

PACIFIC ENGLISH: WHAT IS IT, WHY IS IT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

by

Barbara Gillian Green

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Copyright © 2012 by Barbara Gillian Green

School of Language, Arts and Media
Faculty of Arts and Laws
The University of the South Pacific

(October, 2012)

Dedication:

For Mike, who inspired and supported me, and never lost faith, but didn't live to see it to the end.

Acknowledgement.

There are many people to thank but the first thanks must go to the students over almost four years whose hard work and efforts in their academic writing awakened an interest in the English they used. Throughout the struggle for success, they remained enthusiastic and cheerful, and a great joy to teach.

Secondly, grateful thanks are due to all my colleagues in the Faculty of Arts and Laws, both in Fiji and in Vanuatu, who encouraged me to keep going and who gave me examples of features of language which they had observed and experienced. They were also my caring support when events in Fiji forced me to relocate to Vanuatu, a country I came to love.

Thirdly, I must record deep gratitude to my supervisors, Dr. France Mugler and Dr. Robert Early, who worked with the difficulties of our all being in different countries. France was the one who suggested that I should put the effort into a PhD rather than an article and who read most chapters at least once, and Robert gave me good advice on how to start right at the beginning of the process and guided me through to the end. Both are friends I will value for ever.

Finally, my love and thanks to my family – Nik and his wife Rowena, Rachel and her partner Matt, and my husband Michael who have had unwavering faith in my ability to complete this task. Mike read every word, commented on structure, encouraged me when my confidence waned and put up with my absence for a year when I lived in Vanuatu and he was back in Wellington. I would never have got through this without you.

The greatest pain for me is that Mike did not live to see this through to the end of the path.

Arohanui.

ABSTRACT

This research grew from experience with the Academic English programme in the Faculty of Arts and Laws at the University of the South Pacific beginning in 2005 and from interest in why the English used by so many hundreds of students from at least 12 different nationalities and hundreds of differing languages presented with so many similarities of usage. Using examination essays completed at the end of two teaching semesters in 2006, all written under identical conditions, it examines the possibility that the English being used in the Pacific can now clearly be regarded as a unique variant of the standard form of British English. The research identifies and exemplifies distinctive characteristics which appear in the writing of these young, acrolectal users of English in the Pacific, offering explanations for such use, and compares the Pacific features with those which have been found in other post-exploitation British colonies. The research concludes that while English in the Pacific is developing strongly individual features, the largely exonormative stance of the countries involved means that the widespread variations in usage are, as yet, unlikely to be perceived as formally acceptable within the region.

The work then considers both the reasons why such variations have begun to appear in the English of the Pacific as they have in other British colonies in Asia and Africa, and the implications these linguistic innovations have for educational authorities in the countries of the region and in New Zealand, home to so many Pasifika migrants.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Country references:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| CI 1 / 2 | Cook Islands, Semester 1/Semester 2, 2006 |
| F 1 / 2 | Fiji, Semester 1/Semester 2, 2006 |
| K 1 / 3 | Kiribati, Semester 1, 2006 / Semester 2 2007 |
| M 1 / 2 | Marshall Islands, Semester 1 / Semester 2, 2006 |
| N 1 / 2 | Nauru, Semester 1 / Semester 2, 2006 |
| Ni 1 / 2 | Niue, Semester 1 / Semester 2, 2006 |
| S 1 / 2 | Samoa, Semester 1 / Semester 2, 2006 |
| SI 1 / 2 | Solomon Islands, Semester 1 / Semester 2, 2006 |
| T 1 / 2 | Tonga, Semester 1 / Semester 2, 2006 |
| Tu 1 / 2 | Tuvalu, Semester 1 / Semester 2, 2006 |
| V 1 / 2 | Vanuatu, Semester 1 / Semester 2, 2006 |

Other abbreviations:

| | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| IL | Interlanguage |
| L1 | first language or mother tongue |
| L2 | second language |
| PEC | Post-exploitation colonies |
| PECE | Post-exploitation colony English |
| SLA | Second language acquisition |
| SLL | Second language learning |
| TL | Target language |
| UG | Universal Grammar |
| USP | University of the South Pacific |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------------|
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | v |
| LIST OF FIGURES | ix |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION: HOW AND WHY | 1 |
| Context: University of the South Pacific | 1 |
| The student body | 3 |
| The course: LL114: English for Academic Purposes | 7 |
| The data | 10 |
| CHAPTER 2: ASPECTS OF CONTROVERSY IN THE STUDY OF “WORLD ENGLISHES” | 18 |
| Defining the terms | 18 |
| Shared characteristics of post-expoitation-colony Englishes | 33 |
| Error analysis and PECEs | 39 |
| Errors and Universal Grammar | 46 |
| CHAPTER 3: FITTING THE PACIFIC TO THE MODEL | 53 |
| Condition 1: Non-settlement colonial Experience | 53 |
| Condition 2: Development of English through the education system | 58 |
| Condition 3: English has developed in a region where it was not spoken by a majority of the people | 72 |
| Condition 4: Use of English for a range of functions | 74 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Condition 5: Indigenisation by adapting to linguistic contexts | 79 |
| CHAPTER 4: FEATURES OF ENGLISH IN THE PACIFIC: | |
| SPELLING & MORPHOSYNTAX | 81 |
| Spelling | 81 |
| Noun phrase features | 88 |
| Verb phrase features | 150 |
| CHAPTER 5: FEATURES OF ENGLISH IN THE PACIFIC: | |
| LEXICO-SEMANTICS | 197 |
| Lexical features | 197 |
| Semantic features at sentence level | 216 |
| CHAPTER 6: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION | 267 |
| Pervasive features and tendencies | 271 |
| Pacific English – or not? | 277 |
| Causes and effects of change | 283 |
| a) Reduced input | 283 |
| b) Teaching methodology | 289 |
| c) Transfer phenomenon | 293 |
| d) Simplification | 289 |
| CHAPTER 7: IMPLICATIONS OF DEVELOPING CHANGE | 309 |
| Implications for Pacific nations | 309 |
| a) Curriculum design | 311 |
| b) Resource provision | 319 |
| c) Assessment policies | 320 |
| d) Teacher recruitment and training | 322 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Implications for New Zealand | 327 |
| Pasifika levels of academic achievement in New Zealand | 331 |
| Reasons | 333 |
| Possible forms of support | 339 |
| Conclusion | 343 |
| | |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY: | 345 |
| | |
| APPENDIX 1: Examination questions, LL114 | 401 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|------------------|---|----------------|
| Table 1.1 | Student population USP 2006 | 4 |
| Table 1.2 | Distribution of students by age group USP 2006 | 4 |
| Table 1.3 | Comparison of numbers of students in the LL114 course, and numbers in research data | 12-13 |
| Table 2.1 | Population data for USP clientele nations | 44 |
| Table 3.1 | New Zealand teachers in other Pacific countries on government to government contracts for selected years 1925 – 1980 | 70 |
| Table 4.1 | Comparison of phrase expansion and phrase compression rates | 88 |
| Table 4.2 | Omissions and additions of articles in Pacific data: percentages and per paper occurrences | 110 |
| Table 4.3 | Lexical aspectual categories | 157 |
| Table 5.1 | Omission of arguments in Pacific data | 228 |
| Table 5.2 | Use of ‘like’ as conjunction | 240 |
| Table 5.3 | Comparison of run-on and comma splice rates | 243 |
| Table 5.4 | Frequencies of sentence fragments | 245 |
| Table 5.5 | Idiosyncratic use of capitalisation | 249 |
| Table 5.6 | Frequency of register shift | 258 |
| Table 6.1 | Features found in post-exploitation-colony Englishes | 268-269 |
| Table 6.2 | Percentage use in the Pacific of innovative structures | 271-273 |
| Table 6.3 | Comparison of use across Pacific groupings | 274-275 |
| Table 6.4 | Population data for USP clientele nations | 276 |
| Table 6.5 | Colonial experience in the South Pacific region | 284 |

| | | |
|------------------|---|------------|
| Table 6.6 | Roles of mission schools and government in education, and of English medium education in the Pacific | 286 |
| Table 7.1 | Literacy rates in the Pacific | 313 |

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION: HOW AND WHY

The stimulus for this research was a teaching experience. In 2005 I was appointed to a lecturing position at the University of South Pacific, teaching in the English for Academic Purposes course which was a compulsory undergraduate course for a significant number of programmes at the university. Like other such courses, its intent was to assist students with the adjustment to the requirements of academic study and it was heavily subscribed with between 1200 and 1800 students enrolled in each semester. In any academic year, the course could face more than 2500 students combined in face to face and distance modes, and the clientele includes students from all the 12 countries which make up the university: Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

While marking the examinations for this course I became aware of several strong similarities appearing in the linguistic variations displayed by students, despite the differences in their language backgrounds. It was surprising to find such a degree of homogeneity, if not in specific details then certainly in the types of variations which were apparent. The students came from such varied language backgrounds that more idiosyncratic differences seemed a more likely probability; yet what stood out was the remarkably similar pattern in the structures which students presented. I began to look for information on Pacific English and found remarkably little available on the English found in the countries involved. With the encouragement of a colleague, I began to examine more closely the similarities and differences among these students' written English deviations and to question whether the English being used by many in the Pacific region was identifiable as a regional variety.

The context: the University of the South Pacific

The University of the South Pacific (USP) is a unique institution in many ways. Unlike most other universities supported by government (and donor) money, this is not a national, state, or provincial institution. It is, instead, regional, providing tertiary education access for students from the 12 member states. (The only other

institution with a similar regional role appears to be the University of the Caribbean.) Though some of these countries do not geographically belong to the “south” Pacific, this relationship has been in place since the late 1960s (Crocombe 2001: 247) and the university was established in 1968. The Pacific region covers millions of square kilometres, but the population of each country is too small and too scattered to readily support several national universities, though that is certainly the interest of some of the nations. (Samoa has had the University of Samoa for some years, and in 2005 private money founded the University of Fiji in competition with the University of the South Pacific. Other tertiary institutions in the region include a number of technical colleges and teacher training schools, ‘such as Atenisi in Tonga, and more recently there has been the formation of the Fiji National University, created by an amalgamation of the Fiji College of Advanced Education, the Fiji College of Agriculture, the Fiji Institute of Technology, the Fiji School of Medicine, and the Lautoka Teachers College. However, all competitors currently enrol very small numbers of students.) Regional governments commit financial support to sustain USP as a regional university which aims to meet all the academic needs of the region, and significant donor support is received from Australia and New Zealand, among others such as Canada and Japan. As a result of this international component, students enrolled at the university come from many language backgrounds. The region is linguistically extraordinarily varied and the 12 countries of the university’s primary concern present up to 193 indigenous languages (Lynch 1998: 28).

USP has various campuses across the Pacific, though not all of them are much larger than student services centres. The principal campus is in Suva, Fiji, and this campus has the majority of students working in face-to-face mode as well as being the centre for all distance services to the region. The Alafua, Western Samoa, campus is the centre for the agricultural sciences while the Emalus campus in Vanuatu is the base for the Law School and the Pacific Languages Unit (which predates the university). There are sub-centres in all the 12 countries and several within countries which are composed of many islands or have larger populations, such as Fiji, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. The university has a commitment to students studying by

distance mode providing satellite broadcasts, video-conferencing, regional tutorials and intensive flexi-schools. However, technological limitations and the cost and difficulty of intra-Pacific travel restrict the efficacy of some of these services.

Staff at USP include numerous native speakers of English from a range of countries though the vast majority are from the region and do not speak English as a first language. All are expected to teach in English. For most of the university's staff and students, English has two distinct roles: firstly, it is the lingua franca for those coming from the multitude of languages and cultures that comprise the university's population, and secondly, English is the language chosen for academic instruction and discourse. As a regional rather than a Fijian national university, USP has had to learn to function in a language in which almost every student (and many staff members) is equally disadvantaged, though there is a significant difference between the English language-learning conditions in Fiji, where it is effectively the principal second language, and other countries, such as Kiribati where English is more accurately described as a foreign language. When conversation occurs between members of different cultural and national groups, English is the language of choice because there is little real option, and this is true on any of the university's campuses or centres. All lectures, except those teaching specific languages, are in English; all assignment work and feedback is in English, and, more crucially, all assessment is carried out in English.

The student body

Enrolments at USP have been increasing steadily (despite the political crises which have, on several occasions, disrupted the principal Laucala campus). In 2006, university statistics show, there were about 21,000 students enrolled. Of those 27% were internal, attending classes provided on a limited number of campuses; 52% were external, meaning that they studied as distance learners; and 21% were described as 'multimodal', learning through a variety of channels: online, video-conferencing and distance modes.

Table 1.1: Student population USP 2006 (Source: USP Statistics 2006)

| Country | % total students | Part time students % | Distance students % | Female students % |
|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Cook Islands | 1.5 | 100 | 100 | 70 |
| Fiji | 59.8 | 66 | 30 | 55 |
| Kiribati | 6.2 | 70 | 100 | 65 |
| Marshall Is. | 0.8 | 70 | 95 | 42 |
| Nauru | 0.9 | 100 | 100 | 70 |
| Niue | 0.3 | 90 | 90 | 75 |
| Samoa | 2.6 | 50 | 40 | 60 |
| Solomon Is. | 13.4 | 60 | 95 | 30 |
| Tonga | 4.9 | 50 | 87 | 60 |
| Tuvalu | 1.6 | 50 | 50 | 60 |
| Vanuatu | 6.5 | 50 | 55 | 50 |

(The remaining 1.6% comprises students from non-member countries)

Students from the Cook Islands, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Nauru and the Solomon Islands in 2006 had little option but to study by distance; the 5% not studying in distance mode in the Marshall Islands and the Solomon Islands may reflect those students studying in flexi-schools.

One interesting factor shown by these figures is the high number of female students; only the Marshall Islands and the Solomon Islands had more male students than females enrolled in 2006. In almost all other cases the ratio of females to males was 3:2 or higher. The majority of students was under 25, and in each age group except the oldest, women outnumbered men.

Table 1.2 Distribution of students by age group, USP 2006 (rounded)

| | Under 19 | 19 - 25 | 26 - 30 | 31 - 36 | 37 - 42 | Over 42 |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Male | 1200 | 5100 | 1600 | 900 | 540 | 480 |
| Female | 1800 | 5800 | 1800 | 1000 | 560 | 480 |

Distance students are provided with teaching materials, readers, sometimes CDs and/or videos or, if they are Law students, must have access to a computer to study online. Very few of the student body speak English as a first language but all have been exposed to the language in their various educational systems (see Chapter 3). They have all matriculated from the high school structures of their respective

countries, or have brought their study skills up to undergraduate entry level by successfully completing the university's Foundation programme. All are expected to sit an English language competency test offered by the university and to pass it if they are to be permitted to enrol in degree level studies. A preparatory course for those who fail the test is provided, though staff still have complaints about the level of students' English language receptive and productive skills in the formal English required by academic study.

Though the control of formal varieties of English varies greatly within the university community, all students have been taught English in their compulsory and post-compulsory education, to varying degrees of proficiency. They can use it for social purposes with relative ease, though that ease does not always extend to conversation with staff. The English heard on any of the campuses is casual, idiomatic and punctuated with local terms for items for which there are no English words or for which speakers do not know the English equivalent. But all students must also control the formal variety of English necessary for success in academic essays and reports, textual comprehension and seminar or tutorial presentations. This expected adaptation requires that students can control, among other things, a more formal lexis, a variety of tenses and aspects, textual complexity, and the structuring of text in ways that may be significantly different from those of their mother languages.

In a sense, then, the university environment may be described as a "speech community". In the use of this term, I differ from the views of B. Kachru (1985: 245) in his assertion that "in linguistic literature, a speech community is generally seen as an abstract entity consisting of 'ideal speaker-listeners'". This speech community, though undoubtedly an abstract concept, consists not of 'ideal' speaker-listeners, but of a substantial group, most of whom use English as something other than their L1, but who share an understanding of the functions of English in this specific context. The fact that this group of people uses English for a limited range of functions does not "preclude people from belonging to the same speech community." (Mesthrie, in Mesthrie et al 2000: 37). The university can also be perceived as representing a diglossic environment in which more than one form of the language is spoken – an informal, colloquial form which is functioning as a lingua franca for speakers of a

considerable variety of mother tongues, and the formal form, generally only found in written discourse or the ‘spoken writing’ of prepared lectures. The USP environment does not match exactly with Ferguson’s 1959 interpretation of diglossia, which is:

a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the Language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation (Ferguson, 1959 in Bratt Paulston & Tucker, 2003: 354).

Generally, English in the USP speech community is a language imposed and learned during education and the repertoire needed for university study is undoubtedly formal; further, students are likely to have heard or used this more formal variety very rarely in their pasts, if at all. Though English is a language they use when required, there are not purposeful “extensive differences between the grammatical structures of H (high or more formal variety) and L (the low, or informal variety)” (Ferguson, 1959 in Bratt Paulston & Tucker, 2003: 354). And it cannot truly be said that while “one set of behaviours, attitudes and values was supported, and expressed in, one language, another set of behaviours, attitudes and values was expressed in the other” (Fishman, 1967, in Bratt Paulston & Tucker, 2006: 359) because in the USP context, the L variety is acting as a lingua franca and only a limited range of “behaviours, attitudes and values” is likely to be expressed in this variety. Nonetheless, as Fishman has described in his response to Ferguson, the roles for which these language varieties are used are quite separate and “compartmentalised” and there is little intentional overlap (ibid: 361). All students of USP are at least bilingual; most have a strong basis in the language or languages of their home communities and when possible in the USP environment will use those languages with peers.

While it would be rash to claim that no-one in the speech community speaks in this formal, academic register of English, it would be uncommon and probably stigmatised as “either pedantic or artificial” (Ferguson, *ibid*: 354). It is also a register with which most students are very unlikely to have come in contact before their arrival at university. The English spoken among students, as described above, is highly colloquial and contains forms which are not, as a rule, acceptable within the written academic context. This context carries the high risk implication of being the context of assessment and students often find it a challenge to adjust to the formal register, a weakness which affects their grades .

Furthermore, students do not appear to have had much exposure to clear teaching of how formal writing is structured. The researcher questioned members of all her classes and found fewer than two in any group of 24 to 25 who could recall having been taught how to write sustained formal prose – what they termed “essay writing”. It is not surprising, therefore, that there is a tendency among a considerable number of the students to “register-shift” or “register-mix”. Students learn to adopt many of the generally accepted features of the required genre but they frequently seem unable to sustain the tenor. Perhaps because they are “talking in their heads” when they write, as they described their processing, they unconsciously slip into conversational mode which affects lexical choices and sentence structures.

The course: LL114: English for Academic purposes

Students from the majority of programmes in the university, most especially those which expect students to produce substantial written work, were required to take a 100 level course in academic language skills, known as LL114: English for Academic Purposes, now known as UU114 and compulsory for all undergraduates. This course had been present in the university for several years but, in 1998, had not been rewritten for eight years. One of my principal activities of 2005, after liaison with stakeholders, was to rewrite the course. The new version was trialled through 2005 with face to face students as sections were written, and the new course

materials were published for all students in time for the start of Semester 2 of the 2006 academic year. The course teaches overtly the structuring of a number of academic written genres, reading skills, techniques of research, and the skills of presenting oral seminars. It defines and teaches 5 major modes of academic prose: argument (or one-sided) opinion pieces; discussion, which demands an examination of both sides of an issue; causal analysis; compare and contrast structures; and research reports. The course includes an explicit emphasis on the value of an impersonalised tone, the interpretation of the topic, the choice of an appropriate form of response, the research process, the planning and structuring of academic writing and the process of writing and editing, including referencing.

The course is taught over one semester of 15 weeks and though students are advised to take this course in their first year of university study, there is no obligation on them to do so. As a result, students may choose any semester within their degree work to undertake LL114 so the ages of students in any semester vary greatly. A significant number of students choose to leave this course until their final year, apparently in the perception that it is “difficult” (Tamtam: pers.comm. 2007). As a result, for many the benefits of the course do not feed into their studies.

LL114 is taught in two modes: face to face teaching, which was only accessible on the main Laucala campus during the semesters chosen for investigation, and DFL, or Distance and Flexible Learning. In the Face to Face classes, emphasis is placed on working in teams so that students have the benefits of different points of view, of assistance in deciding what is appropriate in the context of the task, and of guidance in editing. That support is gradually reduced over the semester until students are functioning independently. In the distance study mode, where there is little option for most students other than to work alone, students are provided with a coursebook, a selection of readings (all of which are recorded in oral form on enclosed CDs), a CD of a compressed lecture with Powerpoint screens of the principal features of the course to spread the learning load between reading and listening, and the Assignment booklet. There is also support offered from Suva through fortnightly regional two-way satellite tutorials to explain crucial parts of the teaching programme and twice-yearly video-conferences. However, the only students who could readily use this

service were those who were within reach of one of the campuses or centres of the university, which is not generally true of the majority of students studying by this mode.

In the face to face classes, all written forms are practised as the course proceeds with either in-class or out-of-class assignments. For distance students the short semester time and the many kilometres over which students are spread means that only two essay assignments can be given if they are to be marked and returned to students in time for them to benefit from the experience. The first assignment focuses attention on the first text types taught: argument and discussion while the final assignment offers them choices of topics which require them to focus on one of the remaining untested text types – compare and contrast, cause and effect or reports. The final assessment for all students, no matter what their mode of study, is a three-hour written examination.

Prior to 2005, this examination provided several pages of readings which students were expected to digest and use as evidence for a related essay and which were to be included in a bibliography at the end of the essay. The pressure induced by the complexity of the task under time constraints meant that a significant proportion of the students plagiarised from the readings either deliberately or accidentally. The pass rate for face-to-face (class-based) students was 52%, and that for distance students merely 18%. The difficulty of the task was reducing students' ability to show what they had learned.

In 2006 the decision was made to change the examination format. Instead of many pages of readings, students were presented with single-paragraph prompts on issues having relevance for the region: migration, traditional medicine, extended or nuclear family structures. These prompts were designed to act as triggers for ideas to answer the questions which covered the range of four of the text types covered in the course: argument, discussion, cause/effect, and compare/contrast. Students were asked to write a plan for an academic essay of 6-800 words, the essay itself (with no penalty for longer efforts), and an appropriate abstract within the three hours of the

examination. (See Appendix 1 for the examination questions offered in the semesters from which the data were taken).

These demands, as a result, limited the range of language produced: the essay was expected to be formal, to be constructed along the lines of the text formats taught, to present supported ideas in acceptable paragraphs and to be as grammatically sound as the students could manage under the conditions. Marking was holistic across 10 aspects: the effectiveness of the plan, the range of ideas used, the development of those ideas, the cohesion and coherence of the argumentation, paragraph structure, sentence level grammar, register/tone, the introduction, the conclusion, and the abstract. Each aspect of the marking guidelines had a four division grading: more than meets the demands, meets the demands, approximates the demands or does not meet the demands to reflect the content and intent of the course.

The data

Research into language varieties has often focused on spoken discourse analysis; samples of spoken language from a variety of contexts are recorded and analysed and may then be further tested for acceptability by both native speakers and speakers of the variety in question. In most studies of Pacific languages, and in such studies as have been completed into the English varieties found in the Pacific region (Kelly 1975; Siegel 1987; Watson-Gegeo 1987; Mugler and Lynch 1996; Lynch 1998; Tent and Mugler 1998; Tent 2001; Crowley 2006), the focus of research has overwhelmingly been on spoken forms. This current research focuses on written samples and uses as data the examination papers written over one year, 2006, by students of LL114, the English for Academic Purposes course. The examination is sat at the end of the semester and all candidates have thus completed the same one-semester course and have also completed a minimum of one semester of tertiary study, though many may be in more than their first year of study.

Students therefore constitute, in this sense, an educated sample: for the purposes of this research, all students have completed high school in their own countries or the

university's Foundation programmes which compensate for a truncated secondary education. All these subjects represent language learners who have had a minimum of 10 years of language learning. At the same time, however, it cannot be assumed that language learning throughout compulsory and post-compulsory secondary education is of the same quality in all 12 of the countries or that exposure to the target language is identical.

The materials were chosen for study for four principal reasons. Firstly, students had all had identical input: they were all distance students of the course and had all studied from identical coursebook guidance. Some may have had tutorial assistance during the semester but none would have had more than two hours' help a week. Secondly, all students had had the format of the examination explained to them and a sample provided in their course materials. Those who had access to any tutorial assistance would have had a two hour practice session to help them with the format of the examination, and those, relatively few, within reach of the university's distance broadcast studios in main campuses had access to an hour's satellite tutorial on the examination demands. Students thus had some knowledge of what was required of them. Thirdly, all candidates performed under close to identical conditions: all examinations are held on the same day and in the same part of the day (morning or afternoon) across the region under supervision for a period of three hours. All students sat the identical paper each semester so content is predictable. Finally, given that the work was completed as an examination, students had no access to outside sources of help – no dictionaries, no Spellcheck or Grammarcheck, and no external editing. The resources they utilised to complete the task were entirely their own.

Their performance therefore may be said to represent their competence at that time. As will become apparent, the essays may best reflect their oral proficiency; students frequently sub-vocalise their sentences while writing, and discussion with a selection of students from each class over six semesters about their internal processes revealed that they “talk in their heads” throughout written tasks. For many, as a result, the separation between spoken and written modes is not, as yet, very distinct.

Because this course is a prerequisite for a significant number of university programmes, there are always enrolments from almost all the 12 USP member countries. While the numbers tend to be weighted towards those countries with larger populations (particularly Fiji, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu), there are samples from all the countries except for Tokelau. For those larger populations, a sample of papers was taken which tried to approximate those countries' percentage of the enrolments in the course for the year; for the other countries as many valid papers as possible were included.

In the case of Kiribati, however, some adjustments had to be made. In the year chosen, 2006, it was very difficult to find an acceptable sample of data which met the standards (see below). Almost no students reached a standard which suggested that their control of the English language was a reflection of comprehensible competence. In mid 2007, a qualified tutor was found who could provide guidance, which made a difference to the language learning of the Tarawa-based i-Kiribati students and those in the Kiribati centres visited by the tutor over the semester. Consequently, the examination results of that second semester for Kiribati showed a significant improvement. In order to ensure that samples from Kiribati were included in this research, examples of valid examination papers were included from Semester 2, 2007, but only for students from Kiribati. All other results are taken from the first and second semesters of 2006.

Table 1.3 Comparison of numbers of students in the LL114 course, and numbers in research data.

| | Semester 1, 2006 | | | Semester 2, 2006 | | |
|--------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | # of LL114 students | % of total | # in data | # of LL114 students | % of total | # in data |
| Cook Islands | 20 | 2.0 | 4 | 37 | 5.0 | 7 |
| Fiji | 508 | 52.5 | 46 | 394 | 53.7 | 150 |
| Kiribati | 47 | 4.9 | 22 | 65 | 9.0 | 19 (Sem 2, 2007) |
| Marshall | 3 | 0.3 | 3 | 5 | 0.7 | 0 |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Islands | | | | | | |
| Nauru | 2 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Niue | 2 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Samoa | 72 | 7.4 | 22 | 22 | 3.0 | 4 |
| Solomon Islands | 171 | 18 | 58 | 108 | 15 | 67 |
| Tokelau | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tonga | 43 | 4.5 | 30 | 32 | 4.0 | 5 |
| Tuvalu | 8 | 0.8 | 4 | 7 | 0.9 | 0 |
| Vanuatu | 92 | 9.5 | 32 | 60 | 8.0 | 25 |
| TOTALS | 968 | | 223 | 700 | | 277 |

In order to be considered valid for this research, papers had to have received a minimum mark of 15/40. The minimum mark accepted in the examination is 16 out of a possible 40, or, in other words, 40% of the total. A student who receives a mark of 15 has a chance, on application for a re-assessment, of receiving that necessary one mark but any mark lower than that has little chance of being reassessed positively. The mark received in the examination is then added to the internally assessed mark to provide an overall passing or failing grade. Thus any examination essay with a mark of less than 15 was excluded from the sample on the grounds that this work presented language that was harder to assess: were the deviations a sign of the student's consistent language system or were they simply errors attributable to imperfect learning or a lower level of English language control? The sample chosen ensured that the range of marks covered included those at the upper end as well. Overall, marks ranged from 15 to 34 out of 40. All marking was carried out by the Laucala (Suva) lecturers and tutors who team-marked the first five papers to establish benchmarks to ensure, as far as possible, that all markers understood what evidence of performance was being sought and thus marked accordingly.

This raised the question of whether the decision to limit included material would skew results, but papers scoring below a mark of 15 (most of whom were well below

that mark) showed reduced vocabulary capacity, sentence control and comprehensibility – overall, then, a reduced level of competence. It seemed likely that to include such samples could affect results from subjects whose control of English could be described as competent.

For the purposes of this research, only the work of students studying in the distance mode was included. This ensured that students were working within their own language environment, particularly those students who were not Fijian citizens. Thus Tongan samples are of Tongan students studying in Tonga; Vanuatu samples are from ni-Vanuatu students studying in Vanuatu. Non-Fijian students who were studying in on-campus mode at the main Suva campus or who were distance students in Fiji were excluded because of the potential for their language competence to have been affected by living in Fiji and by being exposed to Fijian English.

The papers were collected and read in detail. Every feature that could be regarded as non-standard was highlighted by colour so that these could be readily recognised on subsequent readings. This part of the research, though time-consuming, was relatively straightforward. On a second reading a code for each “deviation” was written into the margins of each paper so that the number of times that structure was employed could be assessed. Thus, if a student repeatedly modified the main verb in a modal phrase for tense, the feature itself would be noted and the number of times the student used the same form was noted. In the end, the data were entered onto three files: Morphological, Lexical and Discourse innovations, though it was not always easy to assign a particular innovation to just one of the files. It should be noted at this point that the researcher is a native speaker of New Zealand English, not of standard or regional British English. The model against which the data were measured may therefore find some features more or less readily acceptable than would be the norm for standard British academic English.

The data coded each paper so that the individuals could not be identified, but each paper could still be found and the details confirmed, and on entry data was provided for the country of origin, the number of words of each essay and the gender of the writer. The number of times a particular structure appears in a text is included and

samples of each structure are provided for each paper. When the data entry was complete, the total number of the range of innovations could be detailed per paper and the average frequency of occurrence for each paper. This enabled the researcher to see which innovations were the most common across all eleven countries, and to see quickly whether the occurrences of each were generally similar or whether there were individual differences among the countries.

The analysis of the data involved examining the sample sentences and phrases to attempt to find patterns and explanations (either within the data or in mother tongues where possible) for the distinctive features of linguistic practice. In some cases likely reasons were quite clear and samples were very similar from country to country for specific features; in others, it was less easy to propose a basis for new features. Comparisons with other studies of regional English variants (such as those in South Asia, Singapore, Malaysia and East and West Africa) were made to establish whether pattern discernment was possible or whether this Pacific data was distinctively different.

How to approach the analysis became a concern. Gupta in her 1986 article on Singapore English compared three possible approaches: the first was that any English structure which was not identical with Standard English must be seen as displaying error caused by imperfect learning; the second proposed that the differences between the studied English and standard forms can be ranked along a continuum largely based on the respondents' levels of education; and finally she suggested that speakers of the studied variant can best be analysed by the degree to which they are diglossic, utilising, as Ferguson (1959) described them, either H, high (more acrolectal) forms or L or Low (more basilectal) structures. The difficulty for all researchers is to decide what is an innovation and what is an error.

All departures from a given standard model, where they are neither a completely new creation nor a mere paraphrase or valid and meaningful reinterpretation, are basically or ultimately 'errors' – errors either of analysis or interpretation. There must, however, be a clear distinction between 'established' or 'institutionalized' errors (variants) and

‘individual’ or ‘isolated’ or ‘idiosyncratic’ errors (deviants). (Kujore, 1997: 369-70)

The intent of this research was not, however, to judge innovative forms as non-standard but to see which innovations had greater commonality among the respondents and to try to explain why these innovations (or deviations) were appearing. Further, given that all students could generally be described as being at a similar educational level, a continuum based on educational background was not applicable. The diglossia interpretation may have some value, as will be seen, but the principal question was to establish the degree to which the data showed a developing language system rather than a random collection of deviations from a standard model. As Platt et al (1984: vii) expressed it:

When is a new English not a New English? When is something a learner’s error and when is it part of a new language system? Are all New Englishes different because of differences in background languages and cultures or have they some things in common?

This is the purpose of this research: to find the commonalities and thus to be able to make some judgement on whether or not the English found in this sample of Pacific users can be seen as another “New English”.

Chapter 2 examines the history of second language research terminology and its application to the context of English imposed from outside in colonial situations but then, after independence, left to develop alone. The chapter questions how to describe the language structures which have appeared in post-colonial environments and how to judge their acceptability or otherwise. It queries the value of such terms as EFL or ESL to explain the qualities which seem to be widespread in some post-colonial English varieties, and the use of native speaker judgements to evaluate usage in predominantly non-native-speaking environments. Chapter 2 goes on to look at more recent descriptions of the language changes observable in post-colonial contexts by such researchers as Kachru, Görlach, Platt, Weber and Ho, and Schneider in order to find terms which more adequately acknowledge the

developmental process for post-colonial varieties of English which vary from standard forms but which are used by significant numbers of people.

As a result, Chapter 2 distinguishes between settlement colonies and exploitation colonies to examine the ways in which different colonial experiences may have impacted upon the English language forms which developed. It ends by explaining the four criteria which Platt et al (1984) used as their primary descriptors of what they called “New Englishes”.

Chapter 3 then applies those criteria to the South Pacific context to see how closely this region reflects the patterns described. The chapter briefly outlines the history of the arrival of English into the region and discusses in turn the relevance to the Pacific of Platt et al’s descriptors: the development of English through education rather than via natural language learning; its development in a region where English is not the mother tongue of the majority of people; the use of English for a range of valued functions; and the indigenisation of language forms by adaptation to local linguistic contexts morphosyntactically, lexically and in discourse patterns.

Chapters 4 and 5 examine the data in detail, relating features found to wider research into other such post-colonial varieties of English. Chapter 4 pays attention to the morphosyntactic details while the focus of Chapter 5 is on lexical and discourse innovations or deviations from standard structures. Chapter 6 surveys the data and offers a conclusion on whether the written English found in these Pacific essays is at a stage which can be claimed to represent a distinctive variant, and Chapter 7 examines the educational implications of the findings both for countries within the region and for New Zealand which within the next 25 years will face the fact that over 20 percent of its school children are of Pasifika ancestry.

CHAPTER 2: ASPECTS OF CONTROVERSY IN THE STUDY OF 'WORLD ENGLISHES'.

In 1979, my New Zealand parents journeyed around England, revisiting scenes from my father's childhood and exploring for the first time other features of English history and culture. At one point, while driving in Somerset, they found themselves lost among narrow and twisting lanes, and they stopped on the side of the road for my mother to alight and ask a group of locals for directions. My father watched from the car as she talked with them and apparently received advice, punctuated with various hand signals. She thanked them and returned to the car, and my father drove off amidst much waving on both sides.

"Well?" he asked. "Which way do we go?"

"I have no idea," she responded. "I couldn't understand a word."

Yet both parties were speaking English which both used as a mother tongue. So it is reasonable to ask why their respective dialects, anchored in English contexts, are regarded unquestioningly as 'English', while the English spoken in contexts outside Britain, North America, Australia and New Zealand is viewed as "new", different or inherently deficient. Just what these English language "offspring" (Mufwene, 2001) should be called continues to be a cause of some academic controversy.

Defining the terms

Recognising that the English language spoken outside England may sound different and be used differently is not a new phenomenon. In the early years of contact with South Asia, for example, English-speakers noted differences between their use of the language and that of Indian civil servants, among others. B. Kachru (1986) quotes reports from India in the 19th century, deploring the changes in semantic and grammatical use which were appearing, and anyone growing up in New Zealand in the 1950s and 60s will remember the frequent attacks on the "laziness" of New Zealand speech compared with the speech of 'home'. My English grandmother regularly referred to the English spoken in New Zealand as "pig islander English",

and Warren and Britain (2000) have noted a number of observers' concerns over the years about the apparent deterioration in New Zealand vowels.

Language does not reach a stage of optimum change and stay static from that point on, so it seems odd that much ink has gone into regrets about changes in English over the years and so much anxiety continues to be expressed over so-called falling standards, vocal laziness, corruption of vocabulary and acceptable or non-acceptable norms found in the regional Englishes of the world. It must be redundant to point out that any language must adapt to the conditions in which it finds itself and that English in a contact situation is likely to adapt widely. It is also true that the Englishes found in places as varied as Australia, Jamaica, Ghana, Samoa and Sri Lanka display distinctive qualities which differentiate each one from that found in England. Over the centuries those differences have firmed to such a degree that many researchers have been able to describe and exemplify them (for example, Kandiah 1981; 1991; Kachru, B. 1985, 1986; Fernando 1989; Sridhar 1991; Baumgardner 1993; Bamgbose 1996; de Klerk 2006), though explanations have not been so readily achieved. And the same is true of the English found in Caribbean nations, in Southeast Asia, and in sub-Saharan Africa. However, the first difficulty faced by those interested in these developments is, in fact, terminology, because more is carried in the terms used than simply the identification of language change.

In attempting to understand, explain and contextualise what is happening in the English language outside its original homeland, one difficulty appears to be the use of the word "English" to apply jointly to a culture, a language which represents that culture and a language which, in spreading beyond its earlier confines, has taken on qualities not present in the "mother" form. Perhaps, then, as English takes on new roles and functions in a world community, we, as students of the phenomenon, are trapped by our inability to find another term than "English" for all the varieties that struggle for recognition and legitimacy, or for the international variant that has become a modern commercial, scientific and technological lingua franca (Seidlhofer 2001; Jenkins, 2006, 2006b, 2009). The use of the plural "Englishes" (and "new Englishes", introduced in 1984 by Platt, Weber and Ho) has attempted to deal with

this multiplicity of forms and functions but it still labels the language forms being used as “belonging” somewhere else.

This reliance on the one term seems constantly to drag research back to comparisons with the “native speaker” models and this renders as deficit forms many of the studies of English variants examined. While recent studies deplore the use of native speaker standards as benchmarks for the validity (Davies 2002; 2003), most analyses of Indian English (Kachru 1982; 1982b) or Nigerian English (Bamgbose 1992; Bokamba 1982; Banjo 1997) or Singapore English (Gupta 1986; Ooi 2001; Platt 1982; Ho and Platt 1993), among others, are forced at some point to describe the unique qualities of these dialects of English in terms which focus on their differences from standard English (whether that standard is British or American). It appears very difficult to view these linguistic developments on their own terms, rather than as deviations from other norms, no matter how positively intended the analyses may be. The use of the phrase “standard forms” assumes they are the “right” way, the English spoken and written by “mature, socially responsible, literate adults” (Cresswell and McDavid in McArthur 1998: 130). Similarly, the term “dialect”, a regional variation on a standard variety of a language in “syntax, lexicon, morphology and phonology” (Dalton and Seidlhofer in McArthur 1998: 134), often has negative connotations when used by others than linguists. The very terms that the studies of English language varieties have used (such as *omission*, *deviant form*, *interference*, for example) encourage pejorative judgements. The fact that such terms have been in use for so long does not mean that they are without limitation.

The principal difficulty with terminology in the field is its lack of specificity. As a result, descriptors obfuscate rather than clarify the issues which complicate the study of the developing dialects of English. First, students of the data must come to terms with the extremes of views in the field. At one end of the continuum is Braj B. Kachru, the advocate for recognition of local norms, most especially for spoken Indian or South Asian English. He has argued over several years (1982; 1982b; 1986; 1990; 1996; 2006) that the forms of English which have developed in several countries which were once British colonies are stable linguistic forms, nativised by exposure to the different environments of the colonial contexts, and should be

recognised as linguistically valid. Towards the other end of this cline are researchers such as Quirk (1990) who believe that the intelligibility of English would be challenged if local norms were permitted to develop as ‘standard forms’ which, by extension, they assume can only be found in the countries of primary use, England and the United States.

Secondly, there are the terms used to describe the phenomena of the changes found in the Englishes that have appeared outside England. As a way of examining the acquisition of language, there has been a long-standing, evidence-based distinction between the acquisition of language as a first, mother or “native” tongue (L1) and the learning of another language after that first language is in place (L2). Barbara Strang (1970) divided users of English into three categories which she entitled “A, B and C speakers”. The A speakers were those who had learned English as their first and mother language, “the principal kind we think of in trying to choose a variety of English as a basis for description” (p. 17). The many millions who acquire English at various stages of their life because it has value and use in the society in which they live are described as B speakers, while the C speakers learn English because it is part of their school curriculum though it may have no “official, or even traditional standing, in th[eir] country” (1970: 17-18). In 1972 Quirk et al, in their influential work, *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, made the same sort of distinctions but adapted the categories to ‘English as a native language (ENL)’, ‘English as a second language (ESL)’ and ‘English as a foreign language (EFL)’. They applied this to entire countries, which made some analyses appear more straightforward but which at the same time disguised wide variations and continua of language learning and intelligibility within those countries.

What are described as English as native language (ENL) countries (the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand) are not wholly native-speaking. The phrase disguises such facts as invasive colonial settlement which deprived indigenous peoples of the undisturbed development of their own tongues - Scots, Gaelic, Native American, First Nation, Aborigine and Maori to name but the most obvious - and continues to ignore the place those languages have in their countries of origin and the impact they exert on the English spoken there.

The term does not, for example, readily distinguish that within countries designated ENL there are likely to be many migrants who do not, in fact, speak English as a first language. The United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand all had very significant populations before English-speaking colonists arrived and then, despite resistance from indigenous peoples, refused to leave. Since their colonial pasts, these countries have been attractive to many waves of immigrants seeking better or different lives and who enrich the linguistic variety of their new country by continuing to use their own mother tongues in daily life. What is certain in these countries, however, is that English has the pre-eminent position in the political, administrative, judicial, educational, and commercial domains and everyone is expected to be able to communicate effectively in English in order to live easily in those societies. It is not countries which have a language as a native tongue; it is people, as Trudgill (in Singh, R. 1995) states.

Furthermore, the description of a country as having English as a native language does not mean that every English-speaker will find it trouble-free to travel or live in any one of those countries. American English speakers from Maine may have difficulties grasping quickly what a fellow countryperson from Appalachia or the Deep South is saying, while Scots Highlanders and Cornish fishermen may fail to communicate easily in their vernaculars. ENL does not equal instant intelligibility for others defined as native speakers, as my parents discovered in their ramblings, yet it carries the implication that “native speakers” are the arbiters of what is correct or acceptable. It is possible to query whether I, as a New Zealander, am a native speaker of English at all; it is more accurate to say that I am a native speaker of New Zealand English because many of the norms of my speech and usage are not the norms of Standard British English, though I would probably be comprehensible to most users of that standard.

One has to question the validity of a focus on native speaker norms at all in contexts where the greatest percentages of users of English are not native speakers. Both Crystal (1997) and Graddol (1997) have provided persuasive figures which show that, internationally, the vast majority of users of English are not native speakers and nor are they using the language in situations where they are generally communicating

with native speakers. The majority of Pacific Island users of English use the language among themselves. It is the predominant language of many regional institutions and forums: the Secretariat of the South Pacific, the Pacific Islands Forum, and the United Nations regional organisations, among others, and for the most part these users are employing English because the plethora of other languages in the Pacific region means that English functions as the political and socioeconomic lingua franca. In the context of this research, communication with ‘native speakers’ is secondary in importance and in occurrence to communication between citizens of other Pacific Islands. “Native speaker language use is just one kind of reality, and not necessarily the relevant one for lingua franca contexts” (Seidlhofer 2001: 54). Pacific Island speakers of English are intelligible to each other in the formal situations dictated by regional conferences, and in classrooms in the University of the South Pacific. It is thus reasonable to ask how applicable ‘native speaker’ models and standards are to this environment.

So it is not unexpected to find that the division of English speakers into ‘native’ or ‘non-native’ has been questioned. This pairing implicitly places the native speaker in the normative position which by extension renders ‘non-native’ a deficit term because it is *NOT* native; this places learners in the position of being forced to chase a target which, it seems, they can never acquire. Native speaker status has less to do with linguistic acuity and a good deal more to do with an accident of birth (Brutt-Griffler and Samimy 2001; Higgins 2003; Davies 2003). Other considerations relate to the difficulty of describing those who are, in fact, native speakers of one of the ‘non-native’ varieties. While numbers may not be large, there are certainly people in all regions who, in Davies’ definition, have “acquire[d] the L1 (in this case English) of which s/he is a native speaker in early childhood” (2002: 15). R. Singh (1995: 34) insists that Peter Trudgill, for example, whose mother dialect was that of Norwich, and K.P. Mohanan who speaks Indian English are “native speakers of their respective varieties”. Pierce (1995) notes that many so-called ESL-context speakers of English in fact use English as their primary language of communication and view themselves as legitimate native speakers. “[S]peakers’ own ideological stances

towards their linguistic identities should be more significant than the label they are given by others.” (Higgins 2003: 616)

The second of Quirk et al’s three terms, “ESL” or English as a second language, has always been a controversial term and in some places has been replaced in pedagogical discourse by the term “ESOL”, or English for speakers of other languages. This recognises that some new learners may not be acquiring merely their second language; they may be learning their third or fourth or tenth. In multilingual communities such as those in much of the world, English is not a second language but yet another linguistic option in an already complex linguistic scene. ESL, therefore, is sometimes interpreted as a patronising term, reflecting a colonial view of the world in which English was seen as an advantageous civilising influence. Once again, the idea that an entire country can be described as “ESL” ignores that fact that within these countries there will be a wide continuum of control from those who do indeed use English as a primary tongue to those who employ what is sometimes referred to as “broken English”. And, as Conrad says (1996: 22) the term ESL “tells us nothing of the role the language plays for the speaker, whether home language, national language or language of international communication.”

“The standard definition of a second language is one that is acquired in an environment in which the language is spoken natively” (Bhatt 2001: 538) and this has become the basis of an entire industry of language teaching. This interpretation presupposes that English is always present in the community and is being spoken by the majority of the population for a wide range of personal and official functions. Bhatt goes on to deplore the limits of this definition and its resultant reliance on native speaker norms. He argues that this “marginalises the empirical fact that more second language acquisition takes place in ‘normative’ contexts than in ‘native’ contexts” (ibid), and he is not the only one to point this out (Sridhar 1994; Kachru, B 1986; 1991; Crystal 1997; Graddol 1997; Yano 2001). Perhaps once more we are being restricted by the term ESL itself which confusingly straddles several linguistic and pedagogical disciplines and does not clarify the language learning situation found in contexts where the language spoken natively is not English. The countries identified by Strang and others as ESL are now independent ex-colonies, and

English, though it may be recognised by official status in these countries, is not the language of daily intercourse for the majority of the population. Further, there are, within what would be labelled an ESL country, individuals who speak as a native language the variant that is common within that country; Yano (2001: 122), following Kachru (1999) claims that the ENL and ESL divisions are merging into an ENL structure which has two sub-groups: that which is genetically a native language and that which is functionally native. If this view is borne out by empirical research, then the use of “ESL” will no longer be relevant. Moag (1982) proposes that there is a natural life span for ESL forms not found in target language communities, and suggests that eventually they will revert to an English as a foreign language (EFL) structure as the position of English within the community changes to a less official status and as increasing sociocultural confidence values local languages more highly.

English as a foreign language (EFL) is perhaps the clearest of the three terms, and the least pejorative, but in Strang’s interpretation it is still used to describe a “country”. EFL describes situations in which English has no specific cultural value (though the incentive to learn it may be enhanced by its current worldwide usefulness), but is taught as a school subject, a feature of the curriculum just as Science or Mathematics. Moag (1982) suggests that what separates EFL from ESL is that the former has a low level of official recognition, a low rate of innovative features related to use and no particular prestige in the learner society. Unless it is compulsory to learn English in school, it seems extreme to describe an entire country as an EFL one, but the term “foreign language” does explain a learning situation in which the language being taught has no official status in the society but is learned only through education, reflecting international interest in the apparent economic benefits which the English language can offer at present.

A further difficulty with this three-pronged categorisation of ENL, ESL and EFL is that it does not include English-lexified Pidgins or Creoles, which McArthur, at least, views as part of a continuum of English forms (1998: 44). While some of these language forms are closer to the English standard than others, many are regularising or regularised and spoken by many thousands of people who often describe what they speak as English, and these ‘languages’ often exist in societies where Standard

English is an official language. This is particularly true of Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu in the Pacific, for example. (Siegel 1987; 1997b)

Despite the difficulties of precision with the terms ENL, ESL and EFL, they have survived and are still widely used. However, in recent years there have been different interpretations of the data relating to the varieties of English used in the world. In 1981, Strevens suggested that there were two principal, distinguishable variants of English, British and American, with their own spheres of influence – British English in most of South Asia, Africa and Australasia, and American English in the Caribbean and parts of Asia. His work did not focus so closely on the traditional divisions of speakers of English but was more diachronic in its approach, and it identified types such as “Puerto Rican”, “West African” and “Forms of Indian English”. The visualisation of the world divided into two main English language camps was helpful at the time for clarifying which areas of the world were likely to follow which principal features of phonology, pronunciation, spelling, and usage but it was a very generalised interpretation. Strevens was also an early proponent of the idea that no-one “owned” English, that as an international vehicle for communication it should be acknowledged as having unique qualities wherever it was found.

In 1985 Braj Kachru published, in the papers from a conference held to discuss the reality of the degrees of variance within “world Englishes”, his description of world Englishes as being related to various countries’ geopolitical experience of English, a model now known as the Concentric Circles model. The visual image through which he expressed this interpretation has gone through several incarnations: the first was a group of overlapping ovals of decreasing size moving from left to right, not actually concentric circles at all. (Kachru 1988b). The circles to the extreme right were empty, recognising the development of English from the forms it has had in the past, but the main focus was the three circles to the left. The smallest of these three he entitled *the Inner Circle*, representing the countries which stand as the original sources of English use because the majority of these populations speak English as a ‘native language’: Great Britain, the United States of America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In effect, these tally with the earlier description of ENL countries but his title did not recognise the fact that in the latter four countries English came with

colonisers. Kachru later (1996b) described them as First Diaspora members of the Inner Circle. The second, slightly larger circle, *the Outer Circle*, represents those countries who have had English in their societies for some time and where the language continues to have valued status – in other words, colonial and post-colonial states, such as Singapore, the Philippines, Fiji, Malaysia, Nigeria and India, or what Kachru would later refer to as Second Diaspora communities. This corresponds once again to the previous ESL model but it attempts to place these variants of English in a context of historical and political experience. The final and largest of his circles is *the Expanding Circle*, those countries which teach English within the school curriculum but offer it as a school subject, not a privileged language of instruction, which corresponds to the EFL category but in the Pacific region, this division is complicated by the fact that English is also the medium of instruction. This Concentric Circles image found the Caribbean and South African examples difficult to place because, as Kachru himself acknowledged, their linguistic environments were so complex.

Kachru added a further element to this model – the element of norms of usage. He described the countries of the Inner Circle as ‘norm-providing’ meaning that it was to the English of these countries that most ‘non-native’ speakers looked to establish the quality of their English, largely for historical reasons. This is an interesting distinction because it emphasises the power that these countries have had in establishing the legitimacy of a variant. The Outer Circle he saw as ‘norm-developing’, beginning to recognise local forms of English as acceptable within that society (though he would now claim that some of these language communities are already norm-providing), while the Expanding Circle was interpreted as ‘norm-dependent’, still reliant on the standards of the Inner Circle to establish what was and was not acceptable in their use of English.

However, just as with the general descriptors of ENL, ESL and EFL, the terms Kachru chose, though he was attempting to clarify the geo-historic backgrounds to the development of various Englishes, carried a considerable amount of evaluative bias. He had intended that these new descriptors would reduce the “us and them” sense inherent in ENL and ESL, especially as “it is almost unavoidable that anyone

would take ‘second’ as less worthy” (Kachru, Y. and Nelson 2006:79). However, the terms ‘Inner’ and ‘Outer’ carry implications which are at least as problematic. To be in ‘the inner circle’ is generally taken as meaning that one is close to the source of power or has some valuable knowledge which others lack, while ‘being on the outer’ implies that one is excluded from authority – in other words, implicitly, “less worthy”. Further, describing the Inner Circle as “norm-providing” reinforces the idea that those countries are the arbiters of what should be perceived as ‘correct’ or ‘desirable’. It was this exclusionary quality that Pennycook deplored (1994) and which others have highlighted (Modiano 1999; Rajadurai 2005).

Other publications of Kachru’s Concentric Circles Model have envisaged his image somewhat differently which suggests that the divisions he proposed are not fully understood. Some have positioned the circles one inside the other, in the form of a target (Berns 1995; Yano 2001; Schneider 2007), with the Inner Circle in the middle surrounded by the Outer Circle which is itself encased in the Expanding Circle. This has the effect of changing the independence of each group because, in this form, the Inner Circle now becomes the “bullseye” of the target, as has been perceived by critics. Though Kachru was not suggesting that the Inner Circle was the norm target as of right, that has been one concern inferred from his descriptive structure and his terminology. His work has undoubtedly been influential and groundbreaking in its refocus upon the historical roots of the ‘new’ Englishes but unintentionally, by using the term ‘concentric circles’, it has reinforced some of the very judgements it was attempting to dispel.

Visual images of the relationships between the developing variants of English appear to be popular in an attempt to make sense of their development. After Kachru’s overlapping circles there was McArthur’s image of spoked concentric circles, looking rather like an umbrella from above (1997:28). He placed at the hub something he called “World Standard English” which as yet no-one has managed to define, even supposing that there could be such a thing as a single world standard of English. The spokes radiating out separate the parts of “an encircling band of regional varieties” such as Standard British/Irish, American, Canadian, Australian/New Zealand Englishes and “Standardising” forms including East Asian,

South Asian and African Englishes. The fringe beyond this is a mass of sub-varieties – Scottish English, Black English Vernacular, Quebec English, Maori English, Singapore English, Indian English, Zambian English and many more.

Görlach developed this image further (1988). His version is interesting for recognising the central importance of English's international status – it is this form which occupies the centre of his model. Around this core are regional forms: British, American, Caribbean, South Asian and Antipodean Englishes, and beyond that the emerging examples of those regional forms, such as Irish, Scots and Welsh Englishes, or Australian and New Zealand Englishes, or West African and East African Englishes, only some of which are recognised as having linguistic validity. The fourth circle describes sub-variants or dialects: Ghanaian English, Kenyan English, Aboriginal English, Tamil English, Jamaican English. Floating outside the confines of the circle are Pidgins and Creoles, including Tok Pisin, Krio and Sranan.

In 1999 Modiano translated his view of 'world Englishes' somewhat differently (1999: 25) because he focused most on the role English plays as an international lingua franca. He ignores the divisions into geographical regions and pays more attention to functional proficiency. His concept is visualised as what he terms 'two centripetal circles' with a smaller circle in the middle representing those people "proficient in international English". By this he means that such speakers are able to communicate readily with each other without strong interfering accents or syntax, and he includes within this circle any with this skill, whether they have English as a first language or not. The first surrounding oval represents those who have 'native or foreign language proficiency' – able to speak to others of their own level of skill but less able to make the adjustments necessary to be regarded as particularly skilled in 'international' English. The next oval beyond signifies the learners, those who are not yet proficient in English, and beyond that are 'people who do not speak English'. Like other such classifications, this one failed to define what a 'strong accent' was and who would be responsible for making the decision to include or exclude speakers from one or other of the circles, but it did suggest that what is developing in the changing use of English is a form of the language which is no longer attached to its physical roots (England) but which functions as an internationally intelligible

lingua franca, and removes variations from the colonial distinction of national varieties.

Yoneoka (2002) takes the image of an open umbrella in profile as a way of discussing the development of varieties of English while avoiding having to define exactly how many individual varieties there might be. She views the spike at the top of an umbrella as the idealised standard form (whatever that means) and the handle becomes “core ‘easy’ English”. Again, exactly what is meant by ‘core’ or ‘easy’ remains unclear. The fabric of the umbrella represents the socio-cultural systems of each language community (Asian Englishes, Antipodean Englishes, and so on), and the tips are the various detailed forms (which are theoretical and not fully defined).

Platt, Weber and Ho (1984) did not create visual images of language use but did initiate the term ‘new Englishes’. Because the researchers were based in Singapore, many of their examples were from their work in Singapore English, but they also included reference to research into other forms of ‘new’ Englishes and provided a valuable summary of some commonalities. The term ‘new’ has been widely adopted, but while it seems appropriate for some contexts such as the Pacific where the English colonial experience was relatively short-lived, it is a somewhat different story for India where sustained contact between English and Indian languages began with the East India Company in 1600, or for West Africa where contact began in the late 16th century and continued until the latter half of the twentieth century. The questions that present themselves are, ‘What makes them new? When does one or any of these variants stop being ‘new’? And what then?’ “In an obvious sense, *all* varieties of the English language outside its original home, England, may rightly be considered ‘new’ Englishes.” (Kandiah 1998: 3). Yet this term is distinctly not applied to the Englishes of Kachru’s Inner Circle or those of B. Kachru, Y.Kachru and Nelson’s First and Second Diaspora (2006); it is reserved for the English forms appearing in South Asia, Southeast Asia, West and East Africa.

Over the life time of the research into this field, there have been other attempts to describe what has been developing. “World English” was one such term but this tended to sustain the view that there was really only *one* English. This has expanded

to “World Englishes” which became the title of the academic journal whose editorship was taken up by B. Kachru in 1985. The use of the plural form acknowledges that English is being used in different socio-cultural and multilingual contexts, for different functions ranging from interpersonal contact to literary creativity and for interpersonal, intra-national or regional, and international purposes. It requires a pluricentric view which interprets the English language as having multiple forms deserving of recognition (Smith 1981; Kachru 1982, 1986; Lowenberg 1991) and this is especially important in view of the fact that so-called ‘non-native’ speakers vastly outnumber the so-called ‘native’ speakers (Crystal 1997; Graddol 1997). “Labels have a value, they provide a definition”, wrote Kachru (1996: 20) but these labels do not always clarify.

“More than ever we need a clear definition of a ‘second-language variety of English’, also known as ‘a new English’, in order to be able to differentiate between what we would intuitively accept as a variety of English and what we would classify as less than this: as learner language” (Mollin, 2007: 168). Whether, indeed, second-language varieties and ‘new’ Englishes are the same thing is arguable, but a clearer range of terms is undoubtedly required. So I sought labels that either made sense in the context of the research or made me feel more comfortable. ‘Inner/Outer’ and ‘new/native/non-native’ did not make me comfortable, firstly because of the negative judgement implied and secondly because such terms did not appear to be especially clear. Nayar (1997) proposes that all forms of English being learned as something other than a native tongue should be referred to as ‘English as an additional language (EAL)’ because he believes that removes unnecessary distinctions between ESL and EFL. But that term too does not describe with any degree of clarity the English which is forming in the Pacific, where learners might most accurately be described as neither ESL or EFL. They were learning in an EFL environment when the colonial power was in place, and English was the language of that authority and desirable to acquire in order to advance within the colonial society, but when few outside the elite spoke it. After independence, though English in every case continues to be valued within the society, the learning environments are no longer ESL because English is not the language of the socio-political entities, though that may not be true

of Fiji. Yet these learning situations hardly fit with the usual definition of EFL either: English retains a valued place in these communities, often being defined as an ‘official’ language in the various constitutions. Neither ESL nor EFL comes close to describing the special set of learning environments, language use and social position of English within the countries of the Pacific once part of an English-speaking empire.

Instead, I found other terms more reflective of the reality of how these varying forms of English developed. Using Mufwene’s distinctions (2006), Schneider (2007) describes three different forms of colonisation which he believes determined the social and interlinguistic contacts within the colonies. These forms are:

- a) trade colonisation which featured irregular contact between languages and which was not intended to demand a migration of English speakers. This has been a typical experience in the Pacific where trade posts often “evolved into ...exploitation colonies” (Mufwene, 2004: 212, quoted in Schneider, 2007: 24);
- b) exploitation colonies which were those which often began with the establishment of plantations, or were part of an imperial political network. Mufwene points out that these colonies featured a considerable division of economic, political and social power, and varied contact between the colonisers and the colonised and, on the whole, offered little appeal for large numbers of migrants from the colonising culture;
- c) settlement colonies which were those attracting significant numbers of migrants from the European country which claimed them. This meant that indigenous people were marginalised as their lands were taken over by people with a different cultural concept of land ownership, and the colonisers’ languages, political and economic structures and social priorities dominated the extant societies.

What B. Kachru has termed the ‘Inner Circle’ coincides with the concept of Settlement colonies, where English became firmly settled after the ‘first diaspora’.

English moved out from Britain with its emigrants to the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, despite varying resistance from the indigenous peoples, and that influx of migrants continued until their sheer numerical strength overpowered those earlier cultures and sidelined them and, commonly, their languages as well. So it seems appropriate to label the English that developed in these countries as ‘Settlement English’. That term also adequately describes English in the United Kingdom, and avoids the difficulties with the term ‘native speaker’; at the same time, it does not ignore those within each country who may not be ‘native speakers’, and, recognising that language change occurred in these communities as well, the term can accommodate the differences between the English of New Zealand and that of the United States, and embraces both the English of my parents and that of their Somerset guides. The English found in the Expanding Circle is a ‘Curriculum English’, tied to an educational environment and to foreign language curricula, with little inherent value for those societies overall other than the advantages provided by some knowledge of English in the current business and technological climate.

Shared characteristics of Post-exploitation-colony Englishes

To define the Englishes that have developed, and will continue to develop, in Kachru’s ‘Outer Circle’, Schneider’s choice of ‘Post-colonial Englishes’ seemed to offer a better description because it recognises the particular and shared contact and the socio-political experience that gave rise to the development of these varieties, and it implicitly acknowledges the several similarities in linguistic development and production which they present. However, ‘post-colonial English’ also describes the English forms found in the Inner circle because the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand were all at one time English or British colonies.

The socio-political histories of the post-exploitation colonies share a more specialised group of similarities of experience which makes the development of the English in those societies, including the Pacific, particularly interesting. “There is a shared underlying process which drives their formations, accounts for many similarities between them, and appears to operate whenever a language is

transplanted” (Schneider 2007: 29). The English found as a result of these experiences, I believe, can be described as post-exploitation-colony Englishes (PECEs).

“We can hardly expect, of course, that the resulting varieties would all be alike,” wrote Kandiah (1998: 3) and there are certainly differences in the individual details of each post-exploitation-colony English. The terms “indigenisation” (Kachru, 1985) and “nativisation” (Platt et al, 1984: viii) imply that at least some of the changes likely to be seen among these PECEs will be unique and culturally specific, given the vast variety of substrates present in such varied communities and that is certainly so; yet what is so interesting in studying these forms of English is the remarkable similarities the PECEs display. Why, in the process of indigenisation, or acculturation, do these PECEs not show vast differences? Why should the English innovations in the Pacific, home to hundreds of languages, reflect those of West and East Africa or India, also linguistically rich? Clearly, though all these PECEs show many influences from their respective substrate languages, there is a surprisingly high degree of similarity among them all.

The shared characteristics are both external and internal. Externally, all the countries within the PECE group have experienced colonialism or protectorates. Some began with trade colonisation, such as the countries of West Africa or India, which then expanded into political control from Britain (Bamgbose et al 1997). Some had plantation experience – Jamaica, Samoa and Fiji (Siegel 1987; Nero 2000; Campbell 2003) – while others became colonies because of their geopolitical value, such as Singapore or Hong Kong or Samoa. Significant numbers of people were moved to the Caribbean colonies as slaves from Africa, or as indentured labourers from Britain (or from India, in the case of Fiji (Siegel 1987; Lal 2004), or as administrators, but most of the other colonies did not attract large numbers of English-speaking migrants because the purpose of empire-building was not the spread of English culture but the regional expansion of English/British commercial and economic authority.

Secondly, the contact was sustained, though not equally so. Trade contacts with the Caribbean, India and West Africa date from at least the 16th century, long before the

administration of territories was taken over by the British government. Singapore and the states of the Malay Peninsula came under the British wing in the late 18th century and early 19th. East Africa, however, was less attractive to the British government, and parts only joined the British Empire when transferred from German to British hands after World War I by the League of Nations. In the Pacific region, colonies such as Samoa joined the Empire after World War I; others were accepted into the imperial family with some reluctance in the last 30 or so years of the 19th century. Independence came for these territories between 1962 and the 1980s (see Chapter 3 for details).

Although missionaries to these colonies tended to learn and use major indigenous languages, particularly in the schools they founded (see Chapter 3), that was not the common practice among administrators, though in some colonies, for example, Fiji, there was an expectation that administrators would learn to converse in at least one local language (Siegel 1987) and many administrators became famous for their work in local languages and cultures. The business of politics, justice, regional and/or inter-colonial economics was overwhelmingly in English, and the educational practice was to introduce English as the medium of instruction within the primary system, most especially for an elite which would take on the role of the administrative links between the governing colonial culture and the indigenous communities (Brutt-Griffler 2002). At no point did English challenge the dominant position of indigenous languages as the principal languages of informal and intimate communication in the home, the market or cultural activities. This distinguishes these exploitation colonies from the settlement examples where English, over time, reduced local languages to minority status, during which process many languages were endangered or even lost (Phillipson 1992).

Further, because English became important to the administration of the colonies, it took on several vital functions, many of which had not been a feature of those communities before. In multilingual societies such as those in India, in West and East Africa and in the Melanesian countries, English took on a rather specialised role: as Kachru has shown in India (1986), Adekunle in Nigeria (1997) and Bokhorst-Heng (1998) in Singapore, English was viewed as neutral. By not being

intimately part of the society, English was not associated with a particular culture, clan or tribe so its lexicon did not carry cultural baggage within these societies. It was a way of crossing linguistic barriers. Furthermore, with an English administration came the imposition of English concepts: a retributive judicial system of courts and prisons, international business practices and banks, personal land ownership, and western architectural and infrastructural patterns. For many of these features there were no local linguistic equivalents, and so the language of these functions was English by default as much as by intent.

Finally, unlike the experience of settlement colonies, independence in these exploitation colonies meant that the majority of English-speaking administrators, teachers, judges, businesspeople and the like returned to their homelands. Long-term commitment to the colony was not their intention; they had taken advantage of opportunities or of service postings, and when independence changed either the opportunities or the employer, they moved to other jobs. This meant that the linguistic models presented in a range of fields were no longer present and local models moved in to fill the spaces.

Apart from these shared externally imposed characteristics, there are important similarities in internal attitudes. The first important aspect is that for the vast majority of PECE users their principal interlocutors are other speakers and writers of PECEs, within their own countries or in regional communication. Their need for the language has relatively little to do with English L1 users because once the colonial power left, the opportunity to have daily contact with speakers of an L1 variety was reduced, even if it had generally occurred in the first place during the colonial period. Only a relatively small percentage of PECE users were likely to have the chance to communicate in English with someone for whom it was a first language (Kachru 1988b; Nayar 1997).

The motivation to acquire English was thus largely instrumental. With independence there tends to be an increase in pride in a country's culture and way of life, and there is likely to be less interest in identifying with the colonial culture; changes in educational policy in Tanzania, Malaysia and Sri Lanka, when developing

nationalism placed greater emphasis on local languages, reflect this development (Banjo 1997; Vavrus 2002; Kachru et al 2006; Fernando 1982). This aspect will surely increase over time, rather than reducing. On the other hand, the dichotomous position is that there is a strong general interest in acquiring English because of the language's current place in fields such as science, technology, computer science, international business and more (Crystal 1997; Graddol 1997). In Sri Lanka, there has been a call for improved English language teaching in the face of complaints about falling standards. Tanzania, despite its commitment to kiSwahili, has found that desire for English has not fallen. In Malaysia where almost all education is presented in Malay, the demand for English means that all university students must have English in their degrees. English offers opportunities for advancement in international fields, and the appeal is not for the culture of the language but for its general usefulness.

Another internal similarity which these PECEs share is the fact that the teaching of English, once predominantly in the hands of British or Settlement English teachers, has since independence become the domain of local teachers in local environments. There are likely to be teachers from other countries at tertiary levels which have always had an international component, but compulsory and secondary education is generally in the hands of locally trained and educated teachers. This does not mean that local educators are 'non-standard' or deficient users of English, but that they are likely to be examples of local pronunciation and users of local lexical and structural features while being the models for new learners of English (Kachru, 1982; Banjo, 1997; Ahulu 1994 & 1994b).

Further, education in English and through English is commonly introduced quite early in the educational systems of post-colonial societies. In one or two cases, notably Tanzania and Malaysia, a greater emphasis has been placed on the use of the dominant indigenous language, kiSwahili and Bahasa Malay respectively, in the compulsory education system as the main language of instruction (Bokamba 1982; Ho and Platt 1993; Bunyi 1997; Ooi 2001), but in most other countries with a post-exploitation colonial experience, English continues to have a powerful role to play in the education of compulsory and post-compulsory education. In Singapore the

language policy has ensured that, though community languages are taught, education in English remains the norm and in 1987 “all education under government control was required to be in the medium of English” (Gupta, 1998: 115; Foley et al 1998: 244-247). In Nigeria, despite attempts to make Yoruba the chief language of instruction, English continues to be the medium of instruction in many high schools (Bamgbose 1996), and Mazrui and Mazrui (1996) point out that by the late 1960s more than half of all primary schools in Kenya were taught in English, and in Uganda, despite the disturbances wrought by the civil war, English is still the major language of the classroom. In the Pacific, though English as the medium of instruction is introduced at different stages in different countries, depending to a large degree on whether those countries have one or many indigenous languages to consider, all students must learn through the English language in secondary school. Chapter 3 will clarify this point.

