753 F: Mi jes luk se evri pikini sapos yumi faenem wei somehow blong fos se evri pikini i skul French fas wan ale go long Inglis. Sapos hem i save wok aot? Main purpose blong hem i simply blong holem taet histri? Wetem smol pat blong trade wetem New Caledonia. Hem i wan bigfala polisi blong wan smol kaontri olsem Vanuatu. Jes blong wan risen blong histri nomo. Olsem mi save se i no fault blong=
755 F: M-m.
F: M-m.

FME: Well relationship blong Vanuatu wetem Franis tu i stap sem mak. So hem i nidim. French’s investment long Vanuatu i bigwan tu. Olsem in terms of investment oli bigwan tu long Vanuatu. I no Calédonie nomo be Franis tu i invest so=

F: =Yes i tru.

FME: Er i gat er oli tekem Ostrelia oli yusum fulap bilingual oli (.). Mauritius oli yusum olgeta.

F: No i tru.


F: M-m. (4) Okei.

FME: Ale long saed blong yunivesiti olsem USP? Hem i affiliate long AUF? And AUF hem i affiliate long USP. So (.). i gat link ia i stap finis wetem UNC oli wok tugeta finis. Bae i gat wan expansion we China bae i sud fund/em. Olsem mi tame mi livim Ministri i klosap wan yia nao so (.). ol samting oli bin (.). agreed evriwan finis mi no save olsem wanem Minista i stap.

F: Be bilding i stap gohed finis?

FME: Mi no save.

F: Yu no save. Mane nomo i stap be=

FME: =Be i gat hemia we hem i wan Francophone.

F: M-m.

FME: [From USP]

F: [Be from French] Polynesia i gat?

(3)

USP gavman i pem contribution fee? Hem i pem tuition fee. Mo hem i pem baken.

F: Hem i min blong ol styuden we oli stap skul long Vanuatu.

FME: USP.

F: O eni wea oli stap skul long Fiji tu?

FME: Yes.

F: Evriwan.

FME: So sapos yu lukluk gud i more expensive than hemia blong New Caledonia we (.). gavman i no pem. (1) So (.). hem i mo cheaper. But hem i expensive in terms of (.). er money? Hem i from laef long New Caledonia hem i expensive.

F: M-m. Be i gat eni styuden we oli go skul long Tahiti? O no.

FME: Bifo i gat be naoia from yunivesiti hem i mo klosap long ples ia. i gat wanem we i save faenem long Tahiti hem i stap long New Caledonia.

F: Okei.

FME: And New Caledonia i ser- i serem more cultural values and i mo similar long Vanuatu so hem i more better yet than longwe. Think of for example (.). Agriculture we oli bin go from long Tahiti? Mi ting se blong mekem long New Caledonia hem i mo isi nao. Fulap oli graduate mo long Caledonia long Kumak. Be naoia? UNC i gat wan branch long Dumbéa eh wanem ia Magenta.

F: Hem i wanem.

FME: Yunivesiti. Long Magenta.

F: Oh okei.

FME: We i mekem Agriculture tu ol styuden oli save go longwe.

F: Okei.

FME: I gat fulap i stap long New Caledonia. Afta oli jes stap go long Ostrelia so i no gat wan problem. I gat fulap (.). samfala we oli kam pilot finis. We oli bin stap long Caledonia afta oli jes go mekem piloting blong olgeta long (.). Aviation long Ostrelia. (2) Mi ting se advantage ia i mas continue blong hem i stap. (2) Mas openem up opportunities long ol.

F: M-m.

FME: Olgeta styuden/s ia i stap.
F: Okei.

FME: Tangkiu.

F: Bae yumi finis long ples ia.

FME: Eni mo samting? No.

F: No mi luk se olesm ol kwestin blong mi long saed blong lanwis ating yumi kavremap evriwan finis. Hem i gud nomo blong compare/em wetem ol tingting=

FME: =Well hemia ia hem i point of view blong mi. Mi save se i gat samfala (.) wan professor blong yunivesiti i stap talem (.) i mekem wan comparation wetem long Samoa? Se yumi mekem bilingualism. Be long lanwis blong Tonga wetem Inglis.

F: M-m.

FME: I no case blong Vanuatu. Vanuatu i gat lanwis (.) nasonal lanwis blong hem (.) i gat ol dialects. Taem hem i tokbaot bilingualism?

F: Hem i minim wanem. <laughs>

FME: So mi ridim ol argument blong hem we hem i mekem lastaem. Mi ansa long hem se yu no save tekem case blong Tonga blong yu apply/em long Vanuatu.

F: M-m.

FME: Sapos yu tekem case blong Samoa i apply/em long Vanuatu i min se hamas lanwis nao? Fo finis.

F: Be yu min se hem i stap argue se yumi sud yusum vernacular i go long?


F: M-m. Be olsem mi mi luk se wan tingting blong mi.

FME: Wan man Vanuatu we hem i talem se hem i bilingual be hem i no bilingual.

F: =Yes hem i bilingual taem hem i stap long vilej yet.

FME: Quadri wanem?

F: Quadrilingual yes.

FME: Yes. Yumi tok fo lanwis.

F: Yes yu no statem skul yet be yu bilingual finis.

FME: Yes. Be bilingualism oli come up wetem nomo se taem very few oli wok long gavman we oli no nidim wan translator. (2) Olsem hem i very few yet oli stap tudei. But wetem ol yangfala we oli graduate tudei? Taem yu tekem wan Francophone i
graduate tudei (.) hem i save raet perfectly long Ingis. I gat fulap tu we oli graduate long Law we oli raetem sem mak nomo.

F: Be ol bilingual skul/s taem yu talem bilingual skul hem i minim wanem?


F: So hem i min se i gat Anglophone narasaed Francophone narasaed?

FME: Be taem oli kam aot aot saed be Bislama nomo.

F: Bislama nomo nao from oli nogat (.) yes. Mi luk long wan long Ambae. Ale Rensarie bakegen. Hem i jes=

FME: =Yeah. Nao system ia mi (.) mi totally disagree.

F: Mekem se i had wok blong ol tija tu from i mas gat wan we i tijim Agriculture long French ale=

FME: =Well narasaed hem i save be easy. Long wei we oli exchange/em tija. Olsem tija blong Ingis hem i wan real tija blong Ingis we i go tij narasaed. Mi mi stap olsem jeaman blong skul long Montmartre mifala i recruit/em wan olsem mifala i karem wan full bil- wanem ia (.) Anglophone. I no tok wanpis French.

F: M-m.

FME: Hem nao i tijim Ingis.

F: Okei.

FME: Yeah. So long klas blong hem i no gat wan French. Hem i tok Ingis nomo.

F: Mas Ingis nomo nao. So yu yu actually yu disagree se ol bilingual skul i no sud gat from hemia i jes mekem se Bislama=

FME: =No. Sapos oli wantem oli gat at least wan method blong exchange/em tija bae i oraet. Be taem we i stap long sem fil nomo hem i promotion blong Bislama nomo.

F: From mi mi luk se hem i wan bigfala polisi insaed long VESS. Se bilingual skul/s hem i wan (. ) be actually mi neva really klia se=

FME: =No mi totally disagree long bilingual skul/s from hem i (. ) hem i no promotem nating (. ) er real spirit blong bilingualism.

F: M-m. Mi luk se i sevem mane nomo long saed blong administration be

FME: Hem i no really sevem mane. Yeah i sevem mane long=

F: Wan wota pump nomo wan generator be. <laughs>
FME: Yeah might yu sevem mane long ples ia be (.) i no quality. I no address/em quality.

F: M-m.

(2)

FME: Hem i no address/em quality long wanem we gavman i really wis blong.

F: M-m. Hem i tru. Hemia mi luk se wan kwestin olsem we mi wantem catch up wetem sam blong yufala we yu bin (.) central long saed blong ol polisi.

FME: M-m.

F: From olsem taem mi ridim ol document be VESS hem i=

FME: =No hemia mi totally argue wetem ia be oli gohed blong putum insaed. Be mi talem se be yu no save mekem wan bilingual skul.

(2)

F: Be [Vanuatu i gat bilingual skul be]

FME: [From oli no address/em quality] (2) Hem i save be helpful long wei we issue blong exchange/em tija. O i wan administration be (.) skul ia even though oli kolem bilingual skul wan i sud (.) i sud strict long (.) se skul i olsem. Narawan i mas olsem.

F: So i no gat eni klasrum naoia we oli traem mekem actual (.) evri pikinini insaed oli bilingual. Olsem tija nao i toktok=

FME: =No.

F: Smol Inglis smol French?

FME: No.

F: Bildimap tufala tugeta. No.


F: M-m.


F: M-m.

FME: But hem i mas gat. Bifo long tufala gavman i gat wan tim blong inspectors. We oli goraon long olgeta skul oli go in (.) oli stap wan wik blong inspect/em tija/s. Tudei
wan tija taem we i go tij? Normally probation i should be sikis manis. Be tudei probation hem i olsem se (.) i (.) hol laef blong hem nomo.

F: M-m.


F: M-m.

FME: Be tudei. Teaching Service Commission hem i stap be olgeta inspector oli stap anda long Public Service. So i gat (.) ol legal frame we i no stret bae yumi nid blong luklukbak long hem. Givimbak paoa long (.) ol raet bodi we hem i employ/em olgeta tija/s.

F: Be in-service training hem i nomo gat uh? Hem i jes pre-service.


F: M-m.

FME: Olsem taem yu tekem olgeta ale yu faenemaot wan real issue. Be tudei oli karem taem i bin in-service training be oli go karem hemia we oli bin tija blong praemeri oli wantem go olsem se tija blong secondary. Hemia oli luk se from salary hem i more interesting. Hemia i no.

F: Be mi luk se tu hemia i fault blong (.) olsem yumi expand/em ol secondary school be i no gat tija yet. Be olsem hemia nai problem be oli kam streng long USP i go long klasrum wantaem. Oli no train from teaching be. (1) O junior we oli go antap long senior from we i no gat tija.