Additionally, unlike the situation in one of the commonly accepted interpretations of ESL – that learners are acquiring English in an English-speaking context – the citizens of PECE countries are not surrounded by English. They may be in a predominantly monolingual situation (as in Samoa or Tonga), but many PECE societies are multilingual (especially in India, West and East Africa and Melanesia in the Pacific) and English, as a result, is just one of the languages available for use. Vanuatu, in fact, not only has many dozens of vernaculars but must also juggle two colonial languages, English and French. The language of the family and informal daily contact is likely to be one of the community’s indigenous languages. Thus, though English may continue to have a variety of important roles, the depth of English in these roles may in fact be quite shallow when examined across all sectors of a community. This is borne out in the research literature by the widespread reference to ‘continua’ of use, and to basilectal, mesolectal and acrolectal features (Tay 1982 ; Platt et al 1984; Kachru 1985, 1986; 1988b; Romaine 1988; Ho and Platt 1993; Mufwene 2006). These terms are more usually associated with the study of pidgins and creoles but are also useful in research into PECEs because they draw attention to the fact that users in these contexts may present on a cline of linguistic proficiency: basilectal control describes the level of accomplishment furthest from

the standard form and is often stigmatised; acrolectal represents the dialectal form regarded as having the greatest prestige; while the mesolect is a fluid category somewhere between the two extremes. This cline is not merely a matter of proficiency (especially with reference to a creole which is a fully developed language capable of being the first language of speakers), but it can also present some users of the language in question with a range of diglossic choices; Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 150) quote examples of ‘downshifting’ in lectal choice given a change of social context in a PECE environment.

The term ‘post-exploitation-colony Englishes’, then, appears an appropriate and clearer description of the forms of English that have developed in the countries once part of the British Empire but not settled by colonists. Yet, despite the inexactitude of the term ‘English as a second language’ in this context, much of the work in what is called ‘second language acquisition’ (SLA) is germane to a study of PECEs. First of all, it is relevant to return to Moag’s (1982) suggestion that these Englishes may, in fact, be moving from a ‘second language’ context to a ‘foreign language’ context as the place of English in their communities changes and as some of the first languages of each country are able to regain their natural position in a variety of the functions and domains demanded by a modern society. This is not to say that English will rapidly fade from importance or use – the current world status of English militates against this likelihood – but that national confidence and identity with an independent nation will likely restore indigenous languages to positions of value. There is evidence in countries as varied as Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Tanzania and Fiji of the desire to reinvigorate and make more authoritative national languages, but it is also clear in those countries (among others) that the demand for English and for facility in English remains high. Whether ‘second’ or ‘foreign’ language, the processes by which a language subsequent to the first is learned are useful to an understanding of what has occurred in the development of PECEs.

Error analysis and PECEs

SLA research has given rise to several theories which have relevance to the development of PECEs. The first is ‘error analysis’, which grew out of the work of

Corder in 1967 and followed on from the Contrastive Analysis theory which claimed to be able to predict learner errors by comparing the mother tongue with the second language (Lado, 1957). Corder wrote:

It is quite unreasonable to expect the learner of a second language not to exhibit such slips of the tongue (or pen), ... We must therefore make a distinction between those errors which are the product of ... chance circumstances and those which reveal his underlying knowledge of the language to date ... It will be useful therefore hereafter to refer to errors of performance as *mistakes*, reserving the term *error* to refer to the systematic errors of the learner. (1967, in Richards (ed) 1974: 24-5).

He went on to describe these ‘errors’ as a sign that the learner was in the process of making sense of the new language. Richards (1971) expanded the concept of error by suggesting that three types could be distinguished: those made because of interference from the mother tongue; those which can be described as ‘intralingual’, caused by over-generalising or an incomplete application of rules; and those which are developmental, related to the stages of learning and to limited experience. Dulay and Burt (1974) categorised errors in early learners as (a) developmental, those which are part of the learning sequence; (b) interference, which reflect data from the first language; or (c) unique, errors that do not fit readily into either of the other two.

What all of these proposals show is that it is, in fact, not easy to categorise any errors quite so clearly. There may be a combination of causes for a particular error to appear in a learner’s speech or writing and it is difficult to assign one form of error to one category rather than another. But all these pieces of research viewed errors as casting some light on the learning process, as a form of system which could be analysed even if only tentatively.

These views led to a questioning of the role of first language ‘interference’ which had, until that point, been regarded as the most logical explanation for the approximations of the target language which learners made. This questioning suggested that ‘interference’ was only one of a number of explanations for what learners were doing. Selinker in 1972 extended Corder’s research to present his

theory of 'interlanguage'. The value of his research was his reliance on observable data, not on purely theoretical possibilities. He pointed out that learners provide output which is different from that which a native speaker would have made as input and that:

In the making of constructs relevant to a theory of second language learning, one would be completely justified in hypothesizing, perhaps even *compelled* to hypothesize, the existence of a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a TL norm. This linguistic system we will call 'interlanguage'. (in Richards (ed) 1974: 33)

He continued by identifying five processes which he believed to be an essential part of all second language learning: language transfer (not 'interference'), transfer of training, strategies of second language learning, strategies of second language communication, and over-generalisation. Further, he proposed that certain learning could *fossilise* when certain non-standard structures remain in a learner's performance, no matter how much attention is paid to them (p. 35-6). There have been critiques of these points (Ellis 1986) but what was of value to the study of new Englishes is the claim that interlanguages (IL) represent a linguistic system which has rules, even if those rules do not correspond with those which native speakers might identify. As a theory it was focussing not on the faults but on the learner system which led to approximations of form and which was dynamic.

Use of the notion of 'interference' or language transfer had been part of contrastive analysis and then of error analysis, which claimed that some errors could be explained by patterns from the L1 'interfering' with a firm and complete grasp of structures in the L2. The term has fallen from favour because of its pejorative tone, but the idea that the first language can help or hinder certain features of acquisition of an L2 has continued to be examined because "it has proved impossible to ignore the influence of the native language (L1) in interlanguage data" (Celce-Mercia and Hawkins 1985: 67). It is hard to imagine that a learner would not bring with him/her the L1 language habits already firmly acquired, but it is difficult to say which habits

those are and how they interact with the new learning and there is disagreement about the degree of transfer there might be: Dulay and Burt (1973) claimed that transfer errors accounted for only 3% of their Spanish-mother-tongue students' errors, while Ellis (1994: 302) quotes Lott (1983) who suggested that 50% of his learners' errors could be attributed to transfer. It is clear in data from the Pacific that some examples of resumptive pronoun use are transferred from the mother tongues: in a discussion with ni-Vanuatu colleagues in 2007 those examples were described as "what we do in our languages" (H. Tamtam and H. Bogiri: pers. comm.), and research into relativisation (Hawkins 1989; Wong 1990; Juffs 1998; Newbrook 1998; McDaniel and Cowart 1999; McKee and McDaniel 2001; Izumi 2003; Flynn et al 2004) shows that this is a common strategy among learners from languages whose relativisation processes expect or permit the resumptive pronoun in the relative clause.

Andersen's 'transfer to somewhere' principle (1983) proposed that there were natural conditions which encouraged transfer from the first language; indeed, he claimed that these conditions were essential. His first point was that transfer would occur if "natural acquisitional principles are consistent with the L1 structure" (p.182) which is difficult to pinpoint. The second condition was that there must be evidence in the input, of which the learner is aware, that the L2 can accept the form or structure transferred. In the Pacific, learners often *hear* resumptive pronouns used by native speakers in the way the learners then write them, though native speakers may not use such forms in writing. And the third and final condition was that transfer is more likely to occur with simple and free morphemes which have an equivalent or near equivalent form in the L2. As will be seen, it is possible in the Pacific data to identify potential examples, though what is 'simple' in one language may be decidedly not so in another.

SLA studies are well-established and have thrown a good deal of light on what processes are possibly underway. However, there are some limitations to fitting the PECEs comfortably into SLA theories. Firstly, studies are generally carried out on limited numbers of subjects. Schumann (1974; 1977) developed his theories of language learning and pidginisation working with a single adult over a sustained

period of time; Hakuta (1974 in Hatch 1978), Itoh and Hatch (1978), and Ravem (1978) (among many others) studied one or two subjects, while Dulay and Burt (1973) worked on the natural order of morpheme acquisition with groups of 50-60 children, 150 in all, and Bailey et al (1974) carried out similar research on 73 adult learners from a range of mother tongues. These small-scale studies enabled a close analysis of how an individual made adjustments during language acquisition and of the strategies used to allow communication to proceed. However, they do not necessarily support extrapolation to larger communities.

Secondly, SLA studies have generally focussed on children or adults learning within an English-speaking community who “embark on the learning of an additional language, at least some years after they have started to acquire their first language” (Mitchell and Myles, 2004: 23). In the Pacific context, like other PECE environments, the division between the first and the second language is not as clear as it might be. When children do begin school in Pacific countries, they are commonly, though not exclusively, faced with English as the medium of instruction by the age of eight, if not earlier, as will be examined in Chapter 3. This raises questions about the impact of learning another language while learning content *through* that language when they may still be young enough for their first language acquisition to be incomplete. Further, this presents the assumption that they have had the first crucial years of schooling in their first language: many Pacific, African and Indian children do not have as their mother tongue the language of the school especially when the community is multilingual.

It is true that some Pacific children, most especially those in urban environments, are likely to have some contact with English before they begin formal language instruction. Apart from the fact that there are families across the region who choose to speak English in the home, as there are in other PECE environments (Tay 1982; Fernando 1982; Gupta 1986; 1998), urban children will hear and see advertisements on radio and on television (which is largely in English region-wide), and will possibly have access to English-language cinema or DVDs. But the Pacific population is overwhelmingly rural, especially in countries composed of several islands. The most highly urbanised Pacific nation is Nauru by statistics but no

distinction is made in Nauru between urban and rural districts. The next most urbanised country is the Marshall Islands, but of the remaining countries in this study only the Cook Islands has more than half the population in urban centres. (See Fig. 2.1 below)

Table 2.1 Population data for USP clientele nations.

| | Population 2010 (rounded) | Urban population % | Urban numbers (rounded) |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cook Islands | 15,530 | 72 | 11,200 |
| Fiji | 847,795 | 51 | 432,400 |
| Kiribati | 100,835 | 44 | 44,300 |
| Marshall Islands | 54,439 | 65 | 35,400 |
| Nauru | 9,980 | 100 | 9,980 |
| Niue | 1,490 | 36 | 530 |
| Samoa | 183,125 | 21 | 38,500 |
| Solomon Islands | 549,600 | 16 | 87,900 |
| Tonga | 103,575 | 23 | 23,800 |
| Tuvalu | 11,150 | 47 | 5,250 |
| Vanuatu | 245,000 | 24 | 58,800 |
| Data: www.spc.int/sdp/index.php 2010 | TOTAL: 2,122,519 | | TOTAL: 748,100 |

Local radio reaching outlying areas is generally in local languages, though English may also be used, and television is not a common feature of rural homes, especially when electrification may also not be common in some rural villages.

In such cases as those described above by Mitchell and Myles, learners are surrounded by the target language, whether they are learning naturalistically or through formal education. In PECE environments, the English language has an important societal role but is not generally the language chosen for intimate relationships. In urban communities there are opportunities to interact with English, either passively or actively, but not in rural communities as a rule. This places the majority of PECE communities (with the exception of Singapore) closer to an EFL alignment than an ESL one.

‘Interlanguage’ (IL) does not, therefore, provide a clear description of what is occurring in PECEs. These varieties of English are able to be identified by the forms they display across many hundreds of users, so they are far from simply structures found in individuals. Some of the varieties of what can be described as PECEs are stable in structure and are not moving towards an external ‘target form’ but it is difficult to see them as ‘fossilised’ or stuck in time when most are growing and developing like any natural language. Yamuna Kachru argued (1993: 266):

The question of why a stable system should be characterised as an IL is not answered. It is also not clear what the difference is between ‘stable’ and ‘fossilised’: that which is fossilised is surely unchanging and therefore stable! Additionally, if ‘an entirely fossilised IL competence’ refers to a community ... it is difficult to see why it is an IL and why it is fossilised.

Figures which will be presented in Chapters 4 and 5 of this research suggest that some of the forms appearing in the Pacific region can be viewed as fully or almost fully stable. Class-based error correction exercises demonstrate that some of the so-called ‘errors’ shown in writing are not viewed by many students as requiring remedy and demonstrate by their frequency across several language groups that they are accepted as a normal part of the English of the region. These are not fossilised samples but perhaps a stage in the development of a regional style utilised and understood by its speakers, and understood by outsiders. What the claim of fossilisation appears to present is, as Brutt-Griffler (2002) has suggested, a focus again on language acquisition by individuals and not by whole communities of bilinguals. Bilingualism is the norm in the world, not monolingualism, and it is to be expected that two or more languages in contact in an individual or in a community will induce changes which will possibly stabilise and be used by significant numbers of people.

The concept of an IL is not counter-logical; it is readily believable that a learner may create an intermediate form on the way to a firmer grasp of a target language as s/he struggles with all the various linguistic features that need to be mastered.

Nonetheless, IL studies have been of individuals rather than of language communities and nothing in IL research suggests that ILs are more than descriptions of individual linguistic behaviour, nor does IL research claim that the intermediate stage is a language. “An IL cannot... be an international language because it is not a full language, nor is it a reduced or treated one. It is a point on the way to a full natural language” (Davies 1989: 461). It is also, as Davies suggests, (p. 465) “typically reduced and simple”, not available for use in the full range of functions required and displayed by PECEs. So, as intelligible as the concept of IL is, it does not appear to be applicable to the wider community use which is a feature of PECEs.

It is clear, as Hatch, Gough and Peck (1985: 37) state, that all these SLA studies “can help explain the “errors” students make, not as isolated mistakes but as part of the language acquisition process”; in other words, many errors are systematic rather than idiosyncratic. The question arises then whether the English found among PECE-speakers is something with unique characteristics or whether PECE users can simply be viewed as showing errors common to all ESL or EFL learners. If the deviations from native-speaker norms (however those might be described) show similarities of form and apparent rule-creation, can this be explained by something other than the difficulty of acquiring certain grammatical aspects of English, or is there an influence not merely from the mother tongues but from the contexts in which those mother tongues came into contact with English? Further still, is there something inherent in human language learning that differentiates between the acquisition of the first language and that of any subsequent language?

Errors and Universal Grammar

The possibility that language learning was not merely innate but perhaps universal in its stages of development was first expressed by Chomsky in the 1950s which led to some research that appeared ground-breaking at the time. The studies began as an attempt to test the innatist view of language learning – the theory that language learning was a human predisposition (Kwon, 2005: 1) and thus started with first language speakers. Dulay and Burt in 1974 first extended this research to second language acquisition. Their work was carried out with six and eight year olds from

two language backgrounds, and their paper identified the following acquisition order for those children (1974, in Hatch (ed) 1978: 349):

1. Pronoun case
2. Article use
3. Copula
4. -ing
5. Plural -s
6. Auxiliary use
7. Past regular
8. Past irregular
9. Long plural
10. Possessive
11. 3rd person singular morpheme

In the same year, Bailey, Madden and Krashen carried out the same research on 73 adult L2 learners, assuming that the order of difficulty reflected the order in which morphemes were acquired and found considerable similarity with the sequence identified by Dulay and Burt. While the order was not identical, they concluded that “since subjects with different first languages performed similarly, the results are also consistent with findings that errors in second language learning are not all the result of interference from the first language” (in Hatch 1978: 369). Larsen-Freeman (1975) in a follow-up study found that the frequency of occurrence of these analysed morphemes in natural language, and particularly in the language of adults interacting with child learners, closely correlated to the acquisition order: morphemes controlled earlier were those which appeared most frequently in speech. And, as Kwon (2005: 8) points out, the acquisition order correlates remarkably similarly across second language studies (Dulay and Burt 1973; 1974; Bailey et al 1974, Larsen-Freeman 1975) as well as across first language studies (Brown 1973; de Villiers and de Villiers 1973).

These studies did not negate the validity of language transfer as either an aid or a hindrance to L2 acquisition by particular learners but they did make it clear that transfer could not be the only answer; it is probable, for example, that learners from first languages which feature articles are likely to make greater immediate sense of English articles than those from languages without articles, though it does not mean that the sense they make is consistently correct. Frequency of occurrence, perceptual saliency (the ‘noticeability’ of features by learners), morphophonological regularity and syntactic category of the morphemes can go some way to explaining why these

morphemes are acquired in the order they are and why there are variances in some data (Goldschneider and deKeyser, 2001), and the concept of a particular acquisition order is not as influential now as it was in the 1970s when it first appeared. Nonetheless, these morpheme acquisition studies gave an added boost to an examination of whether L2 acquisition was affected by the possible existence of universal grammar.

The universal pattern of first language learning first hypothesised by Chomsky provided one explanation of how first languages are acquired so effectively by small children yet with such mixed and inconsistent input. He stated that all humans have an innate knowledge of a system of language principles and rules that are common to all human languages, and proposed that the complexity of acquiring a first language was somewhat eased by the fact that there were only certain grammatical or structural choices that have to be made for every given grammatical feature or rule and these 'parameters' were part of the internal knowledge: all languages, for example, have nouns and verbs so a learner's principal decision is not whether there should be nouns and verbs in language X but what forms they should take and in which order they should be linked (2006). There are, in fact, relatively few universals common to all languages and rather more 'universal tendencies' (Comrie 1981). The parameters may present two or more possible choices: is a language able to drop pronouns from specific positions, or is it not; does a language distinguish gender or does it not? In acquiring one's first language, the theory suggests, one has a limited range of choices for each aspect of language learning so a learner does not cast about wildly for patterns but 'simply' sets the parameter in question to the pattern required in the mother tongue (Cook 1988; Flynn 1996; White 2003).

Universal Grammar (UG) in second language acquisition, however, is still controversial. It has a natural appeal as a way of explaining why, for example, those English morphemes appear to be acquired in a similar order irrespective of the first language, and how in a particular community certain features of English as a language subsequent to the first appear to be remarkably homogeneous. UG offers an explanation for the fact that distinct features of Indian English, Singapore English or West African English can be identified. Nonetheless, the role of UG in second

language learning is not wholeheartedly accepted by all linguists and there are three principal hypotheses regarding whether or not UG is available for use in second language acquisition. The first hypothesis is that UG is not available to learners of another language after the first (O'Grady 1996; Eckmann 1996), or that the parameters are set during the acquisition of the first language and cannot be re-set (Clahsen and Muysken 1986; Meisel 2000). This has been supported by the 'critical period' theory, and by overwhelming evidence that learners exposed to another language after the approximate age of eight or nine (or even younger) do not learn that language quite as well as younger learners. Johnson and Newport (1989, in Towell and Hawkins 1994: 14, 30) presented data which made very clear that young SL learners – those under the age of eight - could ultimately perform very nearly as well as L1 speakers, but that proficiency in the acquisition of a second language declined sharply after that age. The enthusiasts for this view point out that second language learners come to the experience with another language already in place. Clahsen and Muysken claim that SLL is actually based upon cognitive theory because they found significant differences in the way children acquired German as a first and as a second language and that as a result, "the L2 learners are not only creating a rule system which is far more complicated than the native system, but also one which is not definable in linguistic theory" (1986: 116) which, they assumed, could not occur if UG was being used in the process. In 2006, Clahsen and Felser extended this claim by proposing a 'shallow structure hypothesis' which explained that adult learners do not achieve the same degree of proficiency as younger learners because they are not able to re-set parameters. Meisel (2000: 132) describes the 'no access' theory as actually suggesting that any parameters not activated during the L1 acquisition process have been permanently lost but that those activated are available for comparison and for use if the L2 conforms to the same parameters; the parameters themselves, once set, however, cannot be re-set. The 'no access' theory holds that there is a "fundamental difference" between the acquisitions of a first and a subsequent language.

A second hypothesis is that UG principles are fully accessible to the L2 learner. Proponents of this approach claim that, as in L1 acquisition, learners must make

sense of extremely complex rules which they could not gain simply from input and therefore UG must be as available to L2 learners as it was to those learners when they acquired their first language. Cook (1988) believes that access is directly to the UG while other supporters of the full access, such as White (2003), argue that, although there are problems fully aligning L1 and L2 learning, a second or subsequent language is constrained by the parameters of UG. White, and Flynn (1996) both examine several of the parameters identified for language acquisition – phrase direction, verb movement and others – to show how L2 learners apply them to their learning and Flynn claims (p.151) that parametric values not utilised in the acquisition of the L1 remain active and available for use, and maintains that her view does not suggest that L2 learning and L1 learning are the same but that L2 learners are sensitive to the qualities of the new grammar from the beginning. White supports a theory of UG-assisted L2 learning while acknowledging that “our perspective on what it means for a grammar to be UG-constrained will inevitably shift as definitions of UG change and develop” (2003: 271).

The third hypothesis is that of partial access, and to a large degree this view developed to answer the problem of the apparent differences in the two processes of L1 and L2 learning and the fact that ‘completeness’ of SLA among adults is rare. Proponents of this view do not, however, comprise a united theoretical belief: some believe that it is possible for parameters, once set, to be re-set, but that parameters not activated are lost (Schachter, 1996, though she believes that they may be available to children acquiring an L2); others believe that UG is available only through the L1 grammar which can act as a filter or as a flint to rule-generation – either supporting hypothesis-formation when the L1 is the same or forcing the learner to rely on general learning strategies where there is a difference – “when a general problem-solving system ... competes with the language acquisition system” (Bley-Vroman et al 1988: 27; Clahsen and Muysken 1989; Towell and Hawkins 1994). This proposal explains why rule-based errors can occur.

The path through these competing theories is difficult as much because of the differences between the contexts of L1 and L2 acquisition as because of the complexity of the UG constructs. Schachter (1996) and Bley-Vroman (1988),

among others, clarify the significant differences between the contexts, especially in adults: that adult L2 learners already have a language and can make judgements about language; that adult learners seldom if ever reach perfect mastery of the L2; that adults go on making errors and ‘non-errors’ in the same linguistic situation; that prior knowledge of one language is likely to have transfer effects; that adult learners have a great range of affective factors impacting their L2 learning, and that they may be content with communicative skill rather than accuracy.

The difficulty for the study of PECEs is whether to describe PECE learners as children or adults: they are exposed to English as children, but generally a non-native variety and in a less than immersion context. For the majority of learners of English in the Pacific, English is a school subject from the child’s first introduction to school and it becomes the language of instruction for all curriculum subjects after periods of time ranging from three to six or seven years when they may be aged anywhere from nine to twelve years old; only for a relative minority is English the only language of the education system from the first contact with school. Additionally, as the language is largely a school-based phenomenon, affective factors relating to interest and cultural identity, and extrinsic factors such as curriculum design, teacher language competence and teaching style may have a significant effect on learning. In other words, these learners do not fit the pattern of most of the learners studied by the UG researchers because, once again, they are not in a traditional ESL learning environment. Research has little to tell us as yet about the application of UG to learners in contexts such as these.

Language learning and acquisition theories, pedagogical methodology and socio-cultural histories must all be seen as having the potential to impact on all the forms of English acquisition in PECE contexts, but this study must start (having decided on an appropriate term – PECEs) by defining what those forms of English actually are. One of the most frequently quoted, and by implication accepted, definitions is that provided by Platt, Weber and Ho (1984: viii). Their definition includes four crucial characteristics. Firstly, a “new English” (a PECE, in this case) develops not through daily contact with English-speakers but through the education system, “taught as a subject and, in many cases, also used as a medium of instruction in regions where

languages other than English were the main languages.” While the first clause could describe English in EFL communities, the difference from the EFL situation is the factor of “medium of instruction”. In EFL communities English tends not to be the medium of instruction of the general classroom whereas in most PECE contexts it inevitably is at some stage in the formal education process.

Secondly, Platt, Weber and Ho suggest that new Englishes, as they describe them, develop where a native variety of English is not the language spoken by most of the population. It is important to recognise that what distinguishes the PECEs from EFLs is the fact that English has some official status within the PECE societies either *de jure* by being so stated in the country’s Constitution, or *de facto* by the deliberate use of English in certain fields and functions of language use.

The third criterion is that a new English is used for a variety of functions and across a range of registers within the society where it is found; they propose that it may be used as a lingua franca in multilingual societies. This is an important distinguishing factor because it is the fact that English has functional importance in Kachru’s Outer Circle societies that ensures that the language needs to be learned in order to take a full part in the society’s legal, commercial, educational or legislative functions. In multilingual PECE societies, English is not necessarily required to be used as a lingua franca though it may have use as a neutral communication device in places where choosing an indigenous language presents political complications, as in parts of Africa.

Finally, Platt, Weber and Ho claim that such an English becomes “localised” or “nativised” by gradually absorbing features from its own society’s language(s) such as pronunciation, intonational and morphosyntactic patterns, a range of lexical items, and pragmatic discourse features.

It is thus important to see how relevant these characteristics are to the Pacific context. In the next chapter, these descriptors proposed by Platt et al (1984) will be applied to the historical experience of the Pacific nations making up the USP speech community, looking at the position that English had in colonial periods and has to this day.

CHAPTER 3: FITTING THE PACIFIC TO THE MODEL

The parameters described by Platt et al (1984: vii) have been widely accepted as relevant to the development of what they called “new Englishes”. In order to apply these descriptors to PECEs, however, it is important to add another crucial defining characteristic: that these varieties of English developed from a non-settlement colonial experience. How, then, do the experiences of the countries of the University of the South Pacific reflect these five conditions:

- a) The variety of English developed from a non-settlement colonial experience;
- b) It has developed through the education system, not as a first language of the home;
- c) It has developed in a region in which English was not spoken by a majority of the population;
- d) It is used for a range of functions from governmental to social;
- e) It has become indigenised or nativised by adapting to new linguistic contexts.

Condition 1: Non-settlement colonial experience:

The Pacific was the last major region of the world to be colonised, and in most cases was colonised somewhat reluctantly. Such control generally grew out of economic involvement rather than immediate political or strategic need. By the mid nineteenth century when the South Pacific island groups fell under the authority of one colonial power or another, there were effectively only four players left in the field – Britain, France, Germany and the United States – and none of the four was interested in more than economic or strategic gain, so no attempt was made to create settlement colonies.

Most of the Pacific countries began their relationships with European powers as trade posts following their “discovery” by European explorers in the 16th or 17th centuries. By the early years of the 19th century, most Pacific island groups were affected in

varying degrees by whaling fleets which came ashore for water and to purchase food stuffs. Only the most distant islands or those with inhospitable coastlines, such as Niue (Campbell 2003; Fischer 2002), escaped these contacts which had reputations for drunkenness and lawlessness.

Sealers and whalers were followed by traders, looking for what the region had to offer. In the early years of the 19th century this included sandalwood which was found mainly in Fiji and what is now Vanuatu. The returns for this scented wood were so lucrative that traders in Fiji waters braved reefs and intertribal strife to obtain it (Campbell 2003: 71-3). The trade began later in Vanuatu than in Fiji and the spread of islands necessitated the building of shore stations, headed by Europeans, to ready the wood for shipment. It was “the most violence-ridden of Pacific trades” (Campbell 2003: 123) but its survival led to the development of localised pidgins, given that the chain of islands which is Vanuatu is multilingual and that languages varied from station to station, even on the same island.

The second major early trade was in beche-de-mer, the sea cucumber, a trade also focussed on Fiji and Vanuatu from the 1820s and 1830s, continuing into the 1850s (P. Mühlhäusler 1987). At about the same time, German trading companies were buying coconuts and copra in the Gilbert Islands (now Kiribati). This trade in the 1850s and 1860s led to the next phase of contact with Europeans as parts of the Pacific region were deemed useful for plantation agriculture.

Though not all of the Pacific island groups had land suitable for plantations, this phase had a considerable impact on the region for a number of reasons. Firstly, those places which experienced the establishment of plantations – cotton and sugar in Fiji, copra and cotton in Samoa, along with large plantations of sugar and pineapples in Queensland, Australia, became the birthplaces of the pidgin Englishes which were to spread across the region (though Fijian plantations tended to use a Pidgin Fijian) (Siegel 1987). Even in the German plantations on Samoa it was an English-lexified pidgin which was the principal language used because many of the incoming labourers had already been exposed to an early form of Melanesian Pidgin English

and the Germans believed it made economic sense to maintain that rather than having to teach German (Siegel 1987: 16, 22, 68, 81-3).

Secondly, the plantations presented a huge demand for labour which was provided by a trade in people from almost every island group in the Pacific. “Over a thirty-five year period..., at least 9300 adult Gilbertese, nearly one-tenth of all Pacific Islands’ labour migrants, worked away from their home islands” (Macdonald 2001: 57). ‘Blackbirding’, or the enforced seizure and transportation of labour, became a feature of the worst of the labour traders; Anejom, an island in the far south of the Vanuatu chain, entered the labour trade period with a population estimated to be 4000, but by the 1930s it was less than 200. Overall, the New Hebrides (as Vanuatu was known at that time) is believed to have lost about half its total population to recruitment and the diseases that the trade brought with it (Fischer 2002: 118).

But it was this labour mobility which spread a number of Pidgin Englishes across the Pacific. The pidgins were the languages of the plantations because they served as a lingua franca for groups of workers from many different mother tongues (Siegel 1987). Those men, and some women (Siegel 1987), who returned home took the pidgins with them to places where they had not naturally developed. “The labour trade made pidgin English almost ubiquitous” (Campbell 2003: 132).

Plantation agriculture and the rapacious search for labour to sustain it led to an increasing lawlessness in the region, and rapid social change. Several attempts were made on many Pacific islands to acquire land to expand personal economic and commercial interests. On Ovalau in Fiji,

the settler population [by 1870] rose to about 2000. Disorder, disputation and anarchy took hold, the quality of race relations sank to a new low, and the settlers clamoured for law and order as they eagerly exploited its absence. (Campbell 2003:110)

The 1870s and 1880s saw calls for the control of labour traders by missionaries and those whose interest lay in wider trading opportunities. In New Zealand, suggestions were made that, in order to protect its growing trade interests in the Pacific, the

country should “send an expeditionary force to take over Samoa...[and] to incorporate the Cook Islands, Fiji, Tonga and the Society Islands with New Zealand” (Gordon 1960: 19). By 1873 the situation in Fiji was so out of control that Cakobau, high chief of Bau, already in debt to American traders, appealed to the British government to annex the Fiji Islands which Britain finally but reluctantly agreed to do in 1874 (Routledge 1985; Campbell 2003).

Trading opportunities and the value of plantation production brought various trading companies into competitive contact, stirring certain national interests, principally, at this time, Britain, France and Germany. Britain had not viewed the wider Pacific as offering a great deal to her commercial interests (Gilson 1980: 43) but had long been in competition with France. In the 1860s German traders were regularly collecting copra from the Marshall Islands, Nauru and Samoa, and in 1857 the German trading company Godeffroy und Sohn began the complex process of acquiring land in Samoa to establish plantations of coconut and increasingly of cotton (Campbell 2003). In 1878 the same company signed a one-sided treaty with Marshall Islands chiefs to ensure the advantage of German nationals in the area (Spencer 1996). By the late 1870s the lawlessness engendered by the labour trade was threatening the security of trade for many companies.

When German interests expanded to northern New Guinea, an altogether larger and potentially richer target, Britain felt sufficiently challenged to declare a protectorate over south-eastern New Guinea. To formalise authority in the south-west Pacific, an accord signed in 1886 between Britain and Germany divided control between them: Britain took over the economic opportunities in the Gilbert and Ellice Islands (the modern day Kiribati and Tuvalu) and the southern Solomon Islands, while Germany retained authority in the northern Solomons, the Marshall Islands and Nauru, and Samoa. Conflicting interests between Germany and the United States led to the effective division of the Samoan group, Germany holding on to Western Samoa where its principal plantations were situated while the eastern islands and the coaling station of Pago Pago were to be in American hands (Hempenstall and Rutherford 1984; Fischer 2002; Campbell 2003); the United States also took over control of the Hawaiian Islands late in the 19th century.

The increasing interest of the French (Gilson 1980: 43) and the Americans in the region and the lack of effective control over the actions of European speculators and traders caused further calls for British control especially from trading interests in Australia and New Zealand. In 1888 the Rarotongan chiefs in the Cook Islands petitioned Britain for protection which was granted and in 1900 other islands in the group were included in the acquisition of the Cook Islands by Britain. Administratively, however, the group was annexed to New Zealand (Campbell 2003), possibly as a reward for New Zealand's support of Britain in the South African war (King 2003: 291-2). Added to this administrative package was Niue in 1901. Competition with German interests in Tonga persuaded Britain that its deep water port on Vava'u would be at risk, and in 1899 a British protectorate was established over Tonga, putting its foreign affairs in British hands but leaving its monarchy essentially independent.

By the turn of the 20th century, therefore, the colonial race in the Pacific was almost over. French territories included New Caledonia, Wallis and Futuna and an interest in Vanuatu. Germany controlled the northern Solomon Islands (which it later ceded to Britain in return for the cessation of English traders' interference in German activities in Samoa and the Marshalls (Campbell 2003), the Marshall Islands, Nauru and Western Samoa). Britain had annexed the Cook Islands, Niue, Fiji, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, and the southern Solomons, had declared a protectorate over Tonga and, with France, had an interest in Vanuatu which in 1906 was formalised in the Condominium, creating a joint government controlled by both the French and the British.

Politics outside the Pacific created the next changes in colonial ownership of parts of the Pacific region. All German territories came under the control of the League of Nations after World War I. In 1919 Germany lost control of the Marshall Islands to Japan who in turn lost that control to the United States in 1945 at the end of the next world war. Nauru was awarded by the League to the British Empire though it was administered by Australia, and governance of Western Samoa was granted to New Zealand which had effectively taken control of the islands in the first months of the war. By 1920, Germany no longer had any territory in the Pacific and when, after

World War 2, Japan left the Marshall Islands, the region was dominated by English-speaking authorities, along with some significant areas of French influence.

Britain was not an enthusiastic colonial master. It was interested chiefly in the economic benefits of trade and plantations. None of these island groups was perceived to be important or valuable enough to become a settlement colony, and Britain was concerned to reduce the costs of administration, particularly those of education.

Condition 2: Development of English through the education system:

In none of these Pacific colonies was great attention given to centralized education by the British government (Benton 1981; Talu 1993; Baldauf Jr 1993/1994; Keesing 1990; Campbell 2001; Macdonald 2001). On the whole, education by the British focussed upon ensuring that a small percentage of locals were equipped to assist in the running of the colonial administration which was a way of reducing the financial burden of that administration (Brutt-Griffler 2002). The education of the majority of the local populations was left to the mission schools. It was not until the first decades of the 20th century that government responsibility for education expanded.

Missionary activity in the Pacific was concerned with the spread of Christianity and with literacy suitable for the reading of the Bible. Mission schools were set up from the very earliest days of missionary activity in the region. These schools arrived in the 1820s in the Cook Islands, with the London Missionary Society (LMS) whose teachings, wrote Campbell (2003:96), were “enthusiastically embraced by the islands”. In Tonga the same society had attempted to establish a mission in 1800 but chiefly warfare precluded this aim and it was the late 1820s before the Wesleyan Missionary Society achieved a mission there. Competition between these two groups was a feature all over the Pacific, except in the Marshall Islands where the principal influence was the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. They began their work in the 1850s and within 10 years most of the populace had converted (Spencer 1996:17). In the Tokelau Islands, the missionaries were mainly Samoan from the Samoan missions established by the Wesleyan and London Missionary societies, and it was a Samoan language bible which was used in the

Tokelau churches. In both the Solomon Islands and the New Hebrides early missionary activity had been slow and difficult: “by 1850, 40 of the [LMS] teachers or members of their families had lost their lives to violence or disease in mission work in the southern New Hebrides” (Campbell 2003: 135). In fact, the most successful conversions of Solomon and Vanuatu islanders were made on the Queensland or Samoan plantations so that “the labour trade, which in the 1860s and 1870s had been so thoroughly condemned by missionaries, in the end came to serve their cause” (Campbell 2003: 140).

It is relevant to ask what models of English were presented by mission teachers and what curricula they used. Research by Mesthrie (1993, 2003) into the English used by missionaries to South Africa found, somewhat surprisingly, that many of those employed by the LMS were in fact not English but Europeans. By examining the correspondence of some of these church representatives, he found a considerable range of English used from Standard English to dialectal forms. Given that many of the early missionary forays into the Pacific were contemporaneous with the period Mesthrie was studying, it is reasonable to assume that the details might be similar. Missions did not take the best educated individuals or those with teaching skills; they took those best equipped to teach the gospels and survive the likely experiences. It is highly probable that the region’s first sustained contacts with English speakers were with non-standard forms. This parallels, to some extent, the language contact history of the Caribbean where Creoles grew out of the mix of languages in contact, including the great variety of English spoken by transported convicts, indentured labourers, plantation foremen and owners (Haynes 1982; Winford 1997; Nero 2000). In the Pacific, the details may have varied but the English dialects might well have been as mixed.

What is significant about mission schools is that the missionaries generally taught through the local languages, and translated the Bible, as far as possible, into those vernacular languages to serve as the source for literacy which was their principal curricular aim (Jourdan 1990: 166; Teleni 1990: 287; Lui 1996: 111; Macdonald 2001: 30-32; Crowley 2006: 173-5; Mangubhai and Mugler 2006). As Mühlhäusler and Mühlhäusler (2005) point out, this was relatively straightforward in Polynesian

island groups where the range of languages was limited; in Melanesia, however, missions faced multilingual communities often with small numbers of people speaking each language. In Melanesia the missions focused on particular local languages which were either easy to employ for religious purposes or were widely used as lingua franca:

The Mota language was chosen by the Church of Melanesia; the Methodist mission adopted Roviana as the mission lingua franca; the seventh Day Adventist mission emphasized English as well as Marovo as the mission language, while the South Seas Evangelical Mission chose to use pidgin (Glasgow et al, 2011: 3)

In the Solomon Islands, the five principal missions tried to preach in the local languages of the villages in which their churches were situated (Watson-Gegeo 1987) and some began to use Pijin among returning plantation labourers because some of the missions perceived this as a pathway to English which, it was suggested, would serve villagers well and which became the aim of the South Seas Missions training schools for indigenous preachers (Mühlhäusler and Mühlhäusler 2005). By the time the colonial administrations were established, local education was firmly in the hands of mission schools and colonial authorities showed little interest in being involved. In the first years of the 20th century, as stated by Britain's Curzon government's *Report of the Imperial Education Conference, 1911*, "As a general rule a child should not be allowed to learn English until he has received a thorough grounding in his mother tongue" (quoted in Brutt-Griffler 2002: 46). As a result, literacy in the early years of colonial control was generally in local languages and was at that time being effectively accomplished by mission schools. In the Solomon Islands, Jourdan (1990:166) believes, this lack of colonial interest in full-scale development of education ensured the survival of many of the estimated 63 languages (Lynch 1998).

However, by the first decades of the 20th century, many of the missionary societies were finding onerous the costs of maintaining a high number of local schools. In 1904 the LMS in the Cook Islands advised the government that it would prefer that

the colonial authorities took over the schools and though the Society was persuaded to continue for a few more years, in 1910 it could no longer maintain the only secondary school (Gilson 1980: 171-2). In 1913 a similar predicament in the Gilbert and Ellice Islands forced the colonial government to assume some financial responsibility for the schools of the three missions (Talu 1993: 238; Macdonald 2001: 134). The mission societies on Niue also took the step of handing over the education system to the supervising authority in 1908 (Benton 1981). In Samoa, when New Zealand took over control, there was an attempt to improve education. “[The] initial proposals did not meet with much enthusiasm from either the missions or the local population who worried about the increased expense” (Baldauf Jr.1990: 270). In the end the compromise decision was for the government to extend and support financially the mission schools already active.

The competition between the British and French led to the formation of the Condominium in Vanuatu which meant that parallel administrative systems were established: two court structures, two civil services and two education systems. The British schools were left largely in the hands of the missions which taught literacy in some of the major indigenous languages, as the missions did in other countries, but because of the linguistic complexity of the country “many children ...would not have received any part of their formal education through their mother tongue” (Benton 1981: 136). Translations of the Bible, which was the principal teaching resource, were made in several languages but not all equally well (Crowley 2006: 173-5). As long as the missions retained the principal role in education, the focus was on literacy in local languages wherever possible.

The change in administrative oversight for education as the missions handed over responsibility for education was the principal trigger for a change in educational practice. By and large, the missions maintained primary schools at village level using the indigenous languages of each area (or in Samoan in some missions in the Ellice and Tokelau Islands). The curricula were quite narrow and the general aim was to provide students with a Christian education and basic literacy. In some areas, such as the Cook Islands (Gilson 1980), the Gilbert and Ellice Islands (Macdonald 2001) and Fiji (Mangubhai and Mugler 2006: 48), the teaching was of “variable quality”;

nonetheless, the result was that many Pacific people could read and write their own language. With the change in educational funding came an increased focus on English.

In some mission schools, English had been introduced as a subject, assigned a few curriculum hours each week; it was not the intent of mission schools to produce English speakers. In the first two decades of the 20th century, however, there was a change in the attitude towards English as colonial governments began to demand a supply of local people, educated in English, who could act as interpreters and low level officials; colonial administration, as Brutt-Griffler (2002) has explained, was an expensive business, and local petty officials cost less than English ones. In the Cook Islands the decision was made by the New Zealand authorities to raise the level of primary schools to those in New Zealand. “Instruction would be in English in the three R’s, crafts and elementary agriculture, the vernacular being used solely to introduce the new language” (Gilson 1980: 172). There was, however, no teacher training college and very few Cook Islands teachers reached a level of English which enabled them to enter teacher training colleges in New Zealand. As a result expatriate teachers were needed to meet the requirements. The authorities in Fiji called for the education of civil servants with control of English. In the 1890s English was introduced in St John’s Catholic school on Ovalau (Geraghty 2012: pers. comm.), and in 1906 Queen Victoria School was established for the sons of chiefs. English was introduced as a school subject at primary level but by the time the boys entered secondary school, instruction of all core subjects was in English with many expatriate native speakers of English on the staff (Mangubhai and Mugler 2006).

Much the same reasons for expanding the role of English were offered in the Gilbert and Ellice Islands and in Samoa, while in Nauru the justification was the need for labour for the phosphate mines (begun in 1906) to be competent in English. In the Gilbert and Ellice Islands three new government-funded schools for boys were set up (Talu 1993) in which English was the language of instruction (Benton 1981; Macdonald 2001). On Nauru, English as a school subject was introduced and “both English and Nauruan were used in junior classes, with the latter being phased out at

the senior levels” (Benton 1981: 131). Samoa employed a three-tier system: the remaining independent mission schools catered for about 10,000 students and continued to teach a narrow curriculum wholly in Samoan; those schools run jointly by missions and the district administration introduced English as a junior primary subject but all other curriculum requirements were taught in Samoan by Samoan teachers until the fourth year when English as the medium of instruction began to be used: these schools taught about 4000 students in 45 schools (Benton 1981:88). The three schools run wholly by the government, the 16 boarding schools and the three theological colleges, which dealt with around 1800 students, taught in English and teachers were generally expatriates (Benton 1981; Crocombe 1992).

When New Zealand took over the administration of Niue and the missions found the costs of keeping schools going were too high, government schools were built. The curriculum was imported from New Zealand but the level of English required was not immediately achievable, so the curriculum was adapted to being taught in Niuean with English as a school subject. As students progressed through their schooling, they were increasingly exposed to English as the medium of instruction (Lui 1996). In the Solomon Islands, government continued its lack of interest in responsibility for education which encouraged the continuation of education in indigenous languages. The pressure for local civil servants to speak English was reduced because the staff of the colonial administration tended to learn Pijin, though “no...government officer ever learnt a local language” (Keesing 1990: 154).

The most substantial change to education itself occurred in the Marshall Islands. At the end of World War I Japan was confirmed in its takeover of what had been a German trade colony, and almost all missionary activity ceased. Mission schools were restructured to teach the Japanese curriculum in language, mathematics and singing:

Some reports insist that Japanese only was used; others report first-person accounts by Micronesian teaching assistants who claim to have translated the Japanese teacher’s verbal instructions into the vernacular ... But there is no argument against the conclusion that the vernacular languages were

never used in written form during the period of the Japanese educational system. (Spencer 1996: 18)

Because few Marshallese learned to read Japanese, “Micronesian students were deprived of written language, even one in which instruction was provided, during the Japanese period” (Spencer 1996: 18). Nonetheless, almost all students in Japanese Micronesia attended school and most “were exposed to two to three years [of] a daily curriculum” (Fischer 2002: 193), but English did not feature in their learning until the end of World War II.

From the 1930s onwards, in the majority of these colonies, the place of English in the societies expanded and its role in the educational systems was reinforced; as a result, the importance of vernacular languages in the classroom began to decline. The 1930s saw some concern expressed by colonial authorities in the Cook Islands (Gilson 1980; Benton 1981; Crocombe 1992), in Nauru (Benton 1981), in Niue (Lui 1996), and in Samoa (Davidson 1967; Baldauf Jr. 1990) for the health of indigenous languages and cultures faced with the pressure to acquire English. Some desultory attempts were made to introduce local content (Benton 1981; Crocombe 1992) but little sustained effort was made to ensure that that occurred. The 1926 Education Commission Report in Fiji stated that both Fijians and Indians were strongly in favour of English and that, as a result, English should be introduced as early as possible, becoming the language of instruction after the first three years. One clause proposed that:

[i]n schools where the non-European teacher is a competent teacher of English, and in Mission schools taught by European teachers, English will become the medium of instruction at an early age (quoted in Mugler 1996: 277).

Niuean schoolchildren were not making significant educational progress with English as the instructional language in primary school, so the transition from Niuean to English was delayed until the end of primary school. However, English

was the sole language of instruction in the secondary school which was built in the 1940s. “Even in primary schools few Niuean language materials were available, and parents and teachers favoured the use of as much English as possible in the classroom” (Benton 1981:103). “Niuean was considered unimportant in education and had no future for the children outside of Niue” (Lui 1996: 113). This attitude to education and the place of English led to the eventual closure in the 1950s of all the LMS schools which had taught in Niuean.

The years after the First World War, then, saw a gradual erosion in most British colonies in the South Pacific of the place of local languages in education and the increase in the use of English, not only in secondary schools but in early years of primary education. Some of this desire for English in the school system came not from the government authorities alone but very frequently from parents and teachers who increasingly recognised that in the communities of the time English would prove to be a pathway to greater opportunities. This was not just the experience in Pacific communities but has been mentioned by other researchers into PECEs (Kachru 1982a; Mesthrie 1993; Mazrui and Mazrui 1996; Bamgbose et al 1997; Kioko and Muthwii 2001; Fischer 2002). Indeed, some believed that withholding the teaching of and in English was an attempt to keep local people in a disadvantaged position (Phillipson, 1992: 127).

A crucial development from the 1920s onwards was the place in Pacific education systems not merely of English but of New Zealand English in the form of New Zealand curricula and New Zealand teachers, and, in the case of Nauru, Australian curricula and teachers. The New Zealand education system – its subject curricula, its assessment methods, its teacher training design and its philosophy – was injected first into those societies in which New Zealand had some authority, namely the Cook Islands, Niue and later Samoa. However, its impact in later years was considerably wider. The experience of the Cook Islands is illustrative of the ways in which New Zealand education infiltrated these Pacific structures.

Educational reviews in the Cook Islands prior to the 1920s proposed that the New Zealand Education Act of the time should be applied to the local context and that all

teachers should be trained in New Zealand (Gilson 1980: 171), and when in the 1920s questions were raised in New Zealand about the consequent loss of cultural identity brought about by using English as the language of instruction in a non-English-speaking country, Pomare, the New Zealand Maori Minister for the Cook Islands, persuaded the government of the day that it would be too difficult to create textbooks in Cook Islands Maori and that the language was not adequate to the task of teaching certain basic concepts. The only future for the Cook Islands, claimed the then New Zealand Superintendent of Education, Binstead, was “the use of English as the medium of instruction throughout the Cook Islands” (Benton 1981: 99). Though an attempt was made to introduce “native arts” and plans were made to create local Geography and History curricula, this came to nothing (Crocombe 1992). The abolition in 1934 of the use of the vernacular in schools meant that any subjects with a local content were forced to give up class time under the pressure to learn English (Crocombe 1992).

The Beeby Commission into education in the Cook Islands in 1945 was clear in its belief that schools on the main islands saw themselves as “agents of Europeanisation” (Benton 1981: 100). Though Prime Minister Peter Fraser sought to restore Rarotongan Maori as the language of instruction for the first two or three years of compulsory education, many parents and teachers saw English as superior and crucial to children’s advancement and to their unrestricted right of access to New Zealand. As a result there was pressure to provide more and more of the curriculum in English (Balawa 1996: 141). In more recent years, despite the attempt to preserve the vernacular for the first three years of primary education, “the majority of Maori students on Rarotonga who enter primary school for the first time speak English as their first language, so teachers find themselves having to use English as the medium of instruction in the classroom” (Balawa 1996: 139).

Much the same experience was found on Niue. When the first government schools were built following the withdrawal of the missions from sole responsibility for education, the curriculum was transplanted from New Zealand despite the considerable difficulties presented by the language requirements. Though the transition from Niuean to English in classrooms was delayed to the end of primary

education to compensate for this problem, all students faced English only in secondary schools. Because of the special relationship with New Zealand, many children left Niue (and the Cook Islands) to attend schools in New Zealand via a scholarship system, while on the island itself more rural children moved from village schools, where the policy of using Niuean in the first years of schooling was practised, to the principal English-language schools in Alofi, the main town. More pressure was placed on these schools to give children early access to English teaching and in 1972 a New Zealand government report suggested that it would be preferable to remove all Niuean language from the curriculum to allow better development of the quality of primary education, assuming that the role of English should be expanded (Benton 1981).

The 1980s and 1990s saw the provision of resources for the development of a Niuean language syllabus for core subjects in the first three years of schooling, and for a bilingual learning environment from Year 4 to the beginning of secondary education. From that point, however, all secondary education is in English with the Niuean language relegated to a subject for study. As all Niuean students sit for New Zealand secondary school qualifications, the pressure to maintain this educational status quo is strong (Lui 1996: 114-116).

The mission schools in Samoa were partially funded by the New Zealand government after it assumed responsibility for Samoa at the end of World War I and this ensured the survival of Samoan as the language of instruction until the middle of the twentieth century. Government schools and the boarding schools taught in English and there was much debate in Samoa about the role of language in education. While some parents saw English-language education as the gateway to greater opportunities, especially outside Samoa, others viewed it as an assault on *fa'a Samoa*, the Samoan way of life. During the Mau rebellion of the 1920s and 30s, children were frequently withdrawn from government schools as a sign of their families' rejection of the colonial government's policies (Davidson 1967: 122). Among New Zealand government officials, policy proposals were equally divided between not advancing the role of English because of its likely effect on the culture,

and the need to expand control of English as part of working towards independence (Benton 1981: 87-88; Baldauf Jr. 1990: 271).

During the Second World War, education was allowed to decline in quality but after the war the pressure to expand English teaching grew. Benton cites a 1947 situation in which the announcement was made that all Samoan schools would be taught in Samoan – and the next day no-one turned up at school (1981: 88). The establishment of a scholarship system that gave Samoan children ease of access to New Zealand schools further eroded the enthusiasm for Samoan as the language of the classroom, though in 1966 a new Samoan language curriculum was drawn up, and teaching in the vernacular was retained for at least the first years of school. However, in the secondary schools English has continued to hold a valued place, especially as long as students sat for New Zealand-based qualifications. There continue to be perceived problems with the quality and resourcing of post-primary education in Samoa and the place of the English language within the structure. (Afamasaga, 2002: 101). Given the strong trend of migration to New Zealand and the involvement of Samoa in New Zealand's Pacific work schemes there continues to be some incentive to have a working knowledge of English.

These four countries were long influenced by New Zealand because of its role as an agent of the British Empire; indeed, Niue and the Tokelau islands continue to have a "special relationship" with New Zealand. Within the last decade a small majority of Tokelauan people in two public referenda have declared that they reject independence in favour of remaining officially part of New Zealand. Both Niue and the Tokelau Islands now have more citizens living in New Zealand than in the islands themselves, which ensures that English has considerable authority in their education systems. In the Cook Islands, the closeness of the relationship with New Zealand challenges the status of Cook Islands Maori and its future viability (Balawa 1996). Nonetheless, there has been a recent refocusing of policy towards language in schools. The four countries discussed here, and Tonga, have strong vernacular in education policies and a renewed interest in using the vernacular thoroughly, certainly at primary level.

It was not only in politically dependent countries that the New Zealand education system had influence. From the 1960s to the late 1980s New Zealand education was the pattern for the school systems in Kiribati and Tuvalu (once known respectively as the Gilbert and Ellice Islands). After independence there was a change from using the British Cambridge examination to the use of the New Zealand School Certificate examination for which a South Pacific option was designed. Though that has now ended, local education specialists bemoan the fact that teachers are not taught in local teacher-training colleges to design or teach Kiribati studies and that the focus and methods of the formal education system “continue to be based on mainly Western rather than indigenous belief systems” (Thaman 1992, quoted in Teaero 2002: 79)

Tuvaluan students frequently travel to Australia or New Zealand for the last year of secondary education because there is no Form 7 or Grade 12/13 equivalent in Tuvalu. This in itself places pressure on the local education system to respond to those external requirements and expectations. After Form 2, “as the kids go up in the system, the number of hours of English gradually increases and the number of hours in Tuvaluan decreases” (Ielemia 1996: 103).

In Fiji and Tonga, both of which have well-developed education systems, the place of English is also strong. Both have systems based on examinations at several levels of the schools’ structures and there is considerable pressure for students to pass these. For many years, the secondary school curricula were designed to meet the demands of examinations which were set in New Zealand, a situation which continued until 1988 (Puamau 2002: 63; Crocombe 2001: 97).

The introduction of the New Zealand education and/or examination systems after World War II led an influx of New Zealand teachers to teach in the local schools, and herein lies the second aspect of the influence of New Zealand education in the Pacific. New Zealand missionaries had been working in the region for many years: its proximity to New Zealand made it an easy journey for groups of missionaries. Additionally, during the colonial period, Britain often recruited New Zealand teachers for its Pacific territories: this was presumably cheaper than having to move British teachers the many thousands of kilometres across the world.

Crocombe has provided a valuable analysis of the role of New Zealand teachers. Clearly, the territories with the closest relationship with New Zealand were the greatest employers of its teachers, but there were significant numbers of New Zealanders in most Pacific countries. Schemes of Cooperation were created with the countries involved, the terms of which varied from place to place. “The recruiting country paid the local salary while the New Zealand Government paid the difference between that and New Zealand rates, plus fares, children’s educational allowances and other costs” (Crocombe 1992: 97). During my early years as a secondary school teacher in New Zealand in the 1970s, teachers could complete their “country school” requirement for advancement by teaching in the Cook Islands or Niue, and the New Zealand Volunteer Service Abroad still recruits teachers for a wide range of positions in the Pacific and beyond (Crocombe 1992: 34-5). Today, however, the principal source of native-speaking teachers for many countries is the United States’ Peace Corps volunteers who come free of charge.

Crocombe (1992: 97) quotes figures showing the numbers of New Zealand teachers in Pacific countries. From 1925 to 1988, he totals 1905 such teachers, and refers to 5223 “New Zealand teacher/years serv[ing] under government to government schemes”(p. 99), mainly in secondary schools or teachers colleges.

Table 3.1 New Zealand teachers in other Pacific countries on government to government contracts for selected years 1925 to 1988.

| YEARS | 25 | 37 | 41 | 49 | 54 | 57 | 63 | 65 | 67 | 70 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 77 | 78 | 80 | 83 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 88 |
|----------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Fiji | 17 | 19 | 19 | 43 | 68 | 77 | 74 | 79 | 76 | 91 | 75 | 46 | 29 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Sam | - | 3 | 6 | 23 | 30 | 30 | 43 | 39 | 34 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Tonga | - | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Cooks | - | - | 6 | 13 | 11 | 18 | 26 | 42 | 36 | 36 | 30 | 30 | 33 | 28 | 27 | 28 | 24 | 21 | 22 | 20 | 17 |
| Niue | - | - | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 19 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 11 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 |
| Kirib | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | - | -- |
| Sol. Is | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 6 | 15 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| Vanu. | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tokel. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | -- | - |
| Tuval. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| PNG | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 14 | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

(Crocombe 1992: 97)

“As high schools were only accessible to a small proportion of the total population, it is likely that most people who completed high school in the Cook Islands, Niue, Western Samoa, Fiji and Tonga, were taught at some stage by New Zealand teachers” (Crocombe 1992: 99). Ratu Joni Madraiwiwi, previously Vice President of Fiji, is still in regular contact with one of his New Zealander high school teachers (personal communication, 2006).

Rates of use of New Zealanders tailed off after independence, though the need for educational growth and maintenance ensured that some places remained for New Zealand teachers, and for many young Americans who teach through the American Peace Corps volunteer system. However, most English teachers in the region today are themselves L2 speakers of the language and those among them who would have been taught by English native speakers in the heyday of ex-patriate teachers are now approaching retirement age or have left the classroom to become educational administrators. The language models which are provided for current learners are those likely to include samples of regional innovations in their speech and writing.

The last decades of the 20th century saw attempts to provide both local examination structures and a renewed commitment to the place of indigenous languages. The first began in 1980 with the formation of the South Pacific Board for Educational Assessment (SPBEA) which “was created to support national examination units” (Bray 1998: 161), and was given an extra fillip when in 1982 New Zealand announced that it would withdraw its School Certificate South Pacific options. It was formed by agreement between the governments of the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Nauru, Niue and Western Samoa. Others have since joined while Nauru, Niue and the Cook Islands have withdrawn (Bray 1998). When New Zealand signalled its intention to end the New Zealand University Entrance examination in favour of its internal educational reforms, SPBEA “launched a regional examination leading to the Pacific Secondary School Certificate (PSSC) to act as a replacement for the NZUE” (Bray 1998: 162). Though Pacific-focused aspects have been included in SPBEA activities, there are difficulties associated with regional rather than national bodies and with the siting of the SPBEA headquarters in Fiji in view of its political unrest. Further development of individual

countries' examination systems is limited by "expertise and cost ... [and] in public perception of standards and in the value of international recognition" (Bray 1998: 164).

An increasing emphasis on the place of indigenous languages and values in education, especially basic education, has led to several developments. The Rethinking Pacific Education Initiative (RPEI) has held conferences in several Pacific centres to focus on integrating indigenous languages into education, and PRIDE (Pacific Regional Initiative for the Delivery of Basic Education) has encouraged the development of policies on local languages as the medium of instruction, though Huffer (2006) reports that implementation has been slow. While the policies are in place for indigenous languages to be widely used in primary education, this happens in relatively few places except Tonga and Samoa and the phasing in of English as the medium of instruction adversely affects the effective acquisition of a sound control of the mother tongues (Huffer 2006: 13-14).

Resting an education system upon a language which is not the language of the community demands an enormous commitment of funds to resource the structure of education. Teacher training, graded reading materials, authentic and age-appropriate listening resources, and opportunities to interact with the language in meaningful ways all need to be available to learners. In the region, probably only the Cook Islands, Niue and Fiji would have ease of access to English spoken in the community; for the rest, English tends to be found in the classroom or encountered on television.

Condition 3: English has developed in a region where it was not spoken by a majority of the population

As in other regions whose countries have come out of a colonial experience, the Pacific nations display somewhat arbitrary borders. Many of the countries of the South Pacific have become collections of relatively small islands scattered across thousands of square kilometres of ocean. What has become Vanuatu or the Solomon Islands owes more to colonial politics than to deep senses of identifiable ethno-cultural units. Kiribati comprises 33 islands spread across 40 degrees of longitude

from west to east and while the I-Kiribati speak local dialects of the same language, the people who make up Vanuatu speak anywhere between 85 and 110 distinct tongues, depending upon the definition of a “language” (Lynch 1998: 34).

As the region’s colonial history makes clear, little particular interest was paid to specific island groups after their “discovery” by European explorers in the 18th century though whaling and sealing fleets bought coconuts and fresh water (and brought pigs and chickens to what is now Kiribati and Tuvalu). This period interfered little with the languages of the Pacific Islands involved in this provisioning of fleets of uncertain frequency.

At the beginning of the 19th century, therefore, the Pacific region was decidedly non-English speaking. In some island groups only one or two major languages were spoken, though there may have been various communalects spoken in separate villages (Geraghty 1984). This was true of the Polynesian and Micronesian islands; only Tonga (with two languages) and the Cook Islands with three, among the island groups included in this research, spoke more than one principal language. Melanesia, however, presented a very different linguistic pattern: the Solomon Islands is home to an estimated 63 languages and Vanuatu to 85 to 110, often more than one on a single island. (Lynch 1998:28).

For most Pacific Islanders, English presents as an additive bilingualism, not challenging their use of their own language/s for intimate domains. Tent (2000a: 241) in his study of English in Fiji suggested that, according to the 1996 census, the proportion of native speakers of English is only around two percent. English is certainly found in most urban centres of the Pacific but is far less common in rural areas. Teleni (1990: 287) states that in Tonga “Tongan still predominates in religion, politics and the media”. In Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands the great diversity of languages has created the need for *linguae francae*, and in both countries descendants of Melanesian Pidgin survive in those roles: Bislama and Pijin respectively, and Keesing (1990: 159-60) reports that “[t]he choice is never, for a Melanesian, whether to learn Pijin OR English; it is always whether to learn English as well as Pijin” (emphasis in the original). Independence has tended to reinforce L1s in all Pacific

countries as a mark of national identity, though in countries which have long had a special relationship with either New Zealand or Australia, the appeal of wider employment opportunities and the ease of access to the larger countries exert pressure to be competent in English.

Condition 4: Use of English in a range of functions

In all but a very few communities in the Pacific, the intimate domains of home, market and church tend to be those of the L1s except where the *linguae francae* have a role, but English has a strong influence on other domains within countries which have had a British colonial past. In part, this is historical as administrations after independence maintained the extant political and organisational structures, and remained members of the British Commonwealth where English is the common tongue. Partly, it also undoubtedly reflects the current position of English as offering access to a worldwide range of social, educational, economic, geopolitical and technological advantages. There are national, official, intraregional and international functions which English performs in the Pacific.

A “national” language is one which serves to define a nationality and is generally one spoken by a majority of a country’s people, or by a significant group within the national boundaries but, according to the constitutions of the Pacific region, only Vanuatu and Tonga recognise a national language. Given its multilingual nature, it is not surprising that the national language of Vanuatu is Bislama. Section 3.1 of the Vanuatu Constitution reads, “The national language of the Republic of Vanuatu is Bislama” and Section 3.2 recognises the state’s responsibility to “protect the different local languages which are part of the national heritage, and may declare one of them as a national language”. The Tongan constitution states that Tongan is the national language.

An “official language” is one explicitly recognised by state authorities as serving the purposes of government, which frequently means that the official documentation of the state will be expressed in a language or languages designated as “official”. Several of the constitutions of the region do not designate any language as formally

“official”, Kiribati, Nauru, Samoa, Tokelau and Tuvalu among them. Further, some constitutions make no reference to language use at all (Kiribati, Nauru and Tuvalu).

Vanuatu, in Section 3.1 of its constitution, formally states, “The official languages are Bislama, English and French”, and is the only constitution to specify the languages of education – which are English and French rather than vernaculars. The 1997 Fijian Constitution (abrogated in 2009) declares, “The English, Fijian and Hindustani languages have equal status in the State”. (Section 4.1). The “official” language of Parliament is described as English, though members may use any of the three recognised languages, and Section 4.4 states that any person with business dealings with :

- “ a) a department
- b) an office in the State Service
- c) a local authority

has the right to do so in English, Fijian or Hindustani, either directly or through a competent interpreter.”

The Solomon Islands’ constitution of 1978 declared that the only official language is English, but Pijin is explicitly acknowledged as a language of “common national use” (Chapter 1, Part 5), and the Tongan constitution overtly recognises English as an official language. In other constitutions, however, the reference to official languages is oblique.

In Part II, Section 23 of the Niuean Constitution, reference is made to either Niuean or English being accepted as the language of Parliament, and the Cook Islands Constitution in Clause 35, 1 states that “all debates and discussions [of Parliament] shall be conducted in the Maori language as spoken in Rarotonga, and also in the English language”. Clause 35, 3 proclaims that “The records of proceedings in Parliament or its committees shall be in the English language.” The Samoan

document, in Part V, Section 54 (1, 2) simply states that “all debates, Minutes, papers, bills and reports shall be in the Samoan language and English”. Languages are thus acknowledged as having official status without explicitly being defined as such. The only other way reference is made in many of the constitutions to the role of language within the state organisations is that almost all constitutions state that in the event of a conflict between English language and indigenous language interpretations of the various constitutions, the English language version will prevail: the Cook Island Constitution is typical in stating in Section 35, 4 that “The English language version of any Bill or Act or record will prevail”. The Marshallese Constitution is the only one to state that its own language form is the more authoritative: Article XIV, Section 5 reads, “The Marshallese and English texts...shall be equally authentic, but in case of difference, the Marshallese text shall prevail.” (It is also worth noting that most of these constitutions were written first in English and then translated into the appropriate local languages).

The language of justice across the region depends to some extent on which court level is being referred to. In the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, Tokelau and Tuvalu the local language or languages are used in the lower, district or traditional courts, while English is generally the language of higher courts. In Vanuatu, the language of all courts is described as Bislama (though High Court judges have included expatriates from New Zealand, Australia or Fiji who, as a result, tend to use English). In Tonga, though Appeal Court judges are often expatriate English speakers (Justice Ward 2006: pers. comm.) Tongan is the language of the courts. In the other countries, English predominates.

Media – newspapers, radio and television – tend to be mixed. Newspapers and radio generally reflect local content and languages, though some may offer one or more daily papers in English and some limited air time on radio may also be in English. Few Pacific countries have the infrastructure or facilities to produce their own television programmes though news broadcasts generally make an effort to present items in local languages in those countries with television stations. Most programming is taken from Australia, New Zealand, the United States and, increasingly, China. Cable television is international in content, those countries with

cinemas purchase overseas films, and there are strong markets in many countries for pirated DVDs. Furthermore, such media bring to the region the cultural norms of other societies and some concern is often expressed about content and influence. (Lotherington 1998). The internet, though its range of languages is expanding rapidly, is overwhelmingly accessed in English in the region.

Despite the common roots of most of the languages of the South Pacific, they are not mutually comprehensible. Intra-regional contacts tend to use English as a regional lingua franca. It is the language of the principal organisations affecting the South Pacific as a region – the Commonwealth, the South Pacific Forum and the Secretariat of the South Pacific. Though members of the Melanesian Spearhead Group (Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu) are sometimes able to communicate in mutually comprehensible varieties of Melanesian Pidgin English, their communiqués are in English. The United Nations and its organisations (WHO, UNESCO, Unifem and others) work in English in those parts of the Pacific which were once British or American colonies. All those countries of the South Pacific once part of the British Empire retain their links with the British Commonwealth; the one exception is Fiji which, during its several coups, has more than once been suspended as a member of the Commonwealth. The Marshall Islands remain in a state of close political agreement with the United States. These emotional, political and economic ties ensure that English continues to be of value because that is the language of most Commonwealth negotiations and English is the lingua franca of the “family of nations” represented by the Commonwealth.

English is also the language of international diplomacy, of science and technology, of medicine, of airline travel (Graddol 1997; Crystal 1997) and it is also the principal language of South Pacific tourism. Staff of hotels, especially those which are members of worldwide chains, are expected to speak English, particularly if they are employed in restaurant, bar, housekeeping or front of house positions. For anyone who has been a tourist in the region, communication in English is generally clear and effective. As the main source markets for South Pacific tourism are Australia, New Zealand and the United States, all of which are “Inner Circle” speakers of English,

the interest in English as an aid to work in the tourism and hospitality industries remains high.

These roles, which are completely separate from the postcolonial ties of the British connections, have made English an important tool of international communication. Phillipson (1992) views the language as a destructive force representing the unequal position of the colonial master and the colonised which actively limits the roles local languages can play by ensuring, through agencies such as the British Council and USAid, among others, that opportunities for economic advancement are tied to the progress of English. But the English language itself is taking no active part in its position in the world. One of the strongest economies of the current climate is that of the United States, and the strongest English-speaking culture is certainly American with its music, cinematic and technological developments. It is other societies' wish to be part of this perceived progress and its economic power that drives the desire for English. Just as French lost its place to English as the language of trade and diplomacy in the 20th century, so it is likely that as the place of the USA as a dominant power inevitably wanes in the future, another language may well be seen as the reflection of power. Until that time, however, it is just as likely that the appeal of English will continue.

Brutt-Griffler (2002) has provided a clear analysis of the diasporas of English-speaking peoples, the first of which established settlement colonies where the development of English as a tongue of primary importance was a result of "the large numbers of English colonists who brought their language with them in their movements" (2002: 114), rather than a definite policy of linguistic conquest. She contrasts this with the imperialism of the late 19th in which economic control of regions of the world was the principal aim and for which Britain did not feel the need to transport large numbers of its citizens or to enforce the whole-scale use of English. In these colonies, English spread through economic and political activity, not settlement, and did not replace the indigenous languages, instead adding another linguistic choice in what were often complex language contexts. These colonies, therefore, became English-using rather than English-speaking. However, there are signs that a language shift to English is occurring in certain groups in the Pacific

(Mangubhai and Mugler 2006) and anxiety is expressed in local media about the maintenance of local languages.

Condition 5: It has become indigenised by adapting to linguistic contexts:

The linguistic context of the Pacific is that of a multilingual environment in which English serves as a useful regional lingua franca in certain situations. It is the most common “second language” taught in schools, tends to be the language of instruction in most regional secondary schools and the regional university, and is the language of regional meetings. Political leaders, administrators and journalists often speak and write English with skill and nuance, and local writers use it to express local interests and concerns in novels, plays and poetry. The list of local creative writers who choose to write in English, though their themes, characters, contexts and purposes are of the Pacific, is large, and would include Sia Figiel, Cresantia Frances Koya, Julian Maka’a, Grace Molisa, Mohit Prasad, Konai Helu Thaman, Larry Thomas, Joseph Veramu and Albert Wendt, among others. Moreover, an examination of regional magazines and newspapers and of the written work of university students shows clearly that the Englishes of the region are “start[ing to go] their own ways ...slowly and hesitantly at first, gaining momentum and confidence as times passes by” (Schneider 2007: 41). The former British colonies of the Pacific have now been independent for between 20 and 40 years and though the social and economic links with Britain and other former colonies are strong through the network of the Commonwealth, the nations of the Pacific have developed senses of national identity demonstrated on the sports field, in their involvement in international organisations and in their ability to take political stands which do not always reflect the wishes of Britain or of the socio-political powers of the region: Australia, New Zealand and, increasingly, China.

Indigenisation or nativisation (Kachru 1982a) refers to the gradual inclusion, in the English spoken in a community, of locally created lexical items, idioms and syntactic structures in ways which have already been described in other PECEs across the world. The similarities between the English forms in the Pacific and those of former colonies in Asia and Africa are a point of interest, and suggest that there is a shared

pattern of language change and innovation in post-exploitation-colony Englishes. The ways in which these changes are expressed in the Pacific are the subjects of the next chapters.

CHAPTER 4: FEATURES OF ENGLISH IN THE PACIFIC: SPELLING AND MORPHOSYNTAX.

Ho and Platt (1993) argued that comparative studies have little option but to use standard language forms as a base in order to describe the ways in which the language structures being studied are showing degrees of independence. As in Ho and Platt's work, the intent of this study is not to suggest that the forms being examined are deficient but to examine what developments have taken place, or are in the process of taking place, and to query whether these signal the evolution of another variety or dialect of the post-exploitation-colony Englishes (PECEs).

One question for a researcher is *how* to examine the data to clarify the situation being exposed. This study will follow a pattern which is not original – almost all of the comparative studies have used the same methodology. Data for this research were collected under three major headings: morphosyntactic, lexical and semantic; as the material at the base of the research was in written form there is no analysis of phonological data but the suspected influences of phonology will be discussed as appropriate. The morphosyntactic details are those related to the morphemic structure of words and the creation of phrases and clauses; lexical items include word choices and creations; and semantics relates to the way meaning is expressed and to idiosyncracies of usage. However, given the considerable overlap among these three categories and the occasional difficulty in deciding exactly where an innovation fits, the data will be discussed as they affect the noun phrase and verb phrase, lexical use, and sentential meaning. In each case, where the features are found in the Englishes of other postcolonial communities, that connection will be identified. Because of word limitations, examples have been reduced to one or two from each country.

In an attempt to prevent the chapters becoming too large, an arbitrary decision has been made to refer in Chapter 4 to issues of spelling and to those features which affect the structure of phrases and clauses while Chapter 5 will pay attention to semantic issues. All quotations from collected data are given verbatim.

| |
|-------------------------|
| PART 1: SPELLING |
|-------------------------|

4.1 Issues related to spelling

Spelling ‘errors’ are manifest in these data, as they are likely to be in most second language data, no matter which second language is the target. Spelling rules in one language (once users are literate) do not always conform to those in another, and students in Pacific data may well be using lexical items whose meaning they control and which they have heard in lectures or tutorials but which they have seldom had to write before. Further, English has notoriously inconsistent rules of spelling and a decided mismatch between phonology and the way many words are spelt.

Analysis of the data shows that many spelling differences are very idiosyncratic: they often reflect the way in which one individual hears and syllabifies a particular word, as in C2:7 *infustructure* (infrastructure) or T1:28 *adulrees* (adulteries), or S1:18 *debatetable* (debatable). It is not easy to generalise the bases upon which these writers have created their own spellings but one or two features stand out.

Pronunciation

Some adaptations are clearly phonetic and reflect the students’ pronunciation of the words they are using. The languages in the South Pacific generally have a five vowel range, though there are phonemic distinctions between long and short vowels:

| | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| i | u | i: | u: |
| e | o | e: | o: |
| a | | a: | |

A few have six or eight vowels but only Rotuman contains significantly more vowels are represented in the data.

There is also a range in the numbers of consonants which regional languages differentiate – somewhere between eight and twenty on the whole, including glottals, nasals and voiced and unvoiced contrasts. When the writing systems for these languages were being designed in the 19th century by mission groups, an attempt was

made to use the “one-phoneme-one-letter principle” (Lynch 1998: 97). This means, in effect, that the written languages (with the exception of Nauruan, whose phonology is still incompletely understood) tend to be pronounced as they are written, once the symbols are grasped.

English, however, offers no such unity. The limited 26-symbol alphabet represents 44 sounds in British English (43 in standard Midwestern American English). Further, as anyone who has learned another language will have experienced, any sounds not in the L1 tend to be harder for learners to produce in the L2 and approximations will be common. Several of these approximations are likely to affect a learner’s spelling.

C1:1 **knifes / lifes** (engendered by a likely lack of contrast in the L1 between [f] and [v], or by analogy)

M1:1 **relize** (realise): probably the result of the pronunciation of those native speakers who monophthongise the [iê].

T1:5 **nobels** (nobles) driven by phonology

T1:32 **suprise** (surprise: a very common usage). Possibly engendered by the pronunciation by native speakers of the first syllable as schwa, as in NZ English.

S1:3 **hassel** (hassle: also very common)

V1:27 **funral / granparents**: both likely to be the result of native speaker use, as the missing syllable and the phoneme are elided in many native speaker dialects.

4.1.1: Reduction of consonant clusters:

Other spelling decisions appear to be methods of avoiding dealing with consonant clusters which are a pronunciation difficulty for learners from certain L1s. In some cases the cluster is reduced to a single consonant sound and in others epenthetic vowels are inserted to create another syllable:

T1:15 **cherises** (cherishes: appears in most uses of this word and reflects a common pronunciation feature in several Pacific communities to conflate /s/ and /sh/ into one sound)

T2:2 **Government** (government)

SI 1:41 **husban** (husband)

SI 2:4 **pratice** (practice: used across several groups)

F1:8 **excetional** (exceptional)

F2:56 **reconised** (recognised: very common)

F2:108 **statergies** (strategies)

V2:25 **symtoms** (symptoms: another common use). Possibly caused by the difficulty of moving from /p/ to /t/, or by extrapolation from native speakers; this is a feature of NZ English.

4.1.2: Use of epenthetic vowel

SI 1:5 **disasterous** (disastrous: by analogy from the noun form)

SI 1:17 **quickily** (quickly)

SI 2:60 **enimity** (enmity)

F1:16 **hinderance** (this both avoids the [dr] blend and is a logical extension of the verb form).

F2:61 **ethinic**

There are many examples of a reduction of redundancy. In several cases this means reducing a doubled consonant to a single one (as is seen in K1:14 *interupt* or in SI 1:3 *totaly* / *sucess*) so that the spelling reflects how a word is pronounced. This demonstrates that the derivational rules for English spelling are not fully understood in that *totaly* represents total + ly. Another common spelling choice is a conflation of spellings as in T1:17: *wheather* which conflates *whether* and *weather*, possibly

because the learning load of distinguishing between homonyms is too great. In one interesting case, what seems to be a phonological conflation of two words owes much to pronunciation and what has very likely been heard from native speakers: V2:25 *priminister*.

4.1.3: Transfer from L1

A further spelling innovation may be attributed to transfer from a variety of Pacific L1s:

T1:18 **proberly**

T2:3 **jumbed** (jumped)

T2:5 **pill** (bill)

Tongan does not include a /b/ phoneme, so /p/ can be spelled /p/ or /b/; if the writers are unsure they are likely to guess.

K1:7 **recomment / affort** (recommend and afford)

K3:3 **elegt** (elected)

K3:10 **cabable** (capable) / **cobra** (copra)

Gilbertese includes /t/ but not /d/; /p/ but not /b/; and /k/ but not /g/. The distinctions between those pairs of sounds, therefore, are not likely to be heard.

V1:19 / SI 1:42 **pride prize** (bride price)

SI 1:27 **cloths** (clothes: frequently used). This is likely to be a pluralized version of *cloth*, assumed to be a countable noun. The pronunciation /klou^hz/ does not exist.

SI 2:26 **park** (bark: used four times in this paper)

F2:62 **idendity** (identity)

All of these samples are from Melanesian languages so it is not possible to say which language is likely to be the L1 except the last where it may be the unaspirated medial /t/ as well as the voiced nasal /n/ which has caused the learner to hear a /d/. In the other cases, the /p/ /b/ confusion may be caused by the fact that several Melanesian languages have a nasalized /b/: if the nasal sound is not heard, the learners may assume that it is /p/, and there is no distinction in these languages between /s/ and /z/.

Vowels sounds also appear in what might be a transfer phenomenon.

T1:25 **vary** (very)

V1:16 **beyound** (beyond: appeared across several groups)

SI 1:24 **gether** (gather)

SI 1:33 **had** (hard: this parallels the use of *a* for 'are' in Samoan data)

SI 2:13 **coastly** (costly) / **bold** (bald).

4.2 Phrasal variation:

There are three principal features in the way these Pacific users of English vary phrase structure in spelling. The meaning is seldom if ever affected in each case. The three features are:

- a) Phrase expansion
- b) Phrase compression

4.2.1 Phrase expansion:

This refers to the relatively common practice of analysing certain English words and phrases by their components and treating those components as unbound: *throughout* becomes *through out*, and *nowadays* is used as *now a days*. Overall, usage was seen in 21% of all papers, and while Cook Islands and Tongan use was only 9% and 11% respectively, among I-Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Fijian and Ni-Vanuatu essays, the rates of use were higher (58%, 48%, 37% and 34% respectively) with an average of events per paper of almost 2.0.

A possible explanation for this linguistic phenomenon is that these learners are dealing with lexical items which they may seldom have used before. As a result, they may syllabify the words and render them as discrete lexical items. The most common occurrence was with sentence adverbs such as *Further more*, *More over*, *There fore* and *Never the less*, which have little semantic meaning but are crucial features of academic text. It may be the relatively uncommon occurrence of such words in speech which leads these students to write them unbound. Structures that begin with *Some*, *When* or *Every*: *Some times*, *Every where*, *when ever*, *any one* and *some body* were particularly common. Other phrases which appeared regularly were *house work*, *man slaughter*, *world wide*, *fore fathers*, *bread winner*, *work load*, *wide spread* (or *wides spread*) and *near by*. As these adjectives can be used as stand-alone words (and, in the case of *some time* or *any one*, may in fact be used in ways that expect the words to be separated), it is not wholly surprising that users may reduce the learning load by treating all uses of these words as identical. Altogether there were 337 instances of phrase expansion.

4.2.2 Phrase compression:

This feature is found in other PECEs, mentioned by Kachru (1982c) and Gupta (1986). The term describes phrases in English which are reduced to a single word. The explanation for this may be phonological – the phrases are heard as a single unit and interpreted as that. More than a quarter of all examples were *alot*; indeed, so common was this use that it was comparatively uncommon to see this used as *a lot*. This is another feature firming in use in New Zealand. Another quarter of the data involved terms beginning with *in-*: *inorder*, *infact*, *inaddition*, *interms of*, *incharge of*, *incase*, *infront of*, for example. It is possible to see how these develop as the article or preposition or conjunction is barely salient and these and other unstressed words often disappear: *nowdays* and *moreless* are examples of this.

May be (modal + *to be*) is clearly confused with *maybe* (adverb), and phrasal verbs and prepositional phrases are frequently compressed: *to breakout*, *to helpout*, *set wayback*, *forexample*, *aswell*, *to sumup*, *upto*. But other uses are less obvious in origin though the relative frequency of use of these terms may suggest to learners

that they are compounds. *Eventhough* is more frequently used than *even though*, and there are examples of *hardwork*, *bothsides*, *mothertongue*, *labourforce* or *On the otherhand*.

However, it is still not completely clear why some phrases, such as those demonstrated in phrase expansion, should lead to the separation of morphemes while those displayed in phrase compression should lead students to merge words. Nonetheless, in Pacific data there are more than 500 examples of phrase compression and the percentage of use is also generally higher than that for phrase expansion.

Table 4.1: Comparison of phrase expansion and phrase compression rates

| Country | Phrase expansion % | Per paper | Phrase compression % | Per paper |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
| Cook Islands | 9 | 1.0 | 9 | 3.0 |
| Tuvalu | 50 | 2.0 | 25 | 2.0 |
| Nauru | - | - | 33 | 1.0 |
| Tonga | 11 | 2.5 | 40 | 3.4 |
| Kiribati | 58 | 2.6 | 44 | 2.4 |
| Samoa | 19 | 1.4 | 30 | 1.4 |
| Vanuatu | 34 | 1.5 | 62 | 3.1 |
| Solomon Islands | 48 | 1.9 | 60 | 2.4 |
| Fiji | 37 | 1.9 | 38 | 2.1 |

PART 2: NOUN PHRASE FEATURES

4.2 Plurality

This is one of the principal features of all postcolonial Englishes: the omission of the plural morpheme from plural count nouns and the addition of the plural morpheme on non-count items. It is, however, also a major feature of all L2 situations (Dulay and Burt 1974; Ellis 1986, 1994; Hatch 1978) and is generally, according to morpheme acquisition studies, acquired relatively early (Hatch 1978; Itoh & Hatch 1978; Larsen-Freeman 1975; Krashen et al 1979). Mention of this feature appears in analyses of the Englishes of:

- East Africa: Bokamba 1982; Mazrui and Mazrui 1996; Burgeya 2006; Hancock and Angogo 1982; Zuengler 1982; Gyasi 1991; Ahulu 1994a, 1994b, 1998b;

- South Africa: Schmied 1991; Mesthrie 1992; van der Walt and van Rooy 2002;
- South Asia: Fernando 1982; Baumgardner 1993; Ahulu 1995; Sharma 2005;
- Southeast Asia: Platt 1982; Tay 1982; Gupta 1986; McArthur 2002; Newbrook 1997;
- Pacific: Siegel 1987; Lynch and Mugler 1999; Tent 2000a; Crowley 2006.

Among the samples in this research, an average of 77.5% of all students displayed inconsistency of pluralisation with a range from 73% of Samoan samples to 98% of Solomon Islands' papers. Samples from the Marshall Islands and Tuvalu showed that 100% of students displayed this feature but as there were only three and four samples respectively, these are not seen as significant representations overall but are included. More importantly, each student made an average of 4.67 omissions per paper (Range: 3.81 per paper among Cook Islands samples to 7.58 per paper among Tongan students).

4.2.1 Omission of the plural.

Nouns in many of the languages found in the Pacific region are generally invariable in form. That is, a noun does not change form to differentiate singular and plural, nor generally do nouns take prefixes and suffixes (Lynch 1998: 107). Those few which do mark the plural do so by lengthening vowels or adding a prefix, not a suffix, or by signaling plurality with a separate word. While English plurals appear straightforward, they have a regular form (with the addition of the suffix *-s*) which may be in three forms: [-s], [-z] or [ɪz], and an irregular form in which there is a conversion of the singular word as in *mouse/mice*, *child/children*, and finally there are nouns for which there is no distinct plural (*sheep*, *deer*) or those which have more than one form; in New Zealand English it is possible to refer to numbers of *fish* or *fishes*. Further, there are uncountable nouns, which do not take plurals at any time, although this is additionally complicated by those nouns which can be countable in one context (*chickens in the yard*) but uncountable in another (*chicken on the plate*). Thus, there is a complex set of rules to control.

The most common groups of adaptations relating to the omission of the plural morpheme found in these data are:

- a). Implied plurals in which a quantifier precedes the noun;
- b). Redundancy avoidance: NP + NP;
- c). “*One of the...*”
- d). “*Family*”

4.2.1a Implied plurals in which a quantifier precedes the noun:

In standard English use, countable nouns are affixed with the –s morpheme in a plural context. Other descriptors of plurality (such as numbers or other plurality adjectives) in the noun phrase do not change this demand. In Pacific English data, however, the use of a plural quantifier preceding the head noun of the phrase commonly triggers the omission of the plural morpheme from the noun: in almost every case, if the noun is preceded by a number (*two, three, four*) or *all, most, many, most, some, lots of, both, more, these* or *those*, there is a very high likelihood that the noun following will not carry the plural morpheme.

K1:3: The disease can spread easily to **all member** in the house.

T1:16: There are **many facet** to this.

S1:16: **Some quotation** were taken from the prompt.

K1:2: It is a very small island has **lots of problem**.

T1:2: **Both side** will be considered.

V1:8: The family have **two parent** only.

S11:9: There are **more mouth** to feed.

F1:42: **Some member** want to move with time.

In Singapore English (SgE), according to Ho and Platt (1993), the use of the plural marker was higher if the noun was preceded by a numeral but this is not borne out in Pacific examples or in several other PECEs (Foley 1988; Platt et al 1984; Zuengler

1982; and Williams (1987) claims that her Singapore data showed that in 30% of cases of plural omission another indicator of plurality was used). Several Pacific languages treat numerals and quantifiers as singular (Lynch 1998: 117), so this usage in English may be an example of transfer from substrates (users' first languages), but its consistency could also be evidence of a systematic approach to pluralisation: that if a noun is preceded by a numeral above one or a quantifier which implies plurality, the noun can omit the plural morpheme. The relationship in Pacific data between the omission of the plural morpheme and the use of some other marker of plurality was significant; such omissions accounted for 41.3% of all cases of omission of the plural marker.

4.2.1b: General redundancy avoidance in NP+NP:

The previous category could be regarded readily as a case of redundancy avoidance but the term is used here to refer to two noun phrases which act as the subject or the object of the sentence and in which one noun carries the plural but the other omits it. This is a common feature, suggesting that when the plural has already been marked once within the subject or object phrase, over-generalising of the plural rules of English inhibits the use of the plural morpheme on the second noun. In all but one or two cases, the first noun is marked so the role of the plural morpheme is clearly understood, yet within only a few lexical items the second noun, which is semantically linked to the first, is used without the morpheme.

M1:2 The peoples or **member** of the family ...

T1:20 These include weddings, **funeral and feast**.

T1:6 ...control by the head in time of funerals, **wedding, birthday celebration and all sort**.

S1:8 Everyone has different thoughts or **view** towards a matter discussed.

V1:21 There are more disadvantages than **advantage**.

V2:15 They set up more high schools and **better hospital**.

SI 1:26 There is only a few plates, **spoon and pot** to wash.

F1:1: There will be some set rules or **standard way** of solving them.

4.2.1c “One of the...” structures:

A further possible implied plural is found in the quantifier phrase ‘*One of the...*’ in which the head noun is seldom given a plural morpheme; this is also a common example in these samples of an apparently rule-governed omission. Of all examples of the omission of the plural morpheme, 11.6% were in this single feature:

M1:3 **One of the advantage** of one type of family is the cost.

T1:1 **One of the Ministry** in Tonga is responsible for Education.

K3:2 The right of women is **one of the major discussion** through out the world.

V2:18 Infrastructure is **one of the development** that is associated between the two parties.

SI 2:9 **One of the most significant example** is that it is dominated by beliefs.

F2:138 It is **one of God’s gift** to human.

There are several potential explanations for this structure. One possibility is that, as with other quantifying pre-posed phrases, the plural is understood and therefore not needed explicitly. A second suggestion is that the authority of the word ‘*One*’ is strong enough to lead learners to create singular concord with that rather than with the head of the phrase. This would accord with what Ho and Platt (1993:22) refer to as a “semantic-syntactic environment” in which it is the apparent meaning of the phrase that governs the rule applied by the writer rather than the grammatical structure.

4.2.1d Collective nouns: Family:

One of the topics for the Semester 1, 2006 examination in LL114 asked students to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of either the nuclear or extended family. As a result, students' essays needed to use the word 'family' in a number of ways and in a significant number of sentences. Every student who attempted this question gave *at least* one perceptually plural use of the word: that is, when a reader could have expected the noun to be plural it was singular but the verb following was plural.

Pacific students appear to be treating this word much as the word 'staff' is used in English – the word is grammatically singular but semantically it carries the notion of plurality. In fact, English generally shows a dichotomous use of collective nouns such as 'team', 'group' or 'staff'. Anyone using these words must decide whether the context demands that they be interpreted either as perceptually singular as a united entity: "The staff (as a whole) was in a meeting", or as perceptually plural, as a group of individuals: "The staff were released in groups of two or three." It was clear that many Pacific learners would put 'family' into the same category – those words which carry the notion of 'several members'. In each context the writers perceive the word 'family' as plural in role and meaning.

Tu1:1 (They are) staying in large **family**.

T1:17 **Extended family**, who are most likely to depend on each other , ...

K1:1 **Nuclear family** give a chance to these people ...to finally have the courage to tend for themselves.

S1:9 What is important to **extended family** is when they grow up they still know, who are they?

V1:20 **Extended family** in such a region are unlikely to be moderned.

SI 1:16 **Nuclear family** have both side effects of them.

F1:15 This essay highlights the advantages that **extended family** have.

There are other less numerous but noticeable tendencies related to plurality, one of which is found in all eleven of the countries but samples per national group are not numerous. In these cases the subject noun is plural but the object, or object of the preposition, which is semantically linked, remains singular.

T1:11 Relatives voiced their **preference** (where it is clear that there was more than one).

T2:4 People from developing **country** move overseas..

V2:4 Chinese shops boast the cheapest **price**.

Further, as Tent (2001) has noted for Fiji English, loan words from indigenous languages are seldom pluralised. This conforms to the way they are used in their indigenous contexts so I-Kiribati students refer to *two bwaibwai* and Tongan students discuss the importance of *'ulumotu'a* in the villages.

Many students attest to the fact that they 'talk in their heads' while writing. Since all but a few Austronesian languages, to which group most of the languages of these Pacific nations belong, display a tendency to open syllables, it may be that the *-s* morpheme is omitted because it either closes a syllable or creates a difficult consonant cluster.

Furthermore while the plural has salience in English for English L1 speakers, the plural *-s* is seldom made salient in any other way and is often unnecessary for the maintenance of comprehensibility. As Williams (1987: 176) points out: "[s]ince preceding quantifiers, numerals, etc. are perceptually more salient than the frequently redundant plural *s*, SLLs (second language learners) frequently opted to use these markers alone to signal plurality." She suggests that this action reflects Slobin's view that there is a constant tension in language between the need for communication to be clear and at the same time to be as straightforward as possible (Williams 1987: 169) and that learners are therefore reducing the learning load by ignoring redundant features.

Whatever may be the most appropriate explanation for the regular omission of the plural morpheme, the most significant aspect of this behaviour is its consistency which suggests it is neither an accident nor simply a mistake. There are many examples of idiosyncratic use of the plural but the patterns mentioned in this section are wide-ranging (across all national groups) and deep (found several times in each user's essay). The application of rules may be explained as over-generalisation or redundancy reduction, but at its base such application is systematic and non-accidental.

4.2.2 Addition of plurality to non-plural features.

Adding a plural morpheme in ways that differ from those of Standard English was found in 63% of all students in the data with an average occurrence per paper of 2.6. I-Kiribati and Solomon Islands students demonstrated the highest percentage of use with 80% of those samples and an average per paper of 2.8 and 2.9 respectively. The lowest average usage was found in Cook Islands' data with a 54% range at an average of 1.3 events per paper, possibly caused by the impact of New Zealand English on the community. Tongan samples of added plurality in non-plural contexts were 73%, about the same as Vanuatu (70%) and Fiji (69%), but Tongan students' frequency of use per paper was the highest at 4.07.

There are five apparent sub-categories:

- a) Pluralisation of non-count nouns
- b) After *each, every, another*, and other singular markers
- c) Pluralisation of certain phrases
- d) Pluralisation of long plural forms.
- e) Pluralisation of adjectival.

4.2.2a Pluralisation of non-count nouns:

Of the 1051 instances of added plurals, 455, or 43%, were examples of plurals applied to non-count nouns. This is the most commonly quoted example of PECE adjustments (Kirk-Greene 1971; Hancock and Angogo 1982; Todd 1982; Pride 1982; Zuengler 1982; Parasher 1983; Platt et al 1984; Gupta 1986; Williams 1987;

Awonusi 1990; Schmied 1991; Ahulu 1994a, 1994b; Tent 2001; Tan 2005; Burgeya 2006; Newbrook 1997; de Klerk 2006).

The distinction between count and non-count nouns is not an aspect of Pacific languages, and the way in which the distinction is marked in English, with certain words being either count or non-count depending on the meaning within the context (*time/times*, or *hair/hairs*, for example), is not conducive to an ease of rule generation. There were relatively few examples of the pluralisation of non-count nouns in the oral Fijian English data of Kelly (1975) and Tent (2001), but it is distinctive and numerically significant in this written Pacific data. Indeed, among the 376 cases of additional plural morpheme use among Fijian samples alone, 80% were pluralised non-count nouns. It occurs frequently enough not to qualify as a “mistake” and it seems true here, as in most of the data, that while learners sometimes recall the correct structure, their default position is the one that either makes more sense or is easier to deal with. Some individuals have not used any non-count noun without a plural ending: in F2:88, the words *employments* and *surgeries* appear three times apiece and the word *equipments* is used 10 times in a single essay of 551 words.

The most frequent examples are *advice*, *employment*, *staff*, *work*, *equipment*, and *homework*, but there is a variety of others. Platt et al (1984) propose that there could be several reasons for this usage. One is transfer from substrate languages which do not make the same distinctions, and another is that the nouns affected are largely those which are semantically plural even if not grammatically so – words such as *furniture*, *fruit* and *equipment*. In the view of Platt et al, the additional plural is less likely to occur with nouns that seem more uncountable such as *petrol*. But a further explanation may be that users are seeking to regularise an irregularity by adding a plural –s to all nouns because the division between count and non-count is not logical enough for them to generalise a standard rule.

It is also true that British English models and American English models differ in their application of the count or non-count structures on some items: Williams (1987: 172) uses the example of *accommodation vs accommodations* and there are others. Confusion of input, especially from mass media, may make it even more difficult for

those not growing up with English as a mother tongue to arrive at a clear rule for the use of nouns.

A few examples from the data of pluralised non-count nouns are:

C2:5 Planting are hard **works**

M1:1 People work for their **retirements**.

T1:1 (They) are providing **employments**. (used three times).

Ni1:4 They take **interests** in the dealing of traditional medicine (used four times).

K1:20 It will force the **kins** to take up conflicting actions.

V2:4 This would enable them to buy household **equipments** and other **inventories**.

SI 1:5 They accord their relatives special **recognitions**.

F1:44 Parents **advices** will collide with others.

F2:29 They don't have qualified **personnels**.

4.2.2b Following *each*, *every*, *another*, and other singular markers:

Approximately 15% of all forms of added plural morphemes (155 out of 1054 cases) are those added to common singular markers, and 63% of those are applied to nouns following *each*, *every* and *another*. While Standard English expects these to govern singular nouns, Pacific examples often attach them to plural nouns.

K1:14 **Every members** of the family wants to give good advices.

This appears to be yet another example of rule creation engendered by the 'perceptual plurality' of certain English words. "[T]he quantifiers each or every result in a presupposition of more than one entity in the referent set denoted by the noun phrase" (Eberhard 1997: 162), which leads to the pluralising of that phrase.

The conflation of *an* and *other* into *another* is clearly not recognised as singular by many, possibly because implicit in the word is the idea of being part of a group.

T1:6 Father is the head of **each sub-units**.

T1:14 It is given to **each individual members**.

K1: 5 **Every individuals** know their roles.

K1:15 They help **each others** by sharing properties especially foods.

S1:4 (It features) the living closely of **each family members**.

S1:20 This is why the childrens argue and fight ...on **each situations** faced.

V1:32 This happens in **every Melanesians societies**.

V2:16 **Each** islands have own needs.

SI 1:6 **Another advantages** of extended families is ...

SI 1:14**Each/ every members** (used five times).

SI 2:25It is the best alternative approaches to protecting the lives of **every single human beings**.

F1:8 The skills is passed down to **each generations** in terms of observing and imitations.

F2:117 **Every Pacific Island countries** (need remittances).

It should be noted at this point that such structures, such as “Each of them want to go” are heard in L1 spoken English but they are much less common in formal written texts.

4.2.2c: Plural added to certain phrases:

Examples such as ‘daughter-in-laws’ or ‘two teaspoonfuls’ are heard even among careful speakers of English as an L1 and reflect a tendency to conform to the

grammatical structure of the word rather than its meaning: the plural *-s* is attached to the end of a noun. In Pacific data there are examples of the same phenomenon:

F1:20 ...a day outs trip

Many English speakers no longer see the phrase ‘daughter-in-law’ as having three words but view this semantically as a single word with a single definable meaning; logically, they pluralise at the end. The same may be true of Pacific users: they conflate the parts of the expression until they are perceived as one unit of meaning. In the cases that follow, the expressions also show an addition of the *-s* morpheme to what are uncountable nouns, but what makes them different from the previous category is that the expressions the students are using are in more common general usage and thus might be expected to be learned as a stock phrase; the fact that they appear *not* to be learned in that manner adds further evidence for the probability that there is a rule being applied, even if that rule does not conform to Standard English norms.

While the use of this structure is not the most common of creative structures, there are 75 instances of it across the data:

T1:9/T1:25 **As results of lots of noises...**

T1:14 Matters brought me **into their attentions.**

K3:2 This is usefull (sic) **in times of troubles.**

K3:6 The advantages are **threefolds.**

S1:16 ...due to the insarficient (sic) **point of views** of family members.

V1:9 Most mothers often have sickness in their **old ages.**

V1:17 After **completing schools**, most of them do not return home.

SI 1:21 **Most of the times...**family members seem to take law into their own hands and **take revenges.**

SI 2:30 It does more **harm than goods.**

SI 2:64 **In this regards**, it is not in standardised does (dose) for **human consumptions**.

F2:81 It is important for their **day to days** living.

4.2.2d Plural morpheme affixed to free plurals:

The most common uses are with the words *children/grandchildren* and *people*. In some essays the word *childrens* as a plural appeared more than five times, and in others *peoples* was never used without the *-s*. These two words, and *womens*, which also appears relatively frequently in this data, are specifically mentioned by de Klerk (2006) in his study of Xhosa English. He believes this is a case of overgeneralising. “Although such a feature conflicts, in many ways, with the tendency to reduce redundancy... the redundancy is not superficially evident in the morphological form” (p. 141).

T1:8 The family has three **childrens**.

T1:17 ..it also include **grandchildrens**, aunty, uncle and grandparents. / The most precious product of a family is its educated **childrens**.

K3:2 Women should stand together on their own **feets**.

K3:4 **Womens** have the right.

K3:7 Problems can cause worries to **peoples**.

S1:5 There are 5 to 6 couples and their **childrens**.

F2:2 This medicinal powers are to be given out to sick **peoples** (used twice).

4.2.2f Addition of plural morpheme to adjectivals:

Other European languages possess adjectivals which agree with their governing noun in gender and number, as in French: *les hommes riches* (*rich people*). This is not, however, a feature of English phrase structure. Its appearance might be expected in Vanuatu data where many students have had a French education, but in fact cases are

spread across most national groups, and while numbers of this aspect in Pacific data are not great, they are frequent enough and broadly spread enough to be distinct.

T2:2 Children find it hard to recognise the **descendants** families.

K3:4 That make people **stricts** in their beliefs.

S1:16 They use **traditionals** practices.

V1:21 It affects the **elderlies** people.

V2:15 People migrate to **others** places.

SI 1:56 It has some **goods** elements.

SI 2:7 They provide schools for **Muslims** students only.

SI 2:37 (It is expensive) to use **privates** doctors.

F2:50 There is variety of **schools** subjects.

The reason for this is unclear but the most probable explanation is an over-generalised rule creation. There are enough examples to suggest that this is something more than a simple mistake, but there are insufficient to provide evidence for a firm hypothesis of cause.

4.3 Pronominals

Many Pacific languages have pronominal systems which are more complex than that of English (Lynch 1998: 100-106). Almost all distinguish between inclusive and exclusive first person plural pronouns, and some have independent pronouns for singular, dual (you two, we two), trial (you three, we three), paucal (more than two but less than many), and plural. On the other hand, few mark gender and not all distinguish between subject and object pronouns; instead, many mark the subject of a sentence or clause with a subject marker showing number and person which may stand alone or be affixed to the verb. There is not, therefore, a close relationship between the forms pronominals take in English and the forms they take in any of the L1s of the region.

This suggests that the English pronominal system with its gender distinctions and limited range of number classes may be difficult to control, and this is borne out by the data. Overall, an average of 67% of students showed some uncertainty with English pronouns: among Fijian students this uncertainty was found in 78% of essays with an average frequency per essay of 3.5 while I-Kiribati students demonstrated the lowest rate of 44% with an average frequency count of 2.2.

Pronominal use as a distinctive feature of PECEs is mentioned by Awonusi (1990), Schmeid (1991), Tent (2001), MacArthur (2002) and Newbrook (1997) and the principal aspects noted are the mismatch between noun and pronoun in number, person and gender. Generally, the assumption is that the absence in those substrates of these distinctions has made it difficult for PECE speakers to generalise the rules: there is reference in several articles by these authors to the “random” use of pronouns. Despite this, there do appear to be some categories of pronominal use which can be differentiated:

- a) Concord with noun in number;
- b) Concord with noun in gender/person;
- c) Use of ‘one’;
- d) Use of reflexives;
- e) Use of ‘it’ without anaphora.

4.3a: Concord with noun in number:

Agreement with nouns in number, and in gender or person, is the most common difference from Standard forms. English has a simple pronominal structure in which users cannot distinguish between interlocutors in first or second person plurals without adding explanatory phrases: there are no inclusive and exclusive first person plural forms to allow a speaker or writer to include or separate the interlocutor in the word “we”, and there is only one second person pronoun which must be used for singular and plural purposes. There is a tendency for some Pacific learners to have difficulty with the use of ‘it’ in matching it to an abstract, neuter or inanimate noun, or to the dummy subject position, possibly because there is no equivalent in the substrate languages. As a result, ‘it’ is among the most randomly used pronoun

forms. Given the objective focus of the essays required by the examinations, there was little call for the use of first person pronouns; those that were used tended to be the first person singular pronoun *I*. There was some use of the second person pronoun *you* but this decreased the objective tone generally required by the text type asked for.

Usage of English pronouns suggests that while the grammatical role of a pronoun is fully understood, the semantic roles are not clearly differentiated. In some cases, the choice of pronoun displays a link to the ‘perceptual plural’ concept carried by *one of the...*, the phrase influencing the pronominal choice to be singular.

S1:3 One of the benefit of extended families is that **it** helps in family matters.

F1:5 Children will learn a lot of things and one of **it** is respect.

For the rest of the examples in which anaphora and pronoun do not match in number, however, it is hard to find a clear explanation. It may be that uncertainty is caused by the simplicity of the English forms, and the low phonological salience of English pronouns may make it more difficult for PECE users to structure the rules, especially in assigning a pronoun to abstract and non-specific nouns. However, this may be an influence from the substrates: Oceanic languages do not usually allow non-singular pronouns to refer to inanimates, so *it* and *one* may be used in the English in the region to refer to all inanimates (Geraghty 2012: pers. comm..)

N2:1 **A migrant** has to take advantage (of migration) in order to make **their** dream a reality. (In this case, it may be the abstract noun which poses a problem).

T1:6 **Most families** has **its** reunion.

T1:23 There are many people marrying **people** that they later know **it** is their own cousins.

T1:30 The children respect their **father** by didn’t eat **their** leftover food or touching **their** hair.

K3:12 (The women) will be able to survive comfortably with **her** children.

V1:12 **Young individuals** who wanted to migrate into towns to find better employment opportunities in fulfil **his or her** dreams.

V2:23 It can supports the victim's hope if **they** has broken **his** legs accidentally.

SI 1:22 They practise their **customs** because they have respect for **it**.

SI 1:39 **Pacific Islands** has long been known for **its** practised of depending on each other.

F1:35 She sets up **a family** and alters **them** after a few years.

F2:34 **Migration** also has **their** disadvantages.

It is possible that, in some of these cases, the complexity of sentence structure has challenged the writer's memory and the noun governing the pronoun has been mistaken. This is a feature which is not unknown in native speaker speech. Given that these samples were written under time constraints, that pressure may have reduced the writer's ability to check for consistency. Sample F1:35, furthermore, may be another example of the perceptual plurality of 'family' affecting the choice of pronoun.

4.3b Concord with noun in gender/person:

Most Pacific languages, as said, distinguish more degrees of person reference than English but fewer differentiate between subject and object forms; many use the same pronoun in both positions with the sentence order making semantic roles clear (Lynch 1998: 103-4), and what object pronouns are present may not be independent structures but are affixes to the verb.

This factor goes some way to explaining why the use of English pronouns, most particularly 3rd person pronouns, in these data showed such variation and, for the first time, a lack of systematic generalisation. In these samples there is significant mismatch between the head noun and the pronoun used to refer to it: feminine nouns

are followed by masculine or plural pronouns, and subject nouns are replaced by object pronoun forms. It is clear that the pronominal rules are understood in principle but not always which ones take which place.

Tu1:1 **She** is my aunty and uncle.

T1:25 **His or he** have reduce number of expenditure.

K3:8 **Their** is responsible to work with **his** family.

V2:13 Someone is trying to paddle upstream in **its** canoe.

V2:25 The disease is passed to **his** husband.

SI 1:37 **The father** will advice **her** daughter to concentrate on her education.

SI 1:43 **Girls** are not allowed to point fingers on **your** brother.

F2:16 **The boy** chewed it ...and forced some into **her** grandmother's mouth.

F2:26 **The government** will have to import more to fulfil the needs and wants of **his** country.

4.3c Use of *one*

There are many examples of the neutral 3rd person singular pronoun *one* in Pacific data and students clearly found it a useful device to avoid the gender decision required by *he* or *she* and the clumsy *he or she* which is frequently used. This was probably introduced by the education system as it is a form very infrequently heard in speech or seen in anything but formal writing. It is perhaps the way in which this form has been taught that accounts for the inconsistency of use: using *one* demands an almost pedantic repetition of the word in subject, object and possessive positions. The use of *one* and of *he or she* in some of this data had the quality of a strategy to avoid the difficulties presented by 3rd person singular pronouns generally:

T1:15 The increasing rates of suicide especially those in nuclear families in which **one** keeps to **one's self her** troubled and depressed mind.

S1:14 The larger the family, the higher the chance that **one** gets help if **he or she** is in need.

V1:25 ...the financial burden **one** has to cope with in supporting **his or her** family.

SI 1:18 **One** finds and works for **their** own benefit.

SI 1:22 In a homes where extended family exists, **one** will not be able to exercise **its** privacy.

F1:15 **One** cannot blame **itself** for the failure sustained.

F1:30 It is easier to focus **one's** attention on **their** child who is in need of attention...without another family member trying to draw **your** attention.

F2:26 If **one** has to improve the future for **oneself** and the future of the country, then **they** have to bear these consequences.

4.3d Use of reflexives

It is to be expected that Pacific students would have some problems with reflexive structures. Few if any of the languages of the region feature forms which resemble the English reflexive pronouns which are polymorphemic and which have strict agreement rules. "It would seem," writes White (2003: 145) "that the L2 English input provides fairly transparent evidence that reflexives are morphologically complex." Further, as was apparent in rule generalization in pluralisation, there also seems to be redundancy avoidance: if the pronoun is plural (*they* or *them*) it is common, though not certain, that the plural will be omitted from *selves*. Once more it is possible to see the influence of the perceptual plurality of words such as *family*.

T1:2 **They** share the warmth of their relationship among **oneself**. It create **oneself** business.

T2:8 **They** can solve it by **themselves**.

S1:18 ...to be able to rely on **ownself**.

V1:30 Feeling of security is within **oneself** wherever **he or she** goes.

V2:22 **People** with a poor education background reside **themselves** in a shanty town area. (This sentence may be more usefully included in examples of verb phrase innovations because in this case the student has transitive an intransitive verb by using the reflexive.)

SI 1:13 **The extended family** live together and cannot support **themselves**. **Some** might end up by selling **themselves**.

SI 1:16 **The nuclear family** isolate **themselves**. (This structure ties back to the widespread interpretation of 'family' as a plural noun).

F1:15 **One** cannot blame **itself** for the failure sustained.

F2:30 **The young generation** is able to make a well-established future for **himself**.

4.4 Articles.

Article use in English is a complex skill to control. The research in the 1970s and 1980s into morpheme acquisition by L1 children (Brown 1973; Dulay and Burt 1974; Larsen-Freeman 1978) illustrated this beyond question. This complexity stems from a number of aspects, including that articles have reduced salience because they have reduced lexical meaning, but there are other complexities created by substrate experience.

Firstly, while article use in other languages may distinguish gender (as in some European languages which have masculine and feminine articles), or number (as in Drehu in New Caledonia which marks eight forms of articles (Lynch 1988: 113) and Samoan which marks number in the articles), Pacific languages generally have articles which are limited in number and have clear rules for use. Indefinite items may not be marked at all (Lynch 1998: 110-111), as in English in such clauses as "Clouds were forming..."

Furthermore, Lynch describes languages whose articles distinguish between specific and non-specific, or generic, items, rather than between definite and indefinite. In these cases, one article can mark an item which is specific (such as a book, or a canoe, or a knife rather than a “thing” or something generic), but which is not known to the interlocutor: specific but not definite; or another can identify differently something which is specific [-generic] and known to the interlocutor (the book on the table over there, the canoe you and I saw yesterday) [+definite], and anything non-specific and indefinite can be left unmarked. This distinction has been described by Platt et al (1984: 53-57) as important to “new Englishes” or PECEs; they explain ‘specific’ as meaning anything previously known to the participants (or believed to be known) while anything non-specific is that whose identity is either unimportant or irrelevant or objects which are generic. In this latter situation, articles are generally unnecessary.

Ekiert (2007: 10-11) and Ellis (1994: 140-141) refer to Huebner’s 1983 classification of articles in which two features of referentiality are described – “whether a noun is a specific referent [+/- SR] or whether *it is assumed* to be known to the hearer [+/- HK]” (my emphasis). It is important to consider, in these data, whether the writer has assumed shared knowledge: it may be that the academic context and the implied distance between the writer and the assessors of the essays have affected the likelihood that cultural items are shared. If this is so, it is probable that students would focus on [-HK] which would engender zero article use.

Ionin et al (2004: 12) in their brief analysis of Samoan article use which uses *le* with [+specific] phrases and *se* with [-specific] phrases make it clear that “definiteness is irrelevant for Samoan articles”. Given the similarities present in Polynesian languages, the same is probably true of Tongan, Cook Islands Maori, Niuean and Tuvaluan.

Both these points reinforce the role that [+/-specific] rather than [+/-definite] plays in Pacific contexts. Research in other PECEs suggests that omission of definite articles is the principal feature (Ahulu 1994a, 1994b; Gyasi 1991; Kachru 1982a; Kachru, Y 2003; Kirk-Greene 1971; Schmeid 1991; Tan 2005; van der Walt & van Rooy 2002),

and this is reflected in these Pacific samples. However, this needs further research to compare accurate applications with non-standard ones before the perception that Pacific learners have greater problems with definiteness could be confirmed. It could be that zero article use is being applied in contexts where a pluralised noun might be expected; the omission of an article, therefore, could be an issue of plurality rather than of article referentiality.

In English the distinction is between definite and indefinite, but generic items can be marked variously: the indefinite article and a singular noun can describe such a situation, as in ‘A dog is man’s best friend’, or the definite article and a singular noun can be used, as in ‘The dog is man’s best friend’, or, thirdly, the article can be omitted and the head noun pluralised – ‘Dogs are man’s best friend’. The rules for inclusion or omission of articles are several and complicated and have frequent exceptions. As a result, it is generally expected that learners will have difficulties with the application of these rules.

Across all the countries in these samples, an average of 86% of learners display these difficulties from a high of 94% of Solomon Islands essays to a low of 70% among the Samoan group. The average number of events per paper is 8.5 in Tuvaluan samples, 7.4 in the Solomons, and 6.4 in Tongan examples, while the lowest average display was found among Cook Islands’ students at 2.9 per paper. These rates may reflect the fact that, as Biber (1988, 2002) has explained, academic text has a higher percentage of noun phrases than informal or narrative texts, and an increase in noun phrases is likely to demand an increase in the need for articles.

Another aspect of these texts which may be relevant is that the essay topics required many general examples rather than specific ones. Students were asked to write about the advantages and/or disadvantages of, or causes and effects of, or to compare and contrast a range of abstractions: migration, traditional medicine, women in Parliament, family structures, and stress (see Appendix 1). As a result, essays tended to supply broad general statements, backed up with non-specific examples from students’ general knowledge. This situation may have led students to see very little of what they wrote as [+definite and +specific]. Not surprisingly, the omission of the

definite article was the principal characteristic, followed by the omission of the indefinite article at 61%. The addition of the definite and indefinite articles was considerably lower at 40% and 30% of samples respectively.

Table 4.2: Omissions and additions of articles in Pacific data: percentages and per paper occurrences.

| | -the | | +the | | -a/an | | +a/an | | Articles in substrates |
|------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| | % | Per paper | % | Per paper | % | Per paper | % | Per paper | |
| Cook Islands | 81 | 2.9 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| Fiji | 82 | 3.8 | 48 | 1.8 | 71 | 3.4 | 32 | 1.4 | Yes |
| Kiribati | 75 | 4.3 | 32 | 2.0 | 36 | 2.5 | 36 | 1.9 | Yes |
| Marshall Is. | 75 | 3.3 | 75 | 1.0 | 75 | 1.3 | 25 | 1.0 | Yes |
| Nauru | 100 | 2.3 | 25 | 1.0 | 50 | 1.1 | 25 | 1.0 | ? |
| Niue | 100 | 4.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| Samoa | 70 | 5.1 | 38 | 1.5 | 61 | 1.4 | 23 | 1.3 | Yes |
| Solomon Is. | 94 | 7.4 | 43 | 1.9 | 79 | 3.2 | 30 | 1.5 | Most |
| Tonga | 78 | 6.4 | 27 | 1.7 | 67 | 2.6 | 29 | 3.1 | Yes |
| Tuvalu | 100 | 8.2 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| Vanuatu | 88 | 5.6 | 32 | 1.3 | 70 | 3.5 | 44 | 2.2 | Varies, but Yes in Bislama |
| Average % | 86 | 4.8 | 40 | 1.5 | 61 | 2.4 | 30 | 1.7 | |

(It is worth noting here that in Fiji, speakers of Fijian Hindi have a mother tongue which does not include articles. No division was made in this data between speakers of Fijian and Fijian Hindi)

It is clear that substrate influence alone cannot explain these figures: ni-Vanuatu students, whose languages do not generally contain equivalents of articles, do not display a higher than average creative use of English articles except for the addition of indefinite articles. Their results are about the average for the omission of the definite article and below average for the addition of that article, and sit at about the middle of the range for omission of indefinite articles. Some of the highest figures are for those whose languages contain the concept of articles, such as the Cook Islands, Fiji, Niue and Tuvalu, and Tongan students display the highest rate per paper of the addition of indefinite articles. These users of English appear to have generalised a rule which is different from both L1 and L2 norms but which is systematic and largely consistent.

4.4.1 Omission of definite articles

Omission of the definite article in these materials can overwhelmingly be related to nouns with weak specificity. For example, ‘the cost of living’ was almost never supplied with an article, definite or indefinite:

T1:3 Families have considered that **cost of fuels** ..is costly

V1:29 There is a high rise in **cost of living**.

V1:32 They can only do according to **cost of living**.

F2:37 ...trying to put up with cheap rent and **cost of living**.

Very few references to *family*, *extended* or *nuclear family* or *government* provided an article. Students were not talking about specific families; they were instead discussing the general tendencies of the concept of such families. In this case, it appears logical that students have omitted an article:

M1:3 People prefer **nuclear family** rather than **extended family**.

Tu1:2 **Extended family** is important to society. (used 12 times)

T1:6 A control in **extended family** is diverse. (x 18)

K1:7 **Extended family** have disadvantages. (x 8)

K1:15 The reason for laws of **family** is to reduce problems. (x 8).

S1:13 This indicates that **nuclear family** can be useless. (x 5)

V1:17 Next advantage of **nuclear family** is ... (x 10)

V1:31 **Extended family** have important roles. (x 20)

SI 1:10 **Extended family** have advantages. (x 19)

SI 1:53 The three disadvantages of **nuclear family** are (x 13)

F1:39 Young people learn in **extended family**. (x 8)

F2:8 This defeats the purpose of the military coups of 1987 and overthrow of **government** of 2000.

4.4.2 Omission of definite and indefinite articles in Adj+N phrases

A further clear category of noun phrases without a definite or indefinite article occurs in phrases where the noun is preceded by an adjective; such a structure in standard English might be *The tall man gave the child a large colouring book*. This usage has been discussed by Trenkic (2007) in relation to Serbian and Turkish learners of English. Though her data were limited, she found across all her learner groups that “the presence of an adjective increased the likelihood of the article drop, irrespective of the overall accuracy rates or rates of omission” (p. 308). One of her explanations was that “the more elements of meaning we need to encode in a single phrase, the more complex and more costly the task. Clearly, then, ... Art+Adj+N contexts will be more taxing than Art+N ones ... [A]ttentional resources will always be exceeded sooner in the former, leading to proportionally more article omissions” (p. 314). And she goes on to point out that with adjectives modifying the noun, the meaning is clear and the article is redundant. She claims that SLLs whose own language does not make definiteness the grammatical feature of articles see:

English articles as nominal particles, and treat them in production as such. This means that their article production is lexically based (articles are treated as lexical words) and pragmatically motivated (i.e. motivated by the perceived need to express the meaning they encode for the learner) (p. 315).

It is difficult to assert that this is true of Pacific learners because no tests have been carried out on these learners’ perceptions of the English article structure. As a result, any suggestion as explanation can only be that: a suggestion. Nonetheless, given the very high number of cases where an expected Art+Adj+N structure was produced as \emptyset +Adj+N, it is likely that the adjective creates a phrase which is [+specific/-definite], and being specific does not require the English definite article. Neither does it require an indefinite article because it is [+specific]; almost all cases of a generic description [Adj+N] appear without the indefinite article.

The rate of omission is certainly too high and too consistent per paper to be accidental. Once more, the obvious interpretation is that a systematic approach is being followed which might be described as: *English nouns take an obligatory definite article only when they are [+specific/+definite]; when the noun is preceded by an adjective or adjectival phrase, an article is non-obligatory.*

SI 1:17: The structure have paved the way for more manageable family.

[+specific] (already mentioned)

[-specific + Adj]

SI 2:9 In the Pacific region, belief system hold the people to surroundings.

[+specific/+definite]

[-specific + Adj]

[+specific /+ definite]

[-specific/-definite]

(Known to all parties)

(Known to all parties)

The omission of the definite article before Adj+N also applies to superlative and numerical phrases. *The best...* or *The most ...* are generally provided without the definite article, though in some cases this may be connected to the adjectival phrase mentioned above. The indefinite article, too, is commonly missing before Adj+N phrases:

M1:1 ..advantages such as **easier way** of doing things.

N2:1 There is also **adequate and safe water supply**.

Tu1:2 There are also problems like **small house and twelve people**.

T1:2 Each family demand **equal share**.

T1:6 **Last point** here is control ...is diverse.

T1:31 **Second advantage** is family needs and wants.

K1:8 **Next advantage** is space.

K1:19 In addition to **previous point....** / This means **very cheap life**.

S1:6 The positive effects include getting **good education** for the children.

SI 1:6 **Next point** is **feeling of belonging**.

V1:2 If the situation does not improve, can result in **more difficult situation**.

V2:11 They are experiencing **high rate of lifestyle disease**.

SI 1:17 The structure have paved **way** for **more manageable family**.

SI 2:17 It will create a gap in societies where **Christian faith** is prominent.

F1:7 There is **great possibility** to attain work.

F1:13 In **worst case scenario** they may start playing truant.

4.4.3 Omission of articles from certain common phrases

When added together across the total data, these phrases account for a considerable number of instances of article omission. The principal examples of such phrases are: \emptyset majority of ...; \emptyset same...; due to ...; in \emptyset future; in \emptyset case of ...; \emptyset lack/loss of...; \emptyset few of ...; such \emptyset ...; \emptyset variety of ...; and on \emptyset other hand. One explanation for this phenomenon is likely to be phonological in that the articles are generally reduced in L1 speech and are thus hard to distinguish:

T1:17 **Majority of some family** survive from farming. (This may be an analogy with ‘most (of)’ which has switched its meaning in Fijian English to ‘many’ (Geraghty 2012: pers. comm.).

V1:32 **Majority of habitants** are from ...Paama.

F1:17 This is true across **majority of the Pacific**.

F2:4 **Majority of Cabinet Ministers** are Fijian.

F2:18 **Majority of Pacific people** are looking for greener pastures.

S1:20 If parents are always partying, **same goes** for the children.

SI 2:64 Both adults and children used **same doses**.

F1:36 They live **same kind of lifestyle** whole of your life.

F2:87 ...and **same for trades people** with skilful knowledge.

SI 1:45 Due to **great number** of people at one place ...

S2:2 Due to **lack of skills**, (accidents can happen).

V1:9 They have enough land for **future**.

F2:42 He wants to become someone in **future**.

Other examples are *greater the people, greater the consumption of resources; On other hand; in weekend; during past three years; they take law into their own hands; there is shortage of land and shortage of jobs; As result ...; ... the world as whole ...; and on day to day basis.*

4.4.4 Omission of indefinite article from generics

In this case, though English would use the indefinite article to establish the generic quality of a noun, Pacific learners seem to follow the model of most of their own languages in which generic nouns are not generally marked. In many of the cases of omission of the indefinite article on generalised nouns, the noun used was abstract in quality which may be a further complication for rule-generalisation.

T1:21 The abuse of children is **concern** in extended family.

T1:28 Family members will also gain **sense of belonging**.

K1:6 Sometimes husband could blame the wife **having affair** with other man.

V2:6 **Patient** with asma is given a spray.

SI 1:57 Someone wants to be **lawyer**.

SI 2:2 Traditional medicine provides **solution**.

SI 2:14 This is through warming up the leaves over **fire**.

F1:23 Parents would go and have **yarn** with the rest of villages.

F1:42 When **problem** arises, members give in their views.

In all these cases, the absence of the articles does not impair the retrieval of meaning. The articles are, therefore, largely redundant which provides a good explanation for their absence.

4.4.5 Addition of definite article on proper nouns

The addition of the definite article may be connected with learners' recognition of the quality of [+specific/+definite] of the name of a particular place or feature or disease, meaning it is understood by all participants, including the reader. As a result, students in these data have applied the article to certain proper nouns:

S1:5 If a family's church is **the Methodist**, then you are expected to attend **the Methodist**.

V1:30 (It is) a few kilometres from the **Luganville town**.

V2:9 ...going to **the Berkley (sic) University**.

V2:21 ...the first cases of **the HIV/Aids**.

SI 2:56 Such migration benefits **the New Zealand**.

F2:2 It were derived from the belief that **the almighty God** blessed all trees and fings (sic).

4.4.6: Addition of articles to non-count nouns

Article use is closely related to the distinction in English between countable and uncountable nouns, a feature, as already noted, not found in Pacific languages. Articles attached to uncountable nouns comprise the single largest group of additional article use. About 47% of all added articles are those with non-count nouns. Because these nouns are not seen as different from any other noun, students regard them as available for article use. In some cases, articles have been attached

because the phrase with the article can be used in other contexts – in public vs the public, for example.

T1:28 She continue to do so **in the public**.

T1:31 **A political unrest** was the result.

K1:22 They experience **a good leadership**.

K3:3 It affects the members in **the politics**.

S2:1 **The inflation** has increased.

SI 1:7 It is rare to find a family living alone in **a bush**.

SI 1:30 Privacy is **a time spent alone**.

SI 2:21 This is to avoid **the malaria**

SI 2:38 **The unemployment** is (an important factor) (used 10 times)

F1:14 Grandparents have to face **the reality**.

F2:55 Migration to some is **a heartbreaking news**.

4.4.7 Addition of indefinite article on plural nouns

This is one instance of article use which does not seem to fit a logical pattern and may reflect a lack of clarity either in the grammatical feature itself or in the method by which this aspect of English has been taught. Given the problems that articles present for many second language learners, it is reasonable to believe that teachers themselves may find it difficult to explain English article use (as, indeed, would many L1 users). It is also possible that learners do not readily hear the difference between ‘the’ and ‘a’ in speech and, as neither has lexical or phonological salience, choose arbitrarily.

M1:1 ... **a good paying jobs**.

T1:4 ... **a certain tasks / ...a major problems**.

T1:29 ... to **do a bad things**. (used six times)

K3:10 Women can be seen as **a busy persons**.

S1:8 It will draw **a conclusions** as to whether the extended family.....is beneficial.

V2:1 ... **a three-generation family ties**.

SI 2:10 Traditional medicine has **a numerous advantages**.

F2:58 These countries has **a vast medical resources**.

F2:112 A Muslim girl wearing **a black clothes** ...

4.4.8 Addition of articles on common phrases

This reflects both 4.4.7 and 4.4.3 but it also suggests that learners recognise that an article is needed. In some cases this recognition leads them to conflate two rather similar terms. The most common example of the additional article is *Last but not the least* which is found widely in these data. Other examples are *As the result ...*; *in the time of grief* (for in times of grief); *in the terms of (extended family)*; *they are at the risk of getting the lifestyle diseases*; and *in the recent years* which conflates a number of related expressions: *in recent years*, *in the recent past* and *in past years*.

Those adding the indefinite article include *For an instance*; *take a step to improve it* (for take steps to); *get an upper hand*; *spread like a wildfire* and *be at a risk*.

4.5 **Derivational morphology**

English parts of speech are identified by word order and by affixes (principally suffixes) which help to distinguish one part of speech of a word family from another. The difficulties which this system presents for learners have two major features, one related to the system itself and the other to the languages of the Pacific region from which these learners come.

The use of some affixes in English is inconsistent. There is a considerable range of nominalisers, *-ity*, *-ment*, *-ness*, *-hood* and *-tion* among them, and others such as –

ing, *-ed*, *-ate*, *-ful* and *-i/able* to form adjectives. No one consistent rule guides learners to which one to use in a given context. As a result, each word needs to be learned as a distinct and discrete structural and semantic item, regardless of how much emphasis is placed by teachers on the value of the ‘word family’. The affix system cannot be ‘trusted’ to create nouns in an identical way so each must be learned separately.

Secondly, “many Pacific languages do not distinguish between adjectives and verbs...[In many], adjectives belong to a class of stative verbs” (Lynch 1998: 6-7). Furthermore, adjectivals follow the noun rather than preceding it as is mostly the case in English (and always if it is a single word). Adjectives which are stative verbs in Pacific languages are often marked for subject, and for tense or aspect (Lynch 1998: 115-120). In these data, problems are displayed across all parts of speech morphologies but the most common, not surprisingly, are found in the use of nouns and adjectives: noun forms being used for adjectives are found in 36% of all students with an average of 2.2 examples per paper, Samoa standing out above that average with 4.7 events per paper. Adjectives being used as nouns occurred in 25% of students but the frequency per paper is lower at 1.8. This difficulty among PECEs is mentioned by Mehrotra 1982; Newbrook 1997; van der Walt and van Rooy 2002; Mugler and Tent 2004; Burgeya 2006; and Schmied 1991, 1996.

4.5.1 Use of adjectives and nouns

Word order errors are seldom an issue in the use of English parts of speech; instead, Pacific students did not choose the affix to create the expected word in the context. It is difficult to find a consistent pattern to offer a certain hypothesis to explain the structures that are seen but there are one or two features that stand out. Interference from substrate languages may explain the confusion of word endings in such cases as ‘economic’ being used for *economy* which was one of the most common, in one paper (T1:8) occurring eight times, or ‘responsible’ for *responsibility*, ‘overcrowded’ for *overcrowding*, ‘expensive’ for *expenses*, ‘unhappy’ for *unhappiness*, and ‘extinct’ for *extinction*, where adjectives were used for standard nouns, or ‘education’ for *educational*, which appeared 63 times, ‘tradition’ for

traditional used 59 times, and ‘science’ for *scientific*, 33 times. What did appear to be consistent in these cases was that the word chosen was among the most commonly used words in that family. Students knew the meaning but could not retrieve the form, it seemed. On the other hand, less common words in a family were also used – ‘advantageous’ for *advantage*, ‘beneficial’ for *benefit*, and a ‘disasterous’ for *disaster*. It may be that the form is interesting enough to stay in the memory or that the longer word is perceived as ‘more academic’.

One pattern was clearer, however, and that was the phonological similarity in word endings. The most common example of this was the lack of apparent distinction between the spellings –e/ant and –e/ance, and the resultant noun-adjective confusion was found more than 45 times. There may also be a resistance to consonant clusters especially at the end of words. In these cases, too, the consonant clusters involve the same pairs of consonants following a schwa sound and the distinction between the role of the [t] and the [s] sounds may not be clear to learners when they hear it, or it may have been analysed as a plural suffix. Though native speakers of English confuse the spellings of words such as *dependent* and *dependant*, there is usually a clear distinction between the –e/ant spelling of the adjective and the -e/ance spelling of the noun.

Confusion of adjectival form for noun

T1:14 ... the **present** of parents, aunts, uncles and grandparents.

K1:19 ... the **important** of socialisation.

SI 1:19 **Dependant** on trade goods has become dominant.

SI 1:43 It promotes **self-reliant** in children.

F2:38 The **evident** of people moving from place to place is eminent.

F2:138 Food is in **abundant**.

Confusion of noun form for adjective

T1:28 She is **confidence** that the public will accept it.

K3:3 It is claimed that men are more **intelligence** than women.

K3:10 They are elected from their **differences** islands. (Here there also appears to be an agreement structure between the noun and the adjective).

V1:11 Family members are **interdependence**.

SI 1:18 Family members of **distance** relation can help-lend a hand.

SI 2.66 Malaria parasites are now **resistance** to chloroquine.

F1:16 Nowadays it is **avidence** that (families are changing).

F2:50 ... kura juice which is **abundance** in the bushes.

4.5.2 Use of verb and noun forms

The next most common form confusion presented was the use of verbs for nouns found in 85 papers (or 17%) and of nouns for verbs in 80 papers. All other parsing issues (adjectives in place of adverbs, and vice versa, verbs for adjectives and vice versa, or adverbs for nouns) appear in less than 12% of cases.

The most frequently encountered structures are those with a likely phonological cause:

Advise for *advice*, or advice for *advise*:

The confusion here is not infrequently found among native speakers, but among many Pacific languages there is no distinction between /s/ and /z/ because none of the languages of the Pacific identified by Lynch (1998:75-80) includes a /z/ phoneme (although some Melanesian languages do have a distinct /z/ phoneme). Consequently the difference between the two words is not likely to be salient to many Pacific users of English.

Use of noun form for verb

S1:14 Parents are not being able to **advise** the children.

F1:31 It is necessary to **advise** him or her.

F2:140 Pregnant mothers are **advised** not to take any herbal mixture.

Use of verb form for noun

T1:19 They need to ask for **advise**.

K1:14 Too many people give **advises**.

An extension of this can be found in the interchangeable use of *lose/loss/loose* which may owe something to the /s/ and /z/ conflation. There are almost 100 instances in the data of these cross uses – adjective for verb; verb for noun; noun for verb.

Adjective for verb

T1:16 It is vital to never **loose** your family relationships.

K3:17 They may feel depressed and **loose** interest in school activities.

S2:1 They do not want to **loose** their identity.

SI 1:6 They stand to **loose** privileges (sic) that are accorded by their link with their extended family.

F1:26 They are all **loosing** their significance.

Verb for noun

V1:21 Punishment is by criticism or **lose** of family privileges.

V2:2 It result in **losing** of certain right within the community.

SI 2:13 Cancer patients may experience **losing** of hair.

F2:33 There is a financial **lose**.

Noun for verb

V1:18 The children will **loss** the tradations (sic). (used three times).

F2:15 This would encourage other races to **lossing** faith in the present government.

4.5.3 Noun form

Related to the parts of speech morphology is the choice of noun made in these data. While this appeared in only 10% of samples overall, it was an aspect of the writing of 26% of Solomon Islands students, and the 11% of Tongan students who displayed this characteristic did so on average 3.8 times per paper. This is identified as being frequent in African forms of English (Kirk-Greene 1971; Gyasi 1991; Simo Bobda 2004), and Wong (1982) describes it as present in Singapore English. Two distinct sub-categories of this feature appear in the Pacific data:

4.5.3a Inappropriate noun choice in the context

In these instances, students have chosen a noun form which is genuinely an English noun but which is not the form relevant to the context: for example, an abstract noun is used for a concrete one, or an animate noun is used for an inanimate one. There are over 40 examples of this across nine of the countries, the exceptions being the Marshall Islands and Nauru, and one possible explanation is the wide range of nominalisers in English. In most Pacific languages there are many fewer nominalising affixes which have clear roles, such as the suffix *-(C)anga* in Maori which can create either an abstract or concrete noun when affixed to a verb (Lynch 1998; Blust 2009). The English range of affixes (e.g. *-hood*, *-ship*, *-ness*, *-ty*), or the change of form (e.g. *to sit > seat*; *to fly > flight*), or identical verb-noun forms (*to purchase / a purchase*; *to swim / a swim*) are likely to make noun formation in English apparently arbitrary. Evidence from the *Fiji Times* suggests that *-ness* is the default abstract nominaliser for many users of Fijian English.

A further explanation for the examples of usage among these students is the pressure to sound ‘academic’ given the context of an examination for English for Academic Purposes.

The examples from these data are varied but the intended meaning is clear in every case:

- C2:2 Many **Cook Islands** migrate to New Zealand. (used several times)
(Cook Islanders)
- K1:1 This may cause **enemies** between brothers and sisters. (enmity)
- K1:8 Some family member can love each other without knowing the
relative. (relationship).
- S1:4 ...in **referral** to disputes. (reference)
- S1:7 They migrate for the **goodness** of the family. (good)
- V1:13 ...compared to his normal **produce** of 200 kilos per day. (production)
- V1:19 Through blood ties their (sic) is **heritage** to property. (inheritance (of))
- SI 1:21 The **visitation** of the relatives encourages close ties. (visit)
- SI 1:36 It is a financial **drainage** for a nuclear family. (drain).
- SI 2:16 The **extracting** of traditional medicine is cheaper. (extraction)
- SI 2:27 There are good economic and social **prospective**. (prospects)
- F1:20 This is a way of showing **dislikeness**. (dislike). (This creates a
neologism which uses derivational morphology appropriately.)
- F2:131 Traditional medicine are extracted from **producters** which are 100%
natural. (products)
- F2:138 More **citizenships** means overcrowding. (citizens)
- F2:149 That medicine provide better **beneficiaries**. (benefits)

4.5.3b Use of gerund forms

Tent (2000a) provides several examples of N-ing forms in Fijian English, especially ‘brooming’ and ‘schooling’, the latter of which appears in other Pacific English contexts. Approximately 33% of Tongan students used this structure, and 30% of Samoan students, 28% of ni-Vanuatu samples and 100% of Tuvaluan papers (though

this amounted to only four students). In the Solomon Islands and Fiji the rates were lower at 18% and 17% respectively. Average use per paper ranges from 3.2 in Kiribati to 1.45 in the Solomon Islands data.

Reading over the examples suggested a pattern which was not wholly consistent but which was very common: only two of the examples seemed to negate a pattern related to the non-punctuality of the event. That is, the actions being nominalised are not immediate but take time, a factor which may be being emphasised in these uses of the gerundal *-ing* which may be perceived as indicative of continuous actions. One of the most commonly used, with more than 70 examples, is “a way of living” for ‘a way of life’.

Tu1:2 This **kind of living** is common in Tuvalu.

K1:5 They always practise healthy **way of living**.

S1:3 Samoa admires its **extended family living**.

S1:20 ...a different **way of living** family.

Another frequent example was ‘schooling’ rather than ‘education’:

T1:3 Working and **schooling** in urban areas is very competitive.

T1:6 Like, over 90% of **schooling** when studying using English language.

K1:2 People in nuclear families see the importance of **schooling**.

K1:2 More employment are exist after **schooling** and after the **leaving** to other countries.

Overall, there is a considerable range of expressions with this structure, some of which seem to be an attempt on the part of the writer to appear more ‘academic’ while still having a durative quality:

Tu1:1 There is no **supporting** from other members.

Tu1:3 ...the **uneducating** of young people.