F: M-m.

FME: But er (.) wan minimum. Se i no blong se yu tij fotin aoa nomo. Long wan wik.
F: Be yes yu no save tijim evri (.) olsem taem mi stap long Ambae fastaem mi mi tijim teti sikis aoa long wan wik from hem i no gat naf tija be hemia. Mi no save nomo. Mi stap flae flae olbaot.

FME: Hemia i no gud. Yu no prepare/em wan gud samting tu. No mi no minim hemia. Mi mi ting se wan taem oli save kasem. Ol tija oli kasem so at least oli kasem twante aoa?

F: M-m.

FME: O maximum twante tu? Hemia mi mekem long Montmartre mifala i mekem so ol tija oli kasem twante tu aoa/s.

F: M-m. Hemia i gud from yu gat eit o ten long wik blong prepare/em ol samting. Be.

FME: Yes.

(3)

F: Yes i tru. I gat sam we taem yumi go long senior secondary yumi specialise tumas?

FME: Yes.

F: Mekem se tija blong Economics? Tija blong Agriculture? Tija blong French. Tija blong IT.

FME: Yes.

F: Be oli no save kavremap tufala sabjek.

FME: Save kavremap tufala sabjek yes.

F: So mi ting se yes oli gat smol (.) light timetable nomo.

FME: Uh i no gat (.) no gat (.) i no gat gud management yet. And tu i no gat wan inventory blong (.) long (.) long Teaching Service Commission mo iven long hol Vanuatu i no gat wan proper system in place blong uh (.) wanem ia human risos developmen. I no gat wan. I mas gat wan human risos developmen i stap whether i stap wetem Skolasip we oli karem rekod blong ol (.) evri graduate hamas man long Vanuatu blong (.) yumi lukluk wea ples nao yumi nidim ol (.) o blong trenem olgeta.

F: M-m.

FME: Blong yumi sanem olgeta. Tudei i gat fulap we oli go from lawyer. I gat fulap lawyers and samfala oli kam unemployed lawyers. Samfala oli kam doti lawyers tu we oli stap mekem sam deal long issue blong graon ia we (.) hem i jes blong mekem mane.

F: Yes.

FME: Normally sapos wan client i kam luk yu yu sud advaesem stret se instead blong yu mekem yu waste/em mane yu sud talem long hem stret se (.) claim blong
yu hem i raet o hem i rong o yu no nid blong waste/em mane. Be samfala? Oli jes mekem blong i tekem mane. Mi ting se hem i no stret.

F: Yes hem i tru mi luk se yumi mas save (.) from samtaem mi luk se long teaching.
From samtaem long senior? Hem i no mekem wok blong o hem i somehow hem i mekem problem long skul. Be skul i no save jenisim hem from i no gat replacement blong hem. Be actually ating i gat sam ples=


F: M-m. Be from principals oli fraet se sapos mi lego tija ia. Olsem sapos Agriculture tija i aot? Be hu bae i kam tijim Agriculture.

FME: Yeah.

F: Mi mi no save ripotem nao. Lukaot Teaching Service Commission i karemaot tija ia? Afta bae ol pikinini bae oli nomo save tekem PSSC o wanem ia.

FME: Yes. Ating hemia tu eria we i stap. Be i no sud gat hemia sapos i gat wan inventory blong olgeta tija/s we oli stap se blong yumi trenem hamas tija nao. Olgeta oli gat shortfall blong ol tija/s blong Science mo Maths. So yu sud luk se i gat naf o (.) direct/em ol styuden/s se hemia i gat opportunity i stap long ples ia. Yufala i go mekem stadi. Be from tudei we i no gat eni inventory i stap? Eni stock take long saed blong human risos long kaontri i no gat. (1) Iven tija i sud gat own wan blong olgeta. Teaching Service i sud holem wan i stap se yumi gat hamas tija blong Science. Hamas hemia blong mekem se yu direct/em skolasip tu se yumi nidim mo blong yu trenem olsem. Yu direct/em teaching service edyukesen (.) er Vanuatu Teachers Education se yufala i bildimap mo ol (.) tija blong Maths Science be long level ia. Tudei long senior secondary skul i shortfall.

F: M-m.

FME: Long ol (.) long tija blong (.) er Maths and Science. Blong both saed.

Anglophone wetem Francophone so. Wetem most long olgeta we oli tij long level ia oli (.) we oli mekem degree nomo. Be sapos yumi wantem i go mo mi ting se yumi mas require/em masters? I no blong yu karem wan masters nomo be yu mas kam yu go long edyukesen blong. Be yu mas identify/em olgeta. Olsem mi talem hem i very impoten blong (.) Teaching Service Commission i gat own stock take blong hem blong ol human risos/es we i stap.

F: M-m.

FME: Taem hem i no gat be yu stap sutum ol man olbaot nomo.

F: M-m.

F: Yes mi mi neva andastan se hao nao=

FME: =Olgeta oli stap base long wanem ia. Namba blong ol pikinini nomo. Se wan tija blong twante faef (.) um pikinini. (2) Yu save taem yu gat hamas sabjek blong yu tijim long ples ia (.) yu givim tija long ol sabjek.

F: M-m.

FME: Yu no save givim tija folem namba blong ol pikinini.

F: M-m.

FME: Sapos really yu wantem ranem wan secondary skul? Be yu mas givim tija long wan (.) wan (.) wan (.) wanem ia long wan sabjek. Mi mi no agri tumas se oli givim tija folem namba blong ol pikinini ia. Tekem for example wan smol secondary skul i stap sam ples long (.) Ambae o wea we bae namba blong hem i siksti nomo yu givim (.) o fifti yu givim tu tija nomo.

F: M-m.

FME: Hao nao yu expect/em blong tufala i tijim we=

F: =Yes bae oli tijim fo sabjek wanwan.


F: Be iven long praemeri. Yumi tokbaot ol bilingual skul finis be i gat wan bilingual praemeri skul long Ambae we oli kaontem aot se hamas pikinini? Mekem se natioa i gat sikis tija? Blong twelvef klas/es. Be from oli kaontem se Klas 1 hem i gat (.) twante pikinini. Be actually ten i stap long Anglophone ten i stap long Francophone. So natioa i min se Klas 1 tija blong Anglophone? Hem i Klas 1 mo Klas 4 wantaem.


FME: Taem oli go long secondary skul hemia bae yu (.) taem yu go long ol risal bae i nil nomo. Hem i wan rong expectation bakegen o wan rong hop we yu givim long ol peren/s.

F: M-m. Olsem mi save se i had. Blong olsem (.) yes yumi gat fulap aelan. I had blong assess/em (.) blong ol inspector i goraon. Be posting? Yu sud somehow=

FME: =No. At least se i sud gat wan inspector.

F: M-m.
FME: Mo tu quality blong ol inspector we oli stap tudei evriwan hem ia ol inspector blong praemeri. Hao yu expect/em blong i go inspect/em ol tija/s blong ol secondary skul/s.

F: M-m.

FME: Level blong olgeta long praemeri. Taem oli go long secondary be (. ) oli save finis se ( . ) oli no save mekem so bae oli neva mekem wan wok.

F: Be mi luk se ol zone curriculum advisors oli gud lelebet. Oli save goraon long ol= 

FME: =Bakegen hem i sem mak. Hem i level blong praemeri.

F: Yes hem i long praemeri i tru. Be mi luk se=

FME: =So oli mekem wok long praemeri nomo. Ol secondary hem i no.

F: Yes long secondary yes ( . ) hem i dipen long PEO nomo. (2) Be wan samting tu we mi lukum long Penama. From oli gat mi no save seven zone? O eit zone ating long Penama?

FME: M-m.


FME: =M-m.


FME: M-m.

F: Hemia i olsem=

FME: =Yes.

F: I had blong travel bakegen from hem i. Yumi stap duplicate long ol

(2)

FME: Yes oli sud er ( . ) yes oli sud mekem bil- ( . ) at least oli putum wan man we hem i save mekem ( . ) i save tok tu lanwis tu?

F: M-m.

FME: Be=

F: =So hem i wan factor bakegen.

FME: M-m.

F: We hem i ( . ) duplicate? O?

FME: Bae hem i no go. Bae hem i no go. Mi save hemia we i stap long Ambae i neva go long Saot Ambae i neva go. I neva go long(.) iven long Is.

F: Be ol narawan mi luk se oli gud smol olsem oli stap long Is Ambae Anglophone? Bae ol mas go kasem long Lolopuepue nomo i kambak. Hemia i olsem isi wok nomo. Be(.) hem bae i mas kasem tri aelan. Yu save Ambae i no isi blong yu wokbaot kasem long narasaed. <laughs>

FME: Yes.

F: Mas goraon olsem.

FME: Yes.

(5)


FME: Yes ating. Mi no save sapos yu gat eni mo kwestin?

F: No mi no gat eni mo kwestin.

FME: Okei tangkiu.

F: Olsem mi talem mi mi willing blong sidaon fuldei blong storian. <both laugh> Be no yumi finis long ples ia nao.
Appendix xxi – Interview with the former Minister of Education (FME)  
(Translation)

Date: 16-11-11

Location: Nakamal at the former minister’s house

Notes: FME was Minister of Education for much of the time when I did the first period of fieldwork at the start of the year (although in and out with all the changes). However, by the time of the interview, he was no longer in office (and was in the opposition).

The interview was arranged through a family member of my contact. He was happy to meet me and I was told to go to his house to find him. My contact had explained a bit about my research and that I was a former teacher on Ambae. He read through my letter on arrival. We sat at one of the tables at the nakamal. A large church project was being constructed right next to the nakamal, so there was a lot of building noise throughout the interview.

F: So my first interest is about the two languages that we use as the principal languages. So English and French.

FME: Yes.

F: So in your opinion do you think that (. ) the standard in schools is enough for education. Or do you think that (. ) in terms of these two languages English and French? What is the standard like now.

FME: It’s not enough. (2) It’s not enough and in (. ) the year before last I think there were two universities Besançon and Oxford University in (. ) England. The two undertook a survey to evaluate the teachers in (. ) how they used them. Used them? Understanding? With (. ) what else in French and English. The results which we (. ) which came out were (. ) too average.

F: M-m.

FME: Only a very few were not (. ) average. And the very few who were not average it was because their parents were exp- expatriates or they were previously from different countries but had come to live in Vanuatu.

F: So that’s on the side of the teachers.

FME: That’s on the side of the teachers.

F: Okay.
FME: But you must start here. With the teachers. If these teachers were monitored well? If they were well trained in the two languages French and English? The students and the children would be able to understand well too.

F: M-m.

FME: And they could help. But if the teachers have a problem with the language of instruction that is a big problem. The teachers are the first ones. It goes back to the training of the teachers. That’s why one of the objectives is to improve the level of training of the teachers. Especially in language first. Before they go to their own subjects. The subjects are similar. Very similar. Maths or Science or whatever. Chemistry whatever. They are all the same. It’s just the language that is different. So language is very important.

F: So is there any training in place now following those results from last year?

FME: Well last year we wanted to improve the level. When I was still in Education. I put a condition in place that teachers must be at the level of Year 13 or Year 14 when they are recruited. They must be students who have done foundation already. That was to help improve the level of the teachers. But they should train for a diploma. Instead of a certificate of education. The language must be reinforced. If the language is if the teacher is well trained and he knows the language well? It will be easy for him to teach the children. That is the main tool for this. Otherwise the other subjects are the same. But language is the vehicle for transferring knowledge.

F: So do you think there is a problem in terms of the students. Like in terms of their learning? That comes from a language problem or?

FME: Well I think that I still believe that language is the vehicle of knowledge it is the vehicle of technology so it must er the teachers must master it well because there are many teachers who who continue to speak Bislama only. They should use French. Whether you are still inside or you are outside the classroom you should they should <mobile still ringing, loudly now. He looks at it while talking but doesn’t answer>. They the students. Most of the time the teachers in their meetings they use Bislama.

F: M-m.

FME: That’s the teachers meetings and even at the council board they use yusum Bislama.

F: Do you think it’s the same on both sides. Anglophone Francophone?

FME: Both sides are the same.

F: Are there no differences now at school like the language is French or the language is English but otherwise it’s just the same.
FME: Yeah most long of the administration they use Bislama so(.) and I think that it doesn’t start now. It started from the very beginning. The way you train the teachers you should reinforce the language. We must start at the bottom(.) to monitor it well.

F: So do you wish that outside the classroom inside the classroom they used French only or English only?

FME: Um.

F: Is there no place for vernacular or Bislama.

FME: There is place for vernacular or Bislama at times but I think that when you are in the classroom then you know that the language of instruction is those two. But most of the time the teachers use Bislama even in some classrooms they use Bislama. When we go to the technical schools it is worse. They speak Bislama.

F: M-m.

FME: So how can you assist a student to go to a VIT school to suppose he wants to go higher to go to university. He must learn the language to go there. He must learn either French or English. If you want to continue.

F: But outside class too? Do you think it is good that(.) as you know some schools have=

FME: =Outside class inside the school boundary?

F: M-m.

FME: It's a bit. During free time Saturday or whatever? People can use lanwis or Bislama. During class I think they should use. Well the teachers must lead by example. Most of time the children the students follow what the teachers do. So if the teachers smoke or whatever then they will also see that(.) but that too. For an institution to improve the standard of language er(.) it's in the hands of the teachers. Because when they go home there are many parents who have never even been to school. They don't know French and English and they can't read or write so. And they also don't know about the subjects. Plenty of parents just trust the teachers that their children will learn when they send them into the classroom.

F: But what about=

FME: =Sometimes they just blindly trust the teachers.

F: Uh-uh.

FME: Because they cannot read. They cannot read their marks they(.) trust them. It's been like this for a long time(.) parents believe in the teachers.

F: But in terms of other(.) like. Suppose you are in Francophone? Okay should English also go inside or do you think it is good that they just focus on French.

FME: What we have now the practice they do is tha- when they enter um secondary school they introduce English. English becomes compulsory. Every Francophone
F: But you think Anglophones do not learn French.

FME: I don't know because I'm not a teacher. I have never assessed them. But there are some who do well. It depends where a child comes from. If the child comes from one (.) parent who is a Francophone it is normal that he understands better French when he is at an Anglophone school.

F: But when we are in the schools do you think like you said that it is good that the teachers (.) enforce or they practise the language of instruction all the time. But at the same time is it good for them to promote both together? Or must they focus on the one they use inside the classroom.

FME: Well I think especially the Francophones it's good for them to use French. In English schools they use English. To become a (.) perfect bilingual it's not er (.) it is a talent that not everyone can (.) can do to become a perfect bilingual. Who can speak write and er (.) in English and French. That is normal that it's not everyone but as long as you have a better understanding. Sometimes it works too for a country that says it is a bilingual country. When foreigners come here they. Sometimes they question that this is supposed to be a bilingual country. But it's not this. Because when you go to hotels for example tourists for example from New Caledonia when they go? They must try their best to speak English.

F: M-m.

FME: English is dominant. Here.

F: M-m. But do you think this has changed. Over the years? Since Independence or not.

FME: Well there are many who speak French too but when they are at work? When they speak English you hear that they are like Anglophones so. But that is a talent of some people. We cannot force people to speak a language. Like the country wants to (.) even government. And at the level of political will it wants the country to continue to be a bilingual country.

F: But what is the main reason behind that? Like to continue both sides together.

FME: Well I mean it's in the constitution. They decided when the country reached independence. The constitution adopted three languages. The national languages are French English and Bislama.

F: It means that we just continue because (.) but there's no (.) I don't know purpose of it or a benefit [of this.]

FME: [Well its purpose] too because the (.) country was a condominium before. And people have continued to live like this too. If you took one out? That
would cause a scandal there would be a revolution. If you changed it. If you took
one out and we like continued with one.

F: M-m. But that is like in terms of history. Like if we go forward and somehow we
managed to remove either English or French? Would the country still be okay?

FME: It. It would be hard. To remove because the countries in the Pacific still
maintain them. Some maintain English and some maintain French. Because er
French and English are the vehicles that the international organisations use or they
are the vehicles of uh knowledge and technological knowledge which this country
doesn’t have. Okay our local languages the languages to teach culture? Traditions
of Vanuatu? How to teach people to (.) plant food in the garden or weave mats or
whatever. I think these languages are for this. But it is not (.) lanwis is not a vehicle
for the technology that we have in the world today. Telecommunications engineering
or whatever. This is the technology the knowledge that we must learn from other
countries. And these countries have their own languages.

F: But that’s it I mean why do we need both together. Like the Solomons just have
English or New Caledonia just has French. As like this vehicle of technology.

FME: No New Caledonia doesn’t just have French. It has English and French <his
mobile rings again> in New Caledonia. It is the same as Vanuatu. English is
compulsory in secondary schools.

F: But the Solomons or PNG?

FME: The Solomons or PNG? Because their status they have always been like that.
They were Anglophone in the beginning. But Vanuatu was not (.) it was a
condominium. England and France ran the administration together in recent years.
This was here already.

F: M-m. But in terms of like economic development? Or technology? Do you think
that Vanuatu=

FME: =For economic development we need to hold tight to both languages because
when you look at the region? In the Pacific region New Caledonia is a territory that
is economically strong. Tahiti (.) is there. (1) I think it is important to maintain them.
Even though economically (.) in terms of trade in terms of exchange it is important
to maintain two languages.

F: So you think we have an advantage over say PNG or the Solomons who only
have one language. One international language.

FME: I think it’s an asset to (.) um you have a citizen or a person who can use both
languages? When you compare with some countries that are like Vanuatu. Like uh
Mauritius or Canada or international organisations. Vanuatu hasn’t reached that
level yet that these countries are at but it can aim for that if it keeps this asset. It is
the quality of an individual to be able to use language to control two languages. Two
international languages.
F: M-m. So for individuals. Like you’ve already said that it is a talent. You can’t force everyone to be bilingual. But do you think that if someone learns both together he will have an advantage over=

FME: =Well the government’s wish is to try and make it so that at least people working in public administration for example or working in offices of for example tourism or whatever. They must be bilingual. There is no need to have a translator to (.) translate. You use only one man for one job. There is not need to use too much translation. Because that is a system which is expensive. Like even though today we find that those who are bilingual are only the Francophones.

F: M-m.

FME: That we cannot introduce starting in French as the er language of instruction and then just (.) what? Franc-. When you force people what to do? And Francophones are the minority. Anglophones are the majority. So when you suggest this they do not agree. Some agree? Some don’t agree.

F: So did you support this policy for everyone to go to Francophone first? And then just go=

FME: =No I didn’t sup-. I looked at it I examined this when I was minister. I asked an expatriate to come.

F: That was Gervais?

FME: Gervais. Yes. He made a proposal. But when Gervais went out to the field? The reaction from the people was totally different. Some people also wanted to teach people in their own language? Unfortunately there is no technology that we can teach in lanwis. Most of the technology that exists comes with its own language. It is better to use these languages to use the words exact words that they use in the (.) technology that they use. They do.

F: But now? What is the status of this language policy. Are they going to start again.

FME: I don’t know. I don’t have any information any more. It was progressing well. There were some proposals? Which came forward. That we can start in dialects in kindergarten. Meaning on the other hand too that we don’t promote these two languages at the disadvantage of (.) the dialects? Which are the real identity of (.) uh the citizens of Vanuatu. That’s why we (. ) the proposal was there to start in people’s dialects in kindergarten. Before we introduce uh French? Some people proposed that English we start introducing English in Class 4? Then slowly it goes up they can teach the subjects on until when they reach Year 10? The children can choose? Whether they want to continue (.) a subject that they choose in English or in French. Yes. So it means that everyone has at least basic uh (.) language at the beginning. When they come to choose higher up whether they will follow uh French or whether they will follow English but those lower down will know (.) that they have some basic uh (.) knowledge already in.