- T1:10 Such a **structuring** ensures that child abuse is not a major issue.
- T1:18 This is a result of **hardworking** of children. (used four times)
- K1:5 The extended family are struggling with the **spreading** of the disease.
- K3:12 It will only lead to the **continuing** of the abusing or beating up of women.
- S2:4 Many are in **factory-working**.
- S2:4 ... a selected area of **residing**.
- V1:26 ...without interest being charged for the **lending**.
- V2:22 This leads to a **reducing** of costs.
- SI 1:4 The **involving** of young children in family discussions is seldom done.
- SI 2:10 The socerer (sic) took the **remaining** of some food.
- SI 2:37... in order to preserve traditional medicine to continue **existing**.
- F2:5 Our government has stopped all road **repairing**.
- F2:51 They need health insurance **covering** for the whole family.

4.6 Adjectivals

Adjectives as a part of speech in the English sense do not exist in many Pacific languages. “In AN (Austronesian) languages generally adjective-like words appear to be stative verbs but in some languages of Northern Melanesia attributive adjectives are often affixed like possessed nouns” (Blust 2009: 486). Adjectival use has been noted as inconsistent in other PECEs by such researchers as Parasher 1983; Platt et al 1984; Gyasi 1991; Newbrook 1997 and Burgeya 2006.

While the common confusion of *-ing* and *-ed* does appear in this data, it is infrequent, occurring in fewer than 10 instances. The more significant adjectival innovations are:

- a) Omitting the *-ed* suffix
- b) Adding the *-ed* suffix
- c) Using *less* in preference to *fewer*
- d) Adjectivals with alternative adjectival endings.

4.6.1 Omitting the *-ed* suffix:

There were 200 cases of the *-ed* suffix being omitted from adjectives. The first impression of this in the data is that the omission is engendered by phonological issues. In only 14 of these 200 samples is the suffix omitted before an initial vowel sound in the following word which might have made the suffix more aurally salient, (as in K1: 14: ‘ashame of doing bad things’) and only two were the omission of /ɪd/ following [t] or [d] (for example K1: 17: ‘a disrupt and disturbed family...’ which might be expected to make the suffix even more obvious. All the rest were examples of the suffix being omitted from situations where use would have created a difficult consonant cluster between the end of one word and the beginning of the next – K3: 7: ‘well-manage money’. It may be that, because these structures are hard to pronounce, they tend to be avoided in speech and thus do not readily register in the written form either. In other cases where the suffix would have preceded a [t] or [d], the omission is likely related to the elision of the sounds.

Avoidance of consonant blend:

N2:3 ... **old fashion** ways.

T1:18 ... to help paying out the **increase** bills.

T2:2 **Tongan-own** shops are declining.

K1:8 Improper decisions might come up due to **inexperience** personals.

S1:10 It is an **advance** way of living.

V1:12 As societies become more **modernise** people tend to forget the ways or values **follow** by their families. (4 examples of this form)

SI 2:34 **Specialise** practioners are limited in number.

F2:128 ... to an **advance** level. (used 7 times)

Elision of -ed suffix into initial following sounds:

S1:10 **Compare** to an extended family...

K3:4 It makes them unable or **disable** to enter parliament.

V2:9 ... the **increase** demand for traditional medicine

SI 1:25 From such **combine** discussions they do not achieve the solutions for that particular problem.

F1:18 Families can discuss problems behind **close** doors.

There are certain words in the data which, when used as adjectivals, seldom attract the *-ed* suffix. These are ‘extend (family)’: 38 instances; ‘advance (equipment, etc)’: 30 instances; ‘increase (number)’: 19 instances, and ‘concern’ which not only appeared without the suffix but was often also used without the usual pattern:

V1:32 They are not willing to co-operate in issues **concern**. (used 3 times)

SI 1:2 Extended family with its component **concern** is common lifestyle.

F2:27 The **concern** country should increase wages.

F2:27 It is beneficial to person **concern**.

4.6.2 Adding the -ed suffix

Adding the suffix to words within the adjectival phrase is not uncommon and is particularly obvious on the adjective ‘secure’: most of the added samples were on this word. Why this happens is not immediately clear though there may be an over-generalisation from the verb ‘secure’, or these are examples of hypercorrection. The word did not feature in the examination question so this does not explain the frequency of use.

C1:2 ...the benefits of a **secured** life. (used twice)

S2:3 ...a peaceful, private and **secured** surroundings.

V1:23 People are sometimes not feeling **secured**.

SI 1:19 Members were always safe and **secured**.

SI 1:55 They feel **secured** when living together.

This is borne out by other cases where there was a clear conflation of verb and adjectival forms on a range of adjectives.

N2:2 ... the **increased** in economic changes.

N2:2 ... an ancient **practised**.

K1:14 ... from my own **experienced**.

V1:26 They have no other **closed** families to ask for help.

V2:16 They are many **squattered** areas.

SI 2:57 The system **inplaced** ...

4.6.3 Using ‘less’ for ‘fewer’

This clearly is connected with the general confusion about the distinction between countable and uncountable nouns, but it should also be acknowledged that the use of ‘fewer’ is beginning to fade in New Zealand, if talkback radio and some local newspapers are anything to go by. There were 91 cases of the use of ‘less’ with countable nouns and only one of ‘fewer’ being applied to an uncountable. In fact a small range of such adjectives is used (‘little’ and ‘smaller’ as well as ‘less’) but all are used with uncountable nouns. This aspect is mentioned in the PECE literature by Parasher (1983) and Platt et al (1984), but the more than 25 years since their research may have seen a more general shift in English generally in the distinction traditionally seen in the use of these words (and in the distinction between ‘amount’ and ‘number’). Nonetheless, this development is mentioned here because it is a widespread characteristic of Pacific usage: overall 20% of writers used “less” in the accustomed place of “fewer”, ranging from 24% of Tongan samples to 9% of Cook

Islands ones with a rate per paper as high as 2.8 in Vanuatu papers. Tongan writers were also the highest users of “amount” rather than “number” (11%).

T1:6 There are **less opportunities** for the individuals.

K1:8 **The lesser the number** of children...**the less expenses**.

S1:2 The home is crowded and **less people** are employed.

S1:4 Having **less family problems** to worry about, parents tends to provide sufficient care.

V1:9 The family turns to (tends to) create **less problems**. (‘less problems’ appeared 20 times overall in this paper).

SI 1:4 **Less financial and economic burdens** result.

SI 2:43 There are **less employment services** provided.

F2:125 These doctors are getting more income but **less cured people**.

F2:149 School have **less teachers**.

Amount vs. Number:

M1:1 ... **a large amount of people**.

K3:5 There is **a certain amount of population** that had voted (used twice).

S1:4 Samoans are able to host **any amount of people**. (used twice).

V2:17 As **the number of migration** is rapidly increasing ...

F2:43 This leads to an increase in the **amount of nutritional diseases**.

F2:73: ... **a good number of employment experience**.

The use of *much* and *many* shows fewer instances of confusion (26 in total) but, similarly, to the data above, the majority of the cases are of *much* used with countable items. In one case of *many* being used with uncountable nouns (F2:139),

the nouns were those with a perceptual plurality because ‘development’ carries the idea of several possible activities and ‘deforestation’ involves the cutting down of many trees: ... *mostly in the villages...in which not many of the development and deforestation has taken place.*

N2:2 Based on their beliefs and **their much experiences** ...

K1:18 An extended family brings **much problems**.

S1: 8 This is usually referred to when families are facing **too much situations** such as funerals, weddings and so forth.

V1:9 The couples are having **too much children**.

SI 1:1 This is due to **much migrated people** investing outside the country.

F2:31 ... and market it to the **much needy countries** of the world.

4.6.4 Adjectivals with alternative adjectival endings

Students have, in 89 cases, shown that they understand that there is an adjectival suffix required but have not been able to distinguish the niceties of meaning implied by different adjectival markers. The result, however, is that sentential meanings are not as apparently intended.

SI 1:35 They may do **regretful** things like committing suicide. (regrettable).

F1:11 The results are very **unwelcoming**. (unwelcome)

F1:23 (If no-one is working) the income can be **minimised**. (minimal)

F2:15 There are **politic** reasons to keep women out of parliament. (political)

The single most common example of this choice of suffixes is the use of ‘economical’ for ‘economic’ which occurs in 56 cases.

4.6.5: Comparatives and superlatives

Use of comparatives and superlatives in PECEs display two distinctive features. The first is common in Englishes as native tongues, wherever they may be found, though it would not be viewed as a standard choice. This is the double marking of comparatives and superlatives, and it is reasonably frequently heard in L1 speech, especially in New Zealand English. It is widely found in ESL and EFL communities as well, and unsurprisingly in Pacific data where 15% of all writers demonstrated this structure: average use per paper varied from one in Samoan essays to 2.7 in those from Tonga. A representative sample of forms is:

M1:1 **more easier**

T1:8 **more easier and faster**

K1:11 much **more better**

S1:16 The **most baddest** thing a person can do ...

F2:133 the **most poorest**

The more distinctive comparative structure is less often seen in general ESL or EFL classrooms but is common in PECE data. It is the omission of the comparative marker *more*. Schmied (1991: 76) refers to this as “the simplification of comparatives”, which does seem to explain the potential process being applied. Descriptions of this feature also appear in the research of Bokamba (1982), Platt et al (1984), Trudgill and Hannah (2002) and de Klerk (2006).

In only one case of 502 scripts was *than* omitted, though there are cases of alternative post-adjectival markers such as *to*, *as* or *from*. However, in 156 other examples of comparative phrases across these data, the initial marker of comparison was omitted. The structure *more (adj) than* is effectively double marking, and redundancy reduction is a consistent feature throughout these data. The Adj+than form as a marker appears to be more salient and maintains meaning; the alternative omission, [more +Adj+ NP], is less clear. Furthermore, adjectives in many Pacific

languages are inherently comparative and thus are not marked for comparison (Lynch et al 2002).

4.6.5a Reduction of markers

T1:23 Some families may not have **alot money than the other**

T1:30 Parents would care for the lives of their children **best than** grandparents.

K1:11 A nuclear family tends to live a **wealthy life than** those of an extended family.

K3:15 Men are considered be **able to carry out political tasks than women.**

S1:3 Extended family is **popular than** one type of family.

S1:10 It reveals a lot of **benefit than** negative issues.

V1:14 People who live outside extended family **can do jobs easily than** nuclear family. (This comparative form was used three times in this essay.)

V1:26 This essay is of the opinion that extended family creates **disadvantages than** it does assists.

SI 1:19 Loss of cultural practices is in **high probability in a nuclear family than** in an extended family.

F2:61 The education in developed countries **are best than** in Fiji.

4.6.5b Replacement of *than* with an alternative:

K1:20 Consequences are **greater to that** of the benefits.

V2:3 ...**better** conditions **to** which they received in their home countries.

V2:8 Traditional medicine is **much, much advance to** modern medicine.

4.6.5c Reduced marking of two comparatives or superlatives:

A further example of simplification is that when two adjectives are linked in the comparative phrase, only the first tends to be marked, though in this case writers use *than* as required.

T1:1 ...making it **cheaper and affordable**.

T1:3 .. the **best and fast** medical attention

K1:4 The more people you have in your family, **the happier and contented** you will be.

K1:19 The living condition was **much superior and healthy** than before.

There is also a tendency to leave one or more markers out of other comparative phrases which, once again, has the appearance of reducing redundancy; indeed, it has the effect of reinforcing that redundancy reduction is a likely explanation of these phenomena. The structures usually affected are:

- [(not) + Adj + enough to] as in *not old enough to vote*

T1:11 Extended family **not flexible to meet** the modern development.

- [as + Adj + as] *as fat as a pig*

F1:18 They **cannot work as well the females**.

- a related one (which is an adjectival phrase of degree) is [too + Adj + to] – *too tired to walk*.

K3:14 Sometimes your body is **really tired to carry on**.

S1:1 It does not mean that **they are weak to lead a country**.

Finally, in what seems to be a phonologically induced adaptation, there are instances of a confusion of *than* / *then*. In most Pacific languages, there is no distinction between /e/ and /æ/ which makes this likely to be phonologically confused in

pronunciation. Across all the nationalities in the Pacific data there are examples of this confusion appearing in written form:

T1:18 They have more disadvantages **then** advantages.

T2:4 Other **then this**, our culture portray our identity.

K1:8 If there is one breadwinner, **than** that person will have to struggle.

SI 1:1 The money **than** can be used to purchase rice or root crops.

F1:14 If they are working **than** money has to be shared.

F2:142 If all things that God made is good for Man, **than** traditional medicine were meant to cure and heal.

There are, overall, 78 instances of such cross-use and although such figures are not sufficient to suggest that this is very widespread in Pacific usage, there does seem to be an identifiable pattern. Without exception in those 78 cases, *then* is used for *than* in comparative phrases where the word is unstressed and the vowel sound is generally reduced to schwa, while *than* was used for the more aurally salient adverb *then*. This merging of the /e/ and /æ/ phonemes is something observed in New Zealand English (Woods 2000). Comment has been made in New Zealand newspapers of the pronunciation of ‘Wellington’ increasingly heard as ‘Wallington’. Can it be suggested that this merging in the Pacific Englishes is a New Zealand influence? (Biewer 2007).

4.7 Relative clauses

Relative clauses appear in PECE research carried out by Mesthrie (1992), Alsagoff and Lick (1998) and Burgeya (2006). These clauses require speakers and writers to deal with the fact that the relative pronoun *replaces* a word, leaving an empty category in the relative clause. Not all languages use such features as relative pronouns. In the Pacific languages discussed by Lynch et al (2002), there are four principal ways of creating such clauses: a) the use of some form of relativiser in much the same way as English, though these may be a very limited class; b) by pre-

posed demonstratives; c) by post-posed demonstratives, or d) by sentence order and, possibly, a retained pronoun. Samoan, for example, retains the pronoun to make the relationship clear:

‘o le mea sa nofo ai le fafine.

ART place PAST stay PRON ART woman:

(the place stayed there the woman) or

‘the place where the woman stayed’ (Payne 1997: 332)

Many second language learners have trouble with relativisation. Firstly, the number of relative pronouns creates some problems in deciding which one to use in a particular context: as a result, there is often a fluidity of choice between *who*, *which*, *that*, *whom*, *where*, *whose* or omission. Secondly, the position of the relative pronoun in English is important – the relative clause generally needs to maintain adjacency to its noun of reference. And thirdly, as mentioned above, the relative pronoun creates an empty category in the relative clause because the word has been replaced by the pronoun.

A further complication is the complexity of possible relativised positions in English. Keenan and Comrie in 1977 (in Ellis 1994) created the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy which asserted that relativisation could be created on phrases in a limited variety of positions:

Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Object of the Preposition >

Genitive > Object of Comparative.

Subject: The man walked home. He had a cane > The man *who* walked home had a cane.

Direct Object: The man was old. I saw him. > The man *whom* I saw was old.

Indirect object: The man was old. I gave a book to him. > The man to *whom* I gave the book was old.

Object of the preposition: The man was old. I smiled at him > The man at *whom* I smiled was old.

Genitive: The man was old. I knew his wife, > The man *whose* wife I knew was old.

Object of the comparative: The man was tall. I was older than him. > The man, *whom* I was older *than*, was old.

There is some difficulty with the genitive because genitive, or possessive, structures can be made which fit all of the other positions, and the object of the comparative creates sentences which are frequently perceived by native speakers as awkward (Ellis 1994: 419).

All the languages of the world have relative clauses which can expand the subject but not all have more than that. Keenan and Comrie's theory proposed that any language which could relativise on one position, for example, object of the preposition, could also relativise on any position to the left but not to the right. English is one of relatively few languages which can relativise across all steps in the hierarchy. Such relative clauses require increasingly complex embeddings and wh-movements the further to the right of the hierarchy they move. Moreover, research into relative clause formation and comprehensibility in English (Schachter 1974; Hawkins 1989; Wong 1990; Juffs 1998; Izumi 2003) all recognise that there is a clear relationship between the Accessibility Hierarchy and the degree of difficulty experienced by SLLs: those positions to the left of the hierarchy appear to be easier to control than those to the right.

And further, the relative pronouns in English contain implied restrictions. 'Who', as Kuroda (1968: 251) points out, contains the expectation of 'human' (*WH+THAT PRO [+HUMAN]*) while 'where' is a pronoun for place *WH+THAT PRO [+PLACE]* and 'when' is reflected in *WH+THAT PRO [+TIME]*. 'Which', on the other hand, is much less definite: *WH+THAT*. Finally, omission of the relative pronoun can only occur in certain restricted contexts, such as clauses reduced to a participial phrase:

I know that man coming into the room. (I know that man who is coming into the room.)

The dog owned by James is a Labrador. (The dog which is owned by James...)

Complicating these clauses even further is the fact that most of the English relativisers are also interrogative markers except for 'that' which, though it can stand for 'which' or 'who' in relative clauses, cannot replace them in interrogative structures. Thus, the semantic load is considerable.

Wong (1990: 109), looking at relativisation in the work of Hong Kong students, used a common four category division of relative clauses based on frequency:

1) **OS:** The object of the main clause is the relativised subject of the relative clause:

I saw the boy who wanted traditional medicine.

2) **OO:** The object of the main clause is the relativised object of the relative clause:

I saw the boy who(m) the doctor treated.

3) **SS:** The subject of the main clause is also the subject of the relative clause:

The doctor who treated the boy was the village headman.

4) **SO:** The subject of the main clause is the relativised object of the relative clause:

The doctor whom the people used was a traditional healer.

Kuno (1975, cited by Wong 1990) argues that sentences with centre embedding of relative clauses are more difficult to grasp and create than those with right branching relative clauses. His view is that OS and OO sentences were likely to be easier for learners. Keenan (1975, cited by Wong, 1990) suggests that relativised subjects are easier to understand and create than relativised objects.

In the Pacific data, the most commonly attempted relative structure was the OS which was three and a half times more common than the next most common, the SS; this supports Keenan's view that relativised subjects are easier to create, a claim which is also borne out by Izumi's research (2003). The range of attempted

structures in the Pacific data covered only the **Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object** positions on the left of the Accessibility Hierarchy, and of the few attempts made to create relative structures in positions further to the right (object of the preposition or genitives), none was successful. (Hawkins (1989: 157) also refers to this avoidance of particular types of relative clauses). In cases of the relativising of the object of the preposition, there was no attempt to tie the preposition to the relativiser, though there were several cases of pied piping where it was not required, where the preposition was used both before the relativiser and at the end of the clause, as in *This is the man to whom I gave the book to*. Relative clauses of the genitive NP did not utilise the relativiser ‘whose’, but there were only three examples of such attempts, which does not enable any conclusions to be reached concerning the structuring.

The four principal categories of relative usage were:

- a) Omission of an obligatory relative pronoun altogether
- b) Replacement of ‘which’ by ‘what’
- c) Replacement of a required relative pronoun by an alternative form
- d) Use of a resumptive pronoun.

4.7.1 Omission of the relative pronoun

A strategy by these Pacific writers in the use of relative clauses in these data appears to be to attempt avoiding them altogether. Generally this was accomplished by using shorter sentences or by joining sentences with conjunctions or alternative subordinate structures:

T1:18 Father and mother knows their role as to look after only their children.

V2:16 The government is the essential leader to consider ways on how migration can be both beneficial and disadvantage.

The larger group of omissions – accounting for 142 of 465 relative clause constructions which were identified as different from standard use – was when a

relative clause was created without an obligatory relative pronoun. The structures are frequently correct in other respects but the relative pronoun is omitted:

- Tu1:2 Citizens know that problems (-) happen have its cause.
- T1:8 My family is a very religious family (-) belong to Roman Catholics.
- T1:18 Abuse of children is high not only from the parents but from other members (-) is a concern.
- K1:17 Eventhough (sic) there should be family problems (-) arise, they can be resolved by consensus.
- K3:3 There were very few women (-) got good educations. (used 3 times)
- S1:1 As the church LDS motto goes, "Families are Forever" (-) shows that families in Samoa have strong family ties.
- S1:7 Thoughts are put together to solve any problems (-) raise up within the extended family.
- V1:14 People tend to marry their own members of family (-) is the result of extended families living together.
- V1:31 An example is the person by the name of MB (-) is the number one thief in Port Vila.
- SI 1:4 So often any problem (-) arise can be within the limits of the immediate family.
- SI 2:6 They earned their livelihood through foreign introduction of packed food (-) to some case pose health risks.
- SI 2:39 This is due to the NMRC based in Honiara (-) wants the herbs to be scientifically tested.
- F2:17 There are unscrupulous agents (-) swindle much hard-earn (sic) money from migrants.

F2:47 It's the whole country (-) benefits.

Many of these sentences are quite complex with several attempted embeddings. It appears possible that, under the pressure of the examination context, students read back only as far as the end of the previous clause or that they can carry only so much in their memory while writing, with the result that the perceived head noun is in fact the object of the earlier clause. The result then appears to be a finite clause. In the sentences quoted above, samples Tu1:2, K3:3, S1:1, S1:7, V1:31, SI 2:39 and F2:17 are examples of this aspect. A related explanation by Dickey (1996) quoted in McKee and McDaniel (2001: 145-46) is that the number of earlier clauses poses problems for the learner's ability to maintain contact with the subject. In his case, it referred to the use of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses, but the same idea is a potential explanation for the formation of some of the relative clause omissions above.

4.7.2 Replacement of *which* or *who* by *that*

Approximately one quarter of the relative clause data comprised examples of the strategy of choosing a constant relativiser. Perhaps as a result of the complexity of choice with which they are faced, students use *that* in a wider range of contexts than would normally be found in formal written English, especially when used in the place of *who*. This suggests strongly that the use of the relative pronoun *that* is being expanded in the Pacific in much the same way as it is being made more formal in Standard Englishes – certainly in Australian and New Zealand English, judging by the writer's recent experience, so this may be regarded as a marginal category. Nonetheless, it is included here because it appears to indicate once again the influence of spoken forms in written texts in the Pacific data. It also represents a systematic strategy which reduces the learning burden.

T1:17 It is only those **that** work (-) will take the risk.

K3:11 Proper time management and work load-management are the consequences **that** are to be considered.

K3:13 We tried and forget what has happened **that** can lead to stress.

S1:6 Most people **that** reside near Apia are probably from rural areas.
(used twice)

V1:4 A meeting is called by the elderly **that** is the chief or head of the families.

V1:8 It is best to seek advice and encouragements from one **that** has experienced alot in the things or activities that are occurring.

SI1:22 Extended family consist of members in a society **that** are related by blood or adoption.

SI 2:1 This can be seen by those **that** are cured.

F1:6 They are isolated from other family members **that** is their close relatives.

F2:82 ...with different beliefs systems but one common thing **that** is traditional or herbal medicine.

4.7.3 Replacement of appropriate relative pronouns by other forms

The decision to use other forms of relativisers accounts for over a quarter of the data samples and may be an extension of the multiplicity of choice of relative pronouns. In order of their frequency in the data, the following are the most common transfers:

Who for 'which'

S1:18 Children from a village **who** has a school...

Which/what for 'who'

T2:2 Even people **what** can be classified as low paid workers ...

Where for 'which'

N1:1 The father missed out on the childhood days of the child **where** he could only imagine.

Whereby for ‘which’

K3:3 The most important thing is good family **whereby** the society needs.

In/for which for ‘which’

T1:12 It limit the space per household **for which** the family lives in.

Where for ‘when’

F2:60 ...the period **where** nurses were migrating..

Whom for ‘who’

SI 1:25...when resolving a problem by a group of people of **whom** are related.

Relatives are also added where one is not required.

K3:8 Likewise, workload management **which** involves a schedule of work needed to be carried out.

The fact that English marks relative clauses with relative pronouns is clearly understood but not, perhaps, the limitations and restrictions governing each choice:

Who = [+animacy]

Which = [-animacy]

That = [neutral for animacy]

Where = [+place]

Whom = [+animacy; object of clause]

When = [+ time].

Whose = [+ possession]

Ø = [omission does not interfere with comprehensibility]

4.7.4 Use of resumptive pronouns

In English relative clauses, the relative pronoun replaces a noun or pronoun in the relative clause leaving an ‘empty category’ which does not need to be filled by a pronoun.

The woman came into the room. She was carrying a coat. >

~~She~~

The woman ^ came into the room. [who] was carrying a coat. >

The woman, who was carrying a coat, came into the room.

In Pacific data, however, it is not uncommon to find the pronoun reference left in the relative clause no matter whether the relative pronoun has replaced the subject or the object of the subordinate clause.

The woman who was carrying a coat, **she** came into the room.

The woman came into the room which **it** was cold.

This is the boy who I gave the book to **him**.

The use of the resumptive pronoun appears to be more common among users of Polynesian languages than among those of Melanesian languages: resumptive pronouns were used by 50% of Tuvaluan students, 21% of Tongan and 20% of Samoan samples. On the other hand, Cook Islands’ papers showed only 9% usage, more reflective of the patterns from Fijian (6%), Solomon Islands (14%) and ni-Vanuatu (14%) papers. Of the students from Kiribati, 20% used this form. Frequency per paper was generally low, ranging from 1.25 in Tonga to 1.5 in Tuvalu, but that also reflected a tendency not to attempt relative clauses (Hawkins 1989: 157; Wong 1990: 114; Ellis 1994: 304-5).

Reference to the use of the resumptive pronoun is common in other studies of PECEs as in Bokamba (1982); Bamgbose (1992); Platt et al (1984); Williams (1987); Schmied (1991, 1996); Gyasi (1991); Mesthrie (1993); Banjo (1997); Wade (1997);

Trudgill and Hannah (2002); van der Walt and van Rooy (2002); Mugler and Tent (2004); and de Klerk (2006). In some cases, the likely explanation is the impact of substrate syntax; all of the researchers above identified resumptive pronouns as being present in many of the substrate languages appropriate to the region being studied.

In English “[resumptive pronouns’] distribution is very limited and appears to be influenced by linear distance, depth and extractability. In a relative clause, resumptive pronouns improve [in acceptability] as they get farther from the head...” (McKee and McDaniel 2001: 114). In other words, as the distance from the principal referent increases and as the movement to the right of the Accessibility Hierarchy advances, it becomes increasingly difficult for the writer or speaker (and the recipient) to retain all the links. A resumptive pronoun apparently becomes an aid to the retrievability of meaning. As the trace becomes more complex there is a greater likelihood that a resumptive pronoun will appear in a later clause.

McKee and McDaniel are in fact examining native English speaker use of resumptives and their work suggests that the further along the Accessibility Hierarchy the relative construction was formed, the greater the chance that English-speaking children would use a resumptive pronoun in the relative clause and the greater the chance that adults would accept a resumptive pronoun as valid in the speech of another (2001: 137). Their work also highlighted the role of distance from the subject of the relative clause, and this may be a relevant aspect of Pacific data in which students are frequently attempting complex sentence structures. For example, K1:21 wrote:

The idea that came to our parents mind is to have a nuclear family, which they found out the advantages of it.

In this case the student had attempted a genitive relative clause: *whose advantages they found out*. The complexity of the sentence structure and the position on the hierarchy which was attempted made all the links difficult to sustain, and so the resumptive pronoun may enhance comprehensibility in the mind of the writer. But it cannot be a coincidence that resumptive pronouns (and pronoun copying of sentential subjects, to be examined later) is a normal characteristic of several Pacific

languages, so that retaining the pronoun in a relative clause is not likely to ‘feel’ ungrammatical. Additionally, the use of resumptive pronouns bears out researchers such as Keller-Cohen (1981), Schachter (1992), Corder (1992) and Zobl (1992) who assert that when learners are in doubt about how to construct a feature in the L2, they will fall back on the only other patterns available to them, their L1.

The principal use of the resumptive pronoun in the data is when it is the direct object of the relativised clause and generally (but not always) modifies the direct object of the main clause. This indicates that relative structures which retain the pronoun tend to be OO sentences; comparatively few OO relative structures were found among the relative clauses without resumptives. In the 85 cases of resumptive pronouns found, 41 were OO and 18 were OS forms (the subject of the relative clause was the object of the main clause). Among the remainder, 12 were on attempted objects of the preposition structures, five on genitives, one only connected with the indirect object (the only one attempted in all the data) and seven were “inextractible”, where the construction of the sentence made the tracing of links impossible to follow.

OO: the relativised argument is the object of both main and subordinate clauses:

M1:1 (They worry about) their educated children who they sent **them** to school.

T1:5 A case is a parents with their daughter in whom they just found out that **she** is having an affair.

T1:24 Not only that but they do not obey what the elderly people decides **what** to do.

S1:16 The most expensive of all is the Samoan mat which each couples in the extended family must have **one** as a present to the particular family fa’alavelave.

S1:20 What he or she sees with her parents he or she is going to show **it** out just like a video dip (sic).

V1:10 They too may be influenced by the night life whereby they tend to think **it's** enjoyable.

V2:18 It is an issue that Vanuatu regards **it** as a source of income.

SI 1:48 Some families tend to adopt a single family unit where they think **it** is much cheaper.

SI 1:54 This nuclear structural family system is seen as an alternative in which people are now following **it**.

F2:28 There is a kind of boil which we believe **it** cannot be healed by modern medical assistant.

F2:112 AIDS is an non-curable disease which many people are getting **it** through migration.

OS: the relativised argument is the object of the main clause and subject of the subordinate:

T1:27 The one that the young people will be sitting on in which **it** is known as the fa'ehuki.

K1:13 That means it is occupied by many people which **they** sometimes be your protection.

K3:4 It will explain the kind of education that women have to which **it** makes them unable or disable to enter parliament.

S1:1 The girl who married the European guy, **she** is Greek. (Another example of fronting of the topic).

SI 1:31 They sometimes want to involved in by demanding fighting or using bad words which **it** causes the fight to become worse or serious.

SI 2:9 Traditional medicine has limited beliefs and methods in which **they** can be transferred ... from one person to another.

F2:13 Some have already experienced violent acts that **they** have caged their lives.

Object of the preposition:

Tu1:1 There is a big drought here in Funafuti that most of the families suffering from **it**.

Tu1:2 (This is) because of the difficult situation that Tuvalu live in **it**.

T1:10 That can be seen in family occasions such as a wedding or funeral which extended family members still come from all over the world for **it**.

K1:19 Nuclear family have few members in which all of **them** share good things.

V1:7 They are quite many in number living on a less value land in which they all depend to live from **it**.

SI 2:34 My aunty of whom I myself have responsible in taking care of **her** proves to me this mentality.

SI 2:52 Evidence can be found in a number of areas which one of **them** is it creates employment.

F2:44 They would be spending most of their lifes (sic) doing jobs which they are not interested in or because of no other choice had to continue with **it**.

A feature referred to in other PECE studies by Verma 1982; Mehrotra 1982; Kachru 1982a, 1986, 1997, 2006; Parasher 1983; Platt et al 1984; Gargesh 2006; and Schmied 1996 is the common complexity of sentence structure or florid style. This complexity leads some of the writers in this data to provide resumptive pronouns in relative clauses so involved that the traces are difficult to extract.

V1:25 Children whom are left orphaned, love and a home will always be found for **them** in family. (a case of fronting of the topic, but it creates relative form which is not straightforward to extract).

SI 2:54 People moving out may include children and young youths which no-one can predict what **their** life would be like in future. (This would have been clearer with a conjunction instead of the relative pronoun.)

In only two cases was a full resumptive provided rather than the pronoun, and the explanation may be a strategy, as in V1:25 above, of emphasising the topic to make it more overt.

F2:84 It also has some disadvantages which needs consideration to overcome **these serious problems**.

F2:104 The sinu leaves are added to hot water in which the sick person inhales the vapour **of the leaves**.

It is clear that some of these samples would support Dickey's view (1996, quoted in McKee and McDaniel 2001: 146) that:

When the (adult) parser meets the third clause in a sentence, it pushes the most complete of the two previous clauses out of active memory. (Note that this could be either the first or the second clause ...). [R]esumptive pronouns ... provide a parsing advantage in the three-clause case but not in the two-clause case.

This effect can be seen in sentences such as:

T1:5 A case is a parents with their daughter in whom they just found out that **she** is having an affair. (3 clauses)

T1:10 That can be seen in family occasions (sic) such as a wedding or funeral which extended family members still come from all over the world for **it**. (3 clauses)

S1:16 The most expensive of all is the Samoan mat which each couples in the extended family must have **one** as a present to the particular family fa'alavelave. (3 clauses)

K3:4 It will explain the kind of education that women have to which **it** makes them unable or disable to enter parliament. (3 clauses)

SI 1:31 They sometimes want to involved in by demanding fighting or using bad words which **it** causes the fight to become worse or serious (sic). (3 clauses)

F2:44 They would be spending most of their lifes (sic) doing jobs which they are not interested in or because of no other choice had to continue with **it**. (4 clauses).

It is possible in these examples to see that the resumptive pronoun is a parsing strategy which supports Slobin's principal of "Be clear". The increasing complexity of subordination, in this view, is likely to trigger resumptive pronouns.

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| PART 3. VERB PHRASE FEATURES. |
|--------------------------------------|

4.8 Noun-verb concord:

The lack of noun-verb concord is one of the most widespread features of SLA of English and is, therefore, not a feature specifically characteristic of PECEs, though all researchers mention it. An average of 98% of all Pacific samples demonstrate aspects of lack of noun-verb concord with an average occurrence per paper ranging from 5.8 in Vanuatu papers to 12.2 (Tongan) to 16 (Niue). On the whole, these rates per paper show that concord variations appear a stable part of English language use in the region.

4.8.1 Singular-plural non-concord

Discord in number agreement between noun and verb occurs in one of two ways: a plural subject is followed by a singular verb, or more usually a singular subject takes a plural verb. Generally when either of these possibilities occurs it would be

perceived as an error by standard English users. However, given the high degree of such discord in these data, it is possible that in fact there is a systematic process occurring. When the data on this feature were viewed alone, with no distraction from other linguistic features, the system appears to be:

| | | |
|-------------------------|----|-------------------------|
| [N + s > V + s] | or | [N -s > V -s] |
| <i>The boys + plays</i> | | <i>The boy∅ + play∅</i> |

This feature hints at a systematisation of the 3Psg *-s* morpheme. Zobl and Liceras (1994) point out that the 3Psg *-s* morpheme is consistently a late acquisition in both L1 and L2 research. “English,” they write (p. 166), “requires the marking of what is universally the default position (3rd P) and furthermore, it marks morphologically the unmarked member of the number contrast (sing.) rather than the marked member (plural)”. As a result, there is a “learning tension” between the morphological roles of the 3Psg *-s* and the plural *-s*, which suggests that they may be perceived as reflections of each other. It is not illogical that, in accounting for their use, learners might assume:

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| unmarked > unmarked | [Nsg > V ∅s] |
| marked > marked | [Npl > V+s] |

Further, this pattern makes intuitive sense – the salience of the plural *-s* morpheme on the subject noun attracts the addition of the *-s* to the verb.

This is not wholly consistent and it is difficult to claim a pattern when distinguishing between system and error. Nonetheless, it is worth considering because as the logical default position is [V-*s*] it might be expected that this would be the more frequent choice. The use of the verbs *to be* and *to have* have been excluded from the numbers because they have an ‘in-built’ *s*-option which tends to act as a distractor for the clear development of a theory of singular-plural concord variations. Despite the complication posed by these two verbs, however, the tendency to use *is/has* with plural nouns was discernible:

T1:7 The cultural **aspects** that **has** been passed on... (the same structure was used 11 times).

T1:9 Their **expenses is** low. (used 8 times).

K1:2 All **sons has** no choice.

S1: 2 Traditional **systems is** very vital from past ancestors.

In the data there are 3352 examples of singular-plural discord. Of the 2243 examples focussed upon, 325 displayed the [Npl > V+s] form and 309 showed the [Nsg > V-s] choice. The absence of the 3Psg -s was particularly apparent after 'it'.

C2:7 The **curiosity cause** them to leave.

M1:3 Parents can afford whatever **their childrens wants and needs**.

N2:1 Racist bills, policies and **schemes...benefits** indiginous Fijians.

T1:3 **It outline** some of the **factors that leads** to urbanisation but also **it stress** out a few **recommendations that needs** to be taken into consideration.

T1:19 **Our societies consists** mostly of this type. / I will describe **the things that happens** in a nuclear family.

K1:1 Only when **they reaches** an age of forty can **they starts**. / **This just do** not give a chance for a student.

K1:3 The family cannot fight to each other because **they only wants** their family. / The disease cannot easily stop as **it cycle** down / **People wants** to live by themselves.

S1:5 **This group expect** you to weave. / **This kinds of fa'alavelave requires** large amount of cash.

S1:13 **These two sections referes** (sic) to the advantages of a Nuclear Family. / **Other family members gets** on her way. / **It often limit** family ties.

V1:12 **Mr. D seek** assistance from the family members. / **B's grandfather instruct** him.

V1:13 There should be **times that allows** them to do some certain things. / (It is) traditional social **system which usually follow** an extended family structure.

SI 1:3 **Western culture tend** to adapt to system of husband/wife and children only per house. / **Families starts** to drift to towns and **starts** living in the urban areas.

SI 1:11 **The paper conclude** by expressing the advantage of nuclear family. / **These simple vocabularies does** not exist.

F1:45 **Social changes occurs** through interaction. / **Nuclear family mainly consist** of father, mother and children.

F2:142 **The establishment of new business seem** to be another reason why people migrate./ **The Governments needs** to implement **legislation that promote** the investment.

4.8.2 Proximity concord

This characteristic has been given several names. 'Proximity concord' is the term used by Vigliocco and Nicol (1998) who quote Quirk et al (1972). Eberhard (1997) entitles it 'attraction error' quoting Strang (1966), and Bock and Miller (1991) refer to the feature as 'broken agreement'. The term 'proximity concord' will be used here. Excluding the countries whose data included less than 10 students, the rates of use of proximity concord among students of the other countries was in the range of 35% in Tonga to 52.3% of Fijian students. The remaining countries had rates in the 40s: Vanuatu (48%), Kiribati (43.9%), Solomon Islands (43.6%) and Samoa (42.3%).

Instances of proximity concord occur when “the head noun and the verb are separated by another noun which disagrees with the subject in number” (Bock and Miller 1991: 46) and the verb then agrees with the closest (local) noun phrase: for example,

C2:4 *These aspects of our culture is important.*

Such examples of proximity concord occur in native speaker informal speech, and Bock and Miller (1991), Vigliocco and Nicol (1997) and Eberhard (1997) quote examples from written texts as well. Bock and Miller (1991) and Vigliocco and Nicol (1997) found that a plural local or proximal noun attracted greater concord issues than a singular one, and Eberhard (1997: 86) commented that “[o]verwhelmingly, the plurality of a local noun phrase was associated with agreement problems, when singularity was not”, and they relate this phenomenon to the markedness of the plural noun attracting more attention.

These findings, however, are the exact opposite of Pacific data: of 401 instances of proximity concord, 271 were of the [Npl + Nsg + V sg] form, (N2:1 *Other issues in human rights abuse is the abuse of women*), while 130 were of the [Nsg + Npl + V pl] type (S 2:1 *The ownership of family properties belong to every member*). In native speakers, the activation of a number feature in the local noun is said to “override the default assignment and is used to directly retrieve an agreeing verb” (Eberhard 1997: 149). This would seem to be the most logical, most readily described explanation, yet this is not true in Pacific data. The [Npl + Nsg + V sg] structure is twice as frequent as the alternative.

The majority of the examples relates to the use of *to be* and *to have* where the use of *is* and *has* is more common generally than the plural form, but other verbs are affected as well. The simplest explanation appears to be that users rely on the default position of the main verb when the subject of the verb is a two-noun phrase. The fact that the two nouns are different in number may present an added encoding burden so the default position is applied. However, agreement between noun and verb in number is not usually a conspicuous feature of PECEs; the rate of non-conformance is very high. Why, then, should agreement with the proximal noun be so pronounced

in those cases where agreement with that noun meant use of a more marked item, as in K 1:19: *Some kids...from the nuclear family seems to be very unsocialise* ? It is not obvious why the default position should not apply in these cases too (which would have presented standard forms), unless writers are in fact consciously choosing to provide agreement with the nearest noun because that seems appropriate.

Use with “to be” and “to have”:

C1:1 **Hygiene** in those days **are** poor.

N2:2 **The disadvantages** of traditional medicine **is** ...

T1:9 **The remittances** in Tonga **has** been increasingly for the last three decades.

K1:18 **Sharing cups**, spoon and plates **are** not good.

S1:3 **These matters** in Samoa **is** known as fa’alavelave.

V2:9 **The supernatural gods** of the sea, land and air **is** not the same thing.

SI 1:23 **Chances** of making a wrong decision **is** high.

F2:58 **Land** which was used by farmers ...to grow cash crops **are** left idle.

Use with other verbs:

T2:1 **This amount of money** offered by our families **help** to increase the economy.

K3:2 **Enetering** (sic) **politics** by women **involve** the full commitment ...

S1:15 **Only one or two people** in that family **works**.

V2:2 **Examples** used in this essay **limits** the scope to the Pacific.

SI 1:4 **Everyday trials** which in some way **moulds** a personality ...

F2:19 **Accepting and adopting** of the foreign lifestyles **become** difficult.

4.9 Tense and aspect

There are distinctive qualities of usage of tense and aspect referred to in almost every study of PECEs. As Payne (1997: 234) acknowledges, “[t]ense, aspect and mode are sometimes difficult to tease apart” and more than one linguist regards them as ‘tense-aspect’ or as a TAM (tense-aspect-modality) complex. In English, it is not easy to distinguish them, but this is not so in all languages and several of the mother tongues in the Pacific region mark features of aspect more than they do tense. Linguistically, English has been described as having only two distinct tenses – past and non-past (Payne 1997) – though some linguists include a future tense structure. Much of what many native speakers of English would consider to be tense is, in fact, better defined as aspect, described as “the way the action is carried out or is seen to be carried out” (Lynch 1998: 133) which is marked morphologically by the use of suffixes such as *-ed* and *-ing* and by the use of auxiliary verbs such as *to be* and *to have*. Payne (1997: 239-41) describes ten aspectual forms including completive (a finished action), habitual (an action which is customary), or iterative (something repeated).

Pacific languages vary in their marking of tense and aspect. Some mark only one or two temporal distinctions such as Fijian which marks only past and future with free morphemes of time, while others mark several past or future tenses, distinct from one another, as Lenakel does in using bound morphemes to mark the present tense, three different past tenses and two future tenses. Several do not mark tense at all but instead distinguish features of aspect, some as bound and some as free morphemes, and some simply by making changes to verbs’ initial consonants. Many combine markers of tense and aspect, in the way Māori does, and several mark the whole sentence as being in a particular time frame, rather than marking each verb (Lynch 1998: 132-5). Among many of the Pacific languages relevant to these data it is aspect which is likely to be demonstrated, lexically or with suffixes or clitics, focussing on whether an action is complete or continuous, habitual, desiderative (as in the English “should”), prescriptive (or obligatory) or irrealis (something not yet undertaken, non-factual or hypothetical).

The difficulties for learners of any additional language is understanding the constraints which attach to certain verbs because “speakers of different languages may conceptualise the divisions of time domains differently” (Hinkel 1997: 308). It is in relation to this that Bardovi-Harlig and Reynolds (1995: 109), following Anderson (1981), and Olsen et al (1998), map out the “semantic qualities of aspectual categories”.

Table 4.3 Lexical Aspectual Categories

| Features | States | Activities | Accomplishments | Achievements |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| punctual | -- | -- | -- | + |
| telic | -- | -- | + | + |
| dynamic | -- | + | + | + |
| durative | + | + | + | -- |
| Examples: | know | march | destroy | notice |
| | have | paint | gather | win |

This helps to illustrate the constraints inherent in classes of verbs. For example, “states persist over time without change” (Bardovi-Harlig & Reynolds 1995: 109): they are not *punctual* because they do not start and end in an instant. They are not *telic* so they do not have an implicit endpoint, and they are not *dynamic* because they do not involve action. Stative verbs cannot take the progressive aspect, even though as states they ‘continue’ or are *durative*, and accomplishments proceed in stages while achievements do not, though both have a natural endpoint and are thus telic. Accomplishments can accept the progressive aspect but achievements cannot. This division of characteristics offers an explanation for the difficulty some learners have with English tenses – if that difficulty is related to aspectual features, it may be harder for learners to use the past tense morpheme on verbs which are [-punctual]. What must be acquired is not merely the lexical meaning of a verb but also its aspectual character and thus which aspectual morpheme can attach to it. Just as studies into the use of articles have proposed that learners are influenced by concepts of specific/non-specific, it is feasible that in creating logical rules about the use of tense forms in English, learners may be influenced by their perceptions of verbs as having certain characteristics.

There is also ‘lexical aspect’ which “resides in the ‘sense’ of a predicate, not its ‘reference’” (Robison 1995: 346), which is referring to the fact that words can carry intrinsically the idea of duration (*write, walk*) or of having a natural end-point - telic verbs - such as *pass, paint (the house), cook (dinner)*, or of being stative, actions which “persist over time without change” (Bardovi-Harlig and Reynolds 1995: 109). How these are perceived by the learner appears to have some influence on how they are marked and verbs which have a completive or punctual quality tend to attract the past tense morpheme *-ed* more than verbs which are seen as durative or dynamic. Ho and Platt (1993: 74-141) studied past tense marking in Singapore English, comparing what they described as punctual, non-punctual and stative verbs, though there was some difficulty assigning verbs to one category or the other. They found that verbs in the punctual category were more consistently marked for past tense than either of the two other classes of verbs. There are examples in this Pacific material of a slightly greater tendency to mark punctual verbs for tense – *erupted, occurred, migrated, arrived, came, resulted, ended up, produced, sold, completed, entered* or *went* were more often used with the marker appropriately applied than words such as *educate, follow, loosen (ties), happen, share, travel, talk, try, want, tend, consider, exist, discover, live, keep on, worsen, prepare* and many others which are durative in quality. However, the results are very variable and can be seen as a tendency only, particularly as the text types demanded were not conducive to a significant number of past tense constructions.

Some of the studies into tense/aspect propose that there is a universal element to the recognition of temporality, and, it is suggested by Olsen et al (1998), an awareness that verbs can have a variety of aspectual qualities. However, if the L1 conceptualisation of temporality and aspect is very different from that found in English, it cannot be assumed that those accustomed to one concept of time in their L1 will be able readily to reconceptualise when they are faced with another. Hinkel (1992: 558) refers to speakers of Hebrew being confused by the apparently indistinguishable functions of various past tense forms in English. Learners of English whose L1 time perceptions do not match those of English may have difficulty seeing meaningful patterns in English tense marking.

4.9.1 Omission of the past tense morpheme

First of all, it must be recognised that the texts produced by these Pacific writers were one of four types: an argument text, developing one opinion in an expository style; a discussion text which examined both sides of an issue but reached a conclusion at the end; a cause and effect essay; or a compare and contrast text (see Appendix 1). In each case, a good deal of description and explanation was required largely using the “constant” present tense as they were focussing on social conditions in Pacific societies which continue to exist – migratory practices, beliefs in traditional medicine, the differing family patterns, attitudes to women in parliament, and stress. As a result, there was a narrowing of the range of verbs and a heavy reliance on the copula *to be* and the auxiliaries *to be* and *to have*. Nonetheless, tense marking showed many of the same characteristics found in other L2 Englishes. “Virtually all profiles of L2 acquisition in English cite [tense unmarking] as a prominent characteristic...and most pedagogues consider it a major hurdle to overcome in L2 learning” (Wolfram 1985: 229).

There are several qualities in the use of tense/aspect that must be dealt with. Firstly, English uses certain markers for more than one element of tense and aspect, as in “He walked” (simple past) versus “He has walked” (present perfect). Because of the confusion this induces, there is a strong tendency for learners to rely on adverbial markers of time: *yesterday*, *last week*, *two years ago*, *the day after tomorrow*. Bardovi-Harlig (1992) found that though adverbial dependency reduced as facility in English increased, the use of adverbs continued at a rate higher than native speaker equivalents. Further, though use of appropriate tense morphology improved it remained inconsistent and when learners advanced to reporting events out of natural sequence (1992: 311-314), their need for adverbial phrases reappeared. Adverbial use to anchor events in time is common in the Pacific data.

Secondly, there is the apparent acquisition of irregular verb forms before regular ones (Dulay and Burt 1974; Bailey et al 1974; Zobl and Liceras 1974; Krashen 1977, Larsen-Freeman 1978; Kwon 2005). The reason for this is connected with the fact that irregular past forms “must be retrieved *in toto* from associative memory” (Beck

1997: 99). Regular verbs, on the other hand, “are generated by a symbol-manipulating rule that attaches inflections to stems”. Ho and Platt (1993) confirmed that, in Singapore English, verbs which required a form change in the past tense were more salient and thus more often marked. That means that whereas regular past tense forms add the *-ed* suffix to the root of the verb (jump/ jumped; walk/ walked), irregular past forms of verbs have to be memorised because they do not follow an infallible pattern (swim/swam; eat/ate; teach/taught).

Wolfram (1985: 246) proposes that irregular past tense forms do, in fact, represent a consistency of patterns: suppletives where the base form changes form completely (as in *go/went*); internal vowel changes as in *swim/swam*; internal vowel changes + suffix – *do/did* or *keep/kept*; and final consonant replacement as is seen in *make/made*. Though these are categories which learners are unlikely to recognise and apply, Wolfram’s research suggests that irregular constructions are acquired before regular ones and suppletive irregular forms are controlled more readily than any of the remaining categories, perhaps because of the very distinctive and thus more clearly ‘memorisable’ form: those where the changes were less distinctive were more difficult to remember. Irregular forms also tend to be common so are reinforced by use.

The third explanation for the frequent omission of the past tense morpheme is phonological, particularly cluster reduction. Because most Pacific languages from which the majority of these students come do not permit consonant clusters, particularly at the ends of syllables or words, the addition of /d/ or /t/ on many English verbs will create phonologically difficult clusters of consonant sounds (e.g. /ma:k/ to /ma:kt/) and the final one thus tends to be omitted. Wolfram (1985: 236) found an increase in the failure to mark past tenses if the suffix followed a consonant: almost 100% of his research subjects omitted *-ed* in that situation, even after several years of exposure to English. He also found that deletion of a final /d/ or /t/ occurred much less often with lexical clusters where the cluster was part of the base lexical item (*send, aunt*) than with past tense clusters, and omission after vowel sounds occurred considerably more frequently for past tenses (*stay > stayed*) than for lexical forms (such as *read* where the /d/ was generally pronounced).

Finally, there is a strong connection with the hypotheses relating to marked or unmarked forms. The default form tends to be the verb in its base unmarked form – *go, see, want*. Every time a marking is required in English (such as plural *-s*, 3rd person singular *-s*, past tense *-ed*) an extra learning burden occurs. To use the regular past forms consistently, a learner does not recall the form lexically (as with an irregular verb form) but must cognitively apply a rule of affixation.

In the Pacific data, there are examples of many of these features. Firstly, the reliance on adverbs and adverbial clauses of time is distinctive in these data, and in these cases the past is not overtly marked in the verb phrase. Bardovi-Harlig (1987; 1992) found that the use of the adverbial structures made it more likely that the verb would be unmarked, either because marking is perceived as redundant or because the adverbials mark the whole sentence as being in the past.

M1:3 People are no longer active **in the olden days**.

T2:1 **Recently** strike occur in Tonga.

K1:4 (They) take care of us too **when we were young**.

K1:6 **Before the arrival of the missionaries**, Kiribati people always fight each kainga.

S1:7 **In the early years of human life**, people usually follow an extended family structure.

S1:9 **(in) the colonial period...** many western countries try to take over control of them.

V1:13 The extended family in Vanuatu exist **long time ago**.

V2:13 **During the time of the missionaries**, most missionaries leave their country to live, work in another country.

SI 1:39 Extended family **once upon a time** exist.

SI 2:20 Those who cause **the September 11 attacks** are migrants.

F1:5 That is how they live and be successful **in the past**.

F1:42 **In the olden days** they live as one type of family.

There is also a greater absence of past tense marking on regular than on irregular verbs. Of a total of 166 omissions of past tense marking, 130 were omitted from regular verbs while only 36 irregular verbs were used without the appropriate past tense form; irregular verbs were more likely to attract the appropriate marked form especially verbs of high frequency such as *came*, *went*, *did* and *saw*. This supports Wolfram's claim that suppletive irregular structures, which demand a complete change of form, are more readily acquired than those more similar to the base form.

F1:18 The eldest daughter **was** hanging around after school with a young boy and **arrive** home after the parents. Little **did** she know that her brother who **is** attending another school, **saw** them and **inform** their parents.

Sentences show frequent changes in marking from one clause to another when in fact the temporality has not changed. Tickoo (2001) proposed that the foregrounding and backgrounding of information in discourse affects the saliency of the marking for tense because subsidiary details are less likely to be marked than what he refers to as "the inceptive data", found in the first clause of a series of clauses. "The suspects was two man and the robber dog. The one man is tall and the one man is fat and short. The dog is very big." (Tickoo 2001: 25). There is some evidence in Pacific data that on some occasions the main clause takes the past tense marker while dependent clauses of description or explanation do not.

T1:2 This **satisfied** both side without arguments because it **happen** in extended families.

K3:5 There **was** a case where a female representative **talk** right back. As the male **responds**, his voice **was** trembling with rage.

V2:15 Some **wanted** to get rid of what **is** stressing them.

S1:1 The whole Greek family **came** over to celebrate and they **dance** and **sing**.

SI 2:35 Those Explorers and Missionaries who **came** to Solomon Islands **tend** to influence most Islanders on English language.

F1:35 They **started** to live in nuclear families when they **get** a job.

4.9.2 Omission of the past morpheme on present perfect and past perfect constructions

Though, as noted, it is not always easy to tease apart tense and aspect, the presence of aspect is believed to be universal to all languages (Payne 1997) while not all languages overtly mark all temporal relationships. English uses the *-ed* morpheme and irregular past forms to mark a feature of time but the additional use of the auxiliaries *to be* and *to have*, the suffix *-ing* and past participles offer a range of aspectual distinctions – continuatives are marked with the *-ing* suffix on the finite verb and the auxiliary *to be*; the future uses the auxiliary *will* or *going to*, and perfect aspect is marked with the auxiliary *to have* and the past participle of the finite verb. It is aspect which is the focus in the use of the perfect structures, the present perfect, the past perfect and the future perfect, which, in English, are delineated by using the auxiliary *to have* and the past participles of the main verb: *have gone, has walked, had bought, will have said*.

These are complex structures: in her article, de Carrico (1986: 667) quotes Moy (1977) who “maintains that the tense of the present perfect is the present, whereas the *perfect* part refers to an aspect”. As a result, she believes, learners perceive the structure as an unspecified past which may lead them to leave the main verb unmarked – **have go, has walk, had buy**. However, it also seems likely that learners interpret present perfect structures as carrying a redundant marker: in order to establish meaning and aspect, it is essential to use only the auxiliary *to have*. The intended use is clear and the use is often accurate in the meaning given, but the past participle is generally replaced by the unmarked finite verb form.

Omission of the past marker on present and past perfect forms accounted for almost another 25% of the omission data, or 107 items.

M1:1 He **has educate** their children

T1:19 They **have loosen** ties with aunties.

K1:3 They **have take** care of us too when we were young.

S1:10 ..what their forefathers **have do** in the past.

V1:17 Families **have somehow tend** to grow bigger in the past.

SI 1:33 There are some good things that it **has bring** to our society.

SI 1:41 Nuclear family **has result** or partly **to be blame** for the increasing poverty.

F1:35 The girl **has learn** to cater for big and small family groups.

F2:90 If traditional medicine did not exist, modern medicine **would not have been exist.**

4.9.3 Use of the progressive -ing

All but a few of the PECE researchers who were studied mentioned the broader use of the progressive, especially on statives but also over-generalised into other contexts. Once again, using the progressive aspect accurately demands a good deal of inferred understanding:

- That statives cannot take the progressive aspect in English, even though they clearly refer to something that can go on for long periods of time. Statives typically refer to “verbs of sensation and mental state” (Payne 1997: 242) which do not change over time – *exist, be, feel (intransitive)*
- That just because a situation ‘feels’ durative, it does not necessarily take this aspect marker;

- That words with an implied endpoint [+telic] can only take the progressive aspect in certain restricted environments;
- That punctual verbs which happen in an instant of time can also only take the progressive aspect in certain environments (which may change the implied meaning) as in:
 - He hit his brother (once)
 - He was hitting his brother. (iterative)

It may be all these implied constraints which complicate the use of the progressive (which generally appears to be acquired early in SLA studies). In much the same way as has been demonstrated in other PECEs, Pacific users of English apply the progressive aspect to statives. Almost all appear to be focussing on the implied meaning of the word, its semantic aspect. It may be, as Bardovi-Harlig and Reynolds (1995) found for past tense marking attraction, that verbs which have a [+durative] quality (which states certainly do) attract the *-ing* morpheme:

T1:12 We **are knowing** each other our role to do.

T1:31 Nowadays, most of families **are staying** as father, mother and children.

K3:8 Teima Onario **is becoming** a Vice President again.

K3:15 Women **are having** lower social interaction.

V1:9 As parents of nuclear family are committed for paying high standard schools, it **is showing** a picture of these children as having a bright future.

V2:20 Sometimes in the very near future, people **will be preferring** more to live in other places.

SI 1:50 They **are having** freedom of choice in choosing whatever they **are wanting**. (This paper contained 25 separate examples of this construction.)

SI 2:22 The police **are discovering** the identity of the boys. (10 events in one paper)

F2:126 Migrations ...can be seen to benefit an individual group who **are wanting or needing** to move.

F2:138 It has been passed down and **is still existing** in today's society.

In other cases, use of the *-ing* morpheme seems to be regarded as sufficient to mark the progressive aspect and as a result the auxiliary *to be* is omitted. Interestingly, this is the reverse of the previous construction, where the auxiliary *to have* is perceived as enough to construct the perfect aspect. In this case, the *-ing* morpheme is clearly more salient to the users: it is a separate syllable and does not cause the formation of awkward consonant clusters. Redundancy reduction can occur, too, in sentences with two verb phrases where the first may be marked for aspect but the second is taken as established by the first.

T1:8 My father **encouraging** the extra classes for all students.

T1:26 Most villages in Tonga **contributing** money for the development of their community.

K3:6 Most women nowadays **doing** all working at homes.

V1:5 This means that families generally **living** with parents.

SI 2:37 Another disadvantage is that they also **making** alot of expenses.

SI 2: 53 Diseases spread out and individuals **becoming** subject to prejudice.

F2:27 A young boy who once **playing** rugby along the beach...**are** now **enjoying** himself in England.

F2:111 Some people **going** to work or trip for entertainment.

Tense/aspect features often seem random but as Bardovi-Harlig and Reynolds (1995), Bardovi (1998) and Prévost and White (2000) make clear in other contexts,

there tends to be a pronounced awareness of aspect among learners, and coherent rules seem to be demonstrated:

- That punctual verbs require the past tense marking more than other types;
- That structures marked for temporal status by adverbs of time do not require the verb also to be marked;
- That redundancy can be avoided in the perfect aspect by omitting the past tense marker from finite verbs after the auxiliary *to have*;
- That verbs with durative lexical aspect can take the *-ing* morpheme;
- That marking with the progressive suffix reduces the need to use the *to be* auxiliary;
- That sentences marked once for tense and/or aspect do not require further marking.

It appears that even advanced users of English present with these implied rules.

4.10 The verb *to be*

“The variety of forms (of the verb *to be*) *am-are-is; was-were*; give difficulty to early learners, not just by their variety but their unrelated surface forms” (Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008: 68). *To be* has several uses, each with its own demands on learners: Ho and Platt (1993: 31-32) identify several contexts likely to involve copula deletion:

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Pre-adjectival (Adj): | He is tall. |
| Pre-nominal (Nom): | He is a teacher. |
| Pre- V+ing (V+ing): | He is talking. |
| Pre-locative (Loc): | He is here. |
| Pre-passives (Pass): | It is said. |
| Pre-clausal (Cl): | This is what they want. |

These can be divided into two principal functional groups: the verb *to be* as a main verb copula and as an auxiliary.

Copula

Pre-adjectival (Adj):

Auxiliary

Pre- V+ing (V+ing):

Pre-nominal (Nom):

Pre-passives (Pass):

Pre-locative (Loc):

Pre-clausal (Cl):

The principal variation in both uses of this verb mentioned by other researchers is its omission (Tay 1982; Mehrotra 1982; Wong 1982; Platt 1982; Platt et al 1984; Schmied 1991; Ho and Platt 1993; Coelho 1997; Alsagoff and Lick 1998; Mugler and Tent 2004; Sharma 2005). Examining this feature in the data suggests that the verb *to be* in any copula position is not highly salient. Stress patterns seldom focus on its forms and comprehension attention is likely to be on the lexical ‘high points’ of the words on either side of the copula. In speech the verb is often reduced to a contracted state, and even in writing the several forms of the verb do not have high visual salience.

Ionin and Wexler (2002) maintain that “ ‘is’ is easier than ‘-s’”, claiming that lexical items are easier to grasp than morphological affixes. However, that does not seem to be borne out in Pacific data: 54% of all these Pacific learners displayed differences in their use of the verb *to be*. The lowest averages were seen among Cook Islands (22%) and Fijian (37%) students. The highest average was shown by Kiribati students at 79% of the total number of papers, but all remaining samples ranged between 58% and 75% of the total with an average per paper of three. In some individual cases, events per paper were as high as 25.

4.10.1 Omission of the copula or auxiliary:

There were about 700 instances of varied use of the copula or auxiliary and two-thirds of these involved omission: 223 cases of omission of the copula and 255 of the auxiliary. There may be a phonological cause when either the subject phrase ends or the non-finite main verb starts with ‘s’. It appears possible that the learners subsume the abbreviated form of the singular form *is*:

N2:1 **This simply** because they only look into the issue.

SI 2:37 **This sickness** such as headache or diarea (sic).

Further evidence to support this possibility is the fact that while *There is* was generally used correctly, almost as if the words were perceptually fused, *There are* was very often used without *are*. When the word *there* is spoken in the head, it may be that the following [a:] is heard as already present. A similar factor may also explain why *they* is often not followed by *are*. Native speakers generally reduce the *are* to a short schwa after *there* or *they* in speech but not in writing.

N2:1 **There many causes** of this.

T1:24 Whether **there still** the same ways of life ...

T1:27 Children will invite their aunts to an occasion where **they involved**.

K3:14 **They both affected** in their heart.

SI 2:32 **They easy to get**, very common everywhere.

SI 2:38...back to their country that **they born** from.

F1:29 **There only** their parents off. (It is worth noting that ‘there’ and ‘there are’ are homophones to Fijian users of English.)

F1:53 In an extended family, **there vast ideas** explored.

Ho and Platt (1993) isolated the contexts likely to be part of copula deletion in ways noted above. Their research, looking at data taken from interviews undertaken in Singapore, examined all uses of the copula - whether it was present, omitted or used variably – to see if a pattern of usage was implied. Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 93-5) in their comments on this research determined that a

hierarchical pattern exists (in Singapore data): looking at data taken from interviews recorded with a range of speakers of Singapore English, they examined all uses of the copula – present in their data, omitted, or used variably – to see if a distinct pattern was emerging. They found that a pattern

was discernible and described it as: Cl < Loc < Nom < V+ing < Adj.

In other words, clauses were the first context in which learners were likely to use the copula verb, and before adjectives was the last context to be controlled. Their suggestion was that this pattern owed a great deal to the influence of the substrate languages Malay, Chinese and Tamil, all of which permit copula omission in the present tense.

In Pacific data, analysis was made only of the cases in which the data was omitted. Based on these figures, students were least likely to omit the copula before a locative (though it must be recognised that copula + locative was not a common construction in these essays), and most likely to omit it before an adjective. Indeed, the omission of the copula before adjectivals accounted for over a third of all cases of copula omission. The figures for the V+ing and Nom contexts were very similar: the difference in numbers between them was only 10. However, the data suggested a pattern of:

(Loc) < Cl < V+ing < Nom < Adj.

As many Austronesian languages do not employ a copula verb in equational sentences using adjectival or nominal groups, this may conform to the explanation proposed by Ho and Platt that substrate languages may affect the hierarchy of acquisition of copula verb structures. Lynch et al (2002: 49) point out that, typically, equational sentences – those in which the subject of the verb is followed by a noun phrase which describes the subject (He is a teacher) – are created by a “simple juxtaposition of noun phrases with no intervening verb” and state that only “some” languages have a copula. Of the 43 Oceanic languages they describe, only eight appear to have a copula form and of that few only Iaaï appears to possess “several impersonal existential verbs” (Lynch et al 2002: 788). Others present a copula which is an intrinsic part of a locative (as Sobei: p. 181 and Anejom: p. 740), or, as in Lamén, a copula only used in equational sentences (p. 678). Polynesian languages do not possess a copula structure (Krupa 1982). Auxiliary forms which equate with those found in English do not exist in the languages of the region covered.

In their research Ho and Platt (1993: 51-3) also examined preceding environments which might trigger copula omission and decided that there were seven such environments:

After first person singular pronouns (1P)

After third person singular pronouns (3Psg)

After all remaining pronouns (Pro)

After nominal phrases (Nom): Many of the boys are ...

After relative pronouns (RP): which is...

After demonstratives (D): that, those, this, these.

After clauses (Cl).

Ho and Platt's hierarchy this time was: Pro < Nom < 1P < 3Psg < RP < D < Cl, meaning that speakers of Singapore English were most likely to produce a copula after pronouns other than first or third person singular forms, and least likely to do so after a clause. Given that the formal academic text types produced by Pacific students offered little opportunity for the use of the first person singular pronoun, the analysis is not as clear in these data, but results tended to confirm the likelihood of substrate influence: the largest percentage of omissions, at around 40%, followed nominal groups, and the second most common, only slightly lower in number, was following pronouns: in one case, Student T1:28, the pronoun *it* was used without the copula 22 times. When sentences were Nom or Pro followed by Adj or Nom, the possibility of the copula being absent was increased.

C2:7 **This cool**

Tu1:7 Traditional social **system still** in place.

T1:18 One of the problem in **Tonga of** marriage between close families.

T2:8 **It very helpful** for a home that the parent a very old. (While this conversion of *are* to *a* occurs in only 7% of papers overall, its appearance in Polynesian samples reaches as high as 19% with use in Samoan papers averaging 5.2 events per paper).

- K1:5 **It easy** to protect themselves.
- K1:10 They always argued about how some of **them comfortable** and some of them not.
- S1:3 Everything **done and said, it carefully watched**.
- S1:16 They have learned things **which against** the teachings.
- V1:13 Many children of 12 **year walking** around town.
- V1:17 **That the way** in tradition ...to address the little Aunts or uncle.
- SI 1:21 If **you from** a nuclear family then will not be recognised.
- SI 2:28 Traditional **medicine also** interesting.
- F1:29 Though it has disadvantages, **it most preferable**.
- F2:75 **This in terms of** remittances that the government collects.

4.10.2: Addition of the copula or auxiliary:

The remaining one-third of the cases of *to be* use as copula or auxiliary are those where the verb has been added to an infinitive form.

- C2:4 Things **are get** expensive.
- Tu1:3 This is usually **happen**. (structure appears quite commonly with *happen* and *occur*)
- T1:14 Family **are** widely **interact**.
- K1:5 The nuclear family **is** only **consist** of a father, mother and the children.
- K1:5 This **is** always **occur** in an extend family.
- V1:9 With nuclear family **is** heavy labour **cannot be carried out**.

SI 1:24 It **is** also **strengthen** the family ties.

F1:21 A nuclear family is a family that **is consist** of a father, mother and their children.

F2:27 The country of origin **is** always **benefit** through foreign exchange.

Just why this occurs is not easy to explain. Oshita (2000) and Balcom (1997) are interested in what appears to be a similarity between passive structures and the several examples of non-accusative use in [+to be] clauses. However, not all the words which appear in [be + Vb finite] structures are non-accusatives. Common choices are certainly non-accusative, and *happen*, *exist* and *occur*, which Oshita mentions, appear frequently in Pacific data too. However, although non-accusatives are found in the bulk of these data, 28% of samples are applied to transitive verbs.

It may be, as Oshita (2000: 319-20) suggests, that this structure is “ a type of over-generalisation based on the passive morphosyntax of the target English”, but Ho and Platt (1993: 34) propose that in the case of Singapore English the structure acts as a tense marker. This view is a possibility in Pacific data as few examples are alternatively marked for tense, but it may also be a durative marker: there is an interesting relationship which appears between this construction and the use of adverbs in several of the examples above. They and the use of *to be* as an additional auxiliary may represent a reduced continuous aspect – be + V-ing:

T1:20 Water and power **are both require** payments.

T1:22 The grandparents **are often at times need** special attention.

K3:13 They **were once love or like** each other.

V2:10 More Islanders **are now tend** to migrate to Australia and New Zealand.

SI 2:15 They squeeze until the water **is turn green**.

F1:11 Just someone **is offload** concerns and anxieties.

F2:48 Practices such as abortion **are commonly use** this medicine.

4.10.3. Use in passive constructions

Passive constructions are not common among the Pacific languages which are found in the region of these data, but those which do have this distinction tend to attach a consistent suffix to the verb, such as the *-Cia* of Polynesia (Lynch 1998: 142-3). The English passive voice demands that users control forms of the verb *to be* as well as forms of the past participle, both of which are areas of language acquisition vulnerable to difficulty for rule-generalisation. The most common use of the passive in these data, and the passive is frequently avoided, is with either one or the other of the markers omitted, though the intent is generally clear.

The explanation for these phenomena (avoidance or omission of one or other of the markers) appears to be related to aspects already touched upon: the non-salience of several forms of the verb *to be*, the potential complication offered by consonant clusters and the perceptual quality of the finite verb as durative, punctual or telic. Whatever is the closest explanation, Pacific students generally do not present passive structures with both markers in place: of 728 passive samples, 225 omitted the verb *to be* and 341 the past participle. The remaining 162 samples used either the verb *to have* or *to do* in place of *to be*, or they used varying forms of *to be*, especially *been* or *being* (see below: Section 2.3.4). Overall, 55% demonstrated difficulties rationalising the passive voice: the highest rates were found among Tongan (84%) and Kiribati (77%) students with the highest rate per paper found among Marshall Islands papers with an average appearance per paper of 5.

M1:3 More money **spent** on food./ They **are less bother** about their relatives.

N2:2 It is still in our modern world regularly **practise**.

Tu1:1 This is attitude that **practise** by individual person.

Tu1:3 The disease **will easily passed** within family members.

T1:1 The contribution of the family members **does not confine** to cash.

- T1:8 - presents 16 instances of passive use without the past participle.
- S1:2 It can easily make decision and **control** by one voice.
- V1:7 The traditional structure **is then replace** with a more advance structure.
- SI 1:4 Certain bad habits **inject** back into the family **can be spot** quickly and **deal** with it.
- SI 2:7 Migration is **seeing** as ongoing process.
- F2:4 Some garment workers **pay** as low as \$50 per week.
- F2:15 (These medicines) often **obtain** from the natural habitat.

4.10.4 Confusion of *been* and *being*

This relates closely to the use of passive sentences because the structures intended in most cases were passive ones. In this case, the confusion is most likely to be phonological because in rapid speech it is not easy to hear any difference between the two, especially the mid central vowel which follows /i:/ in *being*. (See also sample SI 2:7 immediately above.) Further, both *been* and *being* are legitimate parts of passive constructions so there is not a clear distinction between the words in use.

- T1:3 They are **been** taken by their children to health centres.
- T1:8 It has **being** evidenced how working together in whole lots are very helpful. (Six uses in this paper).
- V1:26 Most families living in town ... are **been** nuclear family.
- V2:21 The traditional doctors gave herbal medicine without people giving payment after **been treated**.
- SI 1:23 An extended family is a gift of unity and so as **being existed** since the creation.
- SI 2:14 Traditional medicine usually used directly after **been made**.

F1:24 It is a family structure that has long since existed and one that has generally **being accustomed to**.

F1:41 There will always be a feeling of **bean (sic) isolated**.

4.11 Modal choice

“The problem [with modality] lies in the recognition and proper use of the meanings underlying the English modal verbs” (Cook, W.A. 1978: 5) though what is defined as ‘proper’ is open to debate. Modality in the Englishes of the Pacific varies slightly from the use in Standard English in that there seems to be a different semantic interpretation of some of these modals.

4.11.1 *Will and would; can and could*

The use of these specific modal verbs has been mentioned in the research of Kirk-Greene 1971, Parasher 1983, Ahulu 1994a, Newbrook 1997, Alsagoff and Lick 1998, Trudgill and Hannah 2002 and Schmied 1996. The tendency that stands out in their research and which appears in Pacific material is the use of *would* and *could* for *will* and *can* respectively, changing the tense of the sentences involved. In the view of Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008:64) “*would* is behaving as a declarative softener”, but in some cases among the Pacific writers it also appears to be used when the context is general or non-specific – as a marker of generalisation. This may be an over-extension of the use of *would* in conditional clauses where the *would*-clause expresses an unreal situation.

T1:30 (Children) know that their grandparents **would** listen to their parents.

K3:13 When the work is done, the church **would** be in good condition.

S1:4 Due to traditional thinking, some families **would** not encourage further educational.

V1:18 A nuclear family **would** consist of a father, mother and their children.

SI 1:38 This **could** be seen in certain occasional where there exists warfare.

F1:14 This way parents tend to realise that their children **would** be more privileged.

4.11.2 Use of *would* clauses in the Conditional

Marking the conditional construct is a complex process in English because of the crucial link between the two clauses – the condition and the result. There are three distinctive forms of the conditional in English marked by relatively subtle changes to verb structures in both clauses which can also cause difficulties for some L1 speakers.

a) **Conditional Probable:** If + present tense, will+V

This structure means that if the condition occurs, the result will also occur.

b) **Conditional Possible:** If + past simple, would+ V.

If the condition happened, the result might well happen, but the condition is not very likely. It is frequently used in English to express a wish or hope.

c) **Conditional Impossible (contrafactual):** If + past perfect, would have + past participle.

This structure often expresses regret for a condition which can never be met because the time has gone. The condition cannot happen, so neither can the result.

All of the differences in meaning are carried by grammatical structures rather than by a change in the overall structure of the sentence or in lexical changes. In many of the languages in this part of the Pacific, conditional sentences may be marked only by irrealis markers of uncompleted action. In some Polynesian languages there is a conditional marker but the ‘result’ clause does not distinguish between possible outcomes. In Tuvaluan, there is a constant marker for the ‘if’ clause (*kafai*) and another marker for the second clause (*ma* [lest], *manafai* [but] or *mana* [lest]) (Jackson 2001). Samoan can mark two conditional structures: a real one, introduced by ‘*aafai*, and an unreal one introduced by *ana* (Milner 1966).

The conditional marker *If*, in the data used for this study, is most often used in the Conditional Probable context to discuss the general realities within the societies being discussed, and in these structures *would* or *could* generally replaces *will*. Once again, this has the appearance of marking general, rather than specific, truths.

S1:3 If they **have** something to say, they **could not even to convey** it to the husbands. (Commenting on the position of women within clan meetings).

S1:13 If you **live** in an extended family, you **would learn** to share.

V1:11 If they **need help**, their families **could not help** them.

SI 1:45 It is likely that if urbanisation **continues** on, the nuclear family **would be practised** more by Solomon Island families.

SI 2:45 If these people **were to return** they **should have increase** the population.

F1:18 If the size of the family **is** small, that standard of living **could be enhanced**. (Commenting on the perceived advantages of the nuclear family structure).

There are not enough data on this use of *If* for it to be claimed as a general rule, as conditional sentences are not common. It is also possible that *would* and *could* are perceived as more polite or more formal and the context of writing a formal academic essay may induce their use. Hinkel (1995) writes that modals can be seen as reflections of cultural norms; she placed more emphasis on modals of obligation, but it may be that *would* and *could* are seen as more appropriate in Pacific cultures, whether as softeners, as generalisers or as politeness signals.

4.11.3 Marked modal structures

Although learners are taught to affix the main verb with markers in some instances, they must remember not to do the same to main verbs in constructions featuring modal + finite verb. The application of affixes in modal structures treats modals and

non-modals as identical and is likely, therefore, to be an over-generalisation of affix rules.

Marked modal + finite V clauses appear in almost one quarter of all students' essays. The highest percentage use is found in Kiribati data in which 51% of students displayed this feature with an average use of 2.4 events per paper; the lowest use was among Samoan students (11% of students). By and large the principal affix was the past tense morpheme – 70% of all cases used *-ed*. The remainder tended to apply the progressive suffix *-ing*. Further, the majority of marked modals appear with the modal *can* and the next most common is with *will*.

M1:3 They **should lived and practised** to live in small family.

Tu1:2 You **can** easily **tells** ...; You **can seen** the results.

T1:26 Respect appears to be a very powerful component of the family and **may results** in strong social bond.

K1:3 They **can then seperated** to another place (used seven times with *can*).

S1:2 Parents **can finalised** the decision making (used three times).

V1:12 The problems ...**may** sometimes **results** in a fatal case.

SI 1:26 Other chores can be shared equally which **may resulted** in nobody having to complained.

4.11.4: Doubling modals

This aspect of modal use was mentioned by Newbrook (1997), Burgeya (2006) and Schmied (1996), and the latter two refer specifically to the use of *can + be able* or *can be + past participle* which appears in Pacific data. This form is found most often in Tongan and I-Kiribati students (24% and 19% respectively). Twenty-five percent of Nauruan students also demonstrated this form but there are only four samples of Nauruan work. Use among other national groups is in less than 12% of papers. It is not immediately clear why this structure appears so consistently but it may be that

the combination makes the sense more salient, or that it is an analytical statement of emphasis.

T1:8 We **cannot be able** to stand together.

K1:19 They **can be ended up** as incapable kids.

S1:13 Parents **can** no longer **be able** to offer advice.

F1:32 They **can be able** to buy their own house.

4.11.5: Use of *do*:

Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008) refer to the way a number of PECEs use the auxiliary *do* as a form of tense marker, especially when used in the past tense:

She **did take** the book (p.70. Used in a non-emphatic context)

This use also appears in Pacific data, but the auxiliary does not always appear in the past form. There does not seem to be the assertive use found in English as in “But I DO want to go!” Mesthrie and Bhatt’s opinion is that the use is a “relic form ... marking the habitual present or past” (p. 70), and this is consistent with Pacific samples where writers are focussing on non-specific social experiences. Zobl (1980: 476) suggests that such constructions “give analytical expression to such elements as negation, tense, aspect and mood”, and that it reflects a principle found in processes of pidginisation. This use of *do* is found in an overall average of only 12% of papers, but is observable in 25% of Tuvalu papers, 19% of Tongan and 15% of I-Kiribati work.

M1:3 They **do less know** their relatives.

K3:5 Women should be at home and **do have** chores like child-upbringing.

V1:5 They **did contribute** alot within living in an extended family.

V1:25 It harms more than it **does assists**.

SI 1.23: This type of family attitude (sic) **does improve** and strengthen family ties.

SI 2:35 Another reason why people **do migrate** their native country is to find better jobs. (The use with *migrate* was one of the most consistent uses).

F1:i6 Pacific Islanders **do live** together to get the ...support of other family members.

F2:47 It can be said that people **do migrate** for different reasons.

4.12 Replacement of *are* by *a*:

This is one structure whose source most likely lies in phonological influence by the L1, since a word-final [r] is a feature neither of Pacific languages nor of the British English which has been the norm of use in most of the South Pacific regions which are part of USP. (It does, however, appear in Fijian English most especially in the pronunciation of proper names such as ‘Sameer’.) Though the use of *a* for *are* is found in only 7% of all Pacific data, it is more common in Polynesian data: 18% of all Cook Island samples, 10% of Tongan samples and 19% of Samoan data. Additionally, among those students who used this replacement, the use per paper was as high as 12 times. This feature of Pacific usage may be phonologically connected with the reduction of *There are* clauses to *There* alone, omitting the copula. It is possible that the examination context has caused students to fall back on a spelling they are more accustomed to in their L1s or a more widely used L2 spelling of a word that sounds the same.

C2:6 There **a** many jobs.

T1:29 The members of the family **a** not too much (10 uses in this paper)

T2:8 Children here in Tonga **a** save from punishment. (12 uses in this paper)

K3:10 There also **a** disadvantages of political structures.

S2:4 Family members **a** unite together. (12 uses in this paper)

V2:23 They ... **a** effective on their specific sickness.

SI 1:19 Extended families **a** best essence of life.

SI 1:36 The learning ability of children brought up in nuclear family **a** better than those in the extended family.

F2:136 Other countries **a** offering better living standard.

4.13 Verb complementation

Verb phrases can take a range of complements in English and there are important constraints on how infinitive, gerundive or *that* clauses are used. The principal variations in usage that appear in the research into PECEs are in infinitive clauses (Kirk-Greene 1971; Bamgbose 1992; Gyasi 1991; Banjo 1997; Newbrook 1997; Trudgill and Hannah 2002 and Schmied 1991, 1996) and *that* clauses (Verma 1982; Gyasi 1991; Newbrook 1997; Burgeya 2006; Gargesh 2006; Schmied 1996).

4.13.1: Infinitive clauses

In Pacific material, 44% of all writers displayed a non-standard use of the infinitive phrase. Among I-Kiribati essays this appeared in 65% of the total papers, but was found in only 23% of Samoan samples. Common forms are affixed infinitives, infinitives which omit *to*, those which add *to*, and those which use gerundive forms instead of the infinitives, or vice versa.

The affixing of the infinitive forms with tense or aspect markers is to be expected, given that this is also common on verb groups which contain a modal. This amounts to an over-generalisation of the rules.

M1:1 there is not much money **to spent**.

N2:2 They come together **to agreeing** in the matter.

Tu1:2 They want **to being** or live together.

T1:4 He may asked him **to helped**.

K1:3 These two workers cannot supported the whole family **to brought** things for them.

SI 1:12 Children tend not **to known** historically where their ancestors originate from.

F2:13 Students have **to spent** hours searching in outdated libraries.

Adding *to* in a situation where the simple infinitive is used in standard English represents an imperfect grasp of the constraints on the infinitive forms:

N2:2 (Doctors) are insisting the patient **to obey** rules.

T1:5 The family will tendedly rely on this person and never **to think** of doing something better.

S1:1 They could not even **to convey** it to their family.

V1:17 It cause the boys **to not to know** some secrets of the customs.

F2:21 This easily makes family members **to forget** their culture.

Finally, there is some confusion over the use of gerundive and infinitive complement phrases. These are used interchangeably in many instances of Pacific English.

Tu1:4 It can end in forbidden of you **in using** family land.

T1:12 It leads to one of the members **to sacrifice continuing** its education.

K1:3 They might gathered together as for **planning** for their party.

SI 2:13 Traditional medicine also has side effects **to causing** the body to become weak.

F2:84 They keep in mind when deciding **of migrating**.

4.13.2 That complementising

Verma (1982), B. Kachru (1996a), Newbrook (1997), Wade (1997), Trudgill and Hannah (2002) and Schmied (1996) all mention the feature of the use of complementisers and complementary clauses. *That* complements are the descriptive or explanatory subordinate clauses introduced by *that* which often follow such subjects as *It is believed/said/noted...* or *They believe...* and which “functions as an argument (subject or object) of some other clause” (Payne 1997: 313). If the *that* marker is omitted, the clause could stand as an independent clause. The creation of *that*-clauses which can function as the object of the main verb raises learners’ sentences into the ‘complex’ variety because accurate formation of such sentences requires a sophisticated understanding of the constraints governing these clauses, most particularly that only certain English verbs permit this clause complement. Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 346-347):

distinguish four categories of verbs that are complemented by *that*-clauses: FACTUAL, SUASIVE, EMOTIVE and HYPOTHESIS. Most verbs belong to the first two categories. The four categories are distinguished semantically, but also by the types of verbs that appear in the *that*-clauses.

They describe two sub-types of factual verbs: those which are public comprising speech acts which introduce reported statements, such as *admit*, *confess*, *explain*, *predict* or *reply*, and those which are private which describe “intellectual states and intellectual acts that are not observable” (1990: 346) including *believe*, *decide*, *guess*, *hope*, *realise* or *understand*. The first sub-type of verbs seems to coincide with Bardovi-Harlig and Reynolds’ (1995: 109) verbs with ‘telic aspect’ – those which have a natural endpoint – while the second resemble statives.

Suasive verbs tend to be used with the intent of *should* (People insist that he *should* move) though *should* does not have to be overt (People insist that he move(s)). Greenbaum and Quirk identify a list of suasive verbs which can appear in these clauses: *agree*, *command*, *move*, *recommend*, and *urge*.

Emotive and hypothesis verbs do not comprise a large group of verbs. The former frequently use *should* in the *that*-clause while the latter tend to use “the hypothetical past or the *were*-subjunctive” (347). Typical verbs are *annoy*, *marvel*, *regret*, *wonder* or *worry* as emotive verbs, but only *wish*, *suppose* and the modal idiom *would rather* appear as hypothesis verbs.

Few native speakers, or teachers of English, would be able to explain what the constraints are, so errors in usage by learners of English are frequent, though not all students attempted to create *that*-clauses. The more successfully completed examples were those in which the clause followed the dummy subject *it*, as in *It seems that extended families are changing*. The greater chance of accuracy in these cases was perhaps aided by the fact that sentences created used only a very limited range of verbs in the initial clause, chiefly *seems* and *is (true)*.

Complement clauses are not regularly marked in the local languages of the region; some have a complementiser which is a universal subordinator (as with *da* in Gapapaiwa (Lynch et al 2002: 319)). Others have specific subordinators of cause or location, but there are few which function in the way in which *that* performs. The tendency in the Pacific material is for learners to over-generalise the use of *that*. Many sentences use it accurately especially after “*it means...*” but generally it is overused in:

- a) Attachment to standard subordinate clauses
- b) Use with verbs outside the accepted categories
- c) Confusion with the role of the relative pronoun

4.13.2a Attachment to standard subordinate clauses

One quarter (25%) of all appearances of redundant words was the use of *that* after subordinate clauses beginning with “As”. This often has the quality of a conflation of forms:

SI 1:32 As I have stated **that** these people identify themselves to common properties.

In this sentence, as in many others, the *As*-clause overlaps the structure of [Subj + vb + *that*-clause]:

As I have stated... and I have stated that...

and the salience of the complement clause appears to override the presence of the subordinating conjunction. The wide usage of these [*As* + clause + *that*] structures in Pacific data strongly suggests that this is becoming a stable Pacific form.

VI:31 Also **that**, too many families living together...can lead to lack of resources.

SI 1:32 As I have stated **that** these people identify themselves to common properties.

SI 1:43 As have been mentioned earlier **that** they spend most of their time in work places.

F2:5 Needless to say **that** one really needs to weigh out the consequences.

F2:30 To name a few advantages is **that** people can provide themselves with things.

4.13.2b Use with verbs not part of the four categories

This use is a clear sign that constraints are not grasped and it is likely that over-generalisation has been based upon what limited exposure these users may have had to the structure. Without a clear explanation of the constraints, learners would probably assume that a wider range of main verbs can take a *that*-clause

K3:9 A husband has to supervise **that** his wife maintain the house.

K3: 12 It will further analyse **that** the disadvantages include the costs...

S1:9 What (came to mind) is **that** the interesting of how they manage and settle a large family.

S2:1 It will discuss **that** economic is a crucial factor (use with *discuss* is common).

SI 1:37 It is **that** someone who married the girl is the one who benefits.

4.13.2c Confusion with the role of the relative pronoun

In these sentences it appears as if the dual roles of *that* as complementiser and relative pronoun conflict with one another. It can also be explained by the tendency found in some of these writers for florid style: the sentences could well have been expressed more clearly and simply another way.

SI 1:8 That means a family **that** consists of a father, mother and children who have become one as a unit of society. (The complementiser is redundant and has been interpreted as a relative pronoun).

SI 1:20 They work to solve whatever problem **that** arises between them. (The role of *whatever* as a relative pronoun is not recognized.)

SI 2:9 Another example is **that** when a soccerer took the remaining of some food ...

F2:13 (They want) to do whatever **that** will be advantageous to them.

F2:28 (They are) diseases which we believe **that** cannot be healed by modern medical assistant.

F2:48 Some contents that scientists have found out **that** can be used are ... (used four times in the essay).

The addition of complementisers, especially *that*, was found most significantly in Fiji data where 57% of all essays displayed such redundancy at an average rate of 2.2 events per paper. Students from smaller centres did not display this feature at all (Cook Islands, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue and Tuvaluan students) but also never attempted to create complex *that* clauses. Average rates among other groups were 47% of Solomon Islands students (2.0 events per paper), 33% of ni-Vanuatu students (1.6 events per paper) and 22% of Samoan essays (1.3 events per paper).

4.14 Prepositions

Every researcher into PECEs has mentioned the innovative use of prepositions, and most refer to a “random use”, which makes it hard to decipher exactly what processes are underway. Connell (1999) claims that some prepositions are beginning to fade from Standard British English as a form of simplification is reducing the choices: the two most particularly discussed are *in* and *at* which appear to be giving way to *on*. Mwangi (2004) suggests that in Kenyan English the prepositions *into* and *onto* are being overtaken by *in* and *on* respectively, and several others, most especially *off* and *down*, “could go out of use as preposition(s)” (p.30).

In Pacific samples, it does appear that *about* is less likely to be used, and *of* is falling off some phrasal verbs but is equally creating phrasal verbs in other cases. Because the choice of preposition in English is often highly idiomatic and thus not very responsive to sense, it is not surprising to see unique constructions. However, a conversation with a student revealed an attempt to rationalise usage. He had difficulty distinguishing between the uses of *to look after* and *to look for* because, he said, one looks (for) someone after they have gone somewhere, thus one *looks after* them and, in an analogy with *care for*, he felt that *to look for* expressed that same meaning. This impressed as logical and thoughtful, but it did not help with the comprehensibility of some of his statements.

The Pacific participants showed a high degree of preposition innovation: 98% of all writers displayed this feature with an average use per paper ranging from a low of 5.5 among Samoan users to a high of 7.3 in Tuvalu papers. The majority of cases of preposition innovation reduce the number of arguments in a sentence. In some instances this de-transitivises the verb. Among the most common structures are:

- To discuss about (ideas, opinions)
- To spread out (diseases)
- To raise up (children, as in upbringing)
- To voice out (an opinion)
- To form up (a family, a story)
- To emphasise on (an idea)

To stress on (problems)

To cover up (bills, costs)

To comprise of (a conflation of comprise and compose of)

To cope up with (problems, difficulties)

These are so common and so widespread that they can only be seen as firm linguistic features, and many are clearly analogies with other structures close in meaning. ‘Discuss about’ may be an analogy with ‘talk about’; ‘raise up’ can be linked with ‘bring up’, and ‘voice out’ may parallel ‘speak out’.

Another element is the opposite – verbs are transitivity by omitting the expected preposition.

C2:1 He is attracted (-) drugs.

C2:5 We work (-) learning other cultures.

T1:18 People take care (-) the water and phone bills.

T1:24 Everyone pick (-) rubbish.

K1:19 Members of the family benefit (-) some good things.

S1:1 The extended family can cope (-) the workload.

V1:24 Members together paying (-) the food and other things.

Finally, the creativity of preposition use leads to lively expressions, some of which are repeated in a single paper or are found in more than one paper.

Ni1:2 It is more work **on top of** the mother’s plate.

T1:3 Children want **to flat out** with friends.

SI 1:29 (Parents) are urged **to stand out** and take up an active role.

SI 1:38 They are the ones who **reared up** their children (common use).

SI 2:61 It cannot **quench away** the traditional beliefs.

F1:19 It is **kept under** close doors.

F2:32 The **coming-up** generations ...

4.15 Word order

Besides the topic-comment emphasis and the resumptive pronoun forms already described, Pacific data demonstrate three other word order features which are common enough to be distinctive. The first is the position of adverbs within clauses; the second is the retention of direct question forms in reported questions; and the third is a breach of the rules of clausal parallelism.

4.15.1: Position of adverbials

The phenomenon of varied word order in the relationship between verbs and adverbials, and between modals and finite verbs, is mentioned by Platt et al (1984), Schmied (1991) and Newbrook (1997). In English, adverbs can hold varied positions in a sentence: *He came **quickly** into the room; He **quickly** came into the room; He came into the room **quickly**.* Frequency adverbs (*usually, always, often* and so on) appear “in front of present and simple past verbs, except *be* ... and between an auxiliary and a main verb” (Azar 1981: 83) and most other mid-sentence adverbs do the same thing. Longer adverbial clauses, on the other hand, do not separate an auxiliary and the main verb. But the rules are not easy to generalise and in Pacific languages there are few free adverbs and many adverbial phrases are prepositional phrases of location or temporality (Krupa 1982; Lynch 1998; Lynch et al 2002).

T1:18 They **sisterly and brotherly** respect each other.

In this case, the *-ly* suffix often associated with the formation of adverbs in English has created adjectives which need to be placed into a prepositional phrase of manner: *in a sisterly and brotherly way*.

S2:1 Children can **because of enough money as a result** live happily.

F2:93 As people migrate they **upon their return** bring in more ideas.

F2:140 Changes in lifestyle like this could **very much** make it difficult for new immigrants.

In these three cases, an adverbial clause of more than one word separates an auxiliary from its main verb.

V2:11 Problems such as crime and many others concerning land, water and environment pollutions **dramatically** can arise.

F1:40 The most basic necessities should be **firstly** met.

These sentences violate the requirement that a single word adverb should be placed between the auxiliary and the main verb.

In Polynesian languages there are adverbials which modify the whole sentence “and denote the spatial and temporal background of the event, state or action expressed by the predicate. This ‘background information’ may also refer to the cause, origin and other circumstances of the event, state or action” (Krupa 1982: 129). This may influence the placement of many adverbs, by these users, at the beginning of the sentence, a common usage especially if the adverb is *even*.

K1:8 **Even** it will be an easy activity for parents to make a budget.

S2:4 **Naturally** our environment contains the cure (context intended: our environment naturally..).

V2:14 **Even** some people migrate ...to get a good job.

SI 1:8 **Even** they will never respect the chiefs, leaders or people in the villages.

SI 2:20 Most societies **even** do not recognise these traditional medicines.

F1:3 **Even** they will be able to save on food.

F2:115 Some they **even** do not get a scholarship.

F2:136 **Even** some are just giving some leaves to eat these leaves three times a day.

4.15.2 Word order in reported questions

The topics for these academic essays and the expectation of formal writing meant that the writers produced very few direct questions and those which were produced were short rhetorical structures accurately formed. In direct questions in standard English, whether British or American, the subject and required auxiliary are inverted by moving the auxiliary or the *wh*-word to the left.

He has eaten it > Has he eaten it? or What has he eaten?

In embedded or indirect questions, the auxiliary does not move but a *wh*-word, if present, does, and there is an aspectual change to the main verb. In many PECEs, however, both the *wh*-movement and the auxiliary move to the left in embedded questions as they do in direct questions.

T1:4 People ask why is that done.

In the view of Arua (1998: 143) “the inversion appears to be a strategy for keeping the original questions in view. In other words, the inversion makes the original question easily recoverable”. This is mentioned in other PECEs by Platt et al 1984, Kachru 1986, 1996a, Schmied 1991, Mufwene 1994, Coelho 1997, Alsagoff and Lick 1998, and Gargesh 2006 (though in many of these accounts the focus is principally on direct questions). Pacific learners reflect the tendency of other PECEs to maintain standard question structure in embedded questions.

Students from seven of the 11 countries displayed this word order feature, and a little more than a quarter (25.6%) of the students from these seven countries were users of this aspect of word order. The occurrence per paper was highest in I-Kiribati writers at 2.2. In all the samples, the inversion is triggered by the presence of a question word, which suggests that, rather than being a “strategy”, the retention of the inversion is a response to the high salience of the question words.

T1:23 The older generation teach the young generation of **how important is our culture to us.**

K1:14 Their main role is to go and listen **what is their main decisions** to be carried out.

V1:18 Family members know **who is their aunt, uncle, children and grandparents.**

V2:8 The question lies in front of the Pacific Islanders that **why are we dying too young.**

SI 1:19 He would still be able to understand and identify himself, **who was he and what would be his property.**

SI 1:34 Parents may not say **what exactly would they like to tell their children.**

F1:16 This essay will discuss **how can we minimise this way of living.**

F2:34 This essay begin by explaining **what is migration and why do people leave their country.**

F2:131 One might ask as to **why do people move “bag and baggage” to another country.**

4.15.3 Parallelism

Parallelism here is used to describe the formation of sentences in which a single subject is followed by more than one complementary clause, each of which uses the same structure, as in:

They sat together, sharing stories and talking of the past.

The expectation is that each clause in the sequence will parallel the form chosen for the first. Parallel structures represent a form of compound predicate in which each clause refers back to a shared subject which is mentioned only once and in which each succeeding clause maintains the pattern of the first. In these data, the longer the

sentence becomes, the greater the possibility that the structural link will be fractured and clauses will begin to change their form.

Tu1:1 They spend time telling stories, laughing together, make things and trust everybody.

The expected clause structure would be the maintenance of the gerund form: *They spend time telling stories, laughing together, making things and trusting everybody.*

Comments have been made in PECE research about the verbosity and florid style adopted by students when attempting to use formal English (Kirk-Greene 1971; Parasher 1983; Mesthrie 1993; Gargesh 2006; Schmied 1996). Some of these characteristics relate to the complexity of sentences chosen (Kachru 1985), and it appears, in their use of complex compounding of predicates, that many Pacific users do not sustain the clause pattern repetition.

They move from clauses to phrases (or vice versa):

K1:11 These disadvantages, they are boresome (boredom), lack of safety and security, and **there is no-one to help out in times of need.** (The issue of fronting of subjects and pronoun copying will be dealt with in Chapter 5.)

S1:6 Living in a nuclear family lack the support of the extended family, feel insecure of the strangely new environment, and lastly, **the limitation of family ties.**

SI 1:12 The discussion will be based on two advantages, greater freedom to pursue individual interests and **limits financial expense.**

SI 1:21 It will cripple the nuclear families, building unwanted habits and **created problems.**

F1:14 A nuclear family has the advantages of independence, **better satisfy the needs and wants of members** and a cheap or low cost on managing this family.

F2:18 It addresses many problems in the Pacific such as reducing.. poverty, **increases foreign remittances, solution to overcrowding and upgrades knowledge and skills.**

Or replace an expected gerund with an infinitive (or vice versa):

T1:56 The family can be able to build new house, buy a new vehical, **using a stove rather than cooking in an open fire** and establish a business.

K3:4 They are tied and busy doing housework, such as feeding the children, cooking, washing clean and also **to obey their husbands.**

Still others combine a variety of predicate forms together:

V2:2 Common reasons (for migrating) include **escaping** from political conflict, **searching** for better work and/or living conditions, **search** for more opportunities, **health-related problems require a better climate.**

In this example the student has combined gerunds, a finite verb and a finite clause.

One explanation may be that the learners see the clauses not as part of a sequence of related examples but instead as a collection of discrete ideas with a generalised rather than a specific subject. These structures also feature a lack of ease of movement from one part of speech to another with certain words: it is possible that student F2:18, for example, did not know, or could not retrieve, the verb form *solve*, only the noun *solution*, or that SI 1:12 knew *limits* but not *limitation*.

The Pacific material shows an average rate of difficulty in sustaining parallelism of 31%, ranging from 75% of Tuvaluan essays (three out of four samples) to 37% of Solomon Islands' papers (46 out of 126 papers) to 16% of Vanuatu examples (eight out of a total of 50 papers). Occurrence per paper of a loss of parallelism was 1.3 among Solomon Islands' essays and 2.2 in those from Kiribati; the structure was not attempted by most students, generally being replaced by two or more finite clauses linked by co-ordinating conjunctions.

Conclusion:

This chapter has dealt with a range of morphosyntactic features which appear commonly across the data used in this study, and has linked them with similar features attested to in other studies of post-exploitation-colony Englishes. The figures for their occurrence demonstrate that, although the commonality of their use is not identical in each national group, many are nearly universal among these users. The next chapter will attempt to establish similar patterns in lexico-semantic and discourse features of English use in the Pacific.

CHAPTER 5: FEATURES OF ENGLISH IN THE PACIFIC: LEXICO-SEMANTICS.

Included in this chapter will be features related to word use or choice, and elements of discourse structure which do not seem to be related specifically to noun phrase or verb phrase construction but more to sentential or discourse form. Students' use of morphological differences from standard forms has been dealt with in Chapter 4. Examination of lexical items in this chapter focuses upon the semantic interpretations of specific words and the tendency to create neologisms.

| |
|--|
| PART 1: LEXICAL FEATURES: |
|--|

It is generally agreed by second language researchers that learners' lexicons are likely to show innovative structures either through borrowings or switching in use, and these lexicons are commonly influenced by the L1 especially in situations where concepts exist in the L1 for which there is no firm equivalent in the L2. But L2 lexicons can also be seen as highly creative as learners apply features of morphology or lexis from the L2 in ways that native speakers of that language are unlikely to do because they are constrained by what they know of "accepted" word-forming patterns, including exceptions, suppletive and irregular forms.

Learners make use of a number of strategies in the development of their lexicons and Pacific students are no exception. This section examines the ways in which learners use what they know of English to create what frequently become new and unusual word forms. In the majority of cases, these innovations are very creative and their meaning is usually clear to all readers.

5.1 Word-building strategies:

A number of word-formation patterns are present in PECEs which are not significantly different from those used in any other English variety – compounding, back formation, hybridisation and blending. What is distinctive in PECEs appears to be which pattern is applied to which lexical items. The two principal strategies are borrowing, and a range of coinage processes.

5.1.1 Borrowing

Schneider (2007: 78-9) argues that “borrowing” is not an appropriate term, firstly because the word or words are never “given back” and, further, because the term implies an uneven relationship between a donor and a recipient language. He prefers to use “word selection” to explain the process but continues to employ “borrowing” because it is so widely understood, appropriate or otherwise. The same will apply to this work.

In Pacific data, borrowings from L1s tend to provide words for items of the local environment or cultures which are not present in English. As a result, they describe items of fauna in particular: in an essay question that asked students to comment upon traditional medicine, many plants unknown to most English societies were used to show the efficacy of herbal poultices, lotions or infusions. Because there may be no English word for these terms, apart from scientific names, they appeared in texts in their L1 form, generally without explanation or glossing.

V2:10 **mamala** plants.

SI 2:9 ...**vuruvare** for curing blood cloths (clots).

SI 2:16 **aroaro** plants

F1:16 **yaqona**

F1:43 **dalo** or **kumala**

F2:50 **kura** or **noni**

F2:125 **wabosucu** leaves.

The context and the described uses made it clear to any reader what was being discussed in a general sense, so comprehensibility was not compromised, but the details of plant type would not be accessible to anyone from a different L1.

Other aspects for which L1 words are used are features distinctive to a particular culture, and of the more than 200 L1 words used in these data, almost 80% relate to

cultural concepts. In these cases, a close English term, even if such a thing exists, cannot carry the cultural values that the indigenous word expresses, and generally a longer English phrase is required to express the important qualities of the L1 term. Such words were infrequently glossed, especially in writing from Tongan and Samoan students who seemed to be the most confident in their use of indigenous lexical items with 21% and 42% respectively of writers using such terms. Further, the occurrence per paper among Samoan samples was 4.5. While only 15% of I-Kiribati students used local terms, those who did averaged 5.8 events per paper.

Among Tongan papers, the most commonly used terms were *ulumotu'a* – the male head of a family or clan who is chosen by the male members of that familial group to lead them and to be the arbiter of any issue that arises to challenge harmony; and *faiva*, a dance. In these cases, though the meanings were checked in a Tongan dictionary (Tu'inukuafe 1992), the use and explanation of the value of the items in question made the meaning clear.

Samoan students most often used:

matai: the titled head of a Samoan extended family who is officially and formally invested with that title.

fa'asamoa: the Samoan customary way of life.

fa'alavelave: anything which disturbs the usual harmony of life and which requires a special intervention.

'aiga: the family (nuclear or extended)

fofo traditional healing or a cure, or a person skilled in massage.

Again the meanings were checked (Milner 1966) but as before, they were generally quite clear from the context.

Kiribati papers referred to the *mwaneaba*, the main ceremonial meeting place and building for each clan; *bwaibwai pits* (for growing the giant taro) and most frequently the *umiwane*, the male leader of the extended family (van Trease 1993).

Solomon Islands' students most frequently used the Pijin term *wantok*, which has a range of implications, both positive (such as unity with one's family members) and negative (such as a favouring of one's friends and extended family in business or political dealings), both of which were referred to. Fijian students, both ethnically Fijian and Indo-Fijian, used a wide range of cultural terms related to family, such as *mataqali* (clan) and *yavusa* or clan group, and cultural aspects such as *tanoa* (kava bowl), *tabua* (sacred whale's tooth), *meke* (ceremonial dances, sometimes used with a plural *-s* morpheme, which Tent (2000a: 23) lists as a symptom of nativisation), *bure* (thatched house) and *talanoa sessions*, the meetings which involve talk and, sometimes, kava. Indo-Fijian students made fewer references to their own cultural lives: *Diwali*, the Festival of Lights, was the only one regularly mentioned.

Data was limited to fewer than five papers for the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue and Tuvalu and none of those papers exhibited any indigenous terms. While the Cook Islands material was somewhat higher at 11 papers, no mention was made of specifically local items.

5.1.2 Coinage

Ahulu (1998a: 31) distinguishes several productive processes within the general term 'coinage':

- a) Derivation:
 - i) affixation
 - ii) conversion
- b) Compounding:
 - i) unusual compounds
 - ii) varying collocations
 - iii) modifier + N reduced from a phrase.

This is a useful place to begin an examination of the processes apparent in the Pacific data.

5.1.2a) Derivation

(i) Affixation

Affixation of standard English morphemes in creative ways is a common feature of this material. The English grammatical system permits a huge number of coinages as long as they are in accordance with productive word-formation patterns (Görlach 1994: 112). This strategy has value for two reasons: firstly, it demonstrates very clearly that the majority of individuals who use it understand the role of a range of English morphemes and how to apply them, and secondly, though the products of the process may not be standard in form, they are consistent with standard structure and thus, generally, wholly comprehensible. It is clear that certain nominal morphemes are more likely to be used than others: *-ness*, *-tion* and *-ment* are the most common nominal suffixes. The most likely adjectival suffixes are *-able*, *-less* and *-ed*. Overall, the process by which these writers have arrived at their morphological decision is obvious and the semantic role seldom challenges comprehensibility.

The creation of new lexical forms is most distinctive in the Kiribati and Samoan texts where occurrence per paper is 5.83 and 4.45 respectively. These figures do not include the creation of new prepositional verbs (dealt with in Chapter 4).

C2:3 **costless** food

C2:6 **jobless** people (a term which is also gaining ground in New Zealand English)

M1:2 an **enjoyful** experience

T1:16 a rise of people living **homelessly**.

K1:11 **boresome** (boring)

K1:17 **unschooled adolescence** (uneducated adolescents).

S 1:5 **overcrowdedness** (one of the most repeated word choices across all national groups).

S 2:3 **malnourished** children.

V1:9 **neglect** of children (also a common usage)

V2:3 **knowable** people.

SI 1:28 The family is **burdenless**.

SI 2:23 They converted people from **infidelity** to Christianity (the only instance where semantic meaning was different from the intended one).

SI 2:46 **belongingness** (a third common choice)

SI 2:49 an **infectant** (a person infected with a particular disease).

F1:1 **underprivileged unemployees** (unemployed people from underprivileged sectors of society)

F1:28 **dislikeness** (used three times)

F2:21 **disheavals** (used three times, and found in other papers)

ii) Conversion

Ahulu (1998a: 31) describes this strategy as changing “the class to which a form traditionally belongs” including the use of prepositions or using nouns as verbs, and so on. Some of the most obvious examples of this have already been referred to in Chapter 4, but are worthy of another focus. Conversions include structures such as ‘cope up with’, ‘discuss about’, ‘form up’, ‘voice out’, ‘raise up (children)’ and others. Further examples which are found in Pacific data are:

K3:4 **to sum-on or add-on**

K3:9 They learn **to team-work**. (noun converted to verb)

S1:22 Family is a **gather-word**. (verb converted to adjective)

V1:21 **moderned** (adjective converted to verb: very common. In this context, the use referred to the changing roles of women: Laws have moderned the roles of women.)

V2:21 (Culture) will be **destructured**. (noun base (destruction converted to verb: common usage)

SI 1:47 ...**kinly** relations (noun converted to adjective)

SI 2:16 Traditional medicine is **two-folded**. (adjective converted to verb)

SI 2:57 It is **outweighted** by the positive impacts. (noun form (weight) (?) + affix to convert to verb)

F1:13 This **upshots** getting children involved in child labour. / ...due to less members working, **upshotting** to more crimes. (noun converted to verb)

F1:40 It will help in **upbringing** them. (noun to verb)

F2:1 The car **bumped** onto an old man (collided with). (Tent (2000) confirms this lexical item as present in Fijian word creation in English).

5.1.2b: Compounding

(i) Unusual compounds

Such structures are those in which morphemes or words are linked to create new words or idioms.

T1:18 ...to **uplife** living standards (used twice. This may be a case of the verb being influenced by the following adjective).

K1:16 .. the new **bornchilds**.

V1:31 ...an area at the **backside** of Port Vila (outskirts?). This is related to SI 1:41: Youths are living in the **backways** settlements.

SI 1:49 **Likeso** (used twice for ‘Thus’)

SI 2:16 ...a **throat-ache** (by analogy from head-ache)

SI 2:43 ...**brain-drainage** (where the addition of the hyphen creates a compounded form)

F1:26 ...a **bread-earner** (which relates to SI 1:13: a **breadweaner**)

F2:38 They are used to the village life and the **drawnback** mood. (laidback)

(ii) Varying collocations:

Many examples of this strategy are, once again, connected to the use of prepositions, but there are also longer expressions which do not collocate idiomatically. Some, it appears, relate to how certain English expressions have been heard but others are creative.

N2:2 This is done **accordingly tradition..** (for *according to*: very common usage across all groups).

T1:19 (They are) **scolded from school.** (meaning *expelled*, but this does express the likely experience).

V1:32 ...**turns to** forget tradition. (for *tends to*: the most common single creation in varying collocations. In Fijian English ‘turn’ and ‘tend’ are homophonic (Geraghty 2012: pers.comm.).

SI 1:33 Individual family who live in town are **eaten away** by their family members. (Commenting on the obligations of urban families to house and feed extended family members).

SI 2:8 (If they had no jobs) they **flew** the country (for *fled*)

SI 2:53 Fiji is a **melting point.** (for *melting pot*).

SI 2:67...**parts and partial** of the existing environment (possibly related to how the term is heard: ‘part and parcel’).

F2:6 ...to **weight out** (used for *to weigh up*. This is connected with many uses of *to outweigh*).

F2:102 Competitions can **bring limelight** to a country.

F2: 149 This lifted their potential to an **uphand level**.

Many of these uses are highly descriptive and evocative and not infrequently fill a lexical or expressive gap in English; seldom is understanding impaired.

(iii) Modifier + N:

There are several cases in these data of the collapsing of a phrase using a preposition such as *of*, *with* or *as* (or a truncated relative clause) into a structure using a modifier and a noun. Some appear to have derived from inverting parts of other common English phrases.

C2:3 (They need) a **help-lending hand**.

T1:14 The family needs **house-in** discussions.

K1:12 The cleaning house is done by **left-behind** relatives.

S2:4 (It reaches) a level of **fully-improving**. (This structure is also a feature of Fiji English speech.)

SI 2:3 (Many people are influenced) especially the practioners (sic) and processors and **downstream livers** (those who live downstream from the site).

SI 2:23 Some end up in a **poverish-state** (a state of poverty)

F1:1 They migrate to **better-living** countries (countries which offer a better standard of living).

F1:40 Parents have to live a **double-minded** life (having to manage everything without help). Speakers of Fijian have pointed out that this structure is a calque from Fijian: *lomalomarua*.

F2:8 They are living (leaving) their motherland where they were **bread and buttered**.

In other instances, a small difference in lexical choice from the one expected creates a new expression which can be vivid and descriptive.

T1:7 **inheritage** (the inheritance of a cultural heritage. This word was used by other writers in different national groups, and more than once in each case.)

V1:9 **overweighing problems** (a conflation of *outweigh* and *overwhelming* seems the likely source for this word).

V2:14 **bywalkers** (passersby)

SI 2:23 It **shutters** people's lives (limits)

SI 2:36 Their positional status may be **unvacant**.

SI 1:44 Many migrants today are **flowy** with speaking Pidgin (fluent)

SI 2:57 (Economic conditions) tend to **be demised** (to decline)

F1:2 The way young generation brings their children up are not **worthable** (worthy?).

F2:13 Some have already experienced violent acts that they **have caged** their lives.

F2:66 It will **spread some light** on the issue.

Other individual words show the links to an English item which would be more generally used. Many students across all groups have used *adapt* and *adopt* interchangeably though most usually *adopt* is used in the place of *adapt*. *Arise* or *rise* are used for *raise* almost exclusively, thus transitivity verbs which are generally intransitive. Further examples of intransitive verbs which were given a direct object were *flourish*:

T1:28 A wise plan can **flourish peace and harmony**;

and *behave*:

K1:21 You teach your children and **behave them**.

Rebuttle was used as a verb which was a logical use of the *-le* affix and which was clearly related to having heard the noun *rebuttal*. *Indepth* became an adjective, modifying *ideas* most commonly, and *Moreso* replaced *Furthermore* as a sentence adverb. In two cases students collapsed *each* and *other* to create *eaches*, though this may have been a slip of the pen.

5.2 Semantic expansion:

Semantic expansion in this context refers to the strategy by which the meaning of a word or phrase adapts to take on a further, but often related, meaning not found in most standard forms. It is widespread among PECEs, mentioned by Bamgbose (1992), Bokamba (1982), Jibril (1982), Kachru (1982a, 1986), Todd (1982), Wong, I. (1982), Platt et al (1984), Mesthrie (1993), Ahulu (1998a), Wee (1998), Anchimbe (2006), Gargesh (2006) and Schmied (1991). There are three principal examples of this strategy in the Pacific data.

5.2.1: Whereby

Among Cook Islands' students the word was used in almost 30% of all papers and at an average rate of four per paper. The next most frequent users are Fijian students but at a lower rate per essay. In Standard New Zealand English the word generally means *by which*, but it is probably perceived as somewhat archaic in daily use. Pacific users in these data, however, expand its use to stand for almost every other relative pronoun, with or without prepositions, and several adverbs of manner. It is possible that the source of this strategy is the classroom where the word has been learned through teaching.

T1:21 Education begins in the home, and this is **whereby** children pick up on language.

K1:1 It is due to close family ties **whereby** older people prefer to live among their offsprings.

V1:11 ...compared to the traditional social systems **whereby** most families were mainly extended (used 7 times in this essay).

SI 1:15 Gatherings are very common in traditional societies **whereby** everyone gathers (for) custom ceremonies.

SI 1:44 Nuclear family has advantages **whereby** could enable Solomon Islands families to have a better life.

F1:41 It is relative to those (who live) in rural areas **whereby** the older generations prefer the free life.

F2:69 It becomes a multi-racial society **whereby** each an (sic) every individual takes part in.

F2:137 An incident happened in that village **whereby** a husband chopped his wife.

5.2.2: Aunty

The second example of an expanded meaning is *aunty*, which is used along with *aunt* in 20% of all Pacific papers. The most consistent users were Polynesian students: 43% of Tongan, 30% of Samoan and 10% of Cook Islands' papers. Marshall Islands and Nauruan students showed high levels of usage at 33% but papers from these two countries numbered only three and four respectively. Among Melanesian and other Micronesian students, overall usage was less than 10%.

The interesting aspect of the use of *aunty* or *aunties* was that using *aunty* rather than *aunt* seemed to be a deliberate choice because in many, though not all, cases the word *aunt* was also used. The difference between the two words (which are generally synonymous in Standard New Zealand English, though the former is less formal than the latter) appears to relate to which aunt is noted. In one useful reference, Student T1:22 explained:

Growing up with cousins all around it automatically teaches a child to respect the *aunty* which is the highest person in a hierarchy of an extended family. Thus it is the father's sister.

Another, T1:30, referred to "the *aunty*, she is the *fahu*, the most noble person..., highly respected by the brother's children". Further in the essay the same student suggested that the *aunty* has special roles to play within the family's ceremonial life. It is apparent that the distinction between *aunt* and *aunty* is between kinship relations and familial role respectively. Wong (2006: 451) in his analysis of the use of *aunty* in Singapore points out that such expressions "are not merely terms of reference; they are indicators of aspects ...of culture".

5.2.3: Cousin-brother and cousin-sister

As has been attested to in other PECEs, especially those in West and East Africa, the terms *cousin-brother* and *cousin-sister* can also be found in Pacific writing. These are used to refer most particularly to first cousins and generally the children of the father's brothers or mother's sisters. In the context of extended family structures these youngsters have such a close relationship with their wider family members that a brother would raise those children as his own should the need arise with no differentiating between them all. In these data, it was Solomon Islands students who used the expressions most frequently: in paper SI 1:46 they were used three times.

Nativisation, suggests Zuengler (1982:115) is a process occurring when cultural patterns of an indigenous language are transferred into the English being used, and this process is already apparent in the Pacific lexicon. It is still underway and may not yet be viewed as wholly stable but the languages present in the Pacific are having a clear effect on some users' English word choices, which is likely to increase rather than diminish over time.

5.3 Strategies to overcome vocabulary gaps:

In all second language learning situations, learners have to develop a range of strategies for coping with moments when a required word cannot be retrieved from the memory or for situations where a lexical item is not yet known. One such strategy is to use indigenous terms for concepts whose translation in the L2 may not be known – borrowing, and this has been discussed in 5.1.1. Other strategies are to use general words, such as the use of *do* and *thing* as a universal verb and noun respectively, and *whereby* as a universal relativiser. (see Section 5.2.1)

5.3.1: Do/does/did

These make up the majority of the examples of vocabulary replacement strategies and overall 21% of all papers demonstrate this strategy, the highest use being among Cook Islands and I-Kiribati data. The verb is used where it appears an individual has not been able to retrieve the appropriate word which in many cases is a collocating verb: we expect decisions and savings to be *made* rather than *done*; responsibilities and treatments are usually *carried out* or *met*, while here they are *done*; we generally *find* solutions in preference to *doing* them. In other cases, students have chosen a sentence structure that may make it more difficult to retrieve the verb sought – some structures are given in the passive voice when an active voice might have made it easier to find the more precise term. For example:

K1:13 It is rare to be **done** in extended families this kind of behaviour.

SI 1:42 In the perspective of bride prize, the commitment has **to be done** by all members.

V1:16 There are solutions that could **be done**.

V2:4 Then the treatment is **done**.

In other examples, a decomposing process appears to be used. Some Pacific users have created verbal forms by using *do* + Noun in contexts where users of standard English would have used a verb derived from the noun. In these data, for instance,

doing general agreement would more likely be rendered in standard English as “by agreeing generally”.

Tu1:2 ...by **doing** general agreement.

M1:1 Some **do** early retirement.

T1:29 One person who want to marry, the saving account help to built (sic) his house, **do** his marry.

K1:8 It will be easy...to make a budget and **do** some savings for future needs.

S1;1 The high chief does not **do** his own decisions.

SI 1:1 (They) invest in another country or **doing** development in their home country.

F2:75 It also is **doing** effects in one’s body.

5.3.2: Thing/things

The use of *thing* is less common than the verbal strategy with *to do*; of 278 examples of vocabulary replacement, only 52 use *thing*. However, the pattern of usage is similar: *thing* has been chosen because a more specific term is not known or cannot be retrieved.

C2:7 ...a lack of pay and **things** like that.

K1:19 (They all live) in one house in which all the **things** are done perfectly.

S1:8 They share thoughts and ideas on **things** to improve living.

V1:16 There should be times that allows them to do certain **things**.

V2:17 They then (tend) to do **things** and adopt the custom of other countries.

SI 1:3 This name identifies the individuals, family, clan or **thing**.

F1:26 Bad family teaches us bad qualities and **things**.

5.4 Echoing

This term is used to describe a phrase or clause in which one word is repeated around *and* or *or* by using a synonymous form, such as “family conflicts or problems” or “talk or discuss about”. In Pacific data, 38% of all writers create such phrases in which the synonyms ‘echo’ each other semantically. The lowest number of samples is found among I-Kiribati writers where 26% displayed this strategy, but among other groups the rate ranges from 32% to 56% with the use per paper highest, at 2.0, among Samoan users.

It is a distinctive feature of the English of these users but there appears no clear explanation for its appearance. Perhaps one answer lies in pedagogical practice in that students may have had their attention drawn to similar structures in their reading as a way of making sense of new lexical items. Learners may then perceive this form as a feature of academic writing. A different possible explanation lies with the need to be sure that the point being made is understood: the redundancy is an attempt to be clear. Whatever the reasons for its use, echoing is found Pacific-wide in these data on nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs.

C2:6 **a topic or issue; effects or consequences**

N2:1 (Women are) **suppressed or prevented** to talk in meetings.

Tu1:3 ...the **reasons or purposes** of migration.

T1:3 Being **prompt or on time** is very important.

T1:5 ...from the last **ten years or decade**.

K1:12 ...**achieving or gaining** historical aspects of the passed days.

K3:2 They were **banned or not allowed** to involve to make arrangements.

S1:1 (Disagreements) are resolved by **general agreement or consensus**.

S1:10 (They are) encouraged **to marry or wed** a young man of any age.

V1:11 It is **cheaper and less costly**.

V2:11 It **reduces or slows down** economic growth.

SI 1:2 (Family gives) support **to help or enable** him **to solve or overcome** the problems.

SI 1:16 The decision will be **quick and fairly fast**.

F1:12 ...**to sight and view** the activities that elders perform.

F2:101 They get all sorts of diseases which even make them **weaker and less strong** sometimes.

Other forms of echoing are found without the linking conjunction. There are several examples of *return back* or *regaining back*, and others using *because of* with *the reasons that* or *due to* or *why*. Often the synonym is used by converting one noun of a pair into an adjective:

T2:4 ...to increase **pay wages**.

S1:2 ...**past ancestors**.

S1:8 Many families have been facing **funeral burials**.

V2:24 ...the **skin bark** of trees. (a common creation).

SI 2:6 ...a **pre-requisite requirement**.

F2:7 ...mother **tongue language**.

Further, there are some interesting expressions which the use of echoing appears to have induced:

V1:25 It is a family that usually consisted of family members whom are related to each other.

SI 2:19...**illegal crimes**.

SI 2:52...migration of people to their **intended destined choice countries**.

F1:10 Usually **more often than none of the time**, there is always someone with a helping-hand.

There is also a minor tendency to use *very* to intensify adjectives which already carry full intensity, or to modify *much* or *less* in ways that are unexpected. *Very* seems to have a more ubiquitous role among Pacific users.

K1:5 It was achieved in a **very perfect** way.

K1:13 Living in an extended family is **very fun**.

S1:1 ...a **very critical** worry.

S1:6 ... a **very crucial** problem.

V2:24 ...and other **very fatal** diseases.

SI 2:12 They are cheap and **very much accessible**.

SI 2:32 Traditional medicine is **very much helpful**.

F1:25 Parents get **very less time** to talk to their children.

F2:55 This requires no or **very less money**.

F2:117 There are **very less employment**.

Several researchers such as Kirk-Greene (1971), Kachru (1982c, 1986, 2006), Parasher (1983), Platt et al (1984), Mesthrie (1993), Tan (2005), Gargesh (2006), and Schmied (1996), refer both to 'reduplication' which involves the direct repetition of a single item (as in *very*, *very big* or *hot*, *hot coffee*), and to a 'florid' or 'overly formal' style. It may be that the echoing structures found in the Pacific material are variations on both these features.

It should also be pointed out that this tautology is becoming increasingly common in New Zealand English, which may, indeed, be influencing its appearance in Pacific English. It is not unusual to hear New Zealanders describe something as ‘very unique’ or ‘very crucial’.

5.5: Conflation of idioms:

Schmied (1996) and Igboanusi (2006) mention this phenomenon which refers to the blending of more than one idiomatic structure to create a new one. There is a considerable variety of creative idiomatic expressions among the 420 examples of conflated idioms. Tu 1:1 and SI 2:30 used the expression *a dead and alive matter* (used six times by the former) or *on the crossroad of dead and alive* as an apparent blending of “a matter of life and death” and “more dead than alive”. Students F1:18 talked of family issues being *kept under closed doors*, while F2:130 claimed that migration *opened doorways*, and Students SI 1:17 created the time phrase *Since time immemorable...*

There are two idioms which together account for 14% of all the 420 samples: these are *in search for* and variations upon *Last but not least*. The first example is clearly a conflation of “in search of” and “to search for”, and is found across all national groups in the data.

C2;7 People migrate **insearch for** opportunities.

Ni1:1 Families tend to break apart **in search for** a better life.

T1:11 This causes unnecessary pressure on the young man or woman while **in search for** their future wife or husband.

Last but not the least is also very common and has been specifically referred to in other PECE studies by Gyasi (1991). This appears to be a conflation of the English idiom ‘last but not least’ with the use of the article in superlative phrases. It was so common in this material that the phrase was almost never used without the article.

T1:5 **Last but not the least**, will consider the economic impacts.

S2:4 **Lastly but not the least**, it also encourages our very own people to preserve...our environment.

V2:23 **Finally but not the least** it will argue that the unknown components and their functions is also a problem.

V2:24 **Lastly, but not the least**, traditional medicine is part of our culture and tradition.

SI 2:25 **Lastly, but, not the least** it concludes that, traditional Medicine is the best alternative approaches (sic).

F1:25 **Finally, but not the leastly**, there is less expenditure in the family.

Conclusion:

The lexicon is one area of second language acquisition which is generally regarded as highly vulnerable to influence from a L1 (Vainikka and Young-Scholten 1996; Eubank 1993/4; Weinreich 1964). Not unexpectedly, everyone conceptualises the world in terms of the vocabulary he or she uses, and it seems obvious that if the concepts of the L1 cannot readily be expressed in the L2, the lexicon of the L1 will be required. Further, a need for communication less with native speakers than with other speakers of PECEs is likely to give rise to new terms whose roots may be in phonological confusion, or intonation difficulties but which frequently demonstrate individual creativity in a new context.

| | |
|----------------|--|
| PART 2: | SEMANTIC FEATURES AT SENTENCE LEVEL |
|----------------|--|

Looking at students' writing at the phrasal and clausal level, especially when focussing on grammatical and lexical innovations, means that less attention is likely to be paid to the texts at a higher level. However, it is this level which casts some light on how these writers configure text and how they construct meaning.

Questioning of classroom students each semester revealed that few believed they had been taught written discourse skills beyond the sentence level in their time at school. This was true of their learning, they felt, in their L1 (supposing they had, in fact,

been provided with literacy in their L1) and in English. Diagnostic writing tests given to on-campus students at the beginning of each semester demonstrated that the majority of students in that mode knew little about formal tone, paragraph construction or argument structure; these features of writing had developed by the end of the semester into forms more acceptable to lecturers in the programmes students were intending to follow, and the examination papers showed general control of paragraphs and a sense of argumentation.

As has been seen in sentences already quoted in this work, Pacific data do not suggest that students were limited in the complexity of their writing. Sentences are often compounded or complex; there was a range of embeddings, though not all were wholly successful at every attempt. Both concrete and abstract ideas were introduced, explained and exemplified.

It is a cliché to say that Pacific cultures are ‘oral cultures’ but there is also truth in this generalization. Most Pacific languages only acquired orthographic systems with the arrival of the mission organisations in the early to mid 19th century. Histories and cultural narratives were traditionally memorized and repeated through succeeding generations, and the appearance of the written word made relatively little difference to that practice. The written word was used largely for church purposes until well into the 19th century, but since its expansion into indigenous literacy, it has given rise to a reputable tradition of literature in several local languages, most particularly in Polynesian languages, and in English.

Nonetheless, there is not a long history of committing aspects of culture and thought to paper and though literacy rates are generally high for most Pacific countries, there has not been consistent provision of quality reading materials in indigenous languages so that students do not have a strong sense of how their own written text is structured (Lynch and Mugler 1996). Most students spoken to about their writing experience claimed that in their time at high school they usually wrote personal narratives or short passages with a focus on the sentence. As a result, the majority of students on intake into LL114 showed in their diagnostic essays that paragraph structure was not something with which they had much experience, and distinctive

features appeared in their writing which would not be common in standard Englishes.

Little study has been made of the contrastive rhetoric of Pacific languages, unlike in several other languages such as Japanese (Kobayashi 1984; Takano 1993), Arabic, Chinese, Korean (Connor 1996). One study which included Samoan, Tongan, Fijian, Indo-Fijian, Tahitian and Hawaiian students, examined the degree of field dependence displayed by those subjects. “Field dependence and field independence have been interpreted as being contrastive tendencies to rely, respectively, on either external or internal frames of reference in perceiving, organizing, analyzing or recalling information and experience” (Hansen 1984: 312). This in effect means that field independent learners are more adept at extrapolating from personal to generic details and at using supports outside their experience, while field dependent learners tend to need reference to personal and immediate experiences and are less self-reliant in learning. She found that only Hawaiian students showed well-developed field independence, explained by their long association with American education systems and society. Fijian and Indo-Fijian students displayed the lowest scores for field independence with Tongan students the most field independent of the students included in the current study. This has relevance for the discourse features of these students’ texts, as will be examined in Section 5.12. In the first part of this section of the chapter, features related to sentence formation will be discussed.

5.6 Pronoun copying:

This term is used to describe a sentence form in which the writer repeats the subject or object with a pronoun in the following clause:

That man he works with my father.

That book, you can get it at the library.

Bokamba 1982, Platt et al 1984, Williams 1987, Gyasi 1991, Bamgbose 1992, Mesthrie 1993, Wade 1997, Mugler and Tent 2004, de Klerk 2006 and Schmied 1996 all make reference to this phenomenon in a range of African, Southeast Asian and Pacific Englishes. Among native speakers of English, pronoun copying is likely

to be found when a shift in topic occurs or for emphasis: “Oh well, the All Blacks, they don’t deserve the money they’re earning” was heard by the author in a post-game conversation between rugby enthusiasts. Wade (1997: online) suggests that pronoun copying is “functionally motivated in that it largely replaces the use of intonational cues to signal topic in Standard South African English”. He also suggests that this is a feature which is likely to become standard in L2 speakers because it is in the language of educators who are L2 users of English, and thus it will be handed on to further generations.

According to Schmied (1996: 140) grammaticality tests of pronoun copying among students in South Africa revealed that 58% of students viewed it as acceptable (though most of their teachers did not). His view is that the decision to repeat the subject with a pronominal apposition is a way of “maximising salience, making it easier for speakers to ‘notice’ the important aspects of utterances” (p.139), a natural part of a topic-comment structure.

English has been described as a subject-dominant language in which the subject carries most focus in a sentence. But many other languages are topic-comment languages in which the topic is introduced first (though it may or may not be the subject) and then reinforced with the clauses of the sentence. In some cases the topic is already the subject of the sentence but will be isolated and reinforced by the pronoun copy before the predicate is provided.

T1:13 **The youth of today, they** are smart on structures of crime.

In others the focus of the comment is actually the object or indirect object of the comment:

K1:11 **A family with only five or six people in it, it** is easy to keep track of **them.**

Furthermore, the comment can present the information in any way which the writer desires; there is no requirement for the comment to refer back to the specific form of the topic. The usual pattern is:

T(topic), [pro V (O)] or T, [S V pro] where pro is the pronoun copy.

“In Oceanic languages, it is generally possible to focus attention on any noun phrase by moving it to the beginning of the sentence” (Lynch 1998: 156). In many instances this requires that another reference to that focus is given. Lynch quotes a number of examples where this occurs:

A’jie: *yam (focus indicator) it grow.*

As for the yam, it’s growing well.

Nakanai: *the dog your, I not see-it.*

As for your dog, I haven’t seen it.

This device is “used to introduce and/or maintain reference in discourse”, claims Williams (1989: 155). It is certainly more commonly found when a new topic or sub-topic is presented or when an important point is being made. It ensures that the point of view is clear and not lost in the text around it, and, in object phrases, it provides a greater emphasis on that object.

S1:7 All of us who live in the Pacific, our parents want **us** to live with cultural values.

The frequency with which this feature appears in Pacific data, and in other English variants, suggests that this is a distinctive quality of these Englishes. Wade (1997) claims that L1 transfer cannot be the only explanation for its use, and Ellis (1996: 313) supports this by suggesting that topic-comment is a very common stage in language development, and can be described as a “universal feature”. In English, it is clearly present in the speech patterns of many native speakers though it is seldom seen in expository text. Nonetheless, topic-comment structures are common in several of the L1s which these Pacific learners speak, especially in Polynesian languages where there is marker specifically to designate the topic (usually the inceptive *ko*), and it is probable that the thinking process which creates those sentences in the L1 is one which learners rely on in writing the L2; as examples can

be heard in the speech of native speakers, there is reinforcement of the acceptability of the structure.

Tent (2000a: 387) quotes Kelly (1975: 29) who claims that in Fijian colloquial English the pronoun copying is never used before a progressive verb form and is “rarely used in the present tense.” Tent does not find that his own data confirm this claim, and neither do these Pacific data. Pronoun copying, it appears, has less to do with tense/aspect than it does with the discourse context. There is a clear topic-comment quality to the sentences created, especially if the topic description is lengthy; it is as if the topic is being reinstated in importance by the use of the pronoun. It may also be true that the L1 does not permit the deletion of the pronoun so the pattern is applied in students’ English sentences.

Pronoun copying of subject phrases is found in 52.5% of writers in these data, and pronoun copying of object phrases in 23%; interestingly, producers of the former type do not necessarily produce the latter. The groups which show the lowest rates of use are the Cook Islands where 36% of papers demonstrate one or the other usage, and Vanuatu essays with a rate of 46%, but most of the other national groups show rates of between 54% and 86%. The average rate of use per paper is over 2, though some individuals have a use per paper of 7 or 9.

5.6.1: Pronoun copying of the subject

N2:2 Some people because of religious background **they** are not permitted at all to use it.

Tu1:1 Some of the people in the family, **they** rely on each other. (Pronoun copying used six times).

T1:5 This pattern of structure, **it** is therefore apply every household.

K1:18 Teenagers **they** can steal things that they liked (pronoun copying 5 times).

K3:16 Counseling with a psychiatrist **this** is not yet practised in Kiribati.

- S1:2 Anyone who can be a chief, **he** can't make decision by himself.
- S1:15 Having an extended family, **this** means all the elders will be involved.
- V1:17 Having an nuclear family, **it** will be an advantage to them.
- SI 1:22 An extended family, **it** consist of different types of people in terms of age.
- F1:5 Grandparents **they** teach the young generations on customs and religion.
- F2:77 Overseas countries **they** have better employment opportunities.

There are some variations within this pronoun copying of the subject. In some cases, the pronoun copy may also have been engendered by the use of a long and complex subject clause which appears to lead the writer to provide a clarity marker in the form of the pronoun copy.

- T2:1 These local peoples, despite migrating overseas, **they** still remember to help their families.
- K3:7 People who are busy doing their daily work **they** cannot pile up their work.
- S1:13 This kind of families where the father and mother and children constitute it, **they** will not suffer as to give up money.
- V1:9 The opportunity this extended family (has) relating to the traditional systems, **it** may be pass on and on from generations to come.
- SI 1:11 Traditionally family in a group of kin believed to have a common ancestor, **they** relate through blood or marriage. (pronoun copying three times).
- F2:127 Securing a job regardless of the qualification which are needed, **it** can provide more than two jobs. (pronoun copying used nine times.)

In other instances there is what seems to be a further marker of emphasis by the use of the word “For” at the head of the topic clause. The structures preceding the sentences do not demand a causal phrase so the word takes on a reinforcement role.

N1:1 For a parent’s love, **it** is very unconditional.

Tu1:3 For children, **they** will learn the good things. (pronoun copying used four times.)

S1:8 For most children brought up in the urban area **they** will never know their culture and custom.

V2:4 For workers in the adopted country, **they** will provide revenue to the country by paying taxes.

SI 1:12 For those children living in nuclear family, **they** are bound not to know the extended immediate families. (pronoun copying three times.)

F2:36 For some, **they** cannot practice their religious beliefs.

In one case, the topic-comment structure was reversed with a post-posed subject:

T1:8 **It** has been clearly discussed, the several advantages of living in one family.

5.6.2: Pronoun copying of the object(s)

K1:17 It will also contaminate the well by using **it** to wash near **it**.

K3:17 In budgeting the time is the most important to know **it**.

S1:20 What he or she sees with her parents, he or she is going to show **it** out.

SI 2:32 (The drugs) are not processed effectively and therefore it is not safe to take **it** (sic).

F2:114 Traditional medicine is readily found and it is easier to prepare **them**.

5.6.3: Pronoun copying of the object of the preposition:

It is worth noting that the use of the pronoun *it* as dummy subject features highly in these constructions which may reflect the absence of similar usage in most languages of the region and thus an uncertain grasp of the role of *it* in this use. It may also reflect the fact that 3rdPSg objects are often obligatorily marked in the L1 of some of these students.

T1:9 In this type of family, there are advantages and disadvantages of **it**.

T1:14 Like marriage and funeral in Tonga, family participation in **it** is regarded as traditional way of doing **it**.

V2:24 With traditional medicine, they have easy access to **it**.

SI 1:19 In the extended family, there is always a sense of strong and unifies relationship in **it**.

Fi:33 This essay will contain two parts to **it**.

F2:116 It has also contributes (sic) to the destruction of traditions, customs and values, something we Pacific Islanders hold **it** close to our hearts.

5.7 **Fronting**

Fronting – moving the focus of the sentence to the beginning – is intrinsically related to the use of a pronoun copy, but what distinguishes it from pronoun copying is the fact that the expected form of the comment is most generally restructured. The topic is fronted and the comment which follows takes whichever form best expresses the intended meaning. The topic establishes the focus and the comment is related but not necessarily grammatically compatible with the phrasing of the topic.

SI 2:36 **The malaria parasite**, most people in the Solomon Islands are dying of this sickness.

This creates the structure **T**, [S V (O)]: the object of the preposition in this case is related semantically but is not in a full pronominal relationship with the Topic.