F: M-m.
FME: One of the two languages.

F: So it means that every child would attend the same system. We would no longer have (.) no longer have two.

FME: In the proposal that is there it is like (.) everyone should go? But I have questioned this a little. My personal feeling when I was there was that we should do a trial first. Create some pilot schools. Try and introduce English in Year 4 like Anglophones have already introduced French in Year 4. Or even French at Lycée Français they have introduced English. They will learn English easily. At the level of Francophones but I don’t think so for Anglophones? I don’t think this language French is quite a complicated language. It is very precise. (2) So the proposal here comes from the government’s wish to have bilinguals. Yeah.

F: So it seems that bo=

FME: =But the system that Francophones have had even today many go to university at Anglophone universities. There are many at USP. Many er very few go to Fiji. (1) They were Francophone but they decided after passing the English the assessments they decided to go and take (.) um their studies in an Anglophone university.

F: So why do you think Francophones can be successful in their system and then switch to English.

FME: I think it is easier for you to go to French then just learn English. But for you as an Anglophone to just learn French is quite difficult. I tell you the language? The French language is (.) well you already know. It is a language which is quite difficult. It’s not difficult but it’s complicated. Because they use words that are really precise.

F: M-m. But you think English is easier than French?

FME: Well English is (.) it’s an international language. Whatever even many people who don’t go to school they speak English so they learn it in the street they learn it wherever in the village. They learn it in the workplace. They learn it wherever they live. So English is a language that is international.

F: So it means that now like in Vanuatu you think that English (.) you said before that English dominates.

FME: Yeah English is=

F: =So does this mean that it’s easy for Francophones to pick up English because they have exposure to it or=

FME: =Yes. You consider it in terms of music in terms of whatever? Many things are in English. Francophones can pick it up easily.

F: But suppose all children schooled French first? Would it be the same?

FME: Proposal.
F: Or do you think English would go down.

FME: English will never go down. English will still remain. Even in many places where they don’t promote English much it’s still alive. Take Vietnam for example. Its languages it’s a place where they speak man- like they used to use French too. But when you go to Vietnam they speak more English than French. So English will still be dominant in (.) in every place. In the Pacific region I think it’s just Vanuatu that is an (.) its an independent country that has the double language?

F: M-m.

FME: At the same time in New Caledonia when you go to hotels even though they speak French they all speak English.

F: M-m. So suppose everyone schooled French here? Actually would they learn English anyway.

FME: It used to be compulsory. It was in the French system before independence. It was compulsory when you went to secondary school. English was compulsory. When you reached Form 4? Then you had to decide on one more language. Either German? Japanese? Or Spanish. That was the system in the condominium. Already in the past. You had to. You had to choose. So but er you couldn’t choose English because English was already compulsory. In the French system that they have in New Caledonia? English is compulsory.

F: M-m. (2) Okay.

FME: I studied in New Caledonia so=

F: =Uh okay?

FME: It is compulsory. English is compulsory.

F: You went to secondary school there? Or?

FME: Secondary.

F: You attended secondary school over there. Okay.

FME: And even in the technical schools? English is still. As a subject.

F: Okay.

FME: I did accounting so English was still a subject they taught.

F: Okay. So yes. You can’t comment now on the (.) current policy that is here at the moment. I’ve been trying to find out about it but=

FME: =I’m not sure exactly what has happened to this policy. But what is there?

You know that I started it when I was there. You know that I think that it was a good programme. Unfortunately it looks like it’s (.) or (.) deteriorated. Now. But there were important objectives in there. One was access. To education for all children of Vanuatu? I don’t think the government can run away from that because that is a
commitment for it too. It has committed itself to it. As er a member of the United Nations.

F: But in terms of equality between the two streams. Do you think there are still problems of an imbalance between (..) Anglophones and Francophones.

(3)

FME: We can’t talk about an imbalance between them because the choice rests with the parents. And some don’t really have a choice. Because what they want in some places? Some of the smaller islands only have one school. So really parents? They don’t really have a choice. They must enrol their children in that school. In whatever school is in proximity to them.

F: But when they like (..) once you are in these two systems? Whether it’s your choice or you’re there somehow for another reason (..) do you feel that the two streams have equal opportunities now? Or=

FME: =In terms of?

F: I don’t know. When you finish (..) either to progress in school. Like at the end of primary to go to secondary? Or at the end of secondary to find [a job or un]iversity?

FME: [It’s not] (1) It isn’t balanced yet in this. There are Anglophones who have more accessibility. (2) Francophones don’t. But er because of the system that we had. Before (..) the Anglophones followed a regional programme. PSSC. Which continues to exist today. That SPBEA runs. Yeah. But Francophones have been let down (..) and have nothing since the baccalaureate. The French government removed it which was a French diploma. It removed it in nineteen eight seven.

F: Okay.

FME: Then uh the government of Vanuatu has had to make its own one and that simply rests on the shoulders of the teachers. Whether they are qualified or unqualified. It’s just the efforts that they make. To try and build something up. And that’s why (..) Anglophones’ (..) Year 13 is foundation. But in reality it’s not foundation either. In some countries it is foundation. Who follow the same programme. Be here? USP doesn’t recognise it.

F: You mean Foundation Form 7? Or USP.

FME: Yeah.

F: Foundation. Form 7.

FME: Yeah. USP doesn’t recognise what SPBEA does. So they have to go and do foundation again at USP.

F: So there is no direct entry after Form 7?
FME: Well when they leave here to go to another country? Like something that I don’t understand. For example Samoa? When they finish they go straight to university to study. But that is the same programme. That’s why er mobile rings again> it is important for us to make our own curriculum here? Because some countries like Fiji they have done away with it too. Because the found this difficulty so we must do away with it making it so that when you do Form 7? Students can go straight to university. That’s why we have come up with a review. These are the objectives we have under the VERM? Access and quality. Which means (.) reviewing the curriculum <mobile rings again> and improving er the training of the teachers these two things must go on. The third thing is to improve the management of education. Starting from the Ministry’s management going to all the schools. The (<.) er principals and er all the others.

F: M-m. But this means that there will be Year 11 12 13 with everyone following a national curriculum. With the statement that has come out.

FME: Not yet. Not yet because only the national statement has come out. Now it must go to the details to write it? And to write it? I asked while I was there for (.) er USP or er UNC long Caledonia to come and follow it up? To assess it. They mustn’t produce a curriculum that only people in Vanuatu do. If there is no regional no university or country that recognises it because here there isn’t one. We must make sure that the universities in the region or even below the region er outside the region recognise the curriculum. This is an issue that is important to consider with the governments. Governments own the uh certification the diplomas belonging to individual countries. It will come to the government too to negotiate.

F: But do you think it will be easy to combine the two streams in this way. I’ve heard a little that some of the Francophone teachers don’t agree they want to leave it and stay with what’s that (<.) DAEU? Like=

FME: =(EFM)?

F: I don’t know I just heard a little that Francophones at senior secondary don’t want to go to a national curriculum. They want to follow DAEU?

FME: No. DAEU is not a Vanuatu diploma. DAEU is a French diploma. Which (<.) I think Vanuatu is the only country doing it. DAEU is a second chance.

F: M-m.

FME: When someone (<.) it’s a diploma that works for French.

F: Okay.

FME: It allows those who have never done their baccalaureate? To go to university. It is a key that gives access to university.

F: Okay. So do you think this will work out at senior level. Will the national (<.) as long as the universities give their input.
FME: It is time for Anglophones and Francophones to sit down together. England and France have both left us here. The country is already in the hands of the people of Vanuatu. And we keep saying one people one nation but there is language there is religion and these things that came from outside? They came and divided the people of Vanuatu meaning that after thirty years it's time to sit down together. And consider what we need. What we need for the country. The two languages are an asset for (.) Vanuatu. They are an important asset to come (.) to have languages like this. I think that ni-Vanuatu must be able to sit down together and come up with a curriculum that can help both sides. Like I said. Language is the only difference. All the other subjects are the same.

F: So when we go to like suppose the curriculum goes up to Year 13? We unify everything?

FME: Yeah my wish was that Year 13 must be foundation. When I was there.

F: Okay.

FME: But like I said we can't just decide these things. There must be assessment. All along. To see where we are with our education system. Even what we have today it's good to assess all the children in Year 2? Whether they have achieved yet. What they are supposed to achieve in Year 2. Before you move them on. Because when you move them there are many parents who cannot read the grades well? They cannot read their children’s grades to assess whether their children are good or whether they have a problem? They trust the school and they trust the teachers. But most of time they are just shocked that their children have gone as far as Year 5 and can’t read or write. Or they go up to Year 10 but just finish there. This was one hope that I held for parents but the parents want their children to be successful in something. So there must be a programme of assessment in Year 4? Year 2 Year 4. Whatever children should reach they must reach.

F: M-m.

FME: And at the same time there must be assessment to see whether the problem is with the children or the problem is with the teachers. If it’s a problem with the teachers then they must go back to school. Like to improve like I said with the curriculum? There is a need to assess every teacher too. Which ones need to go back to training. And what training they should give them. It’s no good taking them and putting them all there when their problems are not the same. Maybe some of the teachers’ skills or methodology are weak. So even though we go and graduate from university. You have a masters or whatever. It doesn’t mean that?

F: You can teach.

FME: Teaching is a different thing. A different vocation. For you to teach children you must have a talent in it. It’s not the same. So you must learn the skill. There are many who come today who come back from university who go straight to the classroom. For me I don’t think they have the skills for teaching. They must go and
learn methodology. How you approach children. We can't have lots of teachers
going along for the job opportunity. So most of the time they will never assist the
children. The students. But they finish their courses and the are out. No. Teaching
for me? It is teaching twenty four hours. It's teaching thirty one days a month three
hundred and sixty five days a year. They must be available at any time for the
children to consult them. Or ask for advice. They must be available to assist the
students too. They must like the word that they say in French encadrement\textsuperscript{38}? They
must have encadrement.