Hakuta (1981:7) points out that in subject-dominant sentences, the subject is internal to the sentence and governs the verb, while in topic-dominant sentences, the topic phrase can stand outside the sentence structure. It is always in sentence-initial position and “takes precedence over the subject”. He quotes Li and Thompson (1976) in suggesting that when the topic is viewed as very significant and is presented first, any form of noun phrase can follow which does not have to recognize the topic as the subject (or the object) of the sentence.

Fronting use generally is rather lower overall than pronoun copying, at 40.5% of all data, but the rate per paper was significantly higher at 4.1. Rates per paper of below 2 were found in Fiji, the Solomon islands, Nauru, Vanuatu and Kiribati, and percentage use in those countries’ essays were 14%, 25%, 25%, 26% and 44% respectively. Among Polynesian writers, the overall rates ranged from 18% in the Cook Islands’ papers to 100% of Tuvaluan samples, and events per paper varied from 2 among Tongan essays to 4 in the Cook Islands samples and 5 in Tuvaluan examples.

There are examples of straightforward fronting in these data:

Tu1:3 **A lot of suffering** they may face.

T1:12 **In a Tongan society**, it is hardship.

SI 2:12 **To find herbal and traditional healers** it is difficult.

F2:24 **To improve their health and get a better quality of life**, people migrate. (used four times).

In these examples, the object of the main verb (or the adverbial phrase) has been fronted, a situation not uncommon in standard English. The grammatical structure of the sentence remains intact. This is not, however, the general rule with most fronted sentences presented in the data where the semantic link remains but the grammatical structure is disrupted.

Some sentences with this structure could be reformulated in a way which would conform to standard expectations by the addition of a single word.

N2:1 **The advantage of traditional medicine**, some people are fond of it.

The advantage of traditional medicine is some people are fond of it.

T1:5 **A couple who are newly wedded**, the wife must move from her origin place.

When a couple are newly married, the wife must move ...

S1:18 **Failure to acknowledge these dangers**, more of our children will adapt the modern ways.

Failure to acknowledge these failures means more of our children...

V2:24 **Muscle pains, little sores**, the traditional medicine kills the germs.

For muscle pains and little sores, traditional medicine ...

F1:5 **To stay in extended family**, children will learn a lot of good things.

By staying in (an) extended family, children will learn ...

In other cases, a relatively simple repositioning of the fronted phrase or clause would create a more grammatically linked sentence:

T2:8 **Hitting children**, more children here in Tonga a save from punishment because of their grandparent.

*Here in Tonga, grandparents save more children **from being hit**.*

V1:24 A **single family that consist of parent and six children**, if the parents are unemployed, these six children would not have the opportunity to go to school.

*If the parents **of** a single family of parents and six children are unemployed, these six children would not have ...*

S1:1 **Everything you have to do**, if you do not perform the task you will be given a punishment.

If you do not perform the task you have to do, you will be given...

SI 1:53 **Outside influence from members of the extended family**, like children are not only taught by their parents to have good character.

*Children are not only taught by their parents to have a good character, **but also by** outside influence from members ...*

Nonetheless, the sentences created by fronting techniques allow writers a range of possible responses which are not restricted by grammatical demands but which still retain an immediacy of meaning. Such sentence formations are common enough to be regarded as distinctive in the Pacific writing studied here

5.8 Reduction of arguments

The reduction of arguments by omitting the subject or direct object of a sentence is a common feature of many L2s, and is the focus of research into the [+/- null subject] parameter in Universal Grammar (UG) studies in both first and second language acquisition (White 1996, 1998, 2003; Meisel 2000; Vainikka and Young-Scholten 1996; Prévost and White 2000; Lakshmanan and Selinker 1994; Zyzik 2008; Roebuck et al 1999). Generally the focus in research has been the omission of subjects since that has been the parameter under discussion; it is also clear that the omission of subjects overall is more common than the omission of objects, even in L1 acquisition. Zyzik (2008: 74) notes that in child L1 acquisition children regularly “omit more subjects than objects ...regardless of the target language”. This difference in omission events may be related to the fact that the subject can be more readily retrieved from the sentence structure in those languages which mark case on the verb, or which, as in many of the languages of the Pacific region, “have a separate set of subject markers...[which] mark the person and number of the subject and usually occur within the verb complex” (Lynch 1998: 103). There are fewer object markers, which is likely to reduce the opportunities for object omission.

In Pacific data, too, subjects are more than twice as likely to be omitted as objects. Over 41% of the 502 papers created sentences without a subject as opposed to 18% whose sentences left out an expected object. What is also interesting is the

appearance of the reduction of arguments in the national data, where some anomalies can be seen.

Table 5.1 Omission of arguments in Pacific data

| Country | % [-subject] | Average per paper | % [-object] | Average per paper |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Cook Islands | 27 | 1.3 | 18 | 2.0 |
| Fiji | 25 | 1.4 | 18 | 1.1 |
| Kiribati | 20 | 1.1 | 10 | 1.0 |
| Marshall Islands | 100 | 2.7 | - | - |
| Nauru | 25 | 2.0 | 50 | 1.0 |
| Niue | - | - | - | - |
| Samoa | 46 | 2.5 | 27 | 1.4 |
| Solomon Islands | 43 | 1.7 | 20 | 1.3 |
| Tonga | 42 | 2.3 | 11 | 1.3 |
| Tuvalu | 100 | 1.3 | - | - |
| Vanuatu | 30 | 1.7 | 42 | 2.3 |

In Nauru and Vanuatu, there is a higher percentage of samples which omitted objects than subjects. In the case of Vanuatu, where the difference is significant both in raw percentages and in events per paper, it is possible that the fact that Bislama marks the transitive verbs, for example, has led to an expectation of such marking of direct objects in English; when it is not present, there is an implication that the object can be omitted. In Nauru, however, the data comprises only four samples and given that the event per paper in the two cases is only 1.0, the probability is that this is a performance error. Among Marshall Islands' students, who numbered only three, all omitted subjects, and more than once per paper. Though this datum is very limited, it does suggest that subject omission may be more than a performance error.

There are patterns which can be discerned in this material, especially in the instances of subject omission. These patterns tend to be:

- a) Omission of the existential *There* and *It*
- b) Omission of subjects which are firmly context-based
- c) Omission of subjects after sentence adverbials
- d) Omission after subordinate clauses.

5.8.1 Omission of existential *There* and *It*

There and *It* are often existential: they cannot be readily translated into many other languages and thus do not have lexical weight. Their use, therefore, must be learned grammatically rather than semantically. Further, both words have identical forms which do have semantic value: the adverb *there* and the 3rd person singular neuter pronoun *it*.

Among Asian-Pacific languages, subject-dropping is not uncommon. Gupta (1986), Alsagoff and Lick (1998) and Tan (2005) refer to the pro-drop characteristic in Chinese which influences Singapore English (SingE). In Bahasa Indonesia, such omission is frequent in spoken forms, especially in response to questions, when “the subject is easily retrievable from the context” (Tan 2005: 166). In many Pacific languages, the subject of a sentence is marked by a morpheme attached to the verbal phrase; word order is relatively flexible, too, because marking identifies the subject, as in Tongan (Lynch 1998: 139):

Na'e 'alu 'a e tangata.

PAST go SUBJ the man: The man went.

These factors may, then, complicate the use of *There* and *It* which are neither grammatically nor lexically marked, nor likely to be phonologically marked by stress. As a result, the omission of these two as subjects is the most common feature of subject omission. Additionally, as *There is* is often perceived as a single lexical unit, if *there* is omitted, the verb *to be* tends to be omitted as well. Much the same can be said of *it is*, though occurrences are less frequent.

5.8.2: Omission of *It* or *It is*

M1:1 In this essay, [-] will explain the advantages.

Tu1:1 Also [-] is a very good chance for a new life.

T1:6 First point [-] will discuss is extended family helps to keep peace ('it' omitted 3 times).

- S1:2 In most parts of the world, [-] usually hold the family tree.
- S1:12 Secondly, [-] easy care because nuclear families contain just a small number of people.
- K1:6 [-] More comfortable in the house as one room for parents and the other for the children.
- V1:30 So whether [-] a good family structure or a bad one depends entirely on the individual or group members.
- SI 1:51 But usually [-] take time to finish both the clearing and planting.
- F2:11 For people in Fiji [-] is hard for them.

5.8.3: Omission of *There* and *There is/are*:

- T1:9 [-] No-one to stay home with the young kids. (This omission found six times.)
- K1:6 [-] More comfortable in the house as [-] one room for the parents and the other for the children. (omission of both *It is* and *There is*.)
- SI 1:4 Resources would be abundant as [-] less people to share.
- SI 1:7 [-] Lack of individual privacy.
- F2:81 [-] More people in the country so [-] more employment.

5.8.4 Omission of subjects which are contextually retrievable

Tan (2005) points out that there is a tendency for subjects to be omitted if the context means that the subject is obvious. This conforms to a feature that has been mentioned before, that of redundancy avoidance which, in these cases, conflicts with the rule in Standard Englishes that the subject of a finite clause can only be omitted if it is identical in form and function and reference to the subject of a prior conjoined phrase. There are clear examples in the Pacific material that when the context has already been established, writers feel less need to clarify the subject.

- Tu1:1 (Migration gives more job opportunities). Also is a very good chance for a new life.
- T1:11 (The extended family has many advantages.) Supply our family needs, our tasks for church and village.
- T2:2 There are racism in the country and seem to focus mainly on the Chinese.
- S1:10 (The extended family has members who can do many jobs.) Plant plantations and sell the produce to receive money.
- S1:17 Many jobs are there to be done and have little time to spend with their extended family
- V1:17 (Living in a nuclear family is better.) Can help them survived and can also do some savings.
- V2:9 (Bad traditional medicines have effects on people.) Will doubt the profession and will lose its customers.
- SI 1:39 (There are racial tensions in other countries.) Less likely one will see these things happening between different race in Solomon Islands.
- SI 2:10 (Local government acts to discourage migration) In Guadalcanal province, encourages people to attend a one-week long workshop.
- F1:29 Not only the nuclear family have advantages but also have disadvantages.
- F2:44 If they had stayed in the Pacific country, would be spending their lifes (without much money).

5.8.5: Omission of subjects following sentence adverbials

Exactly why sentence adverbials trigger the omission of the subject is not clear. It may be that the subject is seen as established because sentence adverbials are

generally modifying developments of topics; this includes *Firstly* which, in these papers, usually follows the essay's thesis statement.

T1:5 Last but not the least, [-] will consider the economic impacts.

T1:9 Therefore, [-] not required to have money to pay.

K3:1 Everyone needs rest to relieve anxiety, therefore [-] could help in reducing stress.

V1:32 Significantly, [-] may be due to culture.

V2:16 Then, [-] will have to wait till the current investor's terms are over.

SI 1:29 Therefore, [-] ruin one's chance to pursue individual options.

S2:18 Finally, [-] will set a scenario (sic) for future implications.

F2:12 Thus, [-] seen to be a waste as the graduant (sic) being qualified opts to work in another country.

F2:129 But, on the other hand, [-] gives rise to a new sickness.

5.8.6 Omission after subordinate clauses:

Sometimes the sentence created appears to lead the writer into dropping the subject: on several occasions a subordinating conjunction or prepositional phrase is used to open the clause which then reduces the likelihood that the clause following will be finite. Were that conjunction removed, the resultant sentence would be complete. For example:

S1:8 By working together takes the load of the family struggling.

Working together takes the load off the family struggling.

On the whole, however, these instances appear to conform to the redundancy avoidance pattern. The subject can readily be retrieved and is thus not seen to be essential.

- T1:15 And by applying this to everyday life, [-] will be a successful person.
- T1:28 When children are married and still decides to live with the parents [-] causes alot (sic) of problems.
- S1:14 As they feel that they would not relied on anybody else, [-] makes them concentrate and work harder.
- V1:4 If the situation does not improve, [-] can result in more difficult situation.
- SI 2:18 If (the vutu) goes through proper scientific tests, [-] can be recognized as a medicine.
- F2:7 Eventhough (sic) it is expensive, [-] is of high quality.
- F2:73 If a person migrates, then [-] can afford electric cooker.
- F2:89 If the published article could include pictures of the plants, [-] would be a great assistance to those who wish to explore these alternative cures.

5.8.7 Omission of the object (direct or indirect):

The transitivity of English verbs is variable: some consistently demand two arguments (a subject and a direct object); some require three arguments (such as *give* or *put*); some do not require a direct object at all – *flow*, *fly*, or *grin*. Others, however, are apparently transitive but can be used in certain contexts without a direct object – *know*, *understand* or *promise*, for example (Azar 1981; Liu 2008).

It is clear that the semantic retrievability of the object features in most cases of object deletion, and that redundancy avoidance is playing a role as well. However, certain verbs seem to attract the omission of the direct object, especially *discuss* (which in other contexts is often de-transitivised by adding the post-posed preposition *with*), and *enable*, and *give* which require three arguments.

- N2:3 The process includes collecting ingredients and then applying [-].

- T1:19 This in turn gives the family members [-] to do things at their own will.
- T2:8 They can argue on things and can solve [-] by themselves (sic).
- K3:8 The government should notify [-] that women should be enter in parliament (sic).
- S1:2 The aim is to examine it and discuss [-] from three aspects.
- S1:10 Some young women ...tend to have violent and abusive husbands who threatens [-].
- V1:2 This will enable [-] to shape oneself.
- V1:21 It will discuss [-] by listing advantages.
- SI 1:19 Extended family enables [-] to preserve one's identity.
- SI 2:39 Then a local herbsman gave [-] a cup of squeezed leaves.
- F2:1 Mothers sometimes collect leaves ...and give [-] to their babies.
- F2:12 One should leave one's birthcountry better than he/she found [-].

Other researchers into PECEs who have mentioned subject dropping are Kirk-Greene (1971), Tay (1982), Platt et al (1984), and Newbrook (1997). Those who refer to the dropping of objects include Mehrotra (1982), Tay (1982), Platt et al (1984), and Tan (2005). The data overall suggest that redundancy avoidance is a strong explanation of the dropping of both arguments in this L2 writing.

5.9 Conjunctions and cohesives:

The use of conjunctions is to “signal relationships and help the [speaker] to manage interaction while contributing little propositional meaning” (Schleppegrell 1996: 273). In writing, however, conjunctions mark meaning between parts of text. Coordinating conjunctions link ideas with equal semantic weight while subordinating conjunctions introduce a clause which modifies a main clause for purpose, cause,

comparison, contrast and so on. Cohesive devices link ideas semantically, marking the relationship between larger parts of a text. In academic text, cohesion ensures that an argument proceeds logically for the reader, and that the relationship between ideas can readily be recognised.

The principal difficulty with many cohesive devices in English is that the words or phrases do not generally have lexical meaning; it is only their placement within a text which provides that meaning. For example, it is somewhat difficult to describe the meaning of a word such as *Nonetheless* without referring to its role in text.

Logical relationships are important in English expository text and the role of conjunctions in marking those is also important. Many learners of English, however, often do not signal inter-sentential or inter-paragraph cohesion in a way that enhances easy comprehensibility. Research by Geva (1992) focuses on students' recognition of the role of conjunctions and cohesives in reading. She quotes (p. 733) other research that found that "non-native adult speakers of English do not exploit cohesive textual links sufficiently and fail therefore to comprehend expository texts adequately", and she quotes another source that concluded that "the comprehension of expository texts by university EFL students may be affected by an incomplete mastery of function words as much as incomplete mastery of content words". If learners are less proficient at recognising the function of cohesives, it is not surprising that use of cohesives is less effective in learners' writing. Clearly, this has implications for pedagogy.

5.9.1: Intra-sentential conjunctions

The main feature that is apparent in Pacific data is that intra-sentential conjunctions, especially *and*, are often omitted. An example is:

N2:2 (Turning to traditional medicine) is due to the financial crisis, the increased in economic changes, the chemical drugs than (sic) can be sometimes damaging.

This sentence structure is very common among these Pacific learners. Overall, 37% of all learners create compound sentences without utilising conjunctions. The highest

percentage of this phenomenon was found in Fijian students (48%) - Standard Fijian has no conjunction to join verb phrases and the one joining noun phrases is optional - and the lowest in those from Kiribati (22%). Papers from the Cook Islands, Tuvalu and Tonga showed rates per paper of 3 or more among those who demonstrated the feature. If, as Bhatt (2001) suggests, we should seek substrate influences and explanations for features, one possibility for the phenomenon of an absence of conjunctions, at least in some Melanesian writing, may lie with the chaining of clauses. Clause chaining means that certain clauses can be adjoined to one another without the need for explicit conjunctions (Lynch et al 2002). Of the languages listed by Lynch, Ross and Crowley (2002), some have a clear co-ordinating conjunction equivalent to *and/but*; others have a conjunction which means *and then*, carrying the addition of a temporal anchoring; and still others can chain clauses with no conjunctive morpheme although some have a clitic which marks the advent of the final clause.

Another possibility is that learners do not hear the use of *and* from other speakers of English because of the tendency for the word to be reduced to a syllabic consonant in a flow of speech. The reduced salience in speech then makes it less likely that these learners will recall the need for *and* in the written mode. Whatever the explanation, this is a common feature among other PECEs (Platt 1982; Platt et al 1984; Newbrook 1997; Y. Kachru and Nelson 2006). In Pacific data, many of the omitted *ands* would link a simple list of nouns [N, N + N]

T1:14 (They) can widely introduce brothers, sisters, cousins.

V1:7 My father's brothers, their wives, their children help out in carrying (sic) out duties.

S1:1 These reasons include the beliefs of the people that sharing, [-] living together is a happy family.

SI 1:41 The decision making, the problem solving are done by consensus.

SI 1:56 The brothers, cousins, uncles are there to work on the project.

F2:11 They will tend to suffer from diabetes, high blood pressure, heart attack. (similar structures used six times in this essay).

In other examples short clauses or phrases which could not stand as finite structures are chained:

T2:4 People broaden their views. [-] widen perspectives.

V1:6 They can send their children to better schools, [-] better health facilities.

V1:53 They share tasks like washing dishes, [-] sweeping the house.

SI 1:40 This may include having respect for one another, [-] sharing with one another.

F2:11 People will eat good food, [-] enjoy light work in offices.

F2:109 Some might be modernized with eating styles, [-] dressing styles, not respecting culture, [-] tradition. (Similar omissions four times in essay.)

There are other examples in which the conjunction is left out of a more complex collection of ideas which are presented as finite clauses. It is possible that what is occurring has less to do with the omission of the conjunction and more with the tendency to create comma splices. (See below Section 5.9.2)

T2:4 They come to Tonga with their American accent and attractive ways of cheating, [-] influence Tongan youths to become involved in dealings. (structure used three times).

K1:12: ...to gather information's about their own family, [-] wars between families in the passed (sic) days.

S1:16 A family of four is very supportable as there are few to be fed, [-] only two or three need to send (sic) to school.

S1:22 Customary traditions will survive family names will continue, [-]
land ownership will remain with rightful owners.

V1:6 A nuclear family can choose whatever religion they go to, [-]
responsibilities are shared among them.

5.9.2: Conjunction balance: (Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008: 74)

In this Pacific material there are over 120 examples of a feature mentioned elsewhere in research by Kirk-Greene (1971), Williams (1987) and Tan (2005). This involves the doubling up of conjunctions of contrast, of cause and effect and of supposition by using a conjunction with both clauses in such sentences. For example:

T1:5 **Although** the parents will be disappointed by this, **but** the story will not be spread out badly.

Overwhelmingly, the majority of these balanced conjunctions relate to contexts of contrast using *Although/but*, *Even though/but* or *however*, or *However/but*. In some Austronesian languages, particularly Indonesian and Malay, this is the norm.

Walaupun Ibu saya sakit, tapi dia masih tiba.

Even though mother me sick, but she still arrive.

Even though my mother was sick [but] she still came.

This would explain the form appearing in Tan's 2005 analysis of Singapore English which has been influenced by the presence in the language community of Bahasa Malay. However, no such patterns seem to be present in data from Pacific languages: Lynch et al (2002) and Krupa (1982) show that, where the conjunction exists, languages use a single conjunction equivalent to *but* which precedes the adversative clause. There is apparently nothing in the L1s which would lead Pacific learners to repeat the marker at the head of both clauses as they so frequently do. In Williams' (1987) view, these features reflect a tendency to "be clear": perhaps there is pressure in contexts of contrast, cause and effect and supposition to mark both clauses because each carries a different part of the proposition being expressed.

T1:7 **Although** there are disadvantages, **but** there will be ways in which to minimise these problems.

K1:3 **While** the place is not enough for them, **but** they can extend the house.

S2:4 The problem **is cause due to** the low level of income.

V1:23 **When** the mother and father left to go to party..., **so** the children are left at home.

V2:20 **As a result** of this **therefore** they decide to move.

SI 2:13 However, **although** traditional medicine is used as best and more advantageous than modern medicine, **but** there is no suggestion for not using (modern medicine).

SI 2:21 **Even if** people buy for traditional medicine **but still** it will be cheaper.

F1:5 **When** people are related **so** the sense of togetherness is more.

F2:72 Nevertheless **even if** the situation of industry collapse is controlled, **but** it increases the industry cost of hiring expertise.

5.9.3: Specific conjunction use

There is a tendency in Pacific usage for the word *Like* to be used to link an explanation or example with the proposition preceding, as a synonym for *such as*. Mugler and Tent (2004) refer to the expanded use of *like* in Fijian English but it is found more widely in the Pacific data. Overall, this usage is found in 21% of all papers and though it does not appear in data from the Cook Islands, Nauru and Niue, it is found in all other groups with Marshallese and I-Kiribati students showing higher levels of use per paper.

Table 5.2: Use of ‘like’ as conjunction

| Country | Total use % | Events per paper |
|------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Fiji | 21 | 1.7 |
| Kiribati | 56 | 2.9 |
| Marshall Islands | 33 | 4.1 |
| Samoa | 19 | 1.0 |
| Solomon Islands | 32 | 2.2 |
| Tonga | 21 | 1.8 |
| Tuvalu | 75 | 1.7 |
| Vanuatu | 14 | 1.4 |

In many cases where the word functions as an example signal, it is likely to trigger a sentence fragment or a run-on form:

Tu1:3 **Like** as we knew.

S1:20 It is very easy to get one leader to control the whole family in different issues. **Like** one leader has the mandate to own his family’s properties.

SI 2:43 They are available everywhere **like** for example some plants grow without our assistance.

F1:38 Less money is spent on the family **like** a saying goes plenty mouths plenty feed.

The use of *Like* has another function – as a marker of focus. In many sentences in this material, the word draws attention to the clause which follows it or, less frequently, to the one preceding it. In some of these instances it appears to function as a spoken pause to add weight to the comment to come.

K3:17 It is **like** somewhat shameful for a man to obey the advice of a woman.

V2:4 The medicine will cost **like** 50 vt.

V2:14 It has its negative side **like**.

SI 1:12 The importance of living in a nuclear family, **like** it help us learn simple vocabularies. (structure used three times in this paper.)

F1:7 Parents and children are **like** being isolated from other family members (also used three times).

F2:137 They have to spend **like** two or three months in the hospital.

This use of *Like* is heard in the informal speech of native speakers, including New Zealanders, but is common in television programmes which originate from the United States. This may be a possible explanation for the presence of the feature especially in urban areas across the Pacific, and it would certainly help to explain its rate of use per paper among Marshallese students whose society is heavily influenced by American culture.

Further, the phrase *Due to* is generally used in different sentence structures to those which might be expected. Most writers prefer to use *Because* or *Because of* and only 25 instances of the use of *Due to* were encountered, but in almost every case the phrase was followed not by a noun phrase but by a finite clause.

T1:18 **Due to some members of an extended family cannot fit in**, there is a need for more space to live in.

V2:22 **Due to modern medicine is more expensive** (people use traditional medicine) (used seven times in this paper).

SI 1:51 This has now changed **due to mostly the people in rural areas are moving into towns**.

F2:61 It will discuss that **due to better living standards in developed countries** has led people to migrate.

While *Because* is followed in standard Englishes by an adverb clause, *Because of* and *Due to* are prepositions and head a noun phrase (Azar 1981: 290). Students have clearly understood that *Due to* is similar semantically to *Because*, but they have

overgeneralised this similarity into the construction of *Due to* clauses rather than phrases.

5.10 Punctuation

The idiosyncrasy of punctuation use is not widely referred to by researchers in the field of PECEs; of the studies examined only Gupta (1986) and Newbrook (1997) mention this aspect of English use by learners. Yet punctuation has much to do with how sentence structure and discourse meaning is perceived.

The presence of run-ons, comma splices and fragments implicitly acknowledges the difficulties some L2 learners have with standard English punctuation. Nonetheless, on the whole, Pacific learners mark the beginnings and endings of sentences effectively if the ideas are distinct and not expansions or exemplifications of preceding ones. Run-ons, comma splices and fragments occur most often when a succeeding sentence is adding detail or explanation to an established proposition. What also stand out in the discourse punctuation of Pacific students are the use of capitalization and the use of the comma.

5.10 1: Run-ons and comma splices:

There are over 900 examples of these sentence forms in the data and in most cases they are identical in structure. Comma splice forms tend to use a comma in the place of an expected period while run-ons do not. All other sentence requirements are present.

Run-on:

V1:14: Traditional ways of behaving such as respecting older people for example young boys cannot go beyond (sic) what everybody has agreed on.

Comma splice:

T1:9: This is different when living with aunts, uncles and their children, it is hard to provide.

In the 912 samples of these structures, approximately two-thirds are comma splices (593) and the rest are run-ons (319).

Table 5.3: Comparison of run-on and comma splice rates

| Country | Run-on % | Per paper | Comma spl. % | Per paper |
|------------------|----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| Cook Islands | 54 | 2.5 | 63 | 3.7 |
| Fiji | 30 | 1.6 | 54 | 2.2 |
| Kiribati | 32 | 1.8 | 32 | 3.0 |
| Marshall Islands | 100 | 2.3 | 66 | 3.5 |
| Nauru | - | - | 25 | 4.0 |
| Niue | 100 | 2.0 | - | - |
| Samoa | 30 | 1.8 | 65 | 2.6 |
| Solomon Islands | 29 | 2.2 | 39 | 3.2 |
| Tonga | 46 | 2.5 | 39 | 3.2 |
| Tuvalu | 75 | 3.3 | 50 | 3.5 |
| Vanuatu | 24 | 2.2 | 50 | 2.2 |

The average rate of use per paper conceals certain individual extremes: SI 1:24 displayed 10 cases of run-on sentences, and T1:12, K1:13, SI 1:37, SI 2:23, F2:27 and F2:69 all demonstrated more than eight cases per paper of comma splices.

The majority of students used comma splices more often than run-on forms. This appears to be further evidence of the influence of the spoken mode upon the written: there are clear signs, in the use of the commas, that students appreciated that another idea was beginning but the closeness of the relationship between the ideas is such that they are blended together, as would likely be apparent in speech.

This aspect of running expansions, descriptions or exemplifications into the principal clause without a conjunction, period or semi-colon also appears to be triggered by certain words. Run-on forms most frequently follow *therefore*, *however*, *then*, *for example*, *so*, *thus* and *then*. *Then*, in particular, may be used in this way several times in a single paper. Comma splices occur most especially before *when*, *this*, *then*, *moreover* and *for instance*.

Run-on sentences:

- C2:7 The Rarotongan hospital is filled with qualified doctors although not of local descent they allow for the medical needs of society to be filled in.
- M1:3 This is because of the living separately of family members not only that, the gathering or reunion of family members nowadays is very complicated.
- S1:5 There are two kinds of family they are the extended family structure and the nuclear family structure.
- T1:17 Majority of some family survive from farming and fishing thus, it has become their everyday life.
- K1:11 This proves why living in a nuclear family is more advantageous than in an extended family however there are also disadvantages.
- SI 2:27 Remember, these things are not accounted for in the government's budget thus it will affect the government's tight budget.
- F2:26 The increase in population can also lead to more exploitation of resources of that country for example reclaiming of more sea areas is to build more houses.

Comma splices:

- M1:3 This is one of the advantages of a one type family, this is because members do not have to do hard works.
- S1:17 Emergencies occur endlessly, knowing that help is just next door is a great relief. (Five run-on structures)
- V1:19 In the South Pacific these features of society are being threatened by Globalisation and other foreign influences, therefore extended family

structures are an important element in the maintenance and strength of these things.

SI 2:17 Most traditional doctors guess the amount to be given, as a result it may cause an upset to the metabolic processes in the human body.

F2.112 However, there are some disadvantages too, one is that there will be cultural discrimination.

5.10.2b Fragments:

The writing of incomplete sentence units is common in the written texts of many L2 learners of English; it is not distinctive only of PECEs but they are frequent features of Pacific data. Overall, 69% of all students in this research provided examples of sentence fragments and generally several times per paper. It is not unusual for four or more examples to be found in individual papers and some show considerably higher rates: T1:32 uses 18 fragmentary sentences, one-third of all sentences written; T2:8 presents 23 examples, 18 of them after the phrase *For example*; and V1:18 provides 19 fragments after *For example*, *Example* or *For instance*.

Table 5.4: Frequencies of sentence fragments.

| Country | % of total | Events per paper |
|------------------|------------|------------------|
| Cook Islands | 63 | 4.2 |
| Fiji | 60 | 2.6 |
| Kiribati | 56 | 2.2 |
| Marshall Islands | 100 | 3.7 |
| Nauru | 75 | 1.6 |
| Niue | - | - |
| Samoa | 77 | 2.5 |
| Solomon Islands | 71 | 2.9 |
| Tonga | 86 | 4.5 |
| Tuvalu | 100 | 5.5 |
| Vanuatu | 70 | 2.7 |

There is a demonstrable pattern in the appearance of fragments. They do not appear in topic-introduction positions so are seldom found as topic sentences in paragraphs: the only exceptions to this are when ordinal numbers are used to introduce a new point. There are several triggers for the creation of sentence fragments. Firstly, they

are likely to provide examples of what has been discussed and so are most commonly used after *For example*, *Example*, *For instance*, *Such as* or *Like*. Other triggers with a similar role are *In particular*, *Especially*, *Same with*, *Thus* or *In other words*. This may well be a written reflection of speech patterns as native speakers of English often pause before introducing examples of what they are explaining and simply append the examples to the introductory phrase, as in: *There are several explanations for the crash [] for example the wet night, poor road lighting on country roads.* (heard in a Radio NZ police report.)

C2:7 For this to happen there must be some sort of motivatie (sic) devices to keep them here. **Such as** increased salary or even accommodation.

T1:22 They are influenced by other customs. **For example**, smoking or drinking alcohol.

S1:3 First of all the politics of the matai system.

V1:31 One of the disadvantages is that it is expensive. **Expensive in the sense** that when only one or two members holds a job.

SI 2:36 Different societies have different cultural belief systems. **Such as** the use of traditional medicine for healing.

F2:68 There is also an increase in the emerging ...of diseases. **Such as** flu, cough, whooping cough and diarrheal cases. (Seven fragments in essay).

Subordinating conjunctions are also likely to engender sentence fragments, the most common of which is *Because*, but other examples present are *As*, *Hence*, *Due to*, *Although*, *Whereas*, *If*, *Since*, *Unlike* and *Despite*, as well as relative pronouns. Once again, this may be related to the application of speech norms to the written mode, or to the ability of the context to provide a link with what has already been stated, either as development or as contrast. As a result, this could be viewed as another aspect of redundancy avoidance: if the fragment's meaning and role is clear, the obligation to complete the sentence is reduced.

M1:2 By caring to one's family without mining (sic) other relatives.

Tu1:1 When the number of people in a family is about 20 members. It causes...problems.

S1:6 Unexperienced of what a Samoan family should be.

S1 2:47 Because of its availability at all times.

F2:78 Bringing the outside world to peoples fingertips.

The final impetus for the provision of sentence fragments is of a different type because it seems to be connected less to a linguistic generalisation than to the ability of a learner to hold sustained stretches of text in the short-term memory. A relatively common root for fragments is the creation of a long, complex or multiply-embedded subject clause which is then not followed by a predicate:

T1:21 Matters such as the lack of space due to the number of people living together in the household.

SI 1:2 Lifetime experiences as well as the contribution of families not forgetting its effects on an individual.

F2:68 Fijian man taking part in fork (sic) dances being performed by white man and indeed the white men doing meke with the Fijian members.

In most cases this suggests that the writer has lost the flow of the thought in the lexical weight of the subject clause and does not realise that the thought is incomplete. Hinkel (2003) suggests that L2 learners, even able ones, are less likely to read back over written text for discourse sense or cohesion, being more likely to pay attention to surface features such as punctuation, spelling or inflections. As a result, learners are not well-equipped to deal with features of discourse unity.

5.10.3 Capitalisation

The use of capital letters to signal the beginning of a sentence is standard in Pacific data: in 1310 instances of capitalisation variations, only 15 involved the failure to use

a capital letter on the first word of a sentence. However, the rules in English for the use of capitals are many and complicated: the concept of proper and common nouns must be understood as must be the differences between the use of certain nouns generically and specifically – *street, building, house, doctor* and many others. It is not surprising that learners might find this aspect of punctuation confusing and difficult to generalise.

The features that are distinctive in the Pacific data are the failure to capitalise certain proper nouns and the use of capitals on common nouns and adjectives. The first is the less common of the group: only 167 examples were found of non-capitalised proper nouns. These tended to be not the names of countries but of nationalities – *tongan* (T1:22: 15 times) – or the region: *pacific islanders* (S1:7: four times) and *melanesia* (used widely).

By far the most frequently encountered feature was the capitalisation of common nouns and adjectives. In some cases, this additional use of capitals may have been sparked by the use of words from the title of the essay topics: it was very common for ‘Extended families’ or ‘Nuclear Families’ or ‘Traditional Medicine’ or ‘Such Advantages and Disadvantages’ to be found in these texts. However, the application of capitals was not only on words which appeared in essay topics. Student SI 2:22 used capital letters 83 times in that essay, capitalising every common noun and almost every adjective, and there were many other papers which showed capitals on common nouns more than 30 times. It is possible that students were using capitals on ideas that seemed important in the context, or words which may have seemed to require stress.

T1:2 ...and the **Paternal** uncles are important in the family. (Is this in contrast to maternal uncles?)

V1:4 Living side by side within their respective boundries in **Peace** and **Harmony**.

K3:17 There are **Gender** expectations.

SI 1:52 This happens within the **Extended** family even **Today**. (is there an implied contrast with the past?)

SI:58 According to well-known **Educators**...

Yet other decisions to use capitals seem more idiosyncratic: ‘Some Countries in Melanesia...’, ‘human Right systems’, ‘the Cousins..’, or ‘ the Children in the Family’ do not give rise to an obvious pattern. But this use of capitals was across all but two of the countries included in the data, and was generally found several times per paper.

Table 5.5: Idiosyncratic use of capitalisation

| Country | % of total | Average per paper |
|------------------|------------|-------------------|
| Cook Islands | 9 | 9 |
| Fiji | 40 | 4.0 |
| Kiribati | 28 | 5.9 |
| Marshall Islands | 33 | 3.0 |
| Nauru | - | - |
| Niue | - | - |
| Samoa | 42 | 2.8 |
| Solomon Islands | 61 | 9.3 |
| Tonga | 14 | 10.4 |
| Tuvalu | 25 | 14.0 |
| Vanuatu | 34 | 4.4 |

Overall, about one-third of all students used capitals more broadly than is usual in standard New Zealand written English and most tended to repeat the pattern several times in the essay. Slightly over half of those who displayed variant capitalising did so an average of 9.7 times per paper. Thus, the use of excessive capitals seems to be more than an individual error or mistake.

5.10.4 Use of commas

The use of commas in sustained written text in English seems to wax and wane, and the current tendency in New Zealand English is to reduce their use. Further, the rules for when the use of commas is obligatory, advisable or optional clearly confuse many native speakers and other able writers. Baron (2001) examines the history of

the developing use of the comma and describes one of the difficulties of use as lying with the conflict between the two theories of use: the rhetorical, which proposes that commas are placed where the speaker would take a breath or naturally pause in the process of reading a text; and the grammatical, which demands that commas should be tied to the grammatical structure of the sentence, separating ideas from each other. This conflict certainly appears to be present in Pacific data because some of the most unusual applications of commas divide grammatical features generally regarded as inseparable. Further, Baron suggests that when the primacy of speech governs an interpretation of the role of punctuation, the rhetorical theory is seen as more important; in communities which hold oral communication to be crucial to culture and tradition, such as those in the Pacific, it is likely that placing commas where a speaker of the text would pause or breathe is more comprehensible. The difficulty in generalising rules for the use of commas in academic text leads many students in this material to avoid using them at all. As a result, parenthetical phrases are often left with no distinction from the wording of the main clause. However, the data also reveal that these learners are clearly attempting to create rules for the use of commas, and there appear to be four distinctive patterns of use.

5.10.4a: Isolating the subject

In this use of the comma, the subject clause is separated from the predicate despite there being no parenthetical phrase between them. This is not only found in sentences where the subject is longer but also in those whose subject is a single word, so it does not appear to be related to a sustained subject which challenges the writer's ability to hold the sequence of words in the short-term memory. There are some possible explanations for this. The first lies in the tendency of these writers to vocalise sentences, which may be leading them to pause or take a breath before continuing. The writer has heard teachers telling students that commas are used where there is a natural pause in the sentence. The difficulty for anyone relying on this interpretation is the point that 'natural pauses' coincide with syntactic units in a sentence, not with the phrasing of an individual speaker. If a learner's phrasing patterns do not reflect those units, as is very often the case, this is likely to lead them into idiosyncratic use of commas.

The second explanation is connected with the topic-prominence sentence structure identified in Section 5.7. The inclination to isolate the subject of a sentence may be a device to emphasise either the topic of the sentence or the comment which follows. In the typical examples provided below there is a strong resemblance to the constructions found in topic-prominent sentences but without the pronoun copy. This structure, therefore, may be a variation of fronting.

Tu1:4 **One advantage of nuclear family, is** that it has a small number of people.

T1:19 **Many family in Tonga, sent** their children overseas to study.

T1:19 **Some of the children also, have** loosen ties with aunties, uncles and grandparents.

K1:9 **The main issue to be discussed, are** the disadvantages which are financial problem, health problem.

K1:20 **Family, generally** means a connection of individuals through genetic relations.

S1:3 **The highly respected village, gets to** chose from any of its respected families a member.

S1:6 **The extended family, gives them** a shallow understanding and knowledge of their family tree.

V1:8 **The nuclear family, is made up** mainly of only two generations.

V2:16 **Marijuana, is said to have been** brought in by foreigners and tourists.

SI 1:2 **Our future generations future, is** guaranteed.

SI 1:58 **Children of the same group living together, normally** play together.

F2:6 **Migration, will always** been an on-going phenomenon.

F2:27 **His statements, means** that the governments in Pacific should do something to curb the increasing rate of migration.

5.10.4b: Commas before lists and examples

This feature is very common in Pacific data and is likely to be an extrapolation of the use of the colon before bullet-pointed details or long lists of items. Secondly, a comma (or semi-colon which seems sometimes to be regarded as having the same function as a comma) is found after introductory phrases *including/includes* and *such as*, which seems to be an over-generalisation from the standard use of a comma before those phrases.

C2:7 **Advantages such as, better job** opportunities elsewhere, the need for skilled workers and a tool in the growth of economic development.

T1:14 The disadvantages will be explained **as such, the self-reliance of other family members ...**

K1:20 **...such as, making** a court order.

K3:13 Some of the ways a person can used **includes, making himself/herself entertained...**

V2:10 Some reasons could be from push factors **such as, employment, Political suppression (sic), entertainment and so on.**

V2:24 The **disadvantages as; the loss of family ties, family burdens ...**

SI 1:13 **...such as, it provide security** and protection.

SI 1:31 In Solomon Islands; extended family; can also help in solving **problems; such as; conflict.** (This paper replaces commas with semi-colons and over-generalises their use 47 times).

F1:27 The negative consequences of nuclear families **includes, the workload being very heavy.**

F1:42 Some disadvantages **discussed were, lack of moral support, no cultural education, ...**

5.10.4c: Commas after subordinating conjunctions

Sentence adverbs in standard New Zealand English are often followed by a comma:

Finally, the costs of migration are high.

In Pacific data, this has been extrapolated to a use with a wide range of subordinating conjunctions, especially (but not exclusively) when those conjunctions are in sentence-initial position. It is difficult to theorise about why this happens: they occur in places not usually perceived as a 'natural pause' but may reflect phrasing patterns.

N2:2 It can be a disadvantage **when, the medicine** person is very unlikely sure of what he is doing.

T1:5 **Although, the parents will be** disappointed... but the story will not spread out badly.

T1:6 Extended family structure is vital **because, it is relevant** to our culture.

K1:21 **Whatever, family commitments** you want to attend, the decision is yours.

S1:19 Money is the one and **only reliable tool; in order to live** and satisfy their needs...

V1:21 **Whenever, the parents are asked** to do anything... they always do it.

V2:16 **Not only this, but, their stay** also benefits mothers and girls at the market places.

SI 1:9 **So, eventhough, you prefer a nuclear family** but...who will you turn to.

SI 1:17 **Since, it is a modern structure,** most family spending are limited.

F1:36 **Before, colonisation our people have** lived in groups of extended families.

F1:41 **Since, the grandparents will not be living** in a nuclear family, there will be no one to provide moral education.

5.10.4d: Before or after *that* (or implied *that*)

The positioning of commas after *that* in complement phrases is mentioned by Gyasi (1991) who considers this a feature of Ghanaian English but does not offer an explanation of its likely source. It is possible that in these cases the use of the comma is related to the role of *that* as a subordinating conjunction. In other instances, commas are found before and after the complementiser, whether it is explicit, or implied in sentences where the complementiser is not present but is possible. The likelihood, once again, is that the writer pauses before structuring the complementary clause and gives that pause a visual identity in written text but there is also a perception of a natural semantic break between the main clause and the complement, even though this is not acknowledged by punctuation in standard Englishes. The use in these instances appears the most logical of the comma's varied uses in the data.

Tu1:4 The main disadvantage of a nuclear family **is that, children** would find problems of not knowing their close relatives.

T1:5 It is **understood, that when people** migrating overseas, they are parting from their immediate ones.

K1:13 **That means, it is occupied** by many people.

S1:1 The disadvantage **side shows that, do not depend** on your family.

V1:11 A disadvantage of one type of family **is that, it results in** not knowing relatives.

SI 1:11 One **advantage of family is, privacy** is maintained within the home.

F1:36 It also **identifies, that education** plays an important role in the values.

5.11 Use of the possessive

In English, the possessive morpheme ('s or s', which have three allomorphs: /s/, /z/ and /ɪz/) is attached to the possessor in written forms, the difference in form indicating the singularity or plurality of the possessor, or the possessive pronouns stand alone and precede the possessed item (and any adjectives which are preposed to that noun). This rule is not always controlled by many English L1 writers.

There are important differences in Pacific forms of possession. Firstly, many languages distinguish between *inalienable* and *alienable* possession. Inalienable possession is applied to those items which are intrinsically possessed – items such as body parts or kin – while alienable possession refers to everything else. In some languages this means that the possessive marker is attached directly to the possessed item, and in others the free possessive marker takes a different form (as in Samoan where 'o' signifies inalienable possession and 'a' alienable: Lynch 1998: 129). Still others have a complex system of classifiers to which the possessive structures are affixed. These classifiers establish the classes of things such as things edible or drinkable by the possessor, land and so on and the numbers of classifiers in individual languages can vary greatly. Possession attached to such classifiers is known as *indirect possession*, as opposed to *direct possession* which describes the structure in which the possessive marker is attached directly to the possessed item (Lynch 1998: 122-130).

Clearly, the English structure of possession is much simpler than that of substrate languages but it employs a marker identical to those for plurality and 3rd person singular present verb reference: three separate –s morphemes. It may be this varied use which makes it difficult for learners to identify the contexts in which the affix is required for possession. Among these data, an average of 55% of all essays showed different possessive patterns: in Vanuatu samples the figure was 60% of essays while the lowest display of difficulties with possessive structures was found in the Tongan data at 43%. The average rate per paper was 2.3 times. Students made one of three principal decisions in marking the possessive: firstly, they applied the –'s to any use

of the plural (which is increasingly found in New Zealand signage, especially at supermarkets: Apple's: \$3.00 a kilo), so that they produced forms such as:

T1:21: all of their **brother's and sister's** live together...

T1:29 ... **family member's** including **brother's and sister's and aunt's**.
(This paper repeated this structure five times.)

The two most common ways of dealing with the demands of the possessive were to add the -s to the noun but to omit the apostrophe, or to leave both the -s and the apostrophe off the required noun. Interestingly, they did not always turn the possessive into a periphrastic form as might have been expected among students whose languages have that form – as in ‘the canoe of my father’ – which would have eliminated the difficulty, but instead maintained normal English phrase structure, including long noun phrases as in “They have benefited a country of origin economy through remittances” (T2:4).

5.11.1: Use of -s but omission of apostrophe

N2:1 A concern is the abuse of **womens** rights.

M1:3 They rely on **one owns** family.

T1:23 ...copying the developed **countries** ways

K1:6 Other people stay with them such as **relatives** children.

K3:2 **Womens** health might be affected.

V1:11 They did not want to involve with **others** problems;

V1:19 Living in such families can hinder **ones** values.

SI 1:2 (There are) **ladies** groups and **mens** groups in the extended family.

SI 1:55 They are subject to the **chiefs** authority which is vulnerable to abuse.

F1:18 A child could end falling in love with the **mothers** brother or sister.

F2:142 One **mans** loss is another **mans** gain.

5.11.2: Omission of -s

T1:12 This means that both side of the **father and mother** side tend to keep the peace.

T2:4 They must go along with that **nation** policy.

K1:5 He interfere in his own **son** private matters.

K1:12 Their children will be like them, imitating their senior **people** actions.

V1:5 It contributes alot to shaping **someone** character too.

V1:24 ...in relation to an **individual** activities that helps in they daily life.

SI:32 ...the confusion that arises in **people** mind.

SI 2:41 (They work) to meet the younger **generation** desires.

F2:56 It broadens **people** knowledge.

F2:108 Traditional medicine really gets into the **body** system.

5.12 Register shift

Accomplished communicators in any language need to control a range of lexical choices, subordination strategies, cohesive techniques and text repertoires in order to be able to move easily from the generally informal registers of speech to the commonly more formal written registers, especially in an academic context. Silva's 1993 survey of research into L2 writing found evidence which suggested that L2 expository texts were "less consistent and academic with regard to language, style and tone" (p. 665), compared to writing by English L1 writers. This is apparent in much of the Pacific data in which more than 50% of writers overall shift register within the essay and, more significantly, do so several times.

Table 5.6: Frequency of register shift

| COUNTRY | % of TOTAL | EVENTS per PAPER |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Cook Islands | 63% | 8.3 |
| Fiji | 44 | 4.3 |
| Kiribati | 56 | 6.8 |
| Marshall Islands | 100 | 4.0 |
| Nauru | 75 | 4.3 |
| Niue | - | - |
| Samoa | 80 | 6.6 |
| Solomon Islands | 44 | 7.0 |
| Tonga | 49 | 7.0 |
| Tuvalu | 50 | 3.0 |
| Vanuatu | 52 | 3.4 |

One of the difficulties faced by writers in a L2 is undoubtedly a limited vocabulary range, both in width (the number of words known) and in depth (the range of synonyms available and retrievable). This means that L2 writers are likely to use the same lexical items more frequently, and the chances are higher that the only alternative for a particular common item will be an informal one. A narrow and shallow lexical range makes it significantly more difficult for a learner to present and sustain a formal mode of address, spoken or written.

Biber (1988) examines a wide variety of texts to describe the range of features likely to be found in particular types of oral or written texts. Academic texts are described as less interactive with fewer first and second person pronouns, direct questions and descriptive adjectives; more abstract with a high number of nominalisations, relative clauses, pied-piping, phrasal co-ordination and passive constructions; and less immediate with a wider range of tense and aspects. These expectations are not a consistent feature of the Pacific academic writing demonstrated in these data.

There are three principal ways in which students display a register shift. While all begin the essay in appropriately formal style, an average of 56% of students begin to address the reader in a conversational style. This is found in an increased use of the personal first and second person pronouns, by the use of conversational asides, and by the use of casual informal vocabulary items.

5.12.1 Use of personal pronouns

While the use of *I, me, my, you* and *yours* is discouraged in standard New Zealand academic writing, it is not an uncommon feature of American English academic text (Biber 1987; Connor 1996). The University of the South Pacific tends to follow British English expectations so advises students that the first and second person personal pronouns should be avoided. In these data the first person pronouns are often used to introduce a personal opinion – *I think..., in my opinion...*- which would be acceptable to some American universities but are less so in the British tradition of writing at university. However, the frequency of this use in this material is greater than merely for the introduction of opinions. Exemplification of points made relating to local cultural practices, which the essay topics certainly expected, were very personalised. Instead of generalising from personal experience to comment more objectively on Pacific cultures, students tended more often to limit examples to their own families or villages. Students T1:12, K1:19, S1:22, SI 2:53, F1:6 and F2:29, for example, used first person singular pronouns and possessive adjectives between 20 and 30 times, and K1:4 used them 39 times in an essay of 726 words. This bears out Hansen's research (1984) which found that Fijian, Indo-Fijian, Samoan and Tongan students are considerably more field dependent than students from Hawaii, and are less able to extrapolate from the specific to the generic or to use decontextualised examples to support arguments.

The second person pronouns (*you, your, yours*) represent a more direct appeal to the reader, and also have a quality which is more commonly found in speech: the generalised “*you*” which seems almost to be a first person inclusive ‘*we*’, found in:

K1:21 (In a nuclear family) Even though, you have commitments but you can decide for yourself.

Second person pronouns represent an increase in involvement, immediacy and concreteness, according to Biber's research (1987). In this Pacific usage, the second person pronouns do not address the reader; rather, they reflect an oral perspective common in speech which, in writing, is often adapted by using the third person

pronouns or the more difficult “one”. In the standard New Zealand tradition of academic writing, this use of *you* represents a change in register.

C1:5 Completion of studies is possible as **you** have more time and space in a nuclear family.

T1:12 It shows gratitude to **your** family by turning up and paying **your** respects to them.

K1:4 The more people **you** have in **your** family, the happier and contented **you** will be.

SI 1:9 Always, **your** family is **your** true support as long as **you** live.

SI 1:35 If **you** do not pay up school fees, they will see **you** as a selfish person.

F1:19 (The advantages) include being responsible for **your** family unit, the ability to send **your** children to school.

F2:108 **You** don't need to lie in a hospital bed...when **you** are taking traditional medicine.

Related to the use of the second person pronouns is the use of imperative statements which also have the effect of bringing the reader closer to the text. Students will have had considerable exposure to these forms, not only in the classrooms and distance learning materials in which the imperative is the language of instruction, but also in church and in bible readings where imperatives feature strongly. In academic text which is expository or persuasive and not instructional, however, imperatives are rare.

T1:24 **Give** the hungry people some food to eat. **Share** with them their sadness.

K3:7 **Do not worry** – problems are in family.

V2:13 **Be on alert** and taking nothing as new.

SI 2:31 **Take**, for instance, before the application of modern science to health.

SI 2:39 **Take** for an example a security guide getting attacked.

5.11.2: The use of conversational asides

In these structures, the writer makes a link with the reader which is strongly derivative of spoken tenors. This usage may owe something to the oratorical styles of church, especially of evangelical religious groups where appeals to personal involvement are explicit..

This includes answered rhetorical questions:

F2:112 **So what becomes of them? Well simply** they are left to struggle;

or addressed emphasis:

T1:21 **Yes**, there is a good side to living in an extended family.

S1:9 Living together does not mean in one big house, **no**, it simply means in the same area.

SI:16 All these are possible, and **yes** they exist in Samoa.

SI 2:28 **Remember**, these things are not accounted for;

or spoken hedges or exemplifications:

T1:15 (The sick person) is laying on, **say**, a couch.

T1:24 If the father leaves for another country, **say** leaving Tonga for Australia.

K1:17 It happens **let's say** in Kiribati.

S1:22 **Say** that ten or more people use the same bathroom.

V1:31 Too many families living together in an area, **say** two or three, and if, say, about three of them are employed.

F2:68 (They choose a career) **say** being an accountant;

and spoken fillers:

T1:14 **Well**, the extended family highly preserves ties between blood.

SI 2:15 **Well**, traditional medicine is a good form of medicine.

SI 2:56 **Well**, migration gives hope.

One consistent structure commonly heard in speech which in these data is transferred to the written mode is *not that* + adj – not that old, or not that friendly, used instead of the more formal [*not very* + adj]. This is often heard in New Zealand speech: the weather is ‘not that cold’, or something of an acceptable price is ‘not that expensive’. It is seldom, however, seen in New Zealand writing in a formal register. The use of this phrase in Pacific writing is another sign of a writer’s attempts to communicate more directly with the reader. This was particularly apparent in the written texts of Solomon Islands and Fijian students.

V2:4 But it’s **not that expensive**.

SI 1:4 Living in towns is **not that easy**.

SI 1:47 Discussions would **not be that co-operative**.

SI 2:34 Her in-laws are **not that important** as her mother or brother.

F1:22 Labasa has **not that many people** living there now as it was.

F2:30 We are **not that well equipped**.

F2:115 They may **not be that experienced** (used four times).

5.12.3: Use of casual informal vocabulary:

Some uses of very casual lexical items suggest that the writer may not be able to retrieve, or may not be aware of the need to retrieve, a more formal item of similar meaning, or that another term is not known. Casual language is generally that found in speech and the English heard on USP campuses features a good deal of informal

language. Engber (1995:141) examined second language learners' lexical choices in academic essays and found, not unexpectedly, that L2 users of English displayed clear differences from native speakers in that they wrote shorter essays, displayed "less variation in the vocabulary and less originality.., [and] little use of idioms and collocations" and she found that there was "a big difference between the number of individual words most frequently used by [learners] and [native speakers]". She also showed that lexical errors – word choice and use – impacted on the perception by readers of the quality of the writing.

These aspects are borne out by these Pacific essays: there is a reduced range of vocabulary with fewer synonyms being retrieved. Further, for learners to choose the word *children*, for example, over *kids*, they have to know that the latter is an informal register. Register, and the importance of avoiding personal pronouns, contractions and 'casual language' was part of the course these students had studied but it is by no means certain that they were able readily to distinguish casual from formal. Register appropriacy tends to be something gleaned from being intimate with the social demands of a particular society and culture, and not easily taught. The need for a register change can often be very subtle and must be picked up by social sensitivity. Many of these students appear to equate formality with 'florid' expressions or wordy constructions, rather than with precision of lexical choices. As a result, their written work is peppered with informalities for which they have no other lexical choice and the tone of the writing moves easily from formal to casual.

The word "stuff", for example, is used in place of a range of alternatives:

T1:26 There is lots of community **stuff** (to deal with). (obligations or tasks?)

SI 2:50...and other medical **stuffs**. (treatments?)

F1:10 ...how to deal with building **stuffs**. (materials?)

F2:75 But **stuffs** and medicines they made are still used. (used twice)
(potions or ointments?)

Other regularly used words and phrases include *stingy*, *hanging out*, *kicked out*, *take the country down the drain*. The most common single word used in this way was *hassle* (variously spelled *hassel*, *hazel*, *hustle*). Examples of the use of this word can be found among Samoan, Tongan, ni-Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and Fijian papers. Overall, one third of the papers displayed slang terms: 100% of Marshall Islands essays; 61% of Samoan, 50% of Tuvaluan, and 28% of Tongan, ni-Vanuatu, Fijian and Solomon Islander work. The only group which avoided any strongly informal language was that from the Cook Islands. Use per paper overall averaged 1.9.

In other cases, the more formal term does appear in the text but is not maintained throughout. This may be caused by the pressure of the examination and the timed context which makes it harder to sustain a more objective and distant tone and to retrieve the appropriate word when students were striving for variety. It also reinforces the impression that the differences between formal and informal lexical items are not fully grasped.

There are 93 instances of the word *kid* or *kids* being used instead of ‘child’ or ‘children’, and 12 cases of *the olds*, *grands* or *great-grands* being used for ‘the elderly’ or ‘grandparents’. *Moms and dads* is often used for ‘parents’ or ‘mothers and fathers’, and *pros and cons* (or *pro’s and con’s*) for ‘advantages and disadvantages’. In some cases this suggests a search for a term different from one already used; in others, strong feelings have apparently led the writer to use a common slang expression.

SI 1:46 (Referring to members of a family who will not share familial obligations) They are just **pathetic!**

F2:61 The (medical) standard here in Seaqaqa is so **pathetic** that everyone tried to leave.

Student F2:143, in defending the actions of the Fijian Police Commissioner who, in late 2006, was in a terse confrontation with, and later expelled by, the military coup leader, described the Commissioner as *not a headache*, meaning his actions did not warrant the treatment he received.

There appears to be a different relationship between text and readers among many Pacific students from that generally found among young writers of formal academic prose in New Zealand English. One could hypothesise about the greater reliance on oratory in Pacific cultures having a ‘flow-on’ effect in writing, but it is also clear that the written language displayed in many of the examples provided in the last two chapters does not suggest that the English being used is unnecessarily simple; complex and thoughtful ideas can be found in a wide range of these students’ writing.

The textual structure, however, does seem to be more conversational, immediate and personalized than would normally be expected in formal academic prose. Halpern (cited in Chafe and Tannen 1987: 388-389) found that spoken language “exhibited ‘parentheticalness’, incomplete parallelism in organization, tense switching and unclear pronominal references”, all of which appear in these Pacific texts. Biber (1988: 14) describes conversational text as featuring few passives, fewer nominalisations than verbal constructions, contractions and the use of first and second person pronouns so that there is a greater interaction between speaker and listener. Academic texts, he says, (p. 21-11) are integrated, meaning that they pack more information into a text through nominalisations, prepositional phrases, relative clauses, *that*-clauses and attributive adjectives; and detached, standing apart from the content by using passives, by not assuming shared knowledge and by using a wide range of cohesion to link ideas. He identifies six “dimensions” of variation across the cline from spoken to written modes; on all his scales, Pacific writers in this study demonstrate a greater degree of spoken genre qualities in their prose – what Biber describes as “real-time production versus edited production” (p. 132). Their writing, on the whole, was more interactive with personal involvement, displayed a higher degree of narrative description, was more situationally dependent, more persuasive at a personal level and less abstract than his factor assessment of academic prose would expect.

It is interesting now to consider whether the English constructions identified in this research can be said to represent the appearance of an independent variety of English in much the way that New Zealand and Australian Englishes can now be viewed –

setting their own standards and providing an acceptable language model within their own contexts. The next chapter will examine this question and consider what has led to the adoption of the differences in grammar, structure and tone that seem to be a part of these PECE learners.

CHAPTER SIX: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The data in Chapters 4 and 5 demonstrate that features are appearing in the written English produced by these students which differ from standard forms. All of the subjects have learned English as an additional language, but their experiences of the process of learning English have not been identical. For some, such as those in Fiji, English plays a role in their society similar to a second language because English is used widely in economic, political and educational institutions; for others, such as students from Samoa, Tonga or Kiribati English is closer to a necessary foreign language, often a *de facto* or *de jure* official language but one which does not challenge the security of mother tongues. In all the countries which have featured in this research, the adaptations and innovations from standard forms show similarities with forms found in other PECEs. Do they demonstrate the development in the Pacific of a distinctive variant of English and what might have led to these variations? This chapter will attempt to establish whether it is possible to claim that a Pacific English is appearing, and it will then examine some of the possible triggers for change.

Chapter 2 has discussed the ways in which the learning contexts for PECEs are distinguishable from EFL and ESL ones. EFL situations are similar to PECE experiences in that English is learned through education, but EFL learners do not live in communities where English has any particular relevance. English is a curriculum subject, seldom the medium of instruction. In traditional ESL situations, English is the *lingua franca* of the society in which learners live; as a result, they have both many native speaking role models and many opportunities to use the language as they acquire it. This differs from PECE contexts where English was once the language of colonial rule, but where English retains status because of its use in many official, administrative, media and educational environments. PECE countries have a distinctive historical and socio-cultural pattern to the development of English which appears to have affected its characteristics.

Chapters 4 and 5 have focused upon the language features which appear in these Pacific data, and have noted where such features are found in other PECEs. It is clear

that PECEs have particular historical and socio-cultural patterns in their development of English and that these patterns affect the characteristics displayed in English language use. Many of the linguistic developments attested to in Southeast Asia, South Asia and Africa are present in the samples taken from the Pacific, which suggests that similar processes are underway in each region.

TABLE 6.1: Features found in post-exploitation-colony Englishes

| FEATURES | Sth-east Asia | South Asia | Africa | Pacific |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Features associated with verb phrases: | | | | |
| A1. Reduced verb inflections | X | X | X | X |
| A2. Regularised past marking | | | X | X |
| A3. Variations of aspect marking | X | X | X | X |
| A4. Infinitives without 'to' | X | | X | X |
| A5. 'would' used for 'will' | X | X | X | X |
| A6. 'could' used for 'can' | X | X | X | X |
| A7. Reduced copula use | X | X | X | X |
| A8. Use of 'did/does' | | | X | X |
| A9. Passives | X | X | X | X |
| A10. Subject/verb agreement | X | X | X | X |
| A11. Proximity agreement | X | | X | X |
| A12. 3 rd person singular -s | X | X | X | X |
| A13. Modal + verb affixing | | | X | X |
| A14. Can + be able | | | X | X |
| A15. Progressives on statives | X | X | X | |
| A16. Placement of adverbs | | X | X | X |
| Features associated with noun phrase | | | | |
| B1. Omitted plural -s | X | X | X | X |
| B2. +s on uncountables | X | X | X | X |
| B3. Count/uncount modifiers | X | X | X | X |
| B4. Reducing plurals w. numbers | | | X | X |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| B5. -ing N | | | X | X |
| B6. Reduction of articles | X | X | X | X |
| B7. Reduction of pronoun gender | X | | X | X |
| B8. Reduced subjects | X | X | X | X |
| B9. Reduced objects | X | X | X | X |
| B10. Reduced possessive use | X | | X | X |
| B11. Simplified comparatives | X | | X | X |
| B12. Relative clause structure | X | X | X | X |
| B13. Preposition use | X | X | X | X |
| B14. Prepositional phrases | X | X | X | X |
| B15. 'That' complements | X | X | X | X |
| B16. Avoidance of 'There...' | | X | | X |
| B17. 'Already' as perfective | X | | | |
| B18. Semantic expansion | X | X | X | X |
| B19. Semantic compression | | X | | X |
| B20. Use of 'whereby' | X | | | X |
| B21. N + prep + N | | | X | X |
| B22. Use of 'very' | | | X | X |
| B23. Syntactic shifts | | | X | X |
| B24. Word/idiom coinage | X | X | X | X |
| B25. Reduplication | X | X | X | |
| Discourse features: | | | | |
| C1. Form of embedded questions | X | X | X | X |
| C2. Use of discourse adverbs | | X | X | X |
| C3. Resumptive pronouns | | | X | X |
| C4. Pronoun copying | X | X | X | X |
| C5. Fronting | X | X | X | X |
| C6. Doubling cohesives | X | X | X | X |
| C7. Reduced conjunctions | X | X | | X |
| C8. Punctuation variations | X | X | | X |
| C9. Sentence fragments | X | X | X | X |

Most learners in the four regions identified have acquired English after their first or mother tongue(s). It is therefore not unusual to find in the data commonalities of second language learning such as variations in the use of the copula, progressives, auxiliaries (in contexts such as aspect distinctions), articles, possessives, simple past affixation, 3rd person singular *-s*, the plural morpheme *-s* and pronoun case. But there is a greater degree of similarity than these characteristics alone. Others which can be found in all PECE regions are the use of:

- ‘would/could’ in place of ‘will/can’ (A5 and 6)
- *+s* on uncountables (B1)
- count/uncount noun modifier use (B2)
- reduced use of subjects and objects (B7 and B8)
- relative clause structures (B11)
- preposition use (B12 – which is probably better considered as a universal ESOL characteristic)
- ‘that’ complements (B14)
- semantic expansion (B17)
- word coinage (B23)
- the structure of embedded questions (C1)
- pronoun copying (C4);
- doubling of cohesives (C6)
- sentence fragments especially with subordinating conjunctions (C9).

A further set of features is found in three of the four regions, the exception generally being either Southeast Asia or South Asia; African and Pacific examples tend to parallel each other closely. This clutch of similarities includes:

- infinitives without ‘to’ (A4)
- proximity agreement (A11)
- progressives on statives (A15: not widely found in Pacific data)
- placement of adverbs (A16)
- reduction of pronoun gender (B6: also not common in Pacific data)
- use of discourse adverbs (C2)

- reduced conjunctions (C7)
- punctuation (C8)

Many claims for the distinctive qualities of regional Englishes have been made. Some of the researchers into particular regional Englishes, most especially into Indian English (Kachru 1982a, 1982c, 2006), Singapore English (Ho and Platt 1993; Gupta 1998; Wee 1998; 2002; Foley et al 1998) and South African Englishes (Mesthrie 1993; Schmied 1991; van der Walt and van Rooy 2002) now present arguments for recognition of these forms as stabilising dialectal variations of English in each place, and Kachru has proposed that some of these varieties can now present standardising forms which are regionally endonormative. The question now is whether the same claims can, or should, be made for the English structures presented in the data which are the basis of this research.

Pervasive features and tendencies

Szmrecsanyi and Kortmann (2009a, 2009b) examined a range of first language Englishes, second language Englishes (which were, in fact, PECEs), and pidgins or creoles, looking for commonalities and for what they referred to as “angloversals” – features which appeared to be distinctive of English in each of the groups. In their attempt to provide a solid framework for a claim of universal tendencies in Englishes, they suggested that in order to describe a feature as “pervasive” it had to be found “in at least 75 percent of any given set of varieties” (2009a: 1647). This is a useful definition to adopt in order to establish high levels of usage in the Pacific data. Further, any characteristic which appears in more than 60% of subjects might be described as a “tendency”.

Table 6.2: Percentage use in the Pacific of innovative structures

| MORPHOSYNTAX | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| FEATURES | % OF USERS |
| Subject-verb concord | 98 |
| Omission of <i>the</i> | 86 |
| Omission of plural -s | 79 |

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Pronoun use | 68 |
| +s | 62 |
| FEATURES | % OF USERS |
| Omission of possessive –s | 55.5 |
| Spelling issues | 54.5 |
| Use of the passive | 54 |
| Omission of <i>a/an</i> | 52 |
| Omission of copula in passive | 51.5 |
| Proximity concord | 49.5 |
| Omission of copula | 49 |
| Use of infinitive | 44 |
| Omission of past marker | 38.5 |
| + <i>ed</i> on adjectives | 31.5 |
| + <i>the</i> | 28.5 |
| Syntactic shift | 28 |
| Nominal use | 19.5 |
| <i>Would / could</i> | 17 |
| Double comparatives | 15 |
| Omission of <i>more</i> in comparatives | 14 |
| <i>Do + vb</i> | 12 |
| Modifiers on uncount nouns | 10.5 |
| <i>A for are</i> | 6 |
| LEXICO-SEMANTIC FEATURES | |
| Preposition use | 98.5 |
| Word use | 65.5 |
| <i>They/their/there</i> confusion | 29.5 |
| Phrase compression | 29 |
| <i>Like</i> | 24.5 |
| Idioms/standard phrases | 24 |
| Phrase expansion | 23 |
| <i>Do</i> as universal verb | 20.5 |
| Neologism / coinage | 18 |
| <i>Aunty / auntie</i> | 17.5 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|------|
| L1 words | 17 |
| Use of <i>whereby</i> | 9.5 |
| Confusion of <i>-ing/ -ed</i> | 8.5 |
| <i>Than / them</i> confusion | 8 |
| DISCOURSE FEATURES | |
| Fragments | 69 |
| Punctuation | 57.5 |
| Relative clause structure | 57 |
| Register shift | 56 |
| Run on / comma splices | 53.5 |
| Resumptives: subject | 48.5 |
| Fronting | 37.5 |
| Echoing | 37.5 |
| Conjunction use | 37.5 |
| Parallelism | 31.5 |
| Omission of arguments | 30 |
| Capitalisation | 24.5 |
| Resumptives; object | 19.5 |
| Embedded question structure | 16 |
| Two cohesive markers | 14.5 |

Relatively few features emerge as pervasive. However, the ones that do (subject-verb concord, omission of the plural *-s*, omission of the definite article, and preposition use) appear, in most cases, to be firmly part of Pacific usage. Those which be regarded as tendencies (pronoun use, fragments, addition of *-s*, and word use choices) are found more than twice in every user's work, which suggests that these items challenge learners and may firm in use unless pedagogical interference occurs. There is also a significant number of features displayed by between 50 and 60 percent of the samples, such as omission of indefinite articles, use of the passive, relative clause structure, and register shift, among others. It remains to be seen whether these become regional tendencies.

When the figures were compared across the data, some interesting contrasts appeared. Samples from certain national groups differed greatly in their use of several of the characteristics identified. Students from the Cook Islands, the Marshall islands, Nauru, Niue and Tuvalu demonstrated, generally speaking, lower rates of changed usage of many of the features discussed. It must be acknowledged that these five countries are represented by very small amounts of data, the largest single group being those from the Cook islands with eleven samples. Nonetheless, the differences were sufficiently distinctive to merit some attention. This group of countries will be labelled Group A, while Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu, comprising 480 papers, will be referred to as Group B. Only the most significant differences will be noted.

Table 6.3: Comparison of use across Pacific groupings

| FEATURES | GROUP A: 20 in total % OF PAPERS | GROUP B: 480 in total % OF PAPERS |
|---|---|--|
| Omission of plural <i>-s</i> | 68 | 90 |
| Omission of past marker | 29 | 48 |
| + <i>the</i> | 20 | 37 |
| Omission of <i>a / an</i> | 45 | 60 |
| + <i>a</i> | 10 | 32 |
| Use of passive | 43 | 65 |
| Omission of copula | 36 | 62 |
| Omission of copula in passive | 40 | 63 |
| + <i>s</i> | 51 | 73 |
| Syntactic shift | 40 | 16 |
| Omission of <i>more</i> in comparatives | 5 | 23 |
| <i>Thing</i> as universal noun | 2 | 17 |
| Word use choices | 49 | 82 |
| Use of L1 words | 0 | 18 |
| Spelling variations | 43 | 66 |
| Phrase compression | 12 | 46 |
| Phrase expansion | 11 | 35 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----|----|
| Run on / comma splices | 66 | 41 |
| Capitalisation | 13 | 36 |
| Embedded question structure | 10 | 22 |

Except in syntactic shift and sentence structures using run ons or comma splices which are more commonly found in Group A samples, all other features are more widely demonstrated by writers from Group B, sometimes by considerable margins. Even among rarer features such as the doubling of modals (5%: 12%) or *then / than* confusion (5%: 11%) the same trend can be found.

One possible explanation for this difference may lie in the special relationships between the countries of Group A and ex-colonial authorities in the Pacific. Cook Islands and Niuean students can reside in New Zealand at will and can readily access the New Zealand education system. New Zealand authorities are advisors to schools in both countries, and both use the New Zealand qualifications framework to assess their high school students, having chosen not to withdraw from the Pacific Secondary School Certificate established by the South Pacific Board of Educational Assessment. In the case of Nauru, the education system has reflected that of the Australian state of Queensland in recent years. Australia provides much of the teacher training and the influence of Australia on many levels of Nauruan society is considerable (Connell 2006).

The Marshall Islands is politically and administratively in a Compact of Free Association with the United States whose education system influences Marshallese education. U.S. funding for vernacular language development and maintenance in education has reduced and the provision of American standard basal readers is the norm. The college of the Marshall Islands is a registered United States institution and must therefore comply with the federal requirements for English language curricula. Public sector employment generally in the Pacific presupposes some proficiency in English, and in the Marshall Islands 60% of the workforce is employed by the government. The influence of American English on Marshallese students is evident in their speech.

Tuvalu does not have any formal “special relationship” with either New Zealand or Australia, though it does rely heavily on donor support from both and perceives them as the places of refuge should Tuvalu succumb to sea level rise. However, there is no Year 12/13 (Form 7 or the final matriculating year) equivalent in Tuvaluan high schools and students who wish to go to university have to leave Tuvalu to attend high schools elsewhere. Several still go to Australia or New Zealand but increasing numbers have travelled to Fiji because of the lower costs (Ielemia 1996). As a result, there are other influences on the English of these students.

Students from the other, larger Pacific nations, Group B, have a greater opportunity to demonstrate whether there is a discernible Pacific variant of English. All have a similar involvement with the British Commonwealth; all, as Chapter 2 has shown, continue to treat English as a prestige language with a role in several areas of local society. These nations also have larger populations and as they are generally less urbanised than the first group, there are smaller percentages of the populations with ready day-to-day access to English and a reduced need for the population as a whole to use it for daily interactions.

Table 6.4 Population data for USP clientele nations.

| | Population 2010 (rounded) | Urban population % | Urban numbers (rounded) |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cook Islands | 15,530 | 72 | 11,200 |
| Fiji | 847,795 | 51 | 432,400 |
| Kiribati | 100,835 | 44 | 44,300 |
| Marshall Islands | 54,439 | 65 | 35,400 |
| Nauru | 9,980 | 100 | 9,980 |
| Niue | 1,490 | 36 | 530 |
| Samoa | 183,125 | 21 | 38,500 |
| Solomon Islands | 549,600 | 16 | 87,900 |
| Tonga | 103,575 | 23 | 23,800 |
| Tuvalu | 11,150 | 47 | 5,250 |
| Vanuatu | 245,000 | 24 | 58,800 |
| Data: www.spc.int/sdp/index.php 2010 | | | TOTAL: 748,100 |

The definitions of “urban” are somewhat flexible: it would be hard to distinguish urban from rural on Niue, and most villages in Samoa would have electricity, TV and telephones, and ready access to roads. Further, these figures do not mean that all those described as urban dwellers regularly use English, but urbanised populations do have generally easier access to English language media, and as administrative departments and a range of larger high schools tend to be found in capital cities or in larger towns, the likelihood that English will be encountered increases. Overall, 66% of Group A populations are in “urban” contexts, whereas an average of only 23.5% of Group B countries’ populations lives in towns or cities. Rural schools on the whole do not attract the most able teachers or the ones who are the most capable speakers of English (and in many Pacific countries teachers are assigned to positions rather than choosing them), so the English being provided in rural schools is less likely to be of standard form, and code-switching or more widespread use of the indigenous languages is likely in the classroom, regardless of government policy (Tamata 1996; Ielemia 1996; Liu 1996; Thaman 1996; Siegel 1996; Mugler 1996; Huffer 2006). The English that appears in Group B countries is less influenced by contact with native speakers and is therefore more likely to begin to show signs of local linguistic adjustments.

Pacific English – or not?

Are these developments comprehensive enough to suggest that the English used in the Pacific is already a distinctive variant form? Gorläch (1998:20) posed the question that bedevils anyone who undertakes “world Englishes” research: “how many features must there be, and how regularly must they be present, to make up an entity that we would like to call X-ean English?” Bamgbose (1998: 3) added further focus:

Is it restricted to a part of a country (*or region: GG*) or is it becoming widespread irrespective of first language background? ... How many people use it? How widely dispersed is it? Who uses it?

Some of those questions have been answered. Many of these variations are very widespread across many thousands of square kilometres and without necessary

reference to first languages. It is not used by many millions of people: only about 2,100,000 people live in the region under discussion and English is not needed at all by large numbers of rural dwellers; it is readily possible to meet people in rural areas of Fiji, Samoa, Vanuatu and Tonga who do not speak English. Even if the 40% of the regional population which lives in urban centres is generally regarded as being able to communicate at some level in English, the total number of potential “users” of English may be only a little under 300,000. More effective speakers of English are likely to be in such occupations as tourism and hospitality, media, medical and educational occupations, but only very few would be likely to function in English all their working days or at home.

Bamgbose (1998) points out that unless features being described occur in the speech and writing of acrolectal users, those features are likely to be viewed as simply non-standard. Though the use of the terms ‘acrolect’, ‘mesolect’ and ‘basilect’ are generally associated with the study of creoles and post-creolisation, they are useful to describe the range of second (or *n*th) language use in a particular community, and they recognise that users may move up and down the proficiency cline depending on what they are discussing and with whom in any specific context.

A basilect is the form, generally spoken only, which is closest to a pidginised variety with simplified grammatical forms and a relatively narrow lexical range, while an acrolect is closest to the standard form of the related language, and the mesolect occupies a position somewhere in between. An acrolect does not imply that it is “near-native” in relation to the target language but, being closest to that standard, is found in “those at the top of the social hierarchy or with the greatest educational status” (Llamas et al 2007: 205). It is the language form that is likely to provide the norms for the standardisation of use of a particular language or dialect.

The Pacific users of English who have provided the data for this research should be viewed as acrolectal users. They are all university undergraduates; all had matriculated from their varied secondary school systems or had completed pre-tertiary Foundation courses. Many of them held scholarships from their respective governments, from regional donors or from regional non-governmental

organisations. They are young adults at the top of the regional academic ladder. Those students questioned on this issue all saw themselves working in the future as teachers, lawyers or civil servants, or as continuing their education or professional fields overseas. Therefore, they cannot be described as uneducated users of English: they are being taught to recognize and use the specific style of formal English common in the university; they can use English to discuss and write about academic topics, with varying proficiency, and thus occupy positions on the acrolectal end of the cline of English language use in the region.

The data these students have provided do offer clear evidence that changes are underway in the English used in the Pacific and that the changes are stronger and more definite in those countries which no longer have such close political and administrative links with the English-as-a-first-language countries on the edge of the region as once they did. It seems likely, or at least very possible, that the features currently identifiable as distinctive in the English of the Pacific will stabilise and spread within the region. It is certain that many of the changes discussed in this paper are far more than simple lexical adoptions from the vernaculars, and that several characteristics considered are at the border of lexis and grammar, a sign that ‘indigenisation’ is in process.

But what moves a usage of English from purely a non-standard form to a “variety of world English” (Bunton and Tsui 2002: 65)? Bunton and Tsui cite Butler 1997 in examining five criteria which the latter uses to define a variant. The first is accent, which this research, based on written data, does not consider. The second is vocabulary, which focuses upon words and phrases to “express key features of the physical and social environment and which are regarded as peculiar to the variety” (Bunton and Tsui 2002: 65). Apart from terms which are taken directly from local languages, this research has provided samples of idioms and phrasings which are distinctive of English in the Pacific region.

The third characteristic is history, the sense that past experiences have been responsible for moulding the language of the community in a particular way. Chapter 3 has shown that all the eleven countries whose students provided language samples

had very similar experiences with colonial governments, and were never exposed to sustained longterm settlement by English L1 speakers. While the periods of colonial control vary greatly from place to place, the relationships between indigenous peoples and traders, missionaries and colonial authorities are not dissimilar.

Butler's fourth deciding quality of a variety of world English is literary creativity. There is no question that Pacific writers who write in English are reflecting the language they hear and use in daily life. There is also no suggestion that the regionalisms being used are in any way sub-standard or "wrong" – they are recognized as local. Authors and poets such as Grace Molisa, Mohit Prasad, Konai Helu Thaman, Larry Thomas, Joseph Veramu and Albert Wendt, to name but few, are widely respected within and outside the region.

This would suggest that the English used by the acrolectal users at the heart of this research is indeed a variant of world English. However, the final criterion quoted by Bunton and Tsui is "reference works: 'dictionaries and style guides – which show that people in that language community look to themselves, not some outside authority, to decide what is right and wrong in terms of how they speak and write their English'" (2002: 65). This mirrors Bamgbose's suggestion (1998: 4) that "codification" and "acceptance" are the crucial test of the validity of a new variety. Without these, he states, any differences from standard forms will continue to be seen as non-standard and errors.

There is no sign yet that the structures discussed in this research are establishing themselves as endonormative in the Pacific, especially in formal written text. Local newspapers, especially in Fiji, Samoa and Vanuatu, not infrequently lament the standard of English language use in their respective countries, and the Law faculty of USP, based in Vanuatu, fields complaints from regional law firms about the quality of law graduates' English writing (Jowitt 2007: pers. comm.). It may be that spoken variants are accepted as long as comprehensibility is not challenged, but written forms are still expected to conform to the standards seen in British/New Zealand /Australian formal written English.

Schneider's 2007 analysis of post-colonial English proposed a series of five phases to describe the movement in a contact system of English from standard to localised forms. His Phase 1 is the foundation of English in a country where English has been imposed by trade links, sometimes involving the use of a pidgin English, and colonial experience and where, generally speaking, the colonising authority does not "bother to learn indigenous languages" (p. 34). Phase 2 he refers to as "Exonormative stabilisation" during which English is "formally established as the language of administration, education, the legal system, etc..." (p.36). Knowledge of English becomes something to strive for because it offers economic opportunity. Innovations, he suggests, (p. 40) "are likely to spring and unfold slowly and inconspicuously, without being consciously observed as yet". This phase can clearly be found in the Pacific already where expressions and usages which differ from standard forms can be found in the columns of newspapers and attract little comment.

Phase 3 is termed "nativisation" during which the society begins to establish and be aware of its own identity. This phase is characterised by a gradual erosion of the difference between standard and indigenous forms as local items of lexicon or syntax become accepted into general use. Schneider identifies some which certainly also appear in Pacific data: set phrases (as in *Last but not the least*); new compounds (such as *help-lending hand*); prepositional use (*discuss about* or *to pick* for 'to pick up'), and noncount nouns with plural suffixes (*furnitures, equipments*) (2007: 46-47). He also mentions code-switching as a "distinct phenomenon" (p. 47), something which is common in Pacific schools (Tamata 1996; Thaman 1996). This latter feature of the variants of English now beginning to appear will become "the main linguistic trend of the 21st century", according to Crystal (2004: 30).

Schneider points out that at these stages, "new" Englishes tend not to be codified, an important step before such a variant becomes endonormative, setting its own standard and nonstandard structures. A dictionary of English in Fiji has been produced (Geraghty, Mugler and Tent 2006) but no others as yet. Such dictionaries are initial steps towards recognition and stabilisation of local characteristics. Similar steps may be possible in other Pacific countries in the future but as relatively few yet

have even monolingual dictionaries of their primary languages, a focus on English in these countries would not seem to be the current priority (Early 2004).

Codification is not the only measure of acceptability. “The authoritative factor relates to the actual use or approval of use of an innovation by writers, teachers, media practitioners, examination bodies, publishing houses, and influential opinion leaders” (Mufwene 1997: 4). Though establishing approval of use will likely require acceptability tests, it is clear that teachers, some English language newspapers and certain works of recent literature can provide many samples of language use similar to that described in this research, either because their differences from standard forms are not recognised or because a writer is creating a sense of the local language context which is, in itself, an acknowledgement that local variants are in common use. However, these features do not appear to be generally accepted in examination systems, a fact which suggests that the English of the region tends still to be exonormative.

In his model Schneider refers to Phase 4 as “endonormative stabilization” which, he points out (2007: 48), does not necessarily coincide with independence. He believes this stage requires the trigger of a significant event which firmly separates the ex-colony from its attachment to the colonial master. Though several Pacific nations have strong senses of their unique identities, it is also generally clear that close relationships with the Commonwealth (or to the United States in the case of the Marshall Islands) are held dear. Phase 4, Schneider claims, is evidenced by the writing of dictionaries of local English(es) and “grammatical description” (p. 56), factors which have not appeared widely in the Pacific.

Phase 5 involves the development of intra-national dialects unchallenged by reference to external norms, caused by variations in internal social and/or ethnic networks. Though there are signs in some parts of the Pacific of “Chinese English” or “Indian English”, Schneider’s assessment of Fiji, the only Pacific nation other than Australia and New Zealand whose English use he has analysed, is that it remains at Phase 2 with weak signs of potential movement towards Phase 3.

Schneider's model and examples (p. 116-118) show that the process of nativisation is underway in the Pacific and that a regional variant of English is developing. If his view of the importance of endonormative stabilization is accepted, reflecting Bamgbose's emphasis upon codification and acceptance, then Pacific English in its written mode cannot yet be said to be a fully-fledged variant of world English. The clashes between those who can accept some of the innovative forms and those who cannot are still alive and active in USP and in the professional sphere in the Pacific. Nonetheless, language will continue to change and "in the course of time, the readiness to accept localized forms, *gradually also in formal contexts*, increases inexorably" (Schneider 2007: 43. Emphasis added). The process is clearly in train, as it is in Southeast Asia, South Asia and Africa.

Causes and effects of change.

So what has given rise to the degrees of commonality found across such a range of distances, cultures and substrate languages in the South Pacific? What links English in the Pacific with Englishes found in West and East Africa or India or Malaysia? Since the mother tongues across such regions are so varied, so unrelated, the answer to these questions seems to lie with the process of contact – how English entered these communities, was employed, and has been acquired after independence. Four principal explanations are offered: reduced input, teaching methodology, transfer phenomena and simplification.

a) Reduced input:

English was introduced and sustained in these colonies in a different way from that in first diaspora countries, the difference being chiefly socio-cultural. It has already been established that the experience of exploitation rather than settlement colonialism is one vital component of the development of these varieties of English. Firstly, many of these colonies were among the last to become part of the British Empire. This meant that the length of time of colonial control was less than four generations (if a generation is taken to be about 25 years). Further, changes in the political fortunes of some colonial powers in the 20th century meant that some Pacific island groups experienced a change in imposed colonial language: several were first

controlled by Germany, and the Marshall Islands had contact with three external authorities – Germany, Japan and the USA.

Table 6.5 Colonial experience in the South Pacific region.

| COUNTRY | Date of acquisition | Colonial power | Date of independence | Yrs of colonial experience |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Cook Islands | 1888-90 | GB: annexed to NZ | 1975: self-govt in association with NZ | 75-77 |
| Fiji | 1874 | Great Britain | 1970 | 96 |
| Kiribati | 1892 | GB: protectorate | 1979 | 87 |
| Marshall Islands | 1886 1914 1945 | Germ. protectorate Japan U.S.A. | 1986: Compact of Free Association | 28 31 41 |
| Nauru | 1888 1918 | Germany GB: administered by Australia | 1968 | 30 50 |
| Niue | 1901 | GB: administered by NZ | 1974: self-govt in association with NZ | 73 |
| Samoa | 1886 1920 | Germ. protectorate New Zealand | 1962 | 34 42 |
| Solomon Islands | 1884 1900 | Germ. in north; GB in south All ceded to GB | 1978 | 16 78 |
| Tonga | 1899 | British protectorate; not annexed | 1970: independence restored | 71 |
| Tuvalu | 1892 | British protectorate | 1975 separated from Kiribati. 1978 independent | 86 |
| Vanuatu | 1906 | Condominium between France and GB | 1980 | 74 |

(Abbreviations: GB = Great Britain; Germ. = Germany; NZ = New Zealand; USA = United States of America; govt = government)

These figures demonstrate that the British colonial period in these countries was longest in Fiji, but in the Marshall Islands and Samoa sustained contact with English before independence was less than two generations. This can be compared with several African countries where similar socio-political histories exist. Cameroon, Tanzania and Namibia were German colonies until the end of World War I, at which point the League of Nations handed their administration to Great Britain/France, Great Britain and South Africa respectively. The majority of other British colonies in Africa became colonies in the 1880s and 1890s. The periods of British colonial or protectorate control ranged from 42 years in British Cameroon to 158 years in Ghana, but the average period overall was 68 years, or somewhat less than three generations (McArthur 2002).

Regular trade links with the Pacific region by English traders (among others) began between the 1820s and 1840s, and brought Pacific people into contact with a wide range of accents and dialects. This experience, too, is one found in Africa. Mesthrie (2003: 453) suggests that “the shape of the superstrate [of PEC Englishes] should not be taken for granted” because it comprised a very wide range of inputs. He notes further that the standard English of the time was very different from that of modern times; he claims (p. 455) that some of the forms currently found in PEC Englishes and English-based pidgins and creoles were normal features of the speech of 19th century traders. More importantly, given the role they played in the development of English in exploitation colonies, he provides evidence that missionaries came into the colonies from a variety of language backgrounds and were likely to have passed on linguistic regionalisms. Much the same is true of the Pacific (Campbell 2003:83).

The influence of missionaries is particularly important because for the first several decades of colonial control, education was in the hands of the missions which had established local primary schools as soon as the various denominations began their work in the region. The principal aim of mission schools was to provide literacy in local languages wherever and whenever possible so that new converts would be able to read a bible translated into those languages (Campbell 2001; 2003; Mangubhai 2003; Mühlhäusler and Mühlhäusler 2005). It was only when the colonial

governments were forced to take responsibility for education that the emphasis on local languages gave way to education in English.

Table 6.6: Roles of mission schools and government in education, and of English medium education in the Pacific.

| COUNTRY | Mission schools first established | Colonial govt. takes over education | English as medium of instruction (MOI) | Yrs of English lang. as MOI by age 14 today. |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Cook Islands | 1821- 28 | 1920 | 1920 | 8-9 |
| Fiji | 1855 | 1916 | 1930s | 5 |
| Kiribati | 1874 | 1962 | 1978: secondary sch. | 2 |
| Marshall Islands | 1857 | 1945 | 1945 | 8-9 |
| Nauru | 1860s | 1923 | 1948 | 8-9 |
| Niue | 1840s | 1901 | 1945: secondary sch. | 8-9 |
| Samoa | 1830 | 1923 | 1924: govt. schools | 2 |
| Solomon Islands | 1861- 70 | 1939 | 1960s: govt. schools | 8-9 |
| Tonga | 1828 | n/a | 1927: secondary sch. | 2 |
| Tuvalu | 1860s | 1962 | 1978: secondary sch. | 2 |
| Vanuatu | 1839 – 48 | 1906 | 1960s: in all English schools | 8-9* |

(* Exclusionary examinations reduce the numbers advancing to middle and secondary schools. Note also that English is introduced as a curriculum subject in primary years in Kiribati, Samoa, Tonga and Tuvalu.)

In the majority of Pacific countries, government control did not occur until well into the 20th century; even the establishment of Departments of Education did not necessarily signal the government's intent to assume control of education. The only early and thorough conversion to English as the language of instruction occurred in the Cook Islands beginning in 1920. For the rest, this step was often taken much later, either after World War II when preparations for independence became a concern, or at independence itself. Often this introduction of English-medium learning was started in secondary schools only, and costs were kept down by employing Australian and New Zealand teachers, many of whom were on contracts paid for by their own governments. The use of Australian and New Zealand teachers reflected the view that English could only be taught by native speakers. (Benton 1981; Watson-Gegeo 1987; Baldauf Jr. and Luke 1990; Campbell 2001, 2003; van Trease 1993; Lotherington 1996, 1997, 1998; Mangubhai 2003; Baldauf Jr. and Kaplan 2006).

Crocombe's figures (1992: 99) on New Zealand teachers in Pacific communities support his claim that something over 150,000 students in Polynesia and Fiji are likely to have been taught by New Zealanders serving on government-to-government schemes. This contact would have been in senior high schools and teacher training colleges to which only a very small percentage of the population of the region would have had access. Nonetheless, these teachers left a legacy of good English standards among those who did well in education. The first generation of leaders in most, if not all, Pacific nations at independence demonstrated this clearly. At independence the majority of contracts with English teachers from abroad ended and local teachers took their places. Thus any lack of linguistic attainment in English may reflect the linguistically insubstantial socio-historical relationships between a colonised society and relatively few colonisers and the even fewer opportunities for contacts with native speakers since independence; research by Rainey in Fiji has shown that older subjects (those over 50 years of age) tended to have more standard forms in their speech and writing than those under 30 (Rainey 2009: pers. comm.). It can therefore be assumed that learners' experience with English through education, before and after independence, represents a condition of reduced input.

Theories of input usefulness have focussed on what makes input contribute to acquisition. Krashen's Input Hypothesis (Krashen 1977) claimed that the essential quality of input was its comprehensibility but that learners had to monitor their learning to make conscious use of new data. Long (1983, 1990, 1996) proposed that input was only available for acquisition if learners negotiated meaning to test the input's comprehensibility and structure. A further development was proposed by Swain (1993) who suggested that real advances in acquisition occurred when learners were required to structure responses to input (which is my own experience as an adult language learner). All three of these hypotheses make a strong link between input (the raw material for hypothesis testing) and the *need* to use it in some way, and all three suggest that interaction should be meaningful, not merely a repetition of structures. So it is relevant to ask, as Ellis (1996: 244) has done, what the characteristics are of the input which, in this case, Pacific learners typically receive today.

English is taught initially as a foreign language curriculum subject in most, but not all, communities in the Pacific. It is a small part of an often crowded curriculum and is learned for three or four hours a week. Early content learning and, more importantly, basic literacy may be established in the vernacular in these cases, though it must be recognised that the vernacular used may not be the home language of many children in Fiji or the Cook Islands where standard rather than local forms of vernaculars are used, or in the multilingual Solomon Islands or Vanuatu where few children are offered the opportunity to acquire primary literacy in mother tongues. Moreover, such basic literacy may be passive because students are rarely asked to write in the vernacular. However, English is the language of school from the first day a child enters school in most of Melanesia (Solomon Islands, English schools in Vanuatu, and Nauru). This has repercussions for the ease with which children become literate and numerate because they commence education in a language none of them speaks as a mother tongue. Cummins (1994: 38) makes it clear that "the better developed children's L1 conceptual foundation, the more likely they are to develop similarly high levels of conceptual abilities in their L2". Further, he claims that for many students working and learning in a language not their own,

the more learning which is done in the L1, the better they are able to learn later through a L2. Immersion programmes, such as the education offered to children who must undertake all formal learning in another language, lead, according to Lotherington (1996: 355), to “atrophied L1 development, inadequate L2 proficiency, poor academic achievement and negative socio-cultural identity,” more especially when the language is one not readily found in the child’s immediate environment. In this case, reduced input is exacerbated by teaching methodology.

b) Teaching methodology:

For many students in Pacific schools, whether they are in immersion programmes from Grade 1 (as happens in the Solomons and Vanuatu), from Grade 4 (as in Fiji) or from Grade 6/7 (as in Samoa and Tonga), the challenge to learn English and through English simultaneously is huge, complicated by several factors. Firstly, access to suitable modern and culturally relevant materials is uncertain. In many of the smaller nations, the cost of producing reading or listening materials appropriate to the social and cultural context, whether in English or the local vernacular, is prohibitive; as a result, children may face reading about events or experiences completely unknown to them. In some countries, most reading material is biblical and not focussed on the learning development of children (Lotherington 1996; Spencer 1996) and in others, classroom reading matter is imported from other English-speaking countries or provided by donors (Lui 1996; Nabobo 2002; Sanga 2002).

Secondly, crowded curricula mean that content must proceed at a sustained pace, pushed by the need for students to face regular examinations. Because these examinations are generally still modelled on external forms (Puamau 1999; Teairo 2002), there is great pressure for teachers to teach to those forms. This raises the question of how much interaction can be afforded in classrooms and what opportunity there is for students to cognitively analyse the language and absorb details of structure as acquisition. Green (2004) refers to a language learning context where the struggle to understand content and meaning left no time to recall structure and store it as usable data. Under pressure of time and reduced opportunities to

question and engage with new content knowledge, the chances that students will grasp the language forms as well become less likely.

Additionally, local teachers have generally come through the same education system. While those in their forties and fifties may have had some contact with expatriate teachers and may therefore present a model of English closer to the standard British variety which is the exonormative standard in the region, teachers in their twenties and thirties represent an English which already shows signs of nativisation (Rainey 2009: pers. comm.). “Most, if not all, teachers of English are not NSs [native speakers] but second language speakers of their own variety of English who have little intention, ability or mandate to teach anything other than what they themselves speak” (Nayar 1997: 30) and in her article on education in Melanesia, Lotherington (1996: 352) states that “[p]rimary school teachers...seldom have native-speaker competence in English, and often lack confidence in their oral proficiency”. All teachers in the Pacific are at least bilingual and many are multilingual and like the rest of their compatriots tend to need English only for their professional lives. No matter how valuable English may be for their professional advancement, for most it is not their language of comfort.

Teacher training weaknesses is a topic referred to by a number of contributors to Lynch and Mugler’s 1996 examination of Pacific languages in education and to Baldauf and Luke’s 1990 study of language planning and education. Research into exactly what happens in Pacific classrooms tends to be anecdotal rather than empirical so it is difficult to assess the degree to which training is impacting on classroom learning. However, teacher training programmes do not focus on making curriculum subject teachers into teachers of the language of their subjects, and English teachers are not generally ESOL trained or knowledgeable about second-language teaching techniques, based on the standard course structure for teacher trainees at USP (USP Calendar, 2009), despite the fact that all will be teaching students the majority of whom do not have English as a first language. The pressure of national examinations in other contexts often has a backwash effect of sacrificing creativity of teaching and innovative practice to rote learning of content. What mention is made of teaching methodology in language in the Pacific suggests that

much learning is based on rote techniques at primary school (Mangubhai and Mugler 2006) while at secondary school the norm is the “chalk-and-talk” practice.

Ielemia, in discussing school staffing in Niue in the 1990s, moreover, notes that the Ministry of Education, under pressure to expand staff numbers, employed untrained high school graduates to teach junior classes. And Fasi (2002: 31) candidly discusses concerns about “the sub-standard performance of many new teachers in recent years”, and some departments of education in the region acknowledge that significant numbers of teachers in their communities are untrained (Henly 2005).

The result, unsurprisingly, is that teachers must use vernacular languages (or the lingua francas of Melanesian pidgins) and the way they themselves were taught to impart concepts, to explain vocabulary and to compensate for academic gaps in their own local forms of English. Numerous commentators on and analysts of Pacific education draw attention to the fact that, despite policies establishing English as the language of instruction in all upper levels of education, this is, in fact, unsustainable and in reality does not occur. Teachers must code-switch if students are to make progress in content areas, especially in view of the need to get students through a range of national assessments at several levels of the education system. In her study of code-switching in Fiji’s schools, Tamata (1996: 98) quotes a teacher who believes “it does not really matter which language is used as long as the children understand”, and she points out that “in rural schools, code-switching is a necessary communicative strategy because of the students’ relatively limited exposure to English”. In Niue, “Niuean was used a lot as a medium of instruction in the village primary schools, not only in the formal teaching of it as a subject on its own, but also in the formal teaching of English for clarification of new concepts” (Lui 1996: 115). Siegel (1996: 161) found in the Solomon Islands that though “English is the official language of instruction in the education system, Pijin is the de facto medium of instruction in most schools” and that “78% of schools use a mixture of English and Pijin”. In Vanuatu, despite the fact that it is widely believed that Bislama, the national language, is not suitable for education and its use in schools is banned, Siegel (1996: 164) feels that it is “probably used unofficially as a medium of instruction in primary education”. Research by Lo Bianco in Samoa (cited in Mugler

1996: 281) confirmed that the official language of instruction is English above Grade 7 but that teachers use both languages and a good deal of translation so that in curriculum subject classes Samoan was used 59 percent of the time.

This means that the amount of English even in classrooms, the only place where children are likely to have consistent exposure to English, is a great deal less than might be expected according to policy. Students may never have to negotiate meaning independently with others because the pragmatic solution to lapses in comprehension is to employ the vernacular or non-English *lingua franca*. In content areas this can have the effect that key concepts are not understood effectively either in English or in the vernacular – what Skutnabb-Kangas (1981: 248) has referred to as “semi-lingualism”. Moreover, as English will probably not be the language of the school ground in village schools, far from being the ‘language of education’, it becomes ‘the language of the classroom – sometimes’.

The restricted opportunities to use English in meaningful interactions; the limited “focus on form” because of crowded curricula and content teachers who are generally not giving a language focus to their teaching; the pressure provided by learning crucial subject content through an imposed language not their own; examinations which are, in some cases (such as Vanuatu), designed to restrict the number of students moving through the education system; and the presence of language models who themselves speak the English of the region, are all likely to lead students to produce what Richards (1974: 174) calls “intralingual and developmental errors” – over-generalisation of rules, under-generalisation of rules, ignorance of rule restrictions, and alternative hypothesis creation.

Over-generalisation refers to the strategy of assuming that x examples of a particular structure mean that is the way the structure functions. One obvious example of this in English use is the expansion of use of the *-ed* marker for certain past tense forms. Learners are likely to assume that if *talk* becomes *talked* and *jump* becomes *jumped*, then logically *buy* turns into *buyed* and *cut* into *cutted*. This may also account for the use of the present continuous without the copula: other verbs in English take a morphemic suffix without requiring the verb “to be”, so, by extension, it is

acceptable to use: Tu1:1: *They coming from the rural area*. Perceptual plurality can also be viewed as a form of over-generalisation. Nouns such as *luggage* and *equipment*, which tend to refer to multiple items are frequently treated as plural and used with the plural *-s* morpheme.

Ignorance of rule restrictions and constraints is common in PECE data and may be the result of the inconsistency of English grammatical rules. Learners find it difficult to make sense of the occasions when rules do not apply in certain specific contexts. Examples of students' not making standard distinctions can be found in the use of tense affixes on finite verbs with modals, as in *He would went*, and in constructions such as K1:3: *This makes every task to finish in a very short time*, or N2:2: *The doctor is insisting the patient to obey* illustrate the absence of the constraints on verbs used with "make", or when to use the infinitive without *to*.

Richards' category of "false concepts" describes a situation where the conceptualisation of language use is faulty (a step which may itself be a feature of over-generalisation or transfer from L1). In Pacific data it is common for sentences to mark tense only once in the apparent belief that that has set the tense context for a multi-clause sentence: T1:29: *God created the world and the last of his creation is man and woman*. Use of articles displays a similar attempt to create a meaningful concept of usage, relating it to a mother tongue experience of [+specific/-specific] as in: V1:30: *...a few kms north from the Luganville town*. To explain why these learner responses occur, there are two broad explanations: transfer from L1 and simplification.

c. Transfer phenomena

The reduced amount of input and teaching methodology that may not give learners enough time or experience to internalize learning make transfer from L1 more likely because learners have only the first linguistic experience to fall back on if the controlled L2 data fail them. DeGraff (1996) quoted in Deumert (2003: 569) makes the point that if the L2 data (called Primary Linguistic data) does not reach a "certain threshold *T*, on the basis of which UG-based [Universal Grammar] learning can proceed", the learner has only one option. That is to call upon prior learning (i.e. the

L1) settings to provide a framework for new learning. This reinforces the impression, as Jain (1974: 190) asserts, that “there is a system in learners’ errors in spite of their apparent arbitrariness in performance data”.

In the period in which the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis was widely used to explain second language acquisition difficulties, it was assumed that examining the first language would explain most of the early divergences from the target language’s standard norms. The hypothesis was attacked for its rigidity in the 1970s but the idea that a L1 might impact on the acquisition of a L2 seems so logical that its usefulness as a theory continues. However, studies in language contact have broadened the scope of contrastive analysis to encompass not only the ways in which the L1 can disadvantage the learning of the L2 but also the ways in which it can advantage acquisition (Schachter 1992; Ard and Homburg 1992), and have linked language transfer to the linguistic concept of Markedness Theory (Rutherford 1982; Zobl 1980), which will be discussed below.

The apparent presence of negative L1 effects on the facility of second language acquisition became known as “interference”, a term used by Weinreich (1964: 1) to describe “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language i.e. as a result of language contact”. Corder (1992: 19) chooses to describe this as “the role for the mother tongue” because he believes that the terms “transfer” or “interference” are too tightly associated with a “particular theory of learning”. For Schachter (1992: 32) transfer cannot be seen as a process at all but as a series of constraints on the learner’s hypothesis testing processes.

Second language acquisition and first language learning cannot be truly identical processes (Ervin-Tripp 1974; Cook 2001) because when acquiring a second or third language learners already have access to a first. In the Pacific context, some learners will already possess more than one language before they start school; others will have access to more than one dialect of a language; and for still others, their first language is their only exposure to language. Unlike children who feature in much research into child L2 acquisition (Hakuta 1974; Itoh and Hatch 1978, among many

others), Pacific children are not acquiring English in a naturalistic environment but in an educational context within communities where English is not widely spoken; even if they have been exposed to some English before going to school, they are very unlikely to have used the language themselves. It would, therefore, seem likely that with reduced positive input around which to create hypotheses, these learners will test against what they know. “When a child is confronted with linguistic material he (sic) does not know,” writes Keller-Cohen (1981: 96), “the hypotheses he formulates are influenced by such expectations. Such expectancies limit the range of possible predictions a child makes”. By the time children are facing instruction in English in their curricula subjects (in most countries between Grades 4 and 7), many of the hypotheses they have already created will be a strong feature of their understanding of English and may not be easy to remedy.

Schachter (1992:33) describes a learner as having to “scan the input, identify its dimensions, ... observe the regularities and isolate the relevant dimensions, and finally ... generalise from those relevant dimensions”. But learners have no control over the input and do not know where they are heading. Because the majority of Pacific classrooms do not appear to provide environments rich with L2-learning opportunities, the resources for hypothesis creation and testing are restricted.

The Pacific data provide several instances of overt transfer, almost all of them forms of “imposition” from the source languages to English (Winford 2007). Besides the obvious cases of indigenous terms for local cultural items, there is the semantic expansion of the word *aunty/aunties* among Polynesian writers. At the clause level, the use of the resumptive pronoun in relative clauses reflects the fact that such structures are common in many Pacific languages. Furthermore, apparent reluctance to create relative clauses further along the Accessibility Hierarchy than the direct object may also be a response to a limited relativity hierarchy in some regional languages. At the discourse level, topic-prominence and pronoun-copying are found widely among the languages of the South Pacific.

Zobl (1992:177), in discussing transfer phenomena, provides evidence that multilingual learners of another language create much wider grammars than learners

with a single language because they have a wider range of options to consider. His view is that such learners “would have to detect, in the input, the absence of those sentences generated by the wider IL [interlanguage] grammar and amend it (by grammar narrowing)”. The restricted input available to Pacific learners reduces the likelihood of this occurring and increases the probability that conclusions reached will be patterned on known structures rather than those generally found in standard varieties of English.

Another piece of research with relevance to the Pacific is that by Selinker and Lakshmanan (1992) who proposed the Multiple Effects Principle (MEP) to explain why even able learners persist in presenting structures which are not of standard forms. Their theory claims that if two or more second language acquisition factors are working “in tandem” (p.98), the chances are greater that a non-target-like rule will be established and will always be more difficult to adjust. They perceive language transfer as one of those factors and Selinker’s other four factors are transfer of training, strategies of second language learning, over-generalisation of target language input material, and strategies of second language communication with native speakers, only the last being of little relevance to Pacific learners as a general rule. Given the absence of varied and interactive input as well as language transfer, and the likelihood of transfer of teacher models and over-generalisation being high, learners in the Pacific (and presumably in other PECE communities) face a Multiple Effects Principle comprising four factors. In the view of Selinker and Lakshmanan, this would indicate that non-standard English features will be created. Given also that “Oceanic languages exhibit ... quite [a] large degree of similarity” (Lynch: 1998: 165), it is not surprising that factors acting within a MEP framework in the region should give rise to an equally large degree of similarity in the English forms found in the eleven countries involved in this study.

There is another perspective to the consideration of transfer and its place in language use, and that is the value to language acquisition of the transfer of learning. What faces many learners in the Pacific is the impossibility of transferring what has never been acquired or has never been part of input. Researchers in second language pedagogy and reading theory (Cummins 1991; 2000; Collier 1995; Singhal 2004;

Genesee 1994; 2004;) have provided firm evidence that literacy skills can be transferred to a L2 learning environment because learners bring with them an understanding that written symbols carry meaning, that certain texts are structured in certain ways and that known concepts may well have parallels in the L2. It therefore seems crucial that children are provided with the opportunity to become firmly literate in their own language(s) before they are required to apply that skill to another language to which they have had limited exposure.

In the cases of Kiribati, Niue, Samoa, Tonga and Tuvalu, new entrants are presented with the opportunity to become literate in the language they speak (or a dialect thereof), though appropriate reading materials in those L1 may not be readily available or varied in text type. In Fiji children are faced with becoming literate in standard forms of languages of which they speak dialects showing considerable variation from the standard. In the multilingual Melanesian countries where the introduction to English (or French in Vanuatu) as the medium of instruction is early, literacy development is slower and the literacy rates show the effects of that delay. The transfer of L1 skills is either reduced or impossible to utilise, and reading and writing are seen by many as demanding or potentially frustrating tasks. A complication in multilingual countries is that not all languages yet have an orthographic system in place, especially in Melanesia. As a result, literacy rates in first languages in Melanesia are low, and many children enter school with no exposure to the written word and no awareness of the ways in which spoken language can be represented in writing yet must face an educational environment in which a teacher attempts to teach primary literacy skills in a language with which they have no experience.

Additionally, the impact of the Christian church has been far-reaching on literacy experiences in the Pacific. Many cultural practices have been overtaken by the practices of the church. Naming ceremonies, harvest festivals, life-cycle rituals are now overseen by ministers of various Christian denominations who use bible translations into a number of local languages. Students at USP frequently advised lecturers that the only book they were accustomed to reading was the Bible. Story-telling within extended families remains active, as many of these essays have

described, and Pacific users of English are often skilled at story-telling in written form, but, as these data also demonstrate, maintaining a more formal written register is a task which many find difficult. It may be that as traditional rituals have faded from use, so the opportunity to hear more formal language in indigenous contexts has also faded and with it the conscious awareness of register. Indeed, some researchers such as Topping (1987) and Mühlhäusler (1996) provide some evidence for the destructive effect of literacy practices on culture generally in the Pacific region, when the shift to literacy in European languages “tended to convey the message that everything the island children knew in the mother tongues was suspect, inferior, or simply wrong” (Topping 1987: 54). With a reduced exposure to how their own languages change with context and purpose, Pacific learners have little chance of transferring into their learning of English the knowledge of register variation. This explains the widespread tendency for writers to rely on a spoken mode and register when working in the written mode.

d. Simplification

The final factor, after reduced input, teaching methodology and transfer phenomena, which impacts on the development of English in the Pacific is simplification which, in this context, is being used to describe a series of learner strategies used to make sense of input. Corder (1992) rightly asserts that learners cannot simplify what they do not yet possess and denies that this can be called a learner strategy. Learners can, however, simplify their own language when formulating responses to ensure that they only deal with structures they are capable of turning into appropriate L2 forms (a technique I have used many times myself). The interaction between prior linguistic knowledge, the reduced input provided in learning, hypothesis testing and transfer probabilities, generates responses which have the appearance of an attempt to simplify the load of data which must be processed during output.

In her 1987 article (pages 168-169) on “non-native Englishes”, Williams refers to Slobin’s Operating Principles and Charges to Language in which he states that there are “four general charges to language:

1. Be clear

2. Be humanly processible in ongoing time
3. Be quick and easy
4. Be expressive”

These are, Williams suggests, unconsciously applied but appear to be “follow[ed] in [speakers’] oral production”. It can be assumed that these four charges can influence the written mode as well.

The need to “be clear” is crucial in all communicative activities. Corder (1992) and Schumann (1977) both suggest that there is, in early stages of SLA, a return to a pattern of speech resembling that of a child acquiring the first language, where language is pared down to its minimal communicative requirements. Corder views this as part of a “simple basic code” (p.25) which is likely to be universal; for Schumann, this is part of a pidginisation process through which he believes all second language learners pass. Williams (1987) perceives one characteristic of this imperative to be “maximising salience”, paying particular attention to those linguistic features which seem to carry the most meaning, such as free rather than bound morphemes, and the positioning of topic to make it more noticeable.

A focus on salience invites reference to markedness and markedness theory which has been part of language acquisition research for many years (Hatch 1978; Bardovi-Harlig 1987; Rutherford 1982; Thomason and Kaufman 1988; Klein and Perdue 1997; Mufwene 2001). It offers an explanation of how a L1 might influence the acquisition of a second or subsequent one. The first claim in markedness reasoning is that unmarked features of a L1 are acquired before marked ones. Hence, in children’s acquisition of English as a L1, they learn to use the simple present tense before the past, and the regular past before the irregular, thus presenting *thought* and *goed* before fully controlling *thought* or *went*. Unmarked features of any language are regarded as the default or core positions; any marked quality requires increased processing time and less simplicity, as in English moving from:

| UNMARKED | to | MARKED |
|-----------------------|----|-------------------------|
| voiceless | | voiced |
| non-nasal | | nasal |
| singular | | plural |
| present tense | | past/present continuous |
| active voice | | passive voice |
| affirmatives | | negatives |
| declarative sentences | | interrogative sentences |
| direct questions | | imbedded questions |
| male | | female |

The natural position is the unmarked, a tendency which appears to be universal (Rutherford 1982; Deumert 2003).

The implications for L2 acquisition are important. In terms of transfer phenomena, it seems generally true that what tend to be moved from the L1 to the L2 are not marked but unmarked default features, especially if the languages are similar or if comprehensibility is unaffected. This explains the omission of the past tense *-ed* marker when an adverbial clause of time is used. The second implication is that acquisition of unmarked features before marked ones is also the logical pattern in SLA; thus, learners display inconsistent use of the *-s* morpheme in plural, 3rd person singular or possessive contexts, and objects which are not obligatory arguments in all situations are often omitted while subjects are less frequently dropped.

There is an important distinction between markedness “in linguistic terms” and the learner’s processing perception or salience. Deumert (2003:592) describes markedness as a “structuralist, system-oriented concept”, related to the grammaticality of languages generally but whose specific features are unique to each

language. Saliency, on the other hand, is not external to the learner but internal, a “speaker-oriented concept”, which, in each learner, dictates what that learner sees as meaningful, clear and explicit. Markedness is a quality of language; saliency is a quality of the learner which provides a rational explanation for a number of PECE usages.

One example is the use of “do+finite verb” in contexts where the auxiliary is not required for emphasis or the formation of negatives or interrogatives. Such a usage focuses attention on the main verb, and appears to clarify a generic state which is common to many.

M1:3 (Those in nuclear families) they **do** less **know** their relatives.

F2:67 The nation as a whole **do suffer**.

Further examples of maximising saliency include the construction *can be able* which emphasises the concept of capability; or the use of echoing. At the discourse level, the saliency of the topic is enhanced by fronting it and including pronominal reference in the comment which follows. The repetition of subordinating cohesives in forms such as *Although / but...* in the same sentence is yet another example which ensures meaning in a complex sentence form. These linguistic behaviours may be anything but simple; some of them appear to represent a situation of complexification in that the structures created carry redundant items. Nonetheless, the result may simplify the encoding and decoding burden of both the parties involved.

This ties the first principle to the second, that of being “humanly processible in ongoing time”. Hatch (1981) believes that because beginners are able to repeat with greater accuracy the information occurring at the end of a sentence, this means that new information should be placed at the end of an utterance. Topic-prominent structures, however, place important information at the beginning, and are common in several Pacific languages. This has the effect of reducing the verbal and comprehension burden of the comment because in speech the topic is often followed by a brief pause, permitting extended processing time. Fronting, then, while it is

potentially a quality transferred from indigenous speech patterns, may also represent an example of Slobin's second principle, emphasising that explanations of language acquisition developments are very unlikely to rest on only one feature.

Regularisation or simplification of irregular forms offers another aid to rapid processing which may also be part of the third principle of "being quick and easy". The Pacific data are replete with examples of the ironing out of irregularities. Regularisation creates structures which are less varied and conform to fewer rules than the target language does. This avoids exceptions which need to be memorised and supports Andersen's position (1984:79) that early second language learners tend to expect a "one-to-one principle" of form and meaning; exceptions compromise this principle. It is logical that learners should attempt to reduce (or simplify) the learning burden.

Examples of regularisation can be found in the minimisation of the distinction between count and non-count nouns and the powerful influence of perceptual plurality. This is unlikely to be a transfer feature because languages in the Pacific tend not to "change form to mark singular or plural" (Lynch 1998: 107); it is more likely that the pluralisation of non-count nouns is a systemising regularisation of nouns with perceptual plurality.

Regularisation is also found in the omission of the 3rd person singular marker on present tense verbs which effectively regularises the English present tense and does not compromise comprehensibility. Another common verb phrase simplification is applying the past *-ed* marker to irregular verbs to match the more salient pattern of stem+*ed*.

T1:23 taught (used twice)

T1:25 choosed (used three times)

SI 1:9 privacy upheld.

Interestingly, an edition of the *Dominion Post* (a Wellington, NZ, newspaper) in the first week of March 2010 used *shined* rather than *shone*; regularisation is not merely a feature of PECEs.

These and other creations such as the reduction of comparatives to [adj+*than*], and marking tense only once on paired verbs are not only examples of regularization but also of redundancy reduction which simplifies encoding and decoding. When meaning can be retrieved readily from the context and by the use of apparently more salient markers, learners tend to limit the number of markers. This maintains clarity while simplifying the processing steps for all interlocutors.

Slobin's final principle – Be expressive – is demonstrated in Pacific data. One expressive usage is the creativity of descriptive phrases and idioms which expand currently used idiomatic phrases: “*the country which has bread and buttered you*” has taken one English idiom and extended both its morpho-semantic structure and its meaning to one of greater emotional implication. Register shifting from formal written mode to spoken one allows a writer to connect more immediately with a reader. These qualities clearly distinguish Pacific formal writing from that of standard NZ English.

Conclusion

English in the Pacific, while there are clearly sub-regional and national characteristics, displays an interesting degree of similarity of specific features which are beginning to firm in use in Group B and to distinguish those English structures from standard usage. It has been hypothesised here that this development owes a great deal to the influence of reduced input which necessarily leads learners to rely on reference to and application of known forms to a new learning environment, and to a reduction of the learning burden to ensure that encoding and decoding works effectively.

These factors help to explain why English in the Pacific presents the forms it does, and also to demonstrate why English used by Pacific writers should have so much in common with other PECEs. The work of Szmrecsanyi and Kortmann (2009a: 1659)

challenges the idea that varieties which are geographically close are likely to be more similar than those which are more distant from one another.

This is not always the case as one leaves behind the department of more or less contiguous native vernaculars and forays into the realm of L2 varieties and contact languages without much of a shared history...[I]f there is no link between geography and typology, future study will want to explore other factors.

The English being used by the Pacific writers at the heart of this research is found among users who are not only geographically relatively close but who share several L1 linguistic characteristics because of their largely common Austronesian ancestry. However, they are geographically and typologically very distant from much of West or East Africa, or South and Southeast Asia. What they share with these farflung PECE partners is a socio-political experience of non-settlement colonialism of (on the whole) relatively short duration; a small number of English L1 speakers in each colony; little or no opportunity for social immersion in English; English language exposure predominantly via education; and a post-independence education system where all teachers are themselves speakers of the developing local variety.

Clearly, socio-political experiences, though different in the details, are sufficiently similar to have had an influence on how a common, imposed language develops. Yet the question of why PECEs show such a high degree of mirroring remains. Why, when so many different substrates are involved in the contact, are the Englishes produced not more dissimilar? Is this similarity inherent in the process of acquiring the language itself?

Chambers (2003: 266) asks, “Why does Carbonear Newfoundland have features in common with rural Northern England...and inner-city neighbourhoods in Detroit and Harlem?” Though his focus is in L1 vernaculars, the answer has relevance for PECEs and for L2 varieties generally. Chambers dismisses diffusion – the gradual spread of characteristics from one area to another – as an explanation because the logical extension of that theory is that it must be able to include the entire globe since

features are so widespread. Acceptance of the theory would demand the acceptance of some unnatural linkages and processes. The alternative answer is that the processes of change and variation are somehow innate and that they are possibly linked with linguistic qualities of English itself. This implies that the adaptations which have appeared so broadly across a range of PECEs are a form of angloversal language adjustment.

This has some supporters, including Chambers himself (2004) and Fasold (1990). Fasold (p.288) states that “a number of the distinctive features called for by the mature grammars of non-standard lects are the same as features that turn up during the acquisition of standard lects by children”, including regularisation of verb tense and agreement of affixation. This suggests that the processes are internal and may be driven by universal stages of L2 acquisition of English. But the theory of universal grammar in language is a good deal less clear in L2 acquisition than it is in L1 acquisition, and there is no certainty even in the latter (White 1987; 1990; 1992; 1996; 2003; Clahsen and Muysken 1986). Chambers (2003: 265) claims that “certain variables appear to be primitives of vernacular dialects in that they appear ubiquitously all over the world”, that these are likely to occur cross-linguistically, and that they will be found in ‘interlanguage varieties’ as well.

Szmrecsanyi and Kortmann (2009b) pursued this idea and examined 49 varieties of English, ranging from L1 varieties to pidgins, using spoken data collections. They identified 76 characteristic features of vernacular dialects, L2 varieties and pidgins/creoles, but found that none of them was genuinely universal. “[F]requent they are, but universal they are not” (2009b: 37). What they make clear, however, is that certain adaptations (such as noun-verb concord, deletion of *be*, *there is* with plural subjects, regularised reflexives, and inverted word order in indirect questions), while not universal cross-linguistically, may be described as typoversals of English. Of the 76 categories they identified, at least 42 are found in Pacific data, and in many other PECE varieties.

In their article “Parameters of morphosyntactic variation in World Englishes” (n.d.), they propose that a variety itself (whether L1, L2 or pidgin/creole) predicts

accurately that variety's position on a scale measuring "L2 acquisition difficulty and ...increasing degrees of transparency (i.e. regularity for synthetic markers of grammatical information" (p.14). By applying indices of syntheticity (the use of bound inflectional affixes), analyticity (the use of free grammatical markers to indicate grammatical information), and a grammaticity index which represents a combination of the other two measures, they established that the L2 varieties they studied (all PECEs) had the lowest degree of grammaticity, eliminating certain kinds of redundancy and preferring "zero-marking over explicit marking", rather than "trading off synthetic marking for analytical marking which is purportedly L2-easy" (p. 19). They also noted that generally written texts are more synthetic than spoken ones, a characteristic identified earlier by Biber (1988). The fact that the grammaticity changes between spoken and written forms in English are smaller than in many other European languages appears to increase the likelihood that spoken forms will appear in written contexts which is relevant to Pacific writing in English.

Szmrecsanyi and Kortmann support Trudgill's view (1983) that contact has had a crucial role to play in the appearance of the distinctions they identify. "Contact" for Trudgill, distinguishes L1 varieties – those included in "high contact" definitions are the products of settlement colonisation or of language-shift situations, while "low contact" L1 dialects are the traditional dialects of southeast and northern England or the Midlands which developed in some degree of separation from the Received pronunciation of Standard British English. If this same sort of distinction is applied to L2 varieties, there is a division between those L2 Englishes developing within English L1 communities, contexts of high contact, as New Zealand or Australia are, and those which have arisen in PEC communities of low contact.

The possibility which emerges from their research is that the very nature of English makes it likely that learners in low contact contexts, no matter what their language backgrounds, will display similar behaviours in creating rule-governed responses to the learning task. Transfer is a process which will introduce a greater variety of specific details, but the same simplification principles will be applied to the learning of English in PEC communities. The strategic principles in a situation of reduced input may be universal tendencies driven by the nature of the English language itself.

The written English found in these eleven Pacific countries displays many features in common with other PECEs, a fact which suggests that the processes leading to the innovations are common to them all. It is clear that the socio-political histories of non-settlement colonies with reduced contact between colonisers and colonised, and the ways in which English has been employed after independence have been important to the way the strategic processes act on the development of English as a de jure or de facto official tongue. Those histories and the functions for which English is now used in those communities means, despite grumblings that appear periodically about declining standards of English use, that there is little real impetus to move English closer to an external standard form, except, perhaps, in academic, legal or regional diplomacy contexts. The further these communities move from the experience of colonialism and the more functionally effective the English they themselves use becomes, the more likely it is that these PECE societies, the Pacific among them, will solidify the linguistic innovations which have appeared into recognised variants of a language they have appropriated to their own use. “It is important for a society to understand”, writes Schneider (2007: 314) “that linguistic norms are not absolute but rather ... they change, and they vary from one context to another. It is absolutely necessary to develop some tolerance towards such changes – they are not “for the worst”, as some conservative language observers tend to suggest”. This has implications for educationalists and language policy planners. What some of those implications might be for the Pacific and for New Zealand is the focus of Chapter 7.

CHAPTER 7: THE IMPLICATIONS OF DEVELOPING CHANGE.

The ramifications of the development of a dialect of English which could, in the future, be labelled Pacific English are not minor and will require thought to be given to language planning and to pedagogy. The impacts will not only be felt in the Pacific itself, especially in the education systems of the various countries which make up the region, but also in the countries of principal migration which will have to consider carefully their responsibilities in the delivery of equitable educational opportunities for migrants from the Pacific and, potentially, English language entry requirements. This chapter will examine what some of those ramifications might be for both Pacific countries and New Zealand.

7.1 Implications for Pacific nations

The implications of the development of a regional variant of English for the region rest first on the presumption that English will continue to play a significant role in the Pacific's political, commercial and educational life. If this is so in the long term, then English will continue to be demanded and taught in schools, and complaints about accomplishment will presumably also continue. Educational authorities therefore are faced with deciding between three standpoints: whether to acknowledge some of the changes which are already apparent in the acrolectal English of Pacific countries and codify them for use by teachers and students, whether to aim for an improvement in overall education as a way of making second language learning more effective, or whether to accept both styles of English use and teach to the styles and levels of language which students demonstrate.

Generally, it is consistently more difficult for societies to accept morpho-syntactic deviations from standard forms in the more formal contexts of written texts than in the less formal ones of speech. Some recognition may eventuate for idioms such as "Last but not the least" or preposition use as in "to discuss about" or even the use of resumptive pronouns in topic-comment sentences, but it will be more challenging for the arbiters of language quality to accept as standard such features as pronoun copying in relative clauses, sentence fragments after subordinators, or proximity concord, all of which can be found in the work of able Pacific writers. At present,

therefore, the acceptance in writing and codification in the Pacific region of such deviations from standard forms seems unlikely. It may be, as proposed by Biewer (2007), that the norms for English in the Pacific, rather than those of Standard British English, will become those of standard New Zealand English (or Standard Australian English) which may be more tolerant of some of the changes but certainly not all.

Nonetheless, as the variations found in the Pacific region firm and stabilise, it will be important for educational policy-makers to consider how to acknowledge the forms of English which are generally spoken by regional users. Standard language, point out Kaplan and Baldauf (2003: 8), is no-one's mother tongue. It is instead a set of idealised practices which very few who do not participate in them from an early age can acquire without variation. The expectation that learners in Pacific schools should be taught and use standard (British) English, which is a non-dominant variety in the region, will be both frustrating and destructive of positive experiences of school for almost all learners. Finally, it would seem more rational to accept that the English used well in the Pacific region, and which is understood by its users and by users from outside the region, is somewhat different in precise details from that used by English users from other parts of the world, and to become increasingly tolerant of a range of differences which do not compromise comprehensibility.

Until that occurs, however, the alternative approach is to make the teaching of English in the Pacific more consistently structured to reduce those aspects of use which are, indeed, errors, and to consider seriously the language-in-education policies. This has further major implications, especially for financial commitments to education from governments already facing difficult decisions on priorities for limited expenditure. The low educational achievement rates found in many Pacific countries are not simply in English but in core content areas, and this implies that the overall delivery of education in the region needs to be overhauled. The principal areas which require attention appear to be curriculum design, including the fraught subject of the medium of instruction; resource provision; assessment policy; and teacher recruitment and training.

a) Curriculum design:

Over several years, commentaries on education in the Pacific have argued that the education systems in the region too closely resemble those of the colonising authorities, with European values in non-European contexts (Thaman 1994, 1996, 2003; Puamau 2005, 2006). Pacific observers bemoan the lack of Pacific focus in students' learning, and the heavy assessment load. A relevant question for educational policy makers is "What is education aiming to achieve?" In the Pacific, the populations tend to be young. With narrow economic bases and a reliance on primary production (as well as a common dependence upon remittances sent home from migrants to Australia, New Zealand and the USA), Pacific communities offer little in the way of careers. The educated young generally have an eye to opportunities outside the region while those who do not make their way through the education system tend to drift to townships in the hope of finding employment in the tourism and hospitality industry, but there are too few jobs available to satisfy demand. It is clear that a "one size fits all" education is meeting few of the development needs of the region:

The continuing pattern is likely to be dominated by an academic, conservative focus; while the plea for relevance is widespread the continuing reality appears to be metropolitan standards and models; while the hope is for expansion of educational opportunity and equity the continuing pattern is likely to be one of selectivity and competition for scarce places, with the growing problem of urban youth educated to a certain level but unable to progress further. (Barrington et al, 1987: 24).

That was written more than twenty years ago but little appears to have changed. Exactly the same conclusions are valid today: "Inappropriate curriculum has been identified as a key factor in the high drop out rates of students from secondary schools", wrote Lameta in 2005, going on to suggest that "Education for all" (EFA) goals cannot be met by the formal education sector as it stands.

One of the first requirements is a broadening of curriculum options, including, as Thaman and others (1996; Paumau 2005) have suggested, topics and courses

appropriate to the cultures in which education is based. This led to a call in the 1980s and 1990s for a more vocational curriculum but studies by Psacharopoulos (1973; 1981) and Psacharopoulos and Woodhall (1985, all cited in Gannicott and Throsby 1992) suggested that the belief that this step would improve the quality of education was not borne out by results, and Tonga, after experimenting with such a curriculum, returned to its 'General Education' with an emphasis on basic skills. However, a recent Asian Development Bank report on the need for vocational skills development (2006) points out that curricula with academic biases, geared to white collar employment, are not providing labour for essential blue collar employment, and "many [young people] have no skills to look after themselves within the village subsistence economy" (ADB, 2006: 14) to which they are forced to return after their school lives. The lack of skilled workers in the Pacific, the report claims, in fields from horticulture to building to hospitality and management, has seriously limited the development of sustainable businesses in the region.

Some of this need may be met by the Australia-Pacific Technical Colleges, begun in 2007, which are vocational programmes partnered with local institutions in Fiji, Samoa, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea, and supported by Australian aid funding. As these programmes establish themselves, they may have a backwash effect on secondary school curriculum developments. This would present greater options for students rather than only an academic stream in which some must inevitably fail (Nair. n.d; Box Hill Institute 2009).

Curricula in the Pacific have generally owed too much to donor countries. Mention has already been made of the impact of New Zealand education in the region well into the 1980s, and of the effect of Australia (Maglen 1990) and the United States on other countries' education systems. Every new reform package offered by donor aid agencies brings with it the cultural norms of that agency's own community. "It is imperative that Pacific countries stand back and reflect on exactly what kind of children they would like their educational systems to 'produce'" (Puamau 2006: 59). It is important that students learn about their own cultures, languages, histories and geographies, and that basic concepts in scientific and mathematical learning are focused on local examples and experiences.

A further aspect of curriculum reform is which courses will be needed in already crowded curricula. Increasing the numbers of compulsory courses decreases time spent on core curricula content. Longer and more detailed exposure to content usually produces improved achievement, but in some countries content teaching is already reduced to two or three hours a week by the number of subjects to be taught and by unscheduled interruptions to teaching time (Fredrick and Walberg 1980; Gettinger 1984). Moreover, attention needs to be paid to what is taught to which level, especially in view of the fact that compulsory education in many countries of the region does not go beyond primary school and an average of only slightly over 40% of Pacific students proceed to secondary education (ADB 2006).

Pacific nations, with the exception of the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, claim high literacy rates ranging from upper eighties percentages to the high nineties. However, exactly what is meant by ‘literacy’ is not clear in any of the figures and the data which is the basis of the figures is also undefined. Recent research in Vanuatu suggests that the actual figures are closer to half of the claimed percentage (Early 2011: pers.comm.).

Table 7.1: Literacy Figures for relevant Pacific countries

| COUNTRY | LITERACY RATE |
|--|------------------|
| Cook Islands | 95 |
| Fiji | 93.7 |
| Kiribati | 89 |
| Marshall Islands | 93.7 |
| Nauru | 96 |
| Niue | 95 |
| Samoa | 99.7 |
| Solomon Islands | 76.6 |
| Tonga | 98.9 |
| Tuvalu | 93 |
| Vanuatu | 74 |
| Sources: www.search.com/reference/ www.indexmundi.com/ www.talktalk.co.uk/reference/encyclopaedia/ | Figures for 2005 |

Traditionally literacy has been defined predominantly as the ability to read; Liddicoat (2004) quotes OECD ‘domains’ of literacy which mention the ability to take meaning from a range of texts but make no reference at all to the ability to transfer meaning to others through writing. Liddicoat goes on to assert that this interpretation of literacy amounts to a checklist of abilities designed not to permit the individual to advance his/her socio-economic status but to make that individual a more efficient cog in the country’s economy. Much rests on how literacy is defined and what it is needed for, and modern literacy is interpreted very differently from that needed in, for example, mission schools of the 1860s.

There are many different literacies, and individuals can be literate in one and not in another. These can range from what Street (1994, 2003) refers to as “local literacies”, reflecting local or sub-regional needs and which include the literate use of local languages, to national literacy, which usually reflects the use of a national or official language (which in much of the Pacific means English), to biliteracies (Hornberger 2002, 2004) which entail “any and all instances in which communication occurs in two (or more) languages in and around writing” (Hornberger 2004: 156) along several continua of language use. Liddicoat (2004) points out that developing countries tend to place emphasis upon relatively low-level reading and writing skills but that modern needs mean that literate individuals should be able to read and write a range of texts “as a maker of meanings, as a purposeful user of information and as a text analyst bringing critical thinking skills to literate work” (p.9), including not only printed matter but a variety of technological media. This, of course, presents a demanding degree of control which not all may aspire to; a broader curriculum, however, offering a greater choice of educational pathways would begin to establish a variety of necessary literacies.

Deciding on literacy policies is, therefore, a complex process because it needs to propose projected outcomes which will vary according to the society, the types of literacy required and for what purposes, the language or languages in which these types are to be acquired, and the place in the educational structure of each country of the teaching of each type. Further, given that compulsory education in much of the Pacific region does not include post-primary access, the structuring of literacy

practices and preparation needs considerable thought with implications for curriculum design, teacher training, educational provisioning, assessment and language policy.

Part of that consideration necessitates a decision on which language will be involved in the delivery of the curriculum. In most education systems in the region, the principal vernacular languages are used in the classroom for the first few years, ranging from two years in Tuvalu (though there is pressure for the exclusive use of English in Tuvaluan schools), to six years in Tonga, where English is introduced bilingually from the first year though that is likely to be delayed until Grade 3 (Pene and Mugler 2005). In the multilingual Solomon Islands and much of Vanuatu, English language schooling starts from entry to primary education. In countries such as Nauru, Niue, Samoa, Tonga or Kiribati where there are largely homogeneous language communities, expecting education to be delivered in English runs counter to logic. English is not the language of the communities but is used for a variety of largely official functions which generally do not affect or involve school-aged children. English is not required to serve as a lingua franca in the classroom, so everyone, including the teacher, is forced by policy to work in a language with which no-one is comfortable. The rationale for teaching curriculum content in a language students do not understand must be questioned.

In the Solomon Islands and in Vanuatu there is a tendency to rely exclusively on English in the former, and on English or French in the latter. In both countries literacy levels, perhaps as a result of a focus on non-indigenous languages, are among the lowest in the region, especially among women (see Fig. 7.1 above). Pene and Mugler's 2005 summary of the language contexts of these two nations comments that "there are plans" to use vernaculars, but little seems to have been done. In the case of Vanuatu this issue is highly politicised with Francophone and Anglophone educational authorities determined to maintain the place of their languages in the system to such a degree that recent proposals suggested that students be taught in French at primary level and in English at secondary school (Early 2007: pers. comm.).

Both these communities could learn from the ‘Viles Tok Ples Skul’ programme used in Papua New Guinea whose language context is even more complex. This programme, which began in a few provinces in 1993 and has spread widely since then, provided “kindergarten (called ‘the preparatory year’) and Grades 1 and 2 in some 380 indigenous languages, plus Pidgin and English” with further indigenous languages added each year (Klaus 2003: 106). As a result of this development, there is evidence of a considerable improvement in children’s literacy both in their L1 and in Tok Pisin (the lingua franca Pidgin English), and of the fact that they transfer those skills more rapidly to other learning as they progress.

At the end of 1998 the results of the Grade 6 examinations in the three provinces which began the Reform first, in 1993, were much higher than the results of students from provinces where students were immersed in English from Day One of Grade One... Children also appear to be more excited, pro-active, self-confident and inquisitive about learning (Klaus 2003:106).

The strategies which set this in place included wide, detailed consultation to ensure that people from family to provincial and national levels were on board. It also included planned and gradual development province by province, only proceeding when everything was ready to go: local participation in building the facilities and providing resources; the recruitment and training as teachers of local speakers of the languages, teachers who are not fully certified so receive less pay but who are provided with opportunities to gain further training (and with it increased salaries); and the use of simple materials mass-produced with pictures but with blank lined pages for filling in with the specific local languages. Support from the National Department of Education has helped to establish orthographic systems and simple dictionaries for those languages without such things, and donor aid has assisted with establishment costs. There was a limitation on the extension of the programme beyond Grade 2 to keep costs down but even within those narrow parameters the success of the programme has been compelling in meeting local educational needs, and in working towards greater general literacy.

The use of a similar programme in the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu could go some way to raising literacy levels and making easier the adjustment to English (or French) later. Another possibility would be to focus on the development of Pijin and Bislama as languages of education which would provide children with literacy in the lingua franca of their respective countries and would not, it appears, have a deleterious effect on the later acquisition of English (Siegel 1997). Use of the pidgins would have the added effect of stabilising their orthographies and vocabularies. Children would then carry that literacy into the task of learning the language of higher education which could be introduced bilingually rather than as the sole language of instruction. Crucially, such a step would enhance the position of local languages, challenging the perception of the privileged position of English (or French) as the only valid indicator of an educated person and as the only languages through which it is thought that learning can take place.

The language of the classroom is an important issue for the Pacific with political ramifications in many places. Though Gupta (1997) argues against the need for L1 literacy when the situation is especially complex in multilingual communities, expecting literacy in languages children do not understand or speak appears more likely to lead to delayed educational outcomes, which is the view of Lotherington (1996) and Collier (1995: online). Benson (2005: 2) states that “ [i]nstruction through a language that learners do not speak has been called ‘submersion’ (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000) because it is analogous to holding learners under the water without teaching them how to swim.” An argument regularly raised against teaching in local languages is that they are not up to the task of transferring complex knowledge or that bilingual teaching will only confuse children as they learn. Yet the evidence is strong that the better equipped for learning children are in their L1, the better they acquire any subsequent language (Cummins 2000; Thomas and Collier 2002; Benson 2005).