F: M-m.

FME: They (.) or even at some time parents during the holiday or whatever he can
seek advice or for the teachers to teach (.) something (.) help the children with it. So
(2) I think that education is all of this.

F: So somehow actually all these issues I have in terms of language. You are
saying that they are all outside this. Like we should focus on teacher training?
Language is no longer important. Whether you teach in English or French? Teacher
training. Assessment. Once we have unified the curriculum=

FME: =Yes. Both languages will be there. To reinforce language at what's that (.)
teachers (.) what's that? (2) Vanuatu Teachers College. V.T.

F: VITE.

FME: Teachers Education. So we must improve language in Vanuatu. Teachers
must be capable too. They must understand. When they learn these languages.

F: Does this mean that we should come to a point when the curriculum is there?
The assessment structure is there? Teacher training is there? That=\n
FME: =There was a timetable but I don't know any more whether they are following
it. Because a lot of money was involved in it. Aid donors have helped us. Because
they know that it is something that could be good. VERM I think is one of the best
policies. It attracted a lot of donors to (.) and it was a unique project in which the aid
donors came together? They made a pool where they put their money. Then the
government (.) managed it. (2) They did the same with access to education it was
the same they all put their money together.

F: M-m.

FME: And. There was. An improvement in access to education there were eighty
eight. Percent this year who went to school. I think that is important. Again? Quality.
It comes back to language. There must be quality. It must ensure quality. And to
have quality there are two things? Curriculum. Ni-Vanuatu must create a curriculum
for the context of the country. There are many issues. Environmental issues. And
traditions. Er the culture that we mustn't neglect because that is the identity of the
people of Vanuatu. But we can't forget the intellectual subjects that are maths and
science and the same for languages. These must go into (.) the area of literacy. And

\textsuperscript{38} supervision
what is science. Must remain. It is very important. This must be a country that
masters science too. We need it. We need it. The country still needs it. Today the
country also depends a lot on (.) not only the country. It depends a lot on external
advisors too. And sometimes I see that the advice isn’t good because they take this
advice from contexts of a country that is already more developed than Vanuatu. So
it is more developed (.) or an industrialised country. When they come to Vanuatu
and give advice to ni-Vanuatu (.) sometimes you feel no that’s not right in Vanuatu
for what we need. It’s because (.) Vanuatu has a different context. It is not an island.
It is many islands. It is an archipelago. It is not (.) and the issue of language. Issue
of the cultures that are a thousand. The dialects that there are more of. So with that
(. ) we diversify but it is complicated too.

F: M-m. But do you think there are any (.) like we’ve talked about the positives of
holding onto English and French. But are there any negatives. Like with regard to
what you say about quality or access or. Are there any negatives of (2) when we
hold onto both together does it make it (. ) like a compromise on quality?

FME: Well there is one (.) it’s not like negative but it is an exercise that will be
expensive. But er (.) in future it means that both languages are (. ) are important.

F: You mean expensive to combine the two systems or?

FME: No if you combine them it won’t be expensive because we will just use the
same teachers.

F: Uh-uh. But the system we have now.

FME: The system we have.

F: Is expensive.

FME: You must employ double teachers.

F: But that (.) in terms of money that’s the only problem (. ) or challenge or whatever.
To quality and access.

FME: To combine the two there are challenges too. There are (. ) after the survey
many didn’t agree so. (2) It means they’ve agreed to go with the expensive system
that we have already.

F: So do you think that for the time being we will leave the two (. ) leave the two
alone. It’s the only way like we’ve leave it so we have Anglophone on this side.

FME: No we can’t leave them. Because when it is a single country I think you must
continue to open up debate to find a solution.

F: No I mean you leave the two systems that we have.

FME: Well yeah we run with this till (. ) the government decides. But er the
government cannot decide on its own. Consultation must continue. (2) If people say
no we need people who are bilingual? You must go to them. Must find a way. (1)
But we cannot just impose it on people. It has come to a time that everything must
have consultation about it. The VERM we have had a wide consultation on it. It’s the same with the curriculum. We carried out a major wide consultation on it in which people expressed themselves. And that expression that came out? Vanuatu can no longer neglect it.

F: M-m.

FME: To it must work with the different universities for them to come and assess it. To see whether the system we are going through is helpful? Whether it can facilitate the students to have access to universities. And other countries. What. We to have diplomas from other countries here? But there must be agreement. From the government on it too.

F: But do Francophones have equal opportunity in=

FME: =There is not equal opportunity in terms of like there are only opportunities for them in Noumea.

F: M-m.

FME: But it’s not since I introduced. Last year I introduced to Angl- to Francophones UU114 which is English almost a degree in English already? So to make it that when they have taken this they can have access to other universities. Because if you talk about a bilingual? Someone who finishes uh who achieves his foundation? He achieves DAEU he achieves the baccalaureate. I think he is already a good Francophone? Whether he wants to go to university I think he has already reached these basics.

F: M-m. So suppose we had this system? Like somehow we combined or promoted the other language would Francophones have greater access to university? But I think Anglophones would just be the same. They wouldn’t go to New Caledonia to=

FME: =It doesn’t mean never. I think once in a while they would go. An Anglophone who goes to New Caledonia.

F: But they have many opportunities already.

FME: Yes.

F: They don't really need to add New Caledonia. Only Francophones really need this.

FME: Yes. It’s not only at this level but at the level of because Francophones. Their failure is also huge. The dropout rate is very high. It was only last year that almost ninety ninety something percent passed the exam. That was the first time in history. But most of time over the years because they do not have enough assistance. That encadrement that I talked about isn’t there. Supporting the children up until they take their exams. Last year they had good supervision because some programmes were put in place to support them to make sure they passed. But when you look carefully maybe in the Anglophone schools in Year 13? I think there are two hundred who or three four how many? Five hundred who sit the exams?
While in Francophone it’s just a few. (1) So that now there is just one school which
which has Year 14. Only one school which is Lycée.

F: Just Lycée.
FME: Yes.
F: At Collège de Santo no. They just have Year 13.
FME: Collège de Santo just has Year 13.
F: Okay.
FME: But I tell you the dropout is high like for example at Tanna yes there is Year
13. But at the time of the exams? In Year 12 there is not one child who passes.
Everyone (.) there are very few who pass (.) to? So they must come here.
F: Okay. So that’s like=
FME: =It’s to do with what’s that (.) access too? What’s that (.) there’s no access.
Uh (3) they must achieve (VHAT) now.
F: M-m. so this means that in the Francophone system there is actually a
benchmark or whatever that?
FME: It rests on a benchmark.
F: If you don’t achieve this then you are out now.
FME: Yeah.
F: Because for Anglophones it’s just (.) supply and demand. Like if there are enough
places okay you can go.
FME: Yeah. I don’t know exactly but for Francophones like you (.) when you fail
your exams then you fail now.
F: Okay.
FME: It doesn’t mean that you are expelled? No it means that if parents can afford
to pay for the child to repeat then he can repeat.
F: M-m but you must reach a standard before you can go to the next level.
FME: Yeah. You must reach this.
F: Okay. Because I think that for Anglophone it’s like you line up the children. You
take them (.) if there are thirty spaces? Okay the thirty who are at the top? Okay you
go through.
FME: Like that in Francophone I don’t agree with it. Because they have also done
this in primary. You have so much. We target quantity but we must target quality. So
I would like to go more towards quality.
F: Okay.

FME: Before you move the children. I would prefer children to repeat a class than for you to just send him along with all the problems that=

F: But this means that in Year 7? So they go back to the system where you have to reach a benchmark.

FME: In Year 7 when we first had top-up? I totally disagreed with it because (.) there was never a curriculum and there were no teachers trained for it. They took the teachers from primary to do it. (1) I totally disagreed with this.

F: M-m.

FME: I totally disagreed. When I was Minister I wanted to close these (.) centre schools. I think that (.) it is a system that has deteriorated a lot.

F: M-m. Yes there are many problems for Year 9 too when they come in but=

FME: Uh that.

F: They have to start again as if they were Year 7.

FME: Disaster. It’s a disaster.

F: But now will it go back to Year 7 going to secondary again.

FME: Well there are many. I decided that they would go back to normal secondary schools. For example the centre schools that were in (xx)? I moved them all out.

Closed them. It went to (.) I spoke to the authority? They went back up. There are some where it cannot happen because (.) there isn’t enough space. In secondary schools. But it doesn’t mean that either. Because if you take it nationally? There are many secondary schools that are empty.

F: M-m.

FME: People are turning round. Because there is a (.) they have made it too political they want too many promises to build classrooms or to close them. In the villages too for (xx) transport to go where. But the government has already invested a lot in building up some of the big schools like Tafea College. Rensarie. Where we are not using their full capacity? Matevulu (.) is not fully using its capacity. So before you go and open new secondary schools I think you must utilise those ones first that are already there. To the maximum. In Port Vila yes. There is not enough space.

Malapoa? And Lycée? There is no more space. That’s why the seconda- the primary schools have added centre schools. But if there was an expansion at Malapoa and an expansion at Lycée I think this could absorb the children into them.

F: Okay.

FME: Because the authorities too like Montmartre and Onesua they are also full. It depends on the places where the population is high. That is here because of the urban drift to come here. So again here there must be more. And they can just go
but you know education too. There is a lot of technology in there. So those who
have access to it are more advantaged.

F: In the towns.

FME: In technology. Power. That’s it that’s why parents send their children.
Because they think that these are the best schools. No every school is the same.
But it depends a lot on the teachers. The management of the teachers they must
know that. Sometimes when there are transfers or (.) with the posting of teachers.
Sometimes they heap up. One category of teachers at one school. But they are
short of other (.) teachers. Or sometimes I don’t really believe a teacher who can (.)
who thinks he is the champion of every subject.

F: M-m.

FME: I don’t believe it. When I was Minister I told them that I didn’t believe this. That
someone who teaches Language can teach Maths and can teach Science.

F: I’ve seen at some schools that I’ve just come from? One teacher is teaching
English French Agriculture Social Science?

FME: So that (.) is just a blanket for. When someone goes to Vanuatu Teachers
Education? When you go train there you go to train in one subject. You want to
come a Literacy teacher? You want to become a Science teacher. Someone
trains to do this.

F: But Year 7 if they go straight to sec- or=

FME: =They will go yes.

F: Will they have the Year 6 exam again? They’ve already cancelled it.

FME: Yes.

F: But Year 8 too will they still have that?

FME: Maybe there will be no exams but I still think that if there are no exams. There
must be an assessment.

F: M-m. Because how will they know who will go to Malapoa. Lycée.

FME: There must be (.) yeah. You must have internal assessment.

F: M-m.

FME: You must have an internal assessment. Even though we (.) if you want to
cancel the national exams in Year 6? Um my wish is that we want this access to go
to Year 10. Why Year 10 because uh the Universal Declaration of the Rights of
children to have education says that we must keep children in school until they are
sixteen. So that is around Year 10 at school. And I think that when children finish in
Year 10? If they don’t continue they can go to a technical school? It will help to bring
up the level of the technical schools too to a level that children can go and learn
trades. Not everyone will go to further studies. But who can learn a job in these places. If the children who come out are sixteen they will have some idea already.

F: They are mature enough.

FME: They want to do it. Or suppose they go back to the village that’s helpful too. It can still be helpful somewhere when they have enough knowledge if they reach Year 10? I think that this is a level that. (1) And er there can be a benchmark in Vanuatu. That every child has at least Year 10. Even Year 6. So that has been my wish. To try and put a benchmark of Year 10.

F: M-m.

FME: That every child should continue until Year 10. Whether they decide to continue with their studies. To go to a technical school? A (xx)? Or to go back to the village to learn something else? At least he will have a strong basic education. We want to build up the responsible citizens of tomorrow? Then we must do this so that at least we have some people who can be responsible and who understand rights and they can understand what they.

(1)

F: M-m. (2) Okay? I think we could talk about this all day. But I think in terms of language we’ve covered everything already. Unless you have any other comments about language but (.) I think that this is=

FME: =Like for language (.) there must be (.) we don’t know. There must be the political will is one thing. And you must have er (.) er consultation with the wide (.) go to (.) go towards what the people really want.

F: M-m. (2) Okay.

FME: I think that if we need to follow the proposal we have? We can create a pilot school anywhere. Like if we want to pilot what we have? The best way to pilot it? Pilot it at Francophone schools.

F: M-m.

FME: Because it won’t (.) it won’t cause too many problems. (2) Or you just take one (.) move one teacher from Anglophone somewhere where there are both nearby? Just move one teacher and say you go and teach in (.) English over there. So we can see. But even though they start English in Year 7? Like I’ve said. They pass the same exams at USP in.

F: M-m. (1) But are they coming out of every Francophone school in Vanuatu? Or are you just talking about Lycée.

FME: All of them.

F: Because I’ve just been at one school on the island? Where I’ve seen the actual level of language. Like at the two secondary schools I’ve seen that the level of English and French is just the same. At both schools.
FME: Yeah but like I've said. It depends greatly on=

F: =I had expected that=

FME: =Quality=

F: =At the Francophone school they would know English too but actually I saw that
the standard of French wasn't very good. The standard of English was just the
same.

FME: Yeah.

F: But at the Anglophone school it's true that French was weak.

FME: Bu::t this is a problem like I've said with the teachers again. When the
teachers monitor them well? When it comes to (.) like I've talked about the level of
the exams? If I take a school like Montmartre. Every year when (.) a hundred
percent pass LLP a hundred percent of the children do it. In LLF11 it's a hundred
percent. I was the school chairman at Montmartre so (1) I know (.) it was one of the
first schools to adopt this programme. They ran it at Monmartre.

F: They take LLF11 when they are at Montmartre?

FME: Yeah.

F: You don't mean after that. Okay I thought they had left already.

FME: No they take it when they are still at Montmartre.

F: Okay.

FME: Those in Year 12 do uh LLP13? And those in Year 13 do LLF11.

F: LLF11 okay. Is that just Montmartre or Lycée too.

FME: No Lycée does it too.

F: Collège de Santo.

FME: Senior secondary schools or- (.). Collège de Santo.

F: Every senior secondary in French.

FME: Secondary schools yes.

F: They take it. Okay. Uh interesting.

FME: There is an extra fee to pay but (2) many parents at the beginning they didn’t
understand? They complained. I said it’s another door. The children if you see the
children who live here? The university we have in Port Vila it’s (.) or (.) the
University of the South Pacific which is Anglophone so (.) for you to have access?
You must do English.
F: So USP like if you just go to Emalus? They will take you straight from
Montmartre? You take your qualification from Montmartre? And LLF11? Now can
you go straight to one hundred level courses? Or must you take foundation first.

FME: There are some who go. Some do that. But I prefer them to do Year 14.
Because in Year 14 I introduced UU114.

F: M-m.

FME: When you have UU114 it’s better (.) much better. There is another
programme too called (xx)? When you do this in Year thir- 14? It is helpful when you
go to university. When you go you can do one hundred level or you do (xx) you can
(.) it’s helpful too. (2) That’s what is there now. So what I proposed is that it’s better
because when you just do LLF11 you go but you will have to go and waste your
time to (.) and it’s also expensive at USP. So it’s better that you try hard to go to
Year 14? Because the government pays for UU114?

F: Okay.

FME: When you have UU114 it’s already an advantage. Now universities can ask (.)
they can accept you when you do this because it means that your English level? Is
good so they can take you already.

F: Okay.

FME: At the beginning many didn’t (.) agree and they didn’t (.) understand. But it is
a double opportunity that is there.

F: M-m.

FME: Because when you achieve this either you can go to New Caledonia or you
can go to (2) USP? Not just USP but you can apply to another university.

F: M-m.

FME: Yes Australia is there too. Or New Zealand. And it’s not just that but be (.) it
will be helpful if you go to become a teacher at VIT? Or you go to nursing school?
Or you go to Maritime. Then it will be helpful. Those who go to the Philippines?
When they have this they can go (.) no problem because they can just proceed.

F: So do you think that Francophones who come out (.) anyone who does Year 13
but they don’t take this opportunity of LLF11 will be disadvantaged. By having
qualifications only in French.

FME: Yeah because you only have one choice. If that choice isn’t open?

F: M-m.

FME: You have to get the key to it.

F: Uh-uh.

FME: But if you don’t get it it means that you are stuck.
F: But the Anglophones? They have no equivalent in French but they are still okay.
FME: They are okay because they have many opportunities. Because if they fail their Year 13 they can have a (.) second chance. At USP. (2) And they can also do foundation at USP. It's right here.
F: So it seems to me that this is the central dilemma for the whole education that (.) we want to hold onto French. Because it’s part of the heritage it is part of history.
Like we cannot let it go. I understand that. But at the same time it seems that English is the main door that gives access to (.) like Anglophones don’t need French.
FME: M-m.
F: So it means that somehow?
FME: But in the professions? Many need it now. They have just realised it but=
F: They need French?
FME: Yeah. For example those who work in trade. How can they trade with New Caledonia.
F: M-m. (3) but only New Caledonia. Like.
FME: Yeah? It’s only New Caledonia but.
F: There is a big world out there=
FME: Yes there is another big world there.
F: I just feel that suppose somehow we found a way for all children to school French first and then go to English. If that could work? The main purpose is simply to hold onto history? And a small concern for trade with New Caledonia. That is a big policy for a small country like Vanuatu. Just because of history. Like I know it’s not the fault of=
FME: =No no. But even like the regional organisations they have also adopted the language. Take the MSG. It has adopted as its languages. French and English. (3) And in the forum. Even though just one is used there must be a translation.
F: M-m.
FME: Even Vanuatu. Vanuatu depends. When it welcomes a minister who is an Angl- a Francophone? Then this requires you to speak this language yes. (2) It’s not just here.
F: M-m.
FME: Well the relationship between Vanuatu and France is the same. So it needs it. French investment in Vanuatu is big. Like in terms of investment they give a lot to Vanuatu. It’s not just Caledonia but France also invests in us so=
F: Yes it’s true.

FME: Er there are er in Australia they use many bilinguals (.). Mauritius they use them.

F: No it’s true.

FME: At the level of banks here or public administration you need to know both languages. (3) Because Vanuatu is affiliated with many Francophone organisations. (OUF) And (APF). (5) And it’s good for other organisations too if you can use French in them? If you have the opportunity.

F: M-m. (4) Okay.

FME: Okay in terms of a university like USP? It is affiliated with AUF? And AUF is affiliated with USP. So (.). there is already a link with UNC they already work together. There will be an expansion which China should be funding. Like I said I left the Ministry almost a year ago now so (.). these things were (.). all agreed already I don’t know that the Minister is now doing.

F: But is the building already going ahead?

FME: I don’t know.

F: You don’t know. The money is there but=

FME: =But there is that which is Francophone.

F: M-m.

FME: [Because USP]

F: [But does French] Polynesia have one?

(3)

FME: USP has (.). Vanuatu is a member of the ORSTOM universities. Because Fiji has its own university too. Tonga has its own university. Samoa has its own university. There are just two countries that depend on USP which are Vanuatu and the Solomons. (1) So that’s why USP must consider Vanuatu’s interests. Vanuatu is a (1) it is unique in the Pacific but it must consider its interests. It cannot just serve Anglophones. No it must serve the people who pay the membership. A hundred million every year? Which it pays in membership fees. On top of that? It pays tuition fees while you compare that with New Caledonia. The government doesn’t may tuition. It pays (2) just the students’ boarding fee and their pocket money but it doesn’t pay for them. (1) But at USP the government pays a contribution fee? It pays the tuition fee. And then it pays again.

F: You mean students who study in Vanuatu.

FME: USP.

F: Or anywhere if they study in Fiji too?
FME: Yes.

F: All of them.

FME: So if you look carefully it is more expensive than in New Caledonia where the government doesn't pay. (1) So it is cheaper. But it is expensive in terms of er money? Because life in New Caledonia is expensive.

F: M-m. But are there any students who study in Tahiti? Or not.

FME: In the past there were but now because there is a university that is closer. We have what we can find in Tahiti in New Caledonia.

F: Okay.

FME: And New Caledonia sha- shares more cultural values and is more similar to Vanuatu so it is better than over there. Think of for example Agriculture that they went to study in Tahiti? I think it is easier to do that in New Caledonia. Many have graduated from Caledonia at Kumak. And now? UNC has a branch at Dumbéa eh what's that Magenta.

F: What's that.

FME: A university. At Magenta.

F: Oh okay.

FME: Who do Agriculture too so students can go there.

F: Okay.

(4)

FME: There are many in New Caledonia. Then they can go to Australia so there is no problem. Many some have become pilots. Who had been in Caledonia and then they went and did their piloting at aviation in Australia. (2) I think this advantage must continue. (2) We must open up opportunities for them.

F: M-m.

FME: For the students here.

(5)

F: Okay.

FME: Thank you.

F: Let's finish here then.

FME: Anything else? No.

F: No I think that we have covered all my questions about language. It's just good to compare ideas=
FME: =Well that is just my point of view. I know there are some (.) a professor at the
university who says (.) who makes a comparison with Samoa? Where they do
bilingualism. But in the Tongan language and English.
F: M-m.
FME: It's not the case in Vanuatu. Vanuatu has a language (.) its national language
(.) it has the dialects. When he talks about bilingualism?
F: What does he mean. <laughs>
FME: So I've read his arguments which he's made. I've told him that you cannot
take the case of Tonga and apply it to Vanuatu.
F: M-m.
FME: If you take the case of Samoa and apply it to Vanuatu it means so many
languages? Four already.
F: But you mean he was arguing that we should use the vernacular and then go to?
FME: No his argument was that bilingualism was his language and the Tongan
language. He said that it worked in Tonga. I say no. The case of Vanuatu is totally
different. Eh not Tonga. Samoa. It is totally different.
F: M-m. But like I think that my opinion.
FME: A ni-Vanuatu who says he is bilingual isn't bilingual. He is=
F: =Yes he is bilingual when he is still in the village.
FME: Quadri what's that?
F: Quadrilingual yes.
FME: Yes. We speak four languages.
F: Yes before you start school you are bilingual.
FME: Yes. But the bilingualism they come up with is so that very few people working
in the government need a translator. (2) Like there are very few still who are there
today. But with the young people who are graduating today? When you take a
Francophone who graduates today (.) he can write perfectly in English. There are
many too who graduate from Law who can write like this the same.
F: But bilingual schools when you say a bilingual school what does that mean?
FME: No. Nothing. They can't. I take bilingualism for example they say that
Freswota is a bilingual school but I totally disagree. Because it is just the promotion
of Bislama. They put two schools together in one compound.
F: So it means that there is Anglophone on one side Francophone on the other?
FME: And when they come outside then it's just Bislama.
F: Just Bislama because they don't have (.) yes. I've seen one on Ambae. And then
Rensarie too. It is just=
FME: =Yeah. Now this system (.) I totally disagree with it.
F: And it's hard for teachers because there needs to be one who can teach
Agriculture in French and then=
FME: =Well on the other hand it could be easy. Through exchanging the teachers.
So that a teacher of English who is a real teacher of English can go teach on the
other side. When I was the school chairman of Montmartre we recruited one like
that we brought a full bil- what's that (.) Anglophone. Who didn't speak any French
at all.
F: M-m.
FME: Then she taught English.
F: Okay.
FME: Yeah. So in her class there was no French. She just spoke English.
F: Must use English. So you actually disagree you don’t think there should be
bilingual school because they just mean that Bislama=
FME: =No. If they want them they must have at least a method for exchanging the
teachers then it will be alright. But when they are just on the same field then it's just
the promotion of Bislama.
F: Because I thought that this was one of the big policies in VESS. To have bilingual
schools (.) but I was never actually really clear about=
FME: =No I totally disagree with bilingual schools because they (.) they don’t
promote anything (.) er the real spirit of bilingualism.
F: M-m. It just looks like it saves money in terms of administration but
FME: It doesn't really save money. Yeah it saves money on=
F: Only one water pump only one one generator but. <laughs>
FME: Yeah you might save money on these things but (.) it's not quality. It doesn’t
address quality.
F: M-m.
(2)
FME: It doesn't address the quality of what the government really wants to.
F: M-m. It's true. I think this is a question like the reason I wanted to catch up with
some of you who had been (.) central in this policy.
FME: M-m.
Because when I read these documents and VESS is=

No I totally argued with this one but they went ahead and put it in. But I told them that you cannot make bilingual schools.

(2)

F: But [Vanuatu has bilingual schools but]

Because they don't address quality] (2) They can be helpful with the issue of exchanging the teachers. Or having a single administration but (. ) even though they call these schools bilingual schools they should be (. ) they should be strict that (. )

this school is like this. The other one is like this.

So are there any classrooms now where they try to make it so that (. ) the children are bilingual. Like the teacher speaks=

=No.

F: Some English and some French?

No.

Building up both together. No.

They just have individual courses. Like I said some Anglophone schools take some French teachers and they go.

At some Anglophone schools they have one teacher who is full time (. ) just teaching French. But another thing. The education system (. ) has no assessment of the performance of the teachers. Sometimes they say that the principal he should (. ) assess all the teachers. Sometimes there is conflict. If a principal does something wrong? He cannot assess the teachers he cannot write reports on them. When he reports on them then they report the principal.

But we must have this. In the past under the two governments there was a team of inspectors. Who went round all the schools they went in (. ) they stayed for one week to inspect the teachers. Today when a teacher goes to teach? Normally probation should be six months. But today probation is like (. ) it's (. ) for his whole life.

There's no longer any assessment. So this is also a failure of (. ) uh the Ministry of Education and they must look at (. ) the Teaching Service Commission. What its role is. That is the employer. It should be assess the teachers.
F: M-m.

FME: But today. The Teaching Service Commission is there but the inspectors are under the Public Service. So there are (.) these legal frames that aren’t right that we need to relook at. Give the power back to (.) the right bodies who employ all the teachers.

F: But there’s no longer any in-service training uh? It’s just pre-service.

FME: In-service? There is training. They just opened it at the beginning of the year or last year. Unfortunately it’s the same. Because before we open in-service training you must assess the teachers first. What are their weaknesses. In terms of language? In terms of understanding? Or in terms of whatever. Um methodology?

F: M-m.

FME: Like when you take them then you find out the real issue. But today when it comes to in-service training they go and take those who have been primary teachers who want to go and teach in secondary. They see that the salary is more interesting. That’s not.

F: But it also seems to be the fault of (.) like we have expanded the secondary schools but there aren’t enough teachers yet. That’s a problem and then they come straight from USP into the classroom right away. They haven’t trained to teach but. (1) Or junior teachers who go up to senior because there are no teachers.

FME: Yeah another thing like there are too many secondary schools and when you look carefully there are many who are doing less hours. They don’t work. Take (.) uh I discovered that at Lycée some are doing (.) ten hours thirteen hours. In Vanuatu Teachers Education (.) some are doing four hours in a month or. (1) There is no consistency in uh (.) the timing of work. You compare a public servant who has to work thirty seven thirty five or forty hours in a week. But teachers don’t work. So that. Well. You must give them time too to prepare their lessons.

F: M-m.

FME: But er (.) a minimum. So that you don’t teach just fourteen hours. In a week.

F: But yes you can’t teach every (.) like when I was first on Ambae I was teaching thirty six hours in a week because there weren’t enough teachers but that’s. I just couldn’t. I was flying all over the place.

FME: That’s not right. You can’t prepare anything properly. No I don’t mean that. I think that at one time they can. Teachers can make it so at least they have twenty hours?

F: M-m.

FME: Or maximum twenty two? That’s what I did at Montmartre we made it so that the teachers had twenty two hours.
F: M-m. That's okay so that you have eight or ten in a week to prepare things. But.

FME: Yes.

(3)

F: Yes it's true. There are some that when we go to senior secondary we are very specialised?

FME: Yes.

F: So there is a teacher for Economics? Teacher for Agriculture? Teacher for French. Teacher for IT.

FME: Yes.

F: But they can't take two different subjects.

FME: Take two subjects yes.

F: So I think yes they have quite light timetables.

FME: Uh there is no we don't have good management yet. And also there is no inventory of at the Teaching Service Commission or even the whole of Vanuatu there is no proper system in place for what's that human resources development. There's nothing. We must have human resources development in place whether it is left to the Scholarships Office to keep a record of how many graduates there are in Vanuatu to we must look at where we need them or to train them.

F: M-m.

FME: For us to send them. Today there are too many who go for law. There are so many lawyers and some become unemployed lawyers. Some become crooked lawyers too just doing deals around land disputes just to make money.

F: Yes.

FME: Normally if a client comes to see you you should tell them straight that instead of wasting money you should tell them straight that your claim is right or wrong or you shouldn't waste the money. But some? They just do it to take the money. I don't think that's right.

F: Yes it's true I think we must know because sometimes it seems that in teaching. Sometimes at senior level? Someone isn't doing their job or somehow he is causing a problem at a school. But the school cannot replace him there are no replacements. But actually there are some somewhere=

FME: =One one is that. But they never report them. Because there is no inspector like I said in the structure of the Teaching Service Commission? Their employer. Today it just depends on what they say. The Teaching Service Commission is just like a clamshell that waits for the wave to feed it. It should use its arms and legs to walk about. Since these are its employees. It must make sure.
There are many who are involved in big problems and they never receive any punishment.

F: M-m. But the principals are afraid that if they release this teacher. Like suppose they sack the Agriculture teacher? Then who will come and teach Agriculture.

FME: Yeah.

F: I can't report this. What if the Teaching Service Commission removes this teacher? And then the children will no longer be able to take PSSC or whatever.

FME: Yes. I think there is this too. But this shouldn't happen if there was an inventory of all the teachers we had so that we could train however many teachers. They have a shortfall of teachers of Science and Maths. So you should see if they have enough or (.) direct the students to say that there is an opportunity here. You should go and study. But because there is no inventory? Any stock take of the country's human resources. (1) Even teachers should have their own. The Teaching Service should have one that says how many Science teachers we have. How many of these so that you direct the Scholarships Office too in what we need more of for you to train them. You direct the Teaching Service Education (.) or Vanuatu Teachers Education to build up more (.) teachers of Maths and Science at these levels. Today senior secondary schools have a shortfall.

FME: In (.) teachers of (.) er Maths and Science. On both sides. Anglophone and Francophone so. With most of those who are teaching at that level (.) who just have a degree. But if we want to go further I think we should require a masters? Not for you to just get a masters but for you to be educated. But you must identify them. Like I said it is very important for the (.) Teaching Service Commission to have its own stock take of the human resources that exist.

FME: When you don't have this you're just shooting people all over the place.

F: M-m.

FME: You must know when you make a posting? You know which subjects are taught there? You send the teachers.

F: Yes I have never understood how=

FME: =What are they basing it on. Just the number of children. One teacher for twenty five (.) um children. (2) You must know how many subjects are being taught there (.) you give teachers for each subject.

F: M-m.

FME: You can't just give teachers according to the number of children.

F: M-m.
FME: If you really want to run a secondary school? Then you must have a teacher for each (..) each (..) each (..) what’s that for each subject. I don’t agree with giving teachers according to the number of children. Take for example a small secondary school somewhere on (..) Ambae or wherever that as sixty children (..) or fifty you just given them two teachers.

F: M-m.

FME: How do you expect the two of them to teach what=

F: =Yes they would each teach four subjects.

FME: Is required at secondary schools. How do you expect this of them.

F: But even at primary. We’ve sp spoken about bilingual schools already but there is one bilingual primary school on Ambae where they have counted how many children there are? So now they have six teachers? For twelve classes. Because they counted that Class 1 has (..) twenty children. But actually ten are in Anglophone ten are in Francophone. So now it means that the Class 1 Anglophone teacher?

FME: She teachers Class 1 and Class 4 at the same time.

FME: That? The result will be zero.

F: M-m. But there are enough teachers? But actually some are on one side. Some on the other so one is teaching Class 3 4 and 5 at the same time. In Francophone. On the other side Class 1 and Class 4 at the same time. So you have to leave the little ones in Class 1 on their own while you go and teach Class 4.

FME: When they go to secondary school you will (..) when you see the results they’ll be nil. That’s a wrong expectation again or a wrong hope you are giving to the parents.

F: M-m. Like I know it’s hard. To like (..) yes there are many islands. It’s hard to assess them (..) for the inspectors to go round. But posting? You must somehow=

FME: =No. At least there should be an inspector.

F: M-m.

FME: And the quality of the inspectors that we have today they are all inspectors in primary. How do you expect them to go and inspect the teachers at secondary schools.

F: M-m.

FME: Their level is primary. When they go to secondary (..) they know already that (..) the can’t do it so they never do anything.

F: But I’ve seen that the zone curriculum advisors are quite good. They go round to the=

FME: =That’s the same again. That’s at the primary level.
F: Yes that’s at primary it’s true. But it seems that=

FME: =So they only work in primary. At secondary they don’t.

F: Yes at secondary yes . it just depends on the PEO. (2) Be something else that I
see in Penama. Because there are I don’t know seven zones? Or eight zones I think
in Penama?

FME: M-m.

F: But seven are Francophone? Eh sorry seven are Anglophone. So it means that
he just has North Ambae. He just has Maewo. He has North Pentecost. It’s like it’s
easy to=

FME: =M-m.

F: But there is just one zone eight which is Francophone. Which means that one

FME: M-m.

F: He is like=

FME: =Yes.

F: It’s hard to travel again because it’s. We are duplicating the
(2)

FME: Yes they should er (.) yes they should have bil- (.) at least put someone who
can do (.) who can speak both languages?

F: M-m.

FME: But=

F: =So that is another factor.

FME: M-m.

F: That is (.) duplicated? Or?

FME: Yes.

F: Wasting time. Like he can never reach Central Pentecost. North Pentecost.

FME: He won’t go. He won’t go. I know the one who works on Ambae he never
goes to South Ambae he never goes. He never goes to (.) even to the east.

F: But the others seem to be quite good like if they are on East Ambae as the
Anglophone? They just have to go as far as Lolopuepue and come back. It’s easy
work. But (.) he has to cover three islands. You know Ambae it’s not easy to
walkabout and get to the other side. <laughs>
1115  FME: Yes.
1116  F: Must go round it.
1117  FME: Yes.
1118  (5)
1120  FME: Yes maybe. I don't know if you have any more questions?
1121  F: No I don't have any more questions.
1122  FME: Okay thank you.
1123  F: Like I said I'm willing to sit and story all day. <both laugh> But no let's finish here.
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Introduction

"Transcribers bring their own language ideology to the task. In other words, all transcription is representation, and there is no natural or objective way in which talk can be written" (Roberts, 1997: 167). The question I address here is how my own ideological position is reflected in the way I transcribe English and Bislama, the English-based pidgin spoken in Vanuatu.

Ideologies

I am aware of three aspects of my own ideological position. Firstly, it irritates me to see different spellings of the same word within a newspaper article written in Bislama, thus perpetuating the belief that the language is unsystematic and ‘can’t be written’. Secondly, students are punished for speaking Bislama in school, which I find unacceptable (and illogical, as it is an official language). As a result of these two aspects, I want to represent Bislama as a systematic, rule-governed code in my transcription, on equal terms with English. However, the third element of my ideological position is that my analytic framework follows the move away from bounded ‘languages’ towards thinking in terms of linguistic ‘features’ or ‘resources’ (e.g. Blackledge & Creese, 2010). This encourages me to reject traditional linguistic boundaries, and aim to represent the fluidity of participants’ language use. Blackledge and Creese achieve this by using a single font type to transcribe the “flexibly bilingual” use of resources, rather than using different types for different ‘languages’.

However, this only addresses half of the problem when dealing with a pidgin and its lexifier. There are many lexical similarities between Bislama and English, often leaving it unclear which ‘language’ is being used, but each has been codified with a different orthography. Choosing which spelling to use thus fixes each element as belonging to one ‘language’ or the other. Moreover, applying consistent rules to determine when one
phrase is written as ‘Bislama’ and another is written as ‘English’ appears to resist the essence of ‘flexible bilingualism’.

Options
The following are three representations of the phrase translated in Standard English as ‘the government is reorganising the languages that we teach in schools’:

1. gavman hem i rijoganaesem_lanwisis_blong yumi tijim long ol skuls.

2. government hem i reorganisem languages blong yumi teachem long ol schools.


In traditional code-switching terms, the matrix language appears to be Bislama, as all grammatical items are features of this language. Ambiguity concerns only the five lexical items. I therefore begin with the principle that an item can be considered Bislama or English if it is listed in a dictionary of the respective language. The items ‘gavman’/‘government’, ‘lanwis’/‘language’, ‘tij’/‘teach’, and ‘skul’/‘school’ are listed for both languages, presenting two possible spellings for each. The fifth item ‘reorganise’ is not listed as a Bislama item, therefore suggesting it to be an ‘English’ verb.

At the morphological level, –Vm is the Standard Bislama transitive suffix, thus suggesting that a verb suffixed -Vm is Bislama. However, since the verb ‘reorganise’ does not have a Standard Bislama form, is the first case a Bislama verb deriving from English, or an English verb stem to which a Bislama suffix has been added? Meanwhile, the suffix –s is the Standard English plural suffix (plurals are marked in Standard Bislama with a prenominal morpheme ‘ol’). Therefore, are the plural nouns English, or Bislama noun stems with English suffixes? This is particularly relevant for the final noun phrase which contains the plural marking associated with both ‘languages’.

Phonology-driven rules need to be considered for the spelling of these suffixes. In (1), the suffix –em has been selected for ‘rijoganaesem’(rather than –im or –um), due to the phoneme in the preceding syllable, since this
phoneme determines the vowel of a Bislama transitive suffix (cf. tijim); for the plural form of ‘lanwis’, however, should the suffix be represented as –is, following the same principle, as in (1), or as –es, as in (3), according to the English spelling rule, given that it is an element of English morphology?

Representations
In (1), every lexical item is represented as Bislama, with ‘rijoganaesem’ and the plural suffixes written according to orthographic principles of Standard Bislama. In (2), every lexical item is represented as English, with the Bislama transitive suffix added to two verbs that are, otherwise, written as English. In (3), all lexical items are represented as Bislama, if they are recognised lexicographically as Bislama, but the non-Bislama ‘reorganise’ remains English. Suffixes are written according to the orthographic rules of the ‘language’ to which they are considered to belong, and a boundary has been created between the stem and the suffix, where these are considered fusions from different ‘languages’.

Ideologies again
The options represent different ideological standpoints: (1) suggests that Bislama has a flexible range of vocabulary (cf. the view that Bislama is a restricted language that can only be used in limited situations, and thus cannot be used in formal education). However, (1) also presents what might be considered an Anglicized version of Bislama, due to the plural suffixation and the incorporation of a non-Bislama item ‘reorganise’ (cf. a purist ideology). (2) presents what is often referred to as ‘Broken English’, since all vocabulary is recognisable as English, but the grammatical structure is not (despite the systematic nature of the Bislama grammatical structure). (3) avoids the labels of both Anglicised Bislama and Broken English, but artificially separates the two ‘languages’ in a way that does not capture the fluidity of the speech.

The example discussed here does not show the extent of the difference between the three representations. However, throughout long data transcripts, the different ideological positions become very apparent. I have chosen to follow the approach of (3) throughout, validating both ‘languages’ in their own right, but thereby falling short in the attempt to erase the boundaries between them.
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