The models of bilingualism currently applied in the Pacific do not represent additive bilingualism in which users achieve full literacy in both languages, though this may be the goal. At best, most are a form of transitional bilingualism where students receive three, four or six initial years of education in their mother tongue but the

intent of the system is to move learners by at least the end of primary education to learning in another language, one which students do not fully control. For many students across the Pacific, no further attention is paid to the development of, and learning about, that initial language. But children need to have attention paid to those aspects of the L1 which they are still learning – “vocabulary, semantics, syntax, formal discourse patterns and complex aspects of pragmatics” (Collier 1995: online). The other form of bilingualism, found in Nauru, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, is immersion bilingualism. Students use their mother tongues for intimate communication but at school they acquire literacy in the colonial language with which they will have had very little contact, for which they may have little use and which challenges their full command of their L1. “Some studies indicate that if students do not reach a certain threshold in their first language, including literacy, they may experience cognitive difficulties in the second language” (Collier 1995: online). Neither of these forms of bilingualism values the mother tongues as languages through which to learn. By extension, this implies that what is represented by that language is also of lesser value (Topping 1987). Nor do they ensure that sound literacy practices can be established, built upon and developed, especially when many teachers feel less than fully competent to teach content through English. Thomas and Collier (2002) show that transitional bilingualism in the best of contexts yields acceptable results until the change of instructional language when learning rates slow and, by Grade 6 or 7, begin to fall. Only additive bilingualism, they claim, which develops equally both a child’s first language and the chosen second, provides consistently sound achievement rates into and throughout secondary school.

Maintaining L1s or lingua francas throughout the process of education ensures that content is acquired more effectively. Benson further argues (2005:7) that “there is no evidence that the L2 must be a medium of instruction to be learned well; countries like Sweden achieve high levels of L2 competence by teaching it as a subject and preserving the L1 for instruction”. Pacific students, like other L2 learners, are frequently denigrated because of the quality of their acquisition of English; employers of USP graduates regularly complain about the level of English accomplishment and as a lecturer at USP I heard or read several such complaints.

The fact that these learners can communicate effectively, in many cases, in another language seems of less importance than that they use forms in their writing which do not reflect standard usage. Yet it has already been well-established that the vast majority of L2 learners, even under ideal learning conditions, will never use that language with the same facility as a native speaker (Bialystok 1979; Birdsong 1992; Cook 2001; Belikova and White 2009, among others). It would seem to make greater sense for educational authorities and the teaching profession to accept that fact, acknowledge the vital place of the L1 in the learning context, and design a strong programme to teach English as an additional language. This is the potential of additive bilingualism, but that demands good resources and effective teaching.

b) Resource provision:

In countries with little disposable income and with many demands on governmental budgets, there is often little available for more than the basics in education. But attention must be paid to creating a genuinely literate base if local needs in technical and managerial areas are to be met. Given that literacy in the region is complicated by the fact that many children are forced to begin literacy training in languages with which they have little contact, it is therefore hardly surprising that reading and writing are not regarded as enjoyable, but another factor is the serious lack of resources to encourage reading, especially in first languages or in lingua francas. Much can be learned from the Papua New Guinea experiment in the production of simple illustrated reading texts because at early stages of literacy development it is important that contexts are local and readily understood. In the past, schools across the region have accepted books from donor countries such as New Zealand and Australia which have not always been appropriate for the situations in which they are to be used: books are often too difficult to understand, cover inappropriate topics, describe lifestyles outside students' experiences or, in the case of non-fiction texts, are seriously out of date, or, perhaps most importantly, present values and social norms which run counter to Pacific values. Elley and Mangubhai created a "book flood" programme in certain schools in Fiji in which children were provided with individual copies of appropriate books and in which teachers read aloud to students

every day. The results showed enhanced interest and reading capabilities in all children exposed to the programme (Elley and Mangubhai: 1983).

An interest in reading develops from the application of the skills of reading, and taking meaning from text is a valuable skill for many forms of employment. In the view of Gannicott and Throsby (1992: 226), “[t]he evidence on the importance of textbooks and other instructional materials for the learning of students is overwhelming. Yet instructional materials are generally the most neglected input into the educational process.” Such materials as there are, especially in the teaching of English, are too often outdated in pedagogical practice, are uninteresting to work from, and display little understanding of a sequence of meaningful language learning.

It is not only reading materials which are in short supply. Rural schools in particular lack such basics as desks, chairs, science equipment, materials for technical education, textbooks for each student, or even pens, pencils and paper. In some schools it is impossible to write clearly on old, cracked blackboards and teachers must account for every stick of chalk used. There are seldom any libraries; in travels to rural schools in Fiji and Vanuatu, I asked to see the library in each one. In one or two, a free-standing room, unlocked at my request, contained a small number of damp and insect-ridden books. In others, the library consisted of three or four shelves in a corner of the staffroom. Computers and access to the internet are uncommon, largely because there is often no electricity in remote areas and because the humid climate makes it difficult to keep electronic equipment in working condition. These factors mean that large numbers of students have never read an entire book nor see reading as a way in which to acquire knowledge. All of these contribute to poor levels of achievement across the region.

c) Assessment policies:

Perhaps because of the lower number of places available in the fewer secondary schools, examination systems in the region are often exclusionary: anyone who fails loses the opportunity to progress further. This effectively means that access to education is limited for many students because there are no second chances,

especially when money must be found to pay school fees. In the Solomon Islands only about one-quarter of primary students go on to secondary school and in Vanuatu secondary schools cater for fewer than 40 percent of primary school intakes (ADB: 2006; Edwatch 2007).

There is no suggestion that examination systems as gate-keepers of standards should be dispensed with but in much of the Pacific they drive the educational structure, rather than reflecting it. Discussions with teachers in several countries brought the same issue to the forefront: that it was difficult to change what and how they taught because they had to have students ready for crucial examinations. For many years, as has been explained, the examinations used in several secondary schools in the Pacific were prepared in New Zealand and even with the development of the South Pacific Option which attempted to bring in the Pacific context, such assessments can only have reflected the standards expected in New Zealand. Though this relationship ended in the late 1980s as New Zealand itself phased out its extant examination structure, the South Pacific Board of Educational Assessment which provides formal school examinations in the Pacific seems to have maintained the academic focus of the past.

The higher in the system a student moves, the greater the likelihood that these important examinations will be in English (or in French, in Vanuatu). This means that students are being assessed not only on their curriculum knowledge but on the ability to explain their understanding in a second or subsequent language. As there is always a question over how much content knowledge is being absorbed when learning is taking place in a language still being acquired, the added burden of being assessed in that other language may be one explanation for poor academic results. The Pacific would be much better served by examination papers in mother tongues or lingua francas, except perhaps for those examinations which test students' use of languages.

A widely held view among teachers in the region is that students are over-assessed and that this fact is limiting the time able to be spent on ensuring that curriculum objectives are fully understood. This is especially so in Fiji. Barrington et al (1988:

20) were of the view that this was “a necessity ... in times of rising rolls and teacher shortage but not now so pressing” and in recent years Fiji has had more teachers moving through its teacher training institutes than it has positions for. It is likely that major national examinations will continue to be viewed as important at the end of primary education and at the end of secondary school, but it is at least questionable whether students need to be pressured so regularly by examination systems which “cater only to selection and promotion to subsequent levels, ignoring other significant examination functions” (Thimmappa and Sharma 2003:46). The current examination system has the potential to end students’ education and drives teaching so that the system’s impact “is reflected in (1) exam-directed subject prescriptions, (2) exam-oriented teaching approaches, (3) stereotyped learning styles, (3) (sic) exam-based assessment approaches, and (4) result-bearing schools” (Thimmappa and Sharma 2003: 46).

d) Teacher recruitment and training:

This problem lies at the heart of many of the issues already discussed: poor assessment results are at least partially caused by ineffective teaching; poor understanding of content and language can reflect teaching methodology, and problems with class sizes, limited resources and curriculum weaknesses can be alleviated to some extent by creative teaching.

It must be acknowledged first of all that there are many able teachers in Pacific education systems but that on the whole teachers live and work in less than ideal conditions and are paid too little for the work they are required to do. Some students recently in teacher training at USP acknowledged that they were entering teaching only because they did not have high enough grades to get into the courses of their first choice; they decided to become teachers as a sort of ‘option of last resort’ which suggests they are unlikely to be as committed to a difficult experience as those for whom teaching was a voluntary choice. The general rule in most Pacific countries appears to be that teachers, upon certification, do not choose their places of employment but are assigned to schools. This ensures that less attractive schools, such as those in distant rural communities, are provided with staff but it also makes it

less likely that all teachers are equally enthusiastic about their appointments. Teachers often resist going to such remote schools (Henly 2005) and move on as soon as possible so that rural schools are more often staffed by inexperienced teachers and have a higher turnover of staff (both indicators of poor student achievement; Heck 2007), than urban schools. The further the distance from an urban centre, the greater the chance that a school will be provided with fewer resources, that buildings will be in poorer condition and that electricity and water supplies may not be available. In some remote villages experienced by this writer, community support is high with parents assigned to prepare teachers' meals or to clean the school, but in poorer villages there is often little time or extra money to expand services at the school. In their study of teacher absence rates in developing countries, Chaudhury et al (2006) found that teachers were more likely to be absent from their schools when they were faced with poor working conditions, and inexperienced teachers were more likely to absent themselves than experienced ones.

Heck (2007) states that teacher quality has profound effects on achievement rates and that vital aspects of teacher quality are the degree of experience and teachers' own educational levels. Some reference has already been made in Chapters 3 and 6 to the weaknesses clear in this aspect of educational practice. Not all teachers region-wide have received any form of training, sometimes because they have not matriculated from secondary school. They therefore have an education only slightly above that of the pupils they are expected to teach. Ielemia (1996) refers to the practice in Niue of using pupil-teachers with some secondary education as teachers in primary level classrooms. Henly (2005), describing new teacher improvement schemes in Vanuatu, claims that 33% of all teachers in Vanuatu are untrained and recruited in the communities they live in because trained teachers cannot be provided. "When the teacher's grasp of material is little better than that of the pupils he or she is teaching, the result is a rigid style of rote memorisation, with little fostering of an analytical approach to learning" (Gannicott and Throsby 1992: 232). Generally, this continues to be the pattern found in primary and secondary education in the Pacific region (Phan and Deo 2008).

In the past the consensus of research into effective schools was that “ethnic and family socio-economic (SES) background factors constituted the dominant determinants of students’ educational outcomes” (Rowe 2003: 4), effectively blaming students and their families for their failure to achieve. Other researchers, however, have suggested the classroom ethos and the role of the teacher has a greater impact on a student’s achievement than his or her background or the quality of a school (Jones 1991; Bishop and Glynn 1999; Darling-Hammond 2000; Alton-Lee 2003; Rowe 2003; Heck 2007). Learning takes place in classrooms and teachers affect what happens in classrooms.

A reliance on curriculum standards and ... assessment strategies without paying due attention to teacher quality appears to be insufficient to gain the improvements in student outcomes sought ...The quality of teacher education and teaching appear to be more strongly related to student achievement than class sizes, overall spending levels or teacher salaries (Darling-Hammond 2000, cited in Rowe 2003: 21).

It is not clear what the parameters are for measuring what makes an effective teacher but Darling-Hammond (2000: 12) asserts that untrained or poorly trained teachers have greater difficulty preparing curriculum, managing classrooms, and diagnosing and meeting students’ needs, and demonstrate fewer effective instructional skills. She claims (p.13-14) that successful teachers use a wide range of teaching strategies and a variety of interaction types to meet the changing needs of students, and that they have “the ability to be clear, structure material, ask higher order questions, use student ideas and probe student comments”. Passive teachers, in her view, “dumb down” the curriculum by relying on workbooks and rote learning as means of keeping students involved. She argues that having “well-qualified teachers is by far the most important determinant of student achievement [across subject areas] in all years and at all grade levels” (p. 30), and that “teacher quality characteristics such as certification status [and educational level] are very significantly and positively correlated with student outcomes” (p. 29). (See also Airini et al 2007: 35.)

Avalos (2000: 460) quotes the UNESCO description of teaching as requiring “expert knowledge and specialised skills, acquired and maintained through rigorous and continuing study”, and herein lies at least part of the problem with the teaching profession in the Pacific region. Too many teachers in front of Pacific classrooms, untrained or under-trained, do not have the specialised skills needed to teach multilevel classes or to teach literacy effectively in mother tongues, let alone in second or third languages, and they are not provided with the resources to establish sound literacy practices. Many lack confidence in their English language ability and in their capability to teach the language to students. “International studies suggest that students do poorly in fields in which teachers are least well-prepared” (Darling-Hammond 2000: 17), and lower levels of teacher education and poor teacher training are contributing factors to increased rates of teacher absenteeism (Chaudhury et al 2006). “Since a majority of teachers [in the Pacific] tend to remain largely passive and reactive ‘technicians’ rather than active and pro-active ‘professionals’ towards any educational innovation and implementation...., they remain calcified for most of their teaching career” (Thimmappa and Sharma 2003: 52). Clearly teacher recruitment and training are areas demanding serious attention. Further, few teachers get any opportunities to receive focused in-service professional development to enhance their skills, so the continuity of teachers’ learning and “continuing study” is ignored though teachers themselves recognise that they would benefit from in-service up-skilling.

Just as the Pacific nations must decide what sort of end products they want from their respective education systems, as Puamau suggested (2006), so they must think carefully about the means to get there, not only in the curricula which will best advantage students but in the teacher education which will give teachers the best path to provide for those needs. It is easy to hold the teaching profession responsible for educational weaknesses and teachers in many parts of the world are blamed for all sorts of shortcomings in educational outcomes, but if the teacher education does not improve, neither will the achievement rates of students. There is a very strong sense in some parts of the Pacific region that those students who do succeed do so *in spite*

of the system, not because of it. The problem must be viewed as crucial especially if regional governments expect their students to compete internationally.

In terms of the teaching of English in the Pacific region, it is clear that there are still many unresolved interests. Countries in the region are not likely to abandon the role of English in either their societies or their education systems any time soon; even without the role that English has played in their pasts, the current place of the language in global political and economic structures will ensure that control of English will be viewed as important. That means that attempts to move English into certain streams of education will probably be perceived as elitism. But exactly how the language is taught probably requires renewed thought. Would it be preferable to teach English as a subject and put effort into training effective language teachers? What percentage of the population of the region needs academic English? Improved and focused teacher training, enhanced language teaching skills and better resource provision would increase the confidence of local teachers in their ability to provide language models appropriate to students' needs.

Unlike French, English has never had an academy to dictate what in the language is acceptable or not.

Standard English is determined by loose consensus of good practice, which means that no individual can reasonably be expected to be completely knowledgeable about what is and what is not considered best practice, especially that individuals cannot be aware of what is considered good practice in one of the English centres other than their own. (Gupta 2001: 367).

Consequently those English centres themselves can and do establish what norms relate to the English used in them. Schneider discusses the changes occurring at the interface between lexis and grammar of the English found in Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, South Africa, Nigeria, Jamaica and Canada, among others. If his "Dynamic Model" is predictive of developments, it can be expected that Pacific authorities will, in time, acknowledge some of the qualities that distinguish their use of English and standardise them for acceptance.

Those who teach English in the Pacific are users of the English in the Pacific which, at least in Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu, is beginning to demonstrate rule-governed variations from the traditional goal of standard British English. Educational authorities, though they may not yet be ready to do so, will finally have to create “a new relationship with their own contexts” (Lather, 1991, quoted in Brutt-Griffler and Samimy, 1999: 429) by acknowledging the local reality, acceptability and regional comprehensibility of certain linguistic adaptations. This does not mean sacrificing the global usefulness of English but setting educational goals which reflect the way English is used in the region.

The most important implication of all, of course, is the financial burden of attempting to improve the standard of education and the outcomes for Pacific nation students. The task is so large and potentially so expensive that it needs to start with a focus on the questions posed earlier in this chapter: what do Pacific nations want and need their education systems to produce, and having decided that, what is the best method of achieving that goal? Without answers to those questions, there can be no integrated programme of curriculum development, language-in-education policy, assessment policy, resource provision, and teacher recruitment and training.

Though the costs of such changes imply that donors may be required to assist with funding, this cannot mean that outsiders have the right to dictate how the process unfolds. There needs to be consultation within each country with all stakeholders – families, communities, teachers, teaching administrations, departments of education and governments – to establish what is required in curriculum choices, content and resources, in literacy (including literacy in local languages), in numeracy, in English, in assessment, in good quality teacher recruitment and in teaching in mother tongues and lingua francas, in teacher support, and ultimately in language policy so that education meets local and regional needs and student retention is raised. Ajibola (2008: 52) in writing of the same concerns in Nigeria states:

The process of constructing the curriculum (*and all its attendant ramifications*) is unique to each national setting. It is a complex outcome of the opinions and solutions that key stakeholders propose for

[a] society's requirements and needs. There are no "successful" international models to copy. (Italicised phrase added).

If Pacific education is to improve and meet the needs of Pacific countries both domestically and internationally, it needs to reflect its local societies first and be valued for its contribution to meeting local needs. When this is successfully achieved, it will be clearer exactly what features of English in the Pacific are characteristic of the region and thus, perhaps, easier to acknowledge as the Pacific's own.

7.2: Implications for New Zealand

It is not only in Pacific Island communities that the gradual changes in the English language used are likely to have ramifications. Principal countries of migration, namely Australia, New Zealand and the United States, must also ensure that their citizens of Pacific background are offered every opportunity to advance and progress. While the points made in this section are also relevant to Australia with its growing Pasifika populations, the section will focus on New Zealand (where Auckland is touted as the 'largest Pacific city in the world') whose education the researcher knows more intimately.

Students of Pasifika heritage (the term increasingly applied in New Zealand to people of Pacific origin) comprise a significant sector of New Zealand society whose academic accomplishments are frequently the subject of public debate because of the lower than expected achievement rates in national examinations and the disturbing percentage of Pasifika students who leave high school without any formal qualifications. The majority of these students have been born in New Zealand: they are the children of Pacific migrants who arrived in New Zealand within the last 15 to 20 years, or of parents who were themselves born in New Zealand. This means that most of these children enter primary school at five years of age and proceed through the school system with their peers, exposed to the same teaching programme as everyone else. But there is a crucial difference between equity of education, which New Zealand can probably fairly claim, and equity of access to education. It is this

difference which is at the heart of the educational experience of too many New Zealand-based Pasifika children.

New Zealand has long had a policy of Pacific immigration, not only from those countries which have a 'special relationship' with New Zealand (the Cook Islands, Niue and the Tokelau Islands) but from much wider afield. At the end of the Second World War, the Pacific community in New Zealand represented "just over one-tenth of one percent of the total population" (Cook et al 1999: 4). Migration was steady until the 1970s when there was a rush to take advantage of employment growth and jobs which New Zealanders of the time tended to avoid, generally manual work. The impact of the economic downturn and reconstruction of the New Zealand economy in the late 1980s reduced this flow; indeed, this was a period of out-migration either to Australia or to return to home countries. By the early 1990s the immigration rate had increased again and by 2006 the latest census figures showed 265,974 Pasifika residents (Statistics New Zealand 2008). There are now more Cook Islanders, Niueans and Tokelauans living in New Zealand than remain in their home countries.

Recent research has shown some important developments in Pasifika populations in New Zealand in terms of residence, spatial distribution, education and employment. Predominantly, Pasifika populations are urban dwellers and chiefly in the Auckland and Wellington regions: two-thirds live in Auckland, about 28% in other parts of the North Island and only about 6% in the South Island. These general figures disguise the fact that certain national groups make different decisions about where they live: Samoans, Tongans and Niueans overwhelmingly choose to live in the Auckland area while the vast majority (74%) of Tokelauan immigrants move to Wellington (Cook et al 1999). The reasons for this tend to be that there are well-established Pacific Island communities already in those cities and many migrants arrive via "kin-and-friendship chains" (Johnston et al 2003) which offer them cultural maintenance and social support while they adjust to a new environment. The desire to sustain their language, cultural practices and religious groupings make it likely that Pacific Islanders will live close to those of the same ethnic background: "among Pacific Islanders...at least half...live in meshblocks where the percentage of their co-ethnics was above 50" (Johnston et al 2003: 118), and approximately 34% live in extended

family groupings (Cook et al 1999: 14). This means that many Pacific Islanders live in contexts with fewer opportunities to interact with other New Zealanders who speak English as their L1 (Johnston et al 2003: 123).

In the first years of the 21st century, the growth in Pasifika populations in New Zealand comes not from migration but from natural growth. Of the more than 266,000 Pacific Islanders who now live in New Zealand over half were born in New Zealand. Cook et al (1999: 3) describe those populations in New Zealand as “characterised by high fertility, rapid miscegenation, a high population growth rate and a youthful population”. Total fertility rates for people from the variety of Pacific groups show that all are above the “theoretical ‘replacement level’ (taken as 2.1 births per woman)”, some by twice as much (Cook et al 1999: 8). The population generally is also young: the median age overall was 21.1 years at the 2006 census, compared with the median age for the general population of 35.9 years. The percentage of the Pacific population aged 15 years of age and less was 38%, compared with 22% for the total New Zealand population. This means that the presence in New Zealand schools of children of Pacific extraction is distinctive and in certain parts of the country, such as South Auckland and Porirua in the Wellington region, Pacific children are the single largest ethnic group in many classrooms and, in some cases, are the only ethnic group.

Almost half of all Pacific Islanders in New Zealand speak more than one language, though that facility is dropping among New Zealand-born Pasifika peoples. Tuvaluans were the group most likely to speak their own language: 71% claimed that skill. Among Samoans, 63% state that they can speak Samoan, and 61% of Tongans speak their heritage language (Statistics NZ 2010). However, birth and residence in New Zealand impacts severely on the maintenance of the mother tongue: while most recent migrants from Samoa speak Samoan, less than half of the next generation does, and though 75% of overseas-born Tokelauans speak their own language only about one-quarter of the next generation can speak it well (Statistics NZ 2008). Among those groups which have had a long and “special” relationship with New Zealand – most especially the Cook Islands and Niue – the mother tongue is fading

from use as successive generations are resident in New Zealand which is likely to put the language under threat in the home islands, as is happening with Niuean.

Nonetheless, many young people of Pasifika background have been exposed to the language of their parents in the family home. Parents who are the first generation migrants continue to use their own language widely – it is the language of festivals, family use and often the church. Based on the pattern of *kohanga reo*, the Maori language nests which provide total immersion Maori language pre-school education, Pasifika communities have established Pacific Islands playgroups, funded by the government's Early Childhood Development Unit, and 33.5% of Pasifika pre-schoolers attend these groups, a little more than attend standard English-language kindergartens (Statistics NZ 1998: 29; Statistics NZ 2010). Furthermore, it is not unusual for some New Zealand-born children to spend time in the Islands with grandparents as a crucial exposure to the home culture. Before starting school, many Pasifika children do not have much social exposure to palagi (European) culture – they spend most time with siblings and their family group, and attend Sunday school and church where the heritage language is generally predominant. There are no Pasifika versions of *kura kaupapa*, Māori total immersion primary education, though there are weekend or after school language centres in several of the Pacific Island languages, and a growing number of mainstream schools with higher percentages of Pasifika students (mainly Samoan) have established mother-tongue units in their schools in which children receive bilingual education (Tuafuti and McCaffery 2005). These have had significant impact on educational outcomes for the children exposed to them. Most other Pasifika children, however, when they enter school at five years of age, are faced with acquiring literacy in the dominant language which may not be the language of their home or to which they may not have had wide social exposure.

Pasifika levels of academic achievement in New Zealand

Currently, there are few figures on how well Pasifika children perform academically in primary school; the principal area of concern for educationalists in New Zealand has been the lower than expected levels of accomplishment at secondary school and the numbers of Pasifika students who leave school with minimal or no qualifications

that will benefit their search for employment. In 1998 (p.18) Cook et al stated that “while 8 percent of the total population are degree graduates, only 2 percent of Pacific men and women are”; more recent figures from Statistics New Zealand 2010 show that the percentage has increased to 3% of the Pacific population. Slightly less than half of Pacific women over 15 years of age had a school qualification though the figures were lower for men, and almost one-quarter of Pacific women had a post-school qualification compared with 20% for men. It is likely that these figures will rise as younger Pacific people move through the education system but the percentage of those Pasifika students currently over 15 who do not have a formal qualification of any kind is over one-third.

Despite the small overall improvement in statistics, Pacific educational achievement levels continue to be lower than those of the general population which has a serious impact on employment possibilities. The percentage of Pasifika people employed increased in the five years 2001 to 2006 from 84% to 89%, with 72% being in full time employment and only 17% being in part time employment. The unemployment rate fell from 16.2% to 10.7% in those same years and in 2007 stood at 6.4%. However, the range of employment for Pasifika people remains relatively restricted: more than 60% of the men worked in blue collar employment – as trades workers, machinery operators, drivers or labourers – of which labouring was the single biggest employer. Women took on a wider range of employment: work as professionals, community and service workers, clerical workers and labourers all took 15% or more of the female work force. Incomes have risen between the two latest censuses but the Pacific workforce still earns a lower median income than that of the overall population of New Zealand by several thousand dollars a year (Statistics NZ 2010).

The 2010 data from Statistics New Zealand show that although achievement levels are improving, they are “under-represented in the group that has University Entrance or a Level 3 qualification or higher ... Only 20% of Pasifika leavers were at this level (compared to 39% of total school leavers) ... The proportion of Pasifika school leavers who left school without reaching a Level 1 qualification dropped from 32% in 2006 to 26% in 2007” (Human Rights Commission 2008: 50-51). Recent figures demonstrate a greater participation and achievement rate than in the past, but while

the percentage of Pasifika students with any form of tertiary qualification is 19%, that for the population overall is 40%, and qualification completion rates among Pasifika tertiary students have fallen in recent years (Human Rights Commission 2008).

Reasons

Just why achievement rates for Pacific Islanders have not reached the national average has been a question for research for some time. One answer may lie with the fact that the current generation of school attendees tend to be what has been termed “Generation 1.5”, meaning a generation normally regarded as the second generation of immigrants but who are still affected by the linguistic and socio-economic characteristics of their families so that they do not make the progress often found in other second generation migrants.

The form of English spoken in the immediate environment of many Pasifika students in New Zealand is likely to bear many similarities to the Pacific English detailed in this study. Migrants who received all their compulsory education in the islands will have faced exactly the conditions outlined in Chapter 6 above. They will have tended to receive reduced input in their English language learning and a limited range of opportunities to use the language before coming to New Zealand. Furthermore, these parents, and in many cases grandparents, also grew up with a particular view of education and schooling, one in which the role of students was to listen attentively, do what they were told and complete the tasks set by the teacher. “It was by ‘making everybody work hard’ and ‘keeping the class under control’ that learning was achieved” (Jones 1991: 97). Education, as has been noted in Chapter 6, was often a matter of rote learning with choral repetitions of newly acquired data. This formality and the importance of listening to those in authority reflects, for example, the structure of Samoan society: there *matai* and pastor expect obedience and so, in turn, do parents and grandparents. The same can be said of Tonga where hereditary chiefs hold sway in all sorts of social, cultural and political decision-making (Lawson 1996). Jones’ (1991) work showed that the girls who were at the centre of her study thought that obedience to parents and teachers was an important part of their

families' view of a stable society. In Samoa, children learn by observing their elders and then performing similarly.

These behaviours are underpinned by a complex set of cultural contexts in which courtesy, obedience, and respect for the elders, whose authority is hardly ever questioned, are of supreme importance. In class, these conforming and conservative aspects of culture result in students remaining passive and very much dependent upon the teacher. Students are restrained from asking questions, and "answering back" is rarely tolerated. (Hang and Barker 1997: 118)

This perception of school dynamics means that many Pasifika students do not question what they are told, may prefer to memorise material rather than discuss its merits, and dislike being called upon to answer questions in class because of the potential for embarrassment, which reflects not just on the individual but on the family and culture behind the individual. Jones (1991) described clearly the lengths to which students in a predominantly Pasifika class would go to avoid responding to open questions and to lead the teachers themselves to provide the answers needed. Families, too, do not query school policies or actions. They not only feel unwelcomed by formal school structures (Siilata and Barkhuizen 2004; Ferguson et al 2008; Franken et al 2008; Fletcher et al 2009), but are not confident of their control of the English language and believe that as schools are established by the state for the education of all, they presumably know best. This has led to a two-way lack of understanding because the absence of parents at open nights or parent-teacher evenings is often taken by teachers as a sign that Pasifika parents are not interested in their children's educational progress, whereas in fact that progress has frequently been the principal reason for migration (Nakhid 2003; Franken et al 2008).

In their study of the English of the children of immigrant families living in England, Leung et al (1997) found that school-aged children demonstrated a complex pattern of language learning dictated by the impact of "multiethnic urban settings" (p. 545). This means that very broad and often inaccurate assumptions were made by teachers about students' language control, ethnic affiliations and sense of identity based on

external factors such as students' colour, names or use of the language of the school ground and of their peer groups (Ferguson et al 2008; Siteine 2010). In certain suburban state schools in South Auckland and Wellington, an "ethnolinguistic complexity" exists which is comparable in effects to that of British inner city suburbs, comprising a mix of Pacific languages and those of more recent migrants and refugees from the Middle East and Northeast Africa. Leung et al (1997: 546) quote from Garcia's 1996 claim that:

The greatest failure of contemporary education has been precisely its inability to help teachers understand the ethnolinguistic complexity of children, classrooms, speech communities, and society, in such a way as to enable them to make informed decisions about language and culture in the classroom.

The students whom Leung et al quote are revealing about how their use of English has developed and the positions they occupy between the culture of the home and the culture of the school which will judge their levels of achievement using the expectations of the mainstream.

P.M. As I started out in high school, I had to develop a cockney accent of speaking in order to fit in with the rest of my friends. I kept on speaking London English to the point where I spoke it naturally.

D.C. I've been speaking Gujerati for all my life but I still can't read it and write it...when I'm with my friends I speak London English including slang.

N.K. People say that I should try to speak proper English not slang or cockney.

M.T. ...my dad is always telling me to use proper English so I don't get in the habit of speaking slang all the time. (Leung et al, 1997: 549-551)

For many Pasifika students in New Zealand these experiences would parallel their own. They may speak or understand the language of their parents but not with the

confidence of the generation before them, and are unlikely to read and write it because they have not been given the opportunity to become literate in the heritage language. Because it is generally true that many of their parents do not speak standard English, students do not have consistent exposure to it even at school where classrooms are frequently sites of casual language. In order to fit in with their peers, they learn to control a register of language replete with slang. In one high school in Wellington where the population is predominantly Pasifika, the ESOL teacher has described the language of the school grounds as being a patois or koiné made up of Samoan, Tongan, Tuvaluan and Tokelauan, a language form which gives the Pasifika students a unique identity and which differentiates them from Māori and Pakeha (Caucasian) students (Hutton, 2004: pers. comm.).

Cheshire, Edwards and Whittle (1993, quoted in Leung et al, 1997: 553) describe the British education system as resting:

... on the assumption that teachers and pupils will use the grammar of standard English. However, the majority of British children are speakers not of standard English but of a non-standard variety of English (a dialect), and this has been recognised as posing extremely important problems concerning language in education.

This is exactly the difficulty faced by Pasifika students in New Zealand schools, most particularly at high school where the National Certificates of Educational Achievement (NCEA), which will define students as successes or failures, expect standard English. More than one teacher in ESOL NCEA workshops in 2002-2004 described the units of NCEA as “beyond our Pasifika students” because those students, especially for the crucial literacy credits, could not produce the type of English wanted (Teachers 2002-2004: pers. comm.). Students may be actively discouraged from attempting certain units or face repeated lack of success.

As in Britain, the expectation among many teachers in New Zealand is that if students sound fluid and competent in their spoken classroom language, that apparent expertise reflects general proficiency in the range of registers teachers would expect from mainstream middle-class students. But this is not the reality for many of Pacific

heritage. They do not control the registers of academic English which are those of examinations. Many are not at ease with the vocabulary of academic study and may find the content of many subjects outside their experience. Many are challenged by classrooms where they are expected to answer questions because that is something they have not been encouraged to do within their own cultural contexts (Fletcher et al 2009; Jones 1991). Throughout their education the differences between the language they habitually use and that of formal written English text, or the form such texts take, are unlikely to have been pointed out to them (or to any other student because all are assumed to control such registers). This fact alone helps to explain the proliferation of undergraduate writing courses. Unless those differences and the means to access formal academic English are explicitly taught, many students in New Zealand, and most particularly those with little opportunity to find this out for themselves because they are not yet proficient in standard forms of English, will always be short-changed.

New Zealand is faced with educational issues in regard to Pasifika students not dissimilar in effect from those impacting Pacific students in their home countries. While the education system may be available to all in New Zealand compulsorily until the age of 16, this fact does not ensure that every student can access it. Students who do not control formal spoken and written English with a wide lexical range; with secure sentence structure, paragraph formation and argumentation patterns; and with the ability to vary register as appropriate, or who cannot take meanings, direct and implied, from texts both literary and expository from a culture not their own, will struggle to achieve academic success, especially in literacy credits without which neither Level 1 nor Level 2 National Certificates can be awarded. Furthermore, the structuring of the demands of NCEA means that a student who fails a particular unit standard may re-submit work but may not be re-taught to focus attention on those aspects of language or content which are inhibiting progress. Without that guidance, a student whose language register limits the adjustment to a more formal one is condemned to fail, and fail, and fail. If the Ministry of Education is serious in wishing to correct this situation, it too must either acknowledge that the English used by Pasifika students represents some qualities uniquely their own which are not by

extension ‘wrong’, or ensure that the teaching profession adjusts to provide better support.

Just as in the Pacific, it is less likely that the English of the region will be readily accepted in New Zealand as a regional norm which students are acquiring, sometimes as a first language, sometimes when they begin pre-school. It reflects the language used by their peers in large urban centres, but what distinguishes many Pasifika students from monolingual English-speaking ones (for which the education system is largely designed) is that while the latter may acquire other registers in their contacts with parents and other older members of their communities, the former generally have no such opportunities because the Pasifika older generations are more likely to speak either their L1 or the English of the Pacific which they received in their education in their homelands. Taumoefolau et al (2002: 21) suggest that the loss of distinctions between formal and informal registers among these speakers is a “frequent indicator of language loss in many societies”. The cultural norms of the Pacific which insist that the young cannot take part in adult conversations further reduces the possibility that school-aged Pasifika students will learn the formal linguistic options demanded in education at secondary and tertiary levels. Attempts have been made in the past to make educational authorities and the Ministry of Education aware of this linguistic situation. This writer was part of a team which in 2004 met with the then Associate Minister of Education, Marion Hobbs, to ask for a reconsideration of the way in which second language learners of English in New Zealand were being penalised and restricted from further education by the interpretation of the linguistic expectations required to achieve the literacy credits crucial for university entry. Though we were received sympathetically by the Associate Minister, the Ministry’s reaction was to reject any discussion of change to those language demands.

If the education system in New Zealand cannot recognise the language used by Pasifika students as having specific and unique qualities, other forms of support must be created within compulsory education to raise achievement levels of Pasifika students. In a long examination of the lack of consistent educational success of ESOL students in the American education system, Thomas and Collier (2002: 10)

write, “As a country, we cannot afford a continuation of current practices, at the risk of under-preparing a large segment of our workforce for the 21st century”. The same can undeniably be said of New Zealand.

Forms of possible support

One form of support would be the provision of bilingual education. Tuafuti and McCaffrey (2005) examined local responses to this need, which have arisen because the decentralisation of education in New Zealand permits a local community to have a say in how education is delivered in their school. This has led to a number of Samoan bilingual units in the Auckland region (p. 482) and pilot classes in other regions, as well as dozens of Pasifika early childhood centres now funded from the national Early Childhood Education budget. Nonetheless, government policy is only committed to bilingual education in Māori and has justified this by stating that “so many Pasifika students were now English-speaking that first language bilingual education was rapidly fading as an option for them” (NZ Ministry of Education 2003, 2004, quoted in Tuafuti and McCaffrey 2005: 483), which was exactly the argument raised years ago against establishing the Kohanga Reo (Māori pre-school language nests) and Kura Kaupapa (Māori immersion primary schools). There are several areas in the country with sufficient numbers of Samoan, Cook Islands, Tongan and Niuean school children to offer bilingual units in certain schools. The same advantages of bilingualism would be available to New Zealand as to Pacific nations: initial literacy and numeracy in the language of the home and culture; cultural and language maintenance; introduction of English as a subject alongside L1 literacy; transfer of literacy skills from the L1 to the L2; firmer understanding of content material; involvement of parents as educational support; and pride in the language and culture. In the assessment of Tuafuti and McCaffery (2005: 492), the bilingual programme at Finlayson Park School in Auckland has contributed to decreased absenteeism, improved levels of leadership both in and out of school, and “literacy achievements in both languages [Samoan and English]...at or above their grade age norms”.

Another form of support, which does not represent an ‘either-or’ option, is that teachers of all curriculum subjects must recognise their roles as providers of the language of the content. Language across the curriculum (LAC) has been around for several years and every so often rather desultory attempts are made to encourage teachers to become responsible for explaining how to be successful communicators of their content subject. The assumption, for example, that good readers automatically become good writers can be disproved any number of times; students need to be shown how to create text that meets the demands of a particular field of study. For students whose exposure to a variety of English texts is limited, this is even more important and the work of Leung et al (1997) and Gee (2001) suggests that because many inner city children in large urban centres, not merely those with another language in their repertoire, identify with and habitually use a form of English which is not regarded as standard, they will need to learn how to adjust to different literacy demands. Making teachers consciously aware of these demands in their teaching should be part of the training required to produce teachers capable of working in multicultural and multiliterate communities, but the evidence in secondary classrooms suggests that, despite much in-service training being devoted to the provision of LAC techniques, the teaching profession as a whole has yet to adopt these as part of their daily teaching practice, especially in the secondary school where the stakes are so high. Perhaps this is merely a reflection of the dichotomous attitude of the Ministry of Education itself to making significant changes in order to meet the needs of Pasifika students.

The final form of support would go some way to answering all the underlying questions inherent in the education of Pasifika students at home and in New Zealand – questions such as “What should our education systems be producing?”; “What does this country need from its education system?”; “How can we best achieve the most productive outcomes?”; “What languages should we be using in the schools and which *forms* of those languages?” and “How can we equip teachers to provide positive outcomes for all students?” It would seem important therefore that countries of the South Pacific, including New Zealand, consider the place of language policies in their philosophies because at present policies relating to language value and

language use are ad hoc and reactionary, and provide too little guidance for the development of language in and through education.

Language contexts within any country, as Phillipson (1992), Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996) and May (2000), among others, have pointed out, are ecological systems involving not only principal and minority languages but “standard” and “non-standard” varieties. The interrelationships between them are complex and entangled and pressure is further applied by historical experiences of migration or invasion, language contact, language death or revival, the social and economic status of speakers and the position within the society of international languages, such as English and French (Kaplan and Baldauf 1998; Ricento and Hornberger 1996). As a result, policies affecting language are likely to have impacts in other areas.

In the Pacific region the creation of language policies which recognise the value of local languages as resources of the state are an important first step to the logical integration of those languages (and whichever colonial language is chosen) into the states’ social, economic and political systems. Language constitutes one vital element of personal and group identity; if a language is allowed to be debased or fall into disuse, the culture which that language helps to carry is likely to falter as well. In New Zealand, the term “Pasifika” may be intended as a non-discriminatory description of those New Zealanders who have Pacific Island heritages but at the same time it deprives each person so labelled of the precise heritage they bear as Cook Island, Fijian, Niuean, Samoan, Tongan, Tokelauan and Tuvaluan New Zealanders. For the most part the attitudes towards language use in the region reflect the expectations and limitations of the dominant socio-political and socio-economic interests at all levels of the respective societies, and the most obvious areas of damage can be seen in language-in-education policies where, effectively, children have no choice in how they are made literate or in which language, and how they receive crucial content learning. When this lack of choice means that the language utilised is not their own, the outcomes are clearly less than advantageous to the child or the state. Most of the countries of the region are signatories to the United Nations Declaration of Linguistic Rights so they have agreed that:

the collective rights of language groups.. may include the following: the right for their own language and culture to be taught; the right of access to cultural services;...the right to receive attention in their own language from government bodies and in socio-economic relations. (Article 3: quoted in Bratt Paulston and Tucker, 2003: 479).

This suggests that people have the right to become literate in the language they speak, to have their language (and by extension their culture) sustained by the state so that government bodies can, in fact, provide “attention in their own language”. It further demands that states, in language policies, should display “a will to respect linguistic diversity and the linguistic human rights of all, at both the individual and the collective levels“ (Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996: 434). Language planning then works through legislation to implement those policies to answer the question, “How can this best be achieved?”

For policies relating to majority languages, there is a need to consider and perhaps to specify “*Whose* language?” and this question is relevant to those societies in which variant dialects of majority languages are spoken. Generally, “dominant groups succeed in attributing the status of language to their own variety while ascribing the status of dialect to those of others” (Wiley and Lukes, 1996: 515). A definition of *which* variant of a language is regarded as the standard carries the implication for education that learners must be given the means to acquire that standard as a second dialect if those learners use another. Without this, education will perpetuate the denial of equity of access, by significant numbers of learners, to the economic and social power that the standard confers. If the standard English in the region is to be Standard British (or New Zealand, or Australian, or Pacific) English, this demands that attention is paid to the methodology which will make it possible for learners to achieve that standard.

In the case of New Zealand, the recognition in policy that Standard New Zealand English is the standard of education would mean that it becomes the responsibility of the education system to ensure that all those New Zealand school children, including (but not limited to) Pasifika students who do not speak or use standard New Zealand

English would have its features explained, exemplified and practised so that they could function in it as required. Without such action, the disempowerment of these students will continue and the education system of New Zealand cannot be said to be providing “equity of access’ to education.

Conclusion

It is clear that policies that recognise all languages in their communities as having value, and that language is an essential element of identity, that assert the right of language groups to their linguistic human rights, and that acknowledge that the language of education is a particular dialect, will involve a rethinking of education formats, of equitable consultation with stakeholder communities, of teacher recruitment and training, of expected methodologies, of resourcing and of assessment. As outcomes for Pasifika students continue to be far short of ideal, both in their homelands and in New Zealand, it is also clear that education systems across the region need to reflect the resource that multilingualism presents, and sustain that resource, supported by just language policies.

The implications, therefore, of English in the Pacific (or of the Pacific English which may be the end result of the natural changes currently underway) are considerable. Whether its existence is officially acknowledged is, in the end, immaterial. The fact is that English in the Pacific, which inevitably includes New Zealand whose Pasifika population grows each year, appears to be stabilising in several of the countries examined, and failing to recognise that fact will not halt the development. Ignoring the changes occurring will only mean that educational achievements for too many Pacific students will not reflect their potential, and their ability to use education as a pathway to a better future will remain stunted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Aarts, B. 1989. Verb-preposition constructions and small clauses in English, *Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 25 (2). (Sept): 277-290
- Adejare, O. 1997. Communicative competence in English as a second language, in Bamgbose, Banjo and Thomas (eds): 152-177
- Adekunle, M. 1997. English in Nigeria: attitudes, policy and communicative realities”, in Bamgbose, Banjo and Thomas (eds): 56-86
- Afamasaga, T. 2002. Personal reflections on education in Samoa, in Pene, Taufe’ulungaki and Benson (eds): 97-101
- Afendras, E., S. Millar, E. Mac Aogain, A. Bamgbose, Y. Kachru. A.P Saleem, B. Preisler, P. Trudgill, F. Coulmas and P Dasgupta, 1995. On ‘new/non-native Englishes: a gamelan, *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol 24: 295-321
- Afolayan, A. 1997. Ineffectiveness in the presentation of English in Nigeria: sources and remedies, in in Bamgbose, Banjo and Thomas (eds): 113-129
- Ahulu, S. 1994a. How Ghanaian is Ghanaian English? *English Today*, 38, Vol. 10 (2): 25-29
- 1994b. Styles of Standard English. *English Today*, 40, Vol 10 (4): 10-17
- 1995. Variation in the use of complex verbs in International English, *English Today*, 42, Vol. 11 (2): 28-34.
- 1997. General English. *English Today*, 49, Vol. 13 (1): 17-23.
- 1998a. Lexical variation in International English. *English Today*, 55, Vol. 14 (3): 29-34.
- 1998b. Grammatical variation in international English, *English Today* 56, Vol. 14 (4): 19-25.
- Airini, S. McNaughton, J. Langley and P. Sauni. 2007. What educational reform means: lessons from teachers, research and policy working together for student success. *Educational Research, Policy and Practice*, Vol. 6 (1): 31-54
- Aitchison, J. 1989 *The articulate mammal: an introduction to psycholinguistics*. (3rd ed). London/New York: Routledge.
- Ajibola, M.A. 2008. Innovations and curriculum development for basic education in Nigeria: policy priorities and challenges of practice and implementation. *Research Journal of International Studies*, Issue 8: 51-58
- Akere, F. 1997. Languages in the curriculum: an assessment of the role of English and other languages in the education delivery process in Nigeria, in Bamgbose, Banjo and Thomas (eds): 179-199

- Alatis, J.E. 2005. Kachru's circles and the growth of professionalism in TESOL, *English Today* 82, Vol. 21 (2): 25-34
- Al-Dabbagh, A. 2005. Globalism and the universal language. *English Today* 82, Vol. 21 (2): 3-12.
- Allan, J-A. 2001. *Review of the measurement of ethnicity: classification and issues*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.
- Allen, J.P.B. and S.P. Corder (eds). 1975. *Papers in Applied Linguistics: Language and language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alsagoff, L. And Ho Chee Lick. 1998. The grammar of Singapore English, in Foley, Kandiah, Bao Zhiming, Gupta, Alsagoff, Ho Chee Lick, Wee, Talib and Bokhorst-Heng: 127-151
- Alton-Lee, A. 2003. Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling: Best evidence Synthesis. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Anae, M. 2010. Research for better Pacific schooling in New Zealand: Teu le va: a Samoan perspective. *MAI Review*. Accessed 12.5.10 from: <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>
- Anchimbe, E.A. 2006. Coping with meaning changes in a West African English language classroom. *Journal of Language and Learning*, Vol 5 (1): 50-62
- 2007. On norms and prejudices: the notion of *maturation* in New Englishes, *Interlinguistica*, No. 17: 151-160
- Andersen, R.W (ed). 1981. *New dimensions in second language acquisition research*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- 1983. Transfer to somewhere, in Gass and Selinker (eds): 177-201
- 1984. The one-to-one principle of interlanguage construction. *Language Learning*, Vol. 34 (4): 77-95
- Ansaldò, U. 2009. The Asian typology of English: theoretical and methodological considerations. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 30 (2): 133-148
- Ard, J. and T. Homburg. 1992. Verification of language transfer, in Gass and Selinker (eds): 47-70
- Arends, J., P. Muysken and N. Smith. 1995. *Pidgins and Creoles: an introduction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Arua, A.E. 1998. Some syntactic features of Swazi English, *World Englishes*, Vol. 17 (2): 139-151.
- and K. Magocha. 2000. Attitudes of parents to their children's use of English in Botswana, *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, Vol. 13 (3): 279-290

- Asian Development Bank. 2006. *Literature review on technical and vocational skills development in Pacific Island countries*. Suva: ADB. Accessed 23.7.10 from: <http://www.paddle.usp.ac.fj/collect/paddle/index/assoc/adb010/dir/doc.pdf>
- Au, K.H. 1998. Social constructivism and the school literacy learning of students of diverse backgrounds, *Journal of Literacy Research*, Vol. 30 (2): 297-319.
- Avalos, B. 2000. Policies for teacher education in developing countries. *International Journal of Educational Research*. Vol. 33 (5): 457-474
- Avery, P. and M. Radisic. 2007. Accounting for variability in the acquisition of English articles. *Proceedings of 2nd Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition (Nth. America: GALANA)* Belikova, A., L. Meroni and M. Umeda (eds). Cascadilla Proceedings Project. Somerville, MA: 1-11
- Awonusi, V.O. 1990. Coming of age: English in Nigeria. *English Today* 22 (April): 31-35
- Azar, B.S. 1981. *Understanding and using English grammar*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bailey, N., C. Madden and S.D. Krashen. 1974. Is there a 'natural sequence' in adult second language learning? In Hatch (ed) 1978: 362-370.
- Bailey, R.W. and M. Görlach (eds). 1982. *English as a world language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Baker, C. 2003. Education as a site of language contact. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 23: 95-112
- Baker, P. and M. Huber. 2001. Atlantic, Pacific and world-wide features in English-lexicon contact languages, *English World-Wide*, Vol. 22 (2): 157-208
- Balawa, V. 1996. Cook Islands Maori, in Mugler and Lynch (eds): 137-141
- Balcom, P. 1997. Why is this happened? Passive morphology and unaccusativity, *Second Language Research*, Vol. 13: 1-9
- Baldauf, Jr, R.B. 1990. Education and language planning in the Samoas, in Baldauf Jr. and Luke (eds): 259-276
- 1993/94. 'Unplanned' language policy and planning, *Annual review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol 14: 82-89
- and A. Luke (eds). 1990. *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- and R.B. Kaplan (eds). 2006. *Language Planning and Policy in the Pacific: Vol I: Fiji, the Philippines and Vanuatu*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bamgbose, A. 1992. Standard Nigerian English: issues of identification, in Kachru, B. (ed) 1982: 99-111

- 1996. Post-imperial English in Nigeria 1940-1996, in Fishman, Conrad and Rubal-Lopez (eds): 357-372.
 - 1997. English in the Nigerian environment, in Bamgbose, Banjo, and Thomas (eds): 9-26
 - 1998. Torn between the norms: innovations in World Englishes. *World Englishes*, Vol. 17 (1): 1-14
 - 2001. World Englishes and globalisation. *World Englishes*, Vol 20 (3): 357-363
 - 2003. A recurring decimal: English in language policy and planning. *World Englishes*, Vol. 22 (4): 419-431
- Bamgbose, A, A. Banjo, and A. Thomas (eds), 1997. *New Englishes: a West African perspective*. Trenton/Asmara: Africa World Press.
- Banjo, A. 1997. On codifying Nigerian English: research so far, in Bamgbose, Banjo, and Thomas (eds): 203-231
- Banks, J.A. (ed) . 2009. *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education*. New York/London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis
- Banu, R. and R. Sussex. 2001. English in Bangladesh after independence: dynamics of policy and practice, in Moore (ed): 122-147
- Bao Zhiming. 1998. Theories of language genesis, in Foley, Kandiah, Bao Zhiming, Gupta, Alsagoff, Ho Chee Lick, Wee, Talib and Bokhorst-Heng: 41-72
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. 1987. Markedness and salience in second language acquisition, *Language Learning*, Vol. 37 (3): 385-407
- 1992. The use of adverbials and natural order in the development of temporal expression. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 30 (4): 300-320
 - 1998. Narrative structure and lexical aspect: conspiring factors in second language acquisition of tense-aspect morphology. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 20: 471-508
 - and D.W. Reynolds. 1995. The role of lexical aspect in the acquisition of tense and aspect. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 29 (1): 107-131
- Barkhuizen, G.P. and D. Gough. 1996. Language curriculum development in South Africa: what place for English? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 30 (3): 453-471.
- Baron, N.S. 2001. Commas and canaries: the role of punctuation in speech and writing. *Language Learning*, Vol. 23: 15-67
- Barrington, J.M., J.W.K. Clark and J.C. Irving. 1987. New Zealand in the Pacific: exporting education, some trends and consequences. *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol 9 (1): 12-25

- Baumgardner, R. 1993. The indigenization of English in Pakistan. *English Today* 21, Vol 6 (1): 59-65
- Bayley, R. 2005. Second language acquisition and sociolinguistic variation. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, XIV, No. 2: 1-15
- Beck, M-L. 1997. Regular verbs, past tense and frequency: tracking down a potential source of HN/NNS competence differences. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 13 (2): 93-115
- Beebe, L.M. and H. Giles. 1984. Speech accommodation theories: a discussion in terms of second language acquisition. *International Journal of Society and Language*, Vol. 46: 5-32
- Belikova, A. and L. White. 2009. Evidence for the Fundamental Difference Hypothesis or not? Island constraints revisited. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 31: 199-223
- Bell, A. and K. Kuiper (eds). 2000. *New Zealand English*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Benseman, J., E. Coxon, H. Anderson and M. Anae. 2006. Retaining non-traditional students: lessons learnt from Pasifika students in New Zealand. *Higher Education Research and Development*, Vol. 25 (2): 147-162
- Benson, C. 2005. The importance of mother-tongue-based schooling for educational quality. *Commissioned study for EFA Global Monitoring Report*. Accessed 2.7.10 from www.unesco.org/images/0017/001777/177738e.pdf
- Benton, R. A. 1981. *The Flight of the Amokura: Oceanic languages and formal education in the South Pacific*. Wellington: NZCER
- Benton, R. 1995. Towards a language policy for New Zealand education. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*. Vol. 4: 161-173
- Beretta, A. 1991. Theory construction in second language acquisition: complementarity and opposition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Vol. 13: 493-511
- Berns, M. 1995. English in the European Union. *English Today* 43, Vol. 11 (3): 3-11.
- Bhatia, T.K. and W.C. Ritchie. 1996. Bilingual language mixing, universal grammar and second language acquisition, in Ritchie and Bhatia (eds): 627-688.
- 2004. *Handbook of Bilingualism and Multiculturalism*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell
- Bhatia, V.K. 1997. Introduction: genre analysis and world Englishes. *World Englishes*, Vol. 16 (3): 313-319.

- Bhatt, R.M. 2001. World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 30: 527-560
- and B. Hancin-Bhatt. 2003. Structural minimality, CP and the initial state in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 18 (4): 348-392
- Bhela, B. 1999. Native language interference in learning a second language: exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage. *International Education Journal*, Vol. 1 (1): 22-31
- Bialystok, E. 1979. An analytical view of second language competence: a model and some evidence. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 63 (5/6): 257-262
- (ed). 1991. *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1997. The structure of age: in search of barriers to second language acquisition. *Second language Research*, Vol. 13 (2): 116-137
- Biber, D. 1987. A textual comparison of British and American writing. *American Speech*, Vol. 62 (2): 99-119
- 1988. *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1999. A register perspective on grammar and discourse: variability in the form and use of English complement clauses. *Discourse Studies*, Vol. 1 (2): 131-150
- S. Conrad, R. Reppen, P. Burd and M. Helt. 2002. Speaking and writing in the university: a multidimensional comparison. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 36 (1): 9-48
- Biewer, C. 2007. South Pacific Englishes – the influence of New Zealand English and the Oceanic substrate languages. *New Zealand English Journal*, Vol. 27: 69-75
- Billingsley, A. and C.H. Caldwell. 1991. The church, the family and the school in the African American community. *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 60 (3): 427-440.
- Birchfield, R (ed). 1994. *The Cambridge History of the English Language: Vol. V: English in Britain and Overseas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Birdsong, D. 1992. Ultimate attainment in second language acquisition. *Language*, Vol. 68 (4): 706-755.
- 2005. Nativelikeness and non-nativelikeness in second language acquisition research. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 43: 319-328.
- Bishop, R. and T. Glynn. 1999. *Culture counts: changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press

- Bley-Vroman, R. W. 1988. The fundamental character of foreign language learning, in Rutherford, W. and M. Sharwood-Smith. *Grammar and second language teaching*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House: 19-30
- 2009. The evolving context of the Fundamental Difference Hypothesis, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 31: 175-198.
- S.W. Felix and G.L. Ioup. 1988. The accessibility of universal grammar in adult language learning. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 4: 1-32.
- Bloom, P. 1990. Subjectless sentences in child language. *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 21 (4): 491-504.
- Blust, R. 2009. *The Austronesian Languages*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Bock, K. and C. A. Miller. 1991. Broken Agreement. *Cognitive Psychology*, Vol. 23: 45-93
- , J. Nicol and J.C. Cutting. 1999. The ties that bind: creating number agreement in speech. *Journal of Memory and Language*. Vol. 40: 330-346.
- Bokamba, E.G. 1982. The Africanisation of English, in Kachru, B. (ed) 1982a: 77-98.
- Bokhorst-Heng, W. 1998. Language planning and management in Singapore, in Foley, Kandiah, Bao Zhiming, Gupta, Alsagoff, Ho Chee Lick, Wee, Talib and Bokhorst-Heng: 287-309.
- Bolton, K. 2004. World Englishes. Reprinted in Bolton and Kachru (eds) Vol. I: 186-216.
- 2005. Symposium on World Englishes today, Part II: Where WE stands: approaches, issues and debate in world Englishes. *World Englishes*. Vol. 24 (1): 69-83
- 2006. Varieties of World Englishes, in Kachru, B., Y. Kachru and Nelson (eds): 289-312.
- 2006. World Englishes today, in Kachru, B., Y. Kachru and Nelson (eds): 240-269
- 2008. English in Asia, Asian Englishes and the issue of proficiency. *English Today* 94, Vol. 24 (2): 3-12.
- and B.B. Kachru (eds). 2006. *World Englishes: critical concepts in linguistics Vols I – VI*. London: Routledge.
- Bongaerts, T. 2005. Introduction: ultimate attainment and the critical period hypothesis for second language acquisition. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. Vol. 43 (4): 259-267.

- De Bot, K., W. Lowwie and M. Verspoor. 2007. A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: language and cognition*, Vol 10 (1): 7-21
- Bourdin, B. and M. Fayol. 1994. Is written language production more difficult than oral language production? A working memory approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 29 (5): 591-620.
- Box Hill institute. 2009. Australia-Pacific Technical College. Accessed March 7, 201 from: <http://www.bhtafe.edu.au/Visitors/Pages/Australia-pacific-technical-college.aspx>
- Bratt Paulston, C. and G.R. Tucker. 2003. *Sociolinguistics: the essential readings*. Malden/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bray, M. 1993. Education and the vestiges of colonialism: self-determination, neo-colonialism and dependency in the South Pacific. *Comparative Education*, Vol. 29 (3): 333-348
- 1998. National self-determination and international dependence: the organization of secondary school examinations in the small states of the Commonwealth. *Assessment in education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, Vol. 5 (2): 151-173
- de Bres, J. 2008. Planning for tolerability in New Zealand, Wales and Catalonia. *Current issues in Language Planning*, Vol. 9 (4): 464-482
- Brown, R. 1973. *A first language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruthiaux, P. 2003. Squaring the circles: issues in modelling English worldwide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 13 (2): 159-178.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. 2002. *World English: a study of its development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- and K. K. Samimy. 1999. Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: critical praxis for non-native-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 33 (3): 413-431.
- ---. 2001. Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes*, Vol. 20 (1): 99-106
- Bunton, D. and A.B.M. Tsui. 2002. Setting language benchmarks: whose benchmark? *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*. Vol. 12 (1): 63-76
- Bunyi, G. 1997. Language education in Kenyan schools, in Cummins and Corson (eds) Vol. 5: 33-45.
- Burgeya, A. 2006. Grammatical features of Kenyan English and the extent of their acceptability. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 27 (2): 199-216.

- Burt, M., H. Dulay and M. Finocchiaro (eds). 1977. *Viewpoints on English as a second language*. New York: Regents Publishing Company.
- Butcher, C. A. 2005. The case against the 'native speaker'. *English Today*, Vol. 21 (2): 13-24.
- Butters, R.R. 2001. Chance as a cause of language variation and change. *Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 29: 201-213.
- Byrnes, H. 1987. Proficiency as a framework for research in second language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 71 (1) 44-49.
- Campbell, I.C. 2001. *Island Kingdom: Tonga ancient and modern*. Christchurch: Canterbury University Press.
- 2003. *Worlds Apart: a history of the Pacific Islands*. Christchurch: Canterbury University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. 2006. Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 26: 197-218
- 2006. The place of world Englishes in composition: pluralisation continued. *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 57 (4): 586-619.
- 2007. Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 91 (Focus issue): 923-939.
- de Carrico, J. 1986. Tense, aspect and time in the English modality system. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 20 (4): 665-682.
- Carroll, S. and J. M. Meisel. 1990. Universals and second language acquisition: some comments on the state of current theory. *Studies in Second Language Research*, Vol. 12 (2): 201-208.
- Carson, J. E., P.L. Carrell, S. Silberstein, B. Kroll and P.A. Kuehn. 1990. Reading and writing relationships in first and second language, *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 24 (2): 245-266
- Celce-Murcia, M (ed). 1985. *Beyond Basics: issues and research in TESOL*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Celce-Murcia, M. and B. Hawkins, 1985. Contrastive analysis, error analysis, and interlanguage analysis, in Celce-Murcia (ed): 60-77.
- Chafe, W. and D. Tannen. 1987. The relation between written and spoken language. *Annul Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 16: 383-407
- Chambers, J.K. 1992. Dialect acquisition. *Language*, Vol. 68 (4): 673-705
- 2003. *Sociolinguistic Theory (2nd edition)*. Oxford/Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Charity, A.H., H.S. Scarborough and D.M. Griffin. 2004. Familiarity with school English in African American children and its relation to early reading achievement. *Child Development*, Vol. 75 (5): 1340-1356

- Chaudhary, N., J. Hammer, M. Kremer, K. Muralidharan and F. Halsey Rogers. 2006. Missing in action: teacher and health worker absence in developing countries. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. Vol. 20 (1): 91-116
- Cheshire, J. (ed). 1991. *English around the world: sociolinguistic perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chevillet, F. 1992. Received pronunciation and standard English as systems of reference. *English Today*, 29: 27-32
- 1993. English or Englishes? *English Today* 36, Vol. 9 (4): 29-33
- Chomsky, N. 2006. *Language and mind (3rd ed)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chumbow, B.S. and A. Simo Bobda. 1996. The life cycle of post-imperial English in Cameroon, in Fishman, Conrad and Rubal-Lopez (eds): 401-429
- Chung, S. and W.J. Selter. 1980. The history of raising and relativisation in Polynesian. *Linguistic Society of America*, Vol. 56 (3): 622-628
- Clahsen, H. 1990. The comparative study of first and second language development. *Studies in Second language Acquisition*, Vol 12 (2): 135-153
- and P. Muysken. 1986 The availability of universal grammar to adult and child learners – a study of the acquisition of German word order. *Second language Research*, Vol. 2: 93-119
- and C. Felser. 2006 Grammatical processing in language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, Vol. 27: 3-42
- Coelho, G.M. 1997 Anglo-Indian English: a nativised variety of Indian English. *Language in Society*, Vol. 26 (4): 561-589
- Collier, V.P. 1989. How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 23 (3): 509-531
- 1995. Acquiring a second language for school. *Directions in language and education*, Vol. 1 (4). Accessed 23-9-01 from: <http://www.Ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/directions/04.htm>
- Collins, P. 2009. Modals and quasi-modals in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, Vol. 28 (3): 281-292
- Comrie, B. 1981. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Connell, J. 2006. Nauru: the first failed Pacific state? *The Round Table*, Vol. 95, 383: 47-63
- Connell, T. 1999. *In versus On: a losing battle?* *English today*, Vol. 15 (1): 42-44
- Connor, U. 1996. *Contrastive rhetoric: cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- 2002. New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 36 (4): 493-510
- and R.B. Kaplan. 1987 *Writing across languages: analysis of L2 text*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

- Conrad, A. 1996. The international role of English: the state of the discussion, in Fishman, Conrad and Rubal-Lopez (eds): 13-36
- Cook, L., R. Didham and M. Khawaja. 1999. On the demography of Pacific people in New Zealand. *Keynote address at Pacific Vision Conference*, Auckland. 27-30 July
- Cook, V. 1988. *Chomsky's universal grammar: an introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 1999. Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 33 (2): 185-209
- 2001. Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, Vol. 57 (3): 402-423
- Cook, W.A. 1978. Semantic structure of the English modals. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 12 (1): 5-15
- Corder, S.P. 1967. The significance of learners' errors. *IRAL*, Vol.V (4): reprinted in Richards (ed) 1978: 19-30
- 1971. Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. *IRAL*, Vol. IX (2) reprinted in Richards (ed) 1978: 158-171
- 1981. Formal simplicity and functional simplification in second language acquisition, in Andersen (ed): 146-151
- 1992. A role for the mother tongue, in Gass and Selinker (eds): 18-31
- Coulthard, M. (ed) 1994. *Advances in written text analysis*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Crocombe, R. 1992. *Pacific neighbours: New Zealand's relations with other Pacific islands*. Christchurch/Suva: University of Canterbury/University of the South Pacific
- 2001. *The South Pacific*. Suva: University of the South Pacific
- Crowley, T. 1989. English in Vanuatu. *World Englishes*. Vol. 8 (1): 37-46
- 1992. *An introduction to historical linguistics*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- 1996. Yumi toktok Bislama Mo yumi tokbaot Bislama, in Mugler and Lynch (eds): 258-272
- 2000. The consequences of vernacular (il)literacy in the Pacific. *Current issues in Language Planning*, Vol. 1 (3): 368-388
- 2001. The indigenous linguistic response to missionary authority in the Pacific. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 21 (2): 239-260
- 2006. The language situation in Vanuatu, in Baldauf Jr. and Kaplan (eds): 154-239
- Crystal, D. 1997. *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2004. *The Language Revolution*. Malden, MA: Polity Press
- Cumming, A. 2001. Learning to write in a second language: two decades of research. *International Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 1 (2): 1-23

- Cummins, J. 1988. From multicultural to anti-racist education: an analysis of programmes and policies in Ontario, in Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (eds): 127-157
- 1991. Interdependence of first- and second-language proficiency in bilingual children, in Bialystok (ed): 70-89.
- 1994. Knowledge, power and identity in teaching English as a second language, in Genesee (ed): 33-58
- 2000. *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- 2001. Author's Introduction: Framing the universe of discourse: are the constructs of power and identity relevant to school failure? *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 71 (4): 649-655
- and D. Corson (eds). 1997. *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol 5*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers
- and N.H. Hornberger (eds). 2008. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education (2nd. Ed). Vol. 5: Bilingual Education*. New York: Springer Science
- Curry, M.J. 2004. UCLA Community College Review: Academic Literacy for English language learners. *Community College Review*, Vol. 32 (2): 51-68
- Cziko, G. A. 1989. A review of the state-process and punctual-nonpunctual distinctions in children's acquisition of verbs. *First Language*, Vol. 9: 1-31
- Dalrymple, M. and H. Lødrup. 2000. The grammatical functions of complement clauses. *Proceedings of LPG00 Conference*. Berkeley: University of California. Accessed 8.11.09 from: <http://www-csli.stanford.edu/publications>
- Darling-Hammond, L. 2000. Teacher quality and students achievement: a review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 8 (1). Accessed 12.7.10 from: <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1>
- Davidson, J.W. 1967. *Samoa Mo Samoa: the emergence of the independent state of Western Samoa*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, A. 1989. Is international English an interlanguage? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 23 (3): 447-467
- 1999. Standard English: discordant voices. *World Englishes*, Vol. 18 (2): 171-186
- 2002. The native speaker of World Englishes, in Bolton and Kachru, K. (eds) 2006. Vol IV: 144-162
- 2003. *The native speaker: myth and reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- L. Hamp-Lyons and C. Kemp. 2003. Whose norms? International proficiency tests in English. *World Englishes*, Vol. 22 (4): 571-584
- deKeyser, R.M. 2005. What makes learning second-language grammar difficult? A review of issues. *Language Learning*, Vol. 55, June supplement 1: 1-25
- Dendrinos, B., M. Karavanta and B. Mitsikopoulou. 2008. Introduction: theorising new English(es). *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 12 (1): 1-14

- Deumert, A. 2003. Markedness and salience in language contact and second language acquisition: evidence from a non-canonical contact language. *Language Sciences*, Vol. 25: 561-613
- Devine, J., K. Railey and P. Boshoff. 1993. The implications of cognitive models in L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of second language writing*, Vol. 2 (3): 203-225
- Devonish, H. 2003. Language advocacy and 'conquest': diglossia in the 'Anglophone' Caribbean, in Mair (ed): 157-177
- Diebold Jr, A.R. 1961. Incipient bilingualism, *Language*, Vol. 37 (1): 97-112
- Dolphyne, F. 1997. A note on the English language in Ghana, in Bamgbose, Banjo and Thomas (eds): 27-33
- Dowty, D.R. 1977. Toward a semantic analysis of verb aspect and the English 'imperfective' progressive. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, Vol. 1 (1): 45-77
- Duff, P.A. 2007. Second language socialisation as sociocultural theory: insights and issues. *Language Teaching*, Vol. 40: 309-319
- Dulay, H.C. and M.K. Burt. 1973. Should we teach children syntax? *Language Learning*, Vol. 23: 95-123
- 1974. You can't learn without goofing: an analysis of children's second language 'errors', in Richards (ed): 95-123
- 1978. Natural sequences in child second language acquisition, in Hatch (ed): 347-361
- Early, R. 1999. Double trouble and three's a crowd: languages in education and official languages in Vanuatu. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Vol. 20 (1): 13-33
- 2004. Monolingual mania: current trends in Pacific dictionary-making. *Paper presented at the Second Asian Lexicography Conference*, Chiangmai, Thailand. May 24-26
- Eberhard, K.M. 1997. The marked effect of number on subject-verb agreement. *Journal of memory and Language*. Vol. 36: 147-164.
- Eckman, F.R. 1996. A functional-typological approach to second-language acquisition theory, in Ritchie and Bhatia (eds): 195-211
- Edwatch. 2007. *Solomon Islands: summary report. Educational Experience Survey*. Asia South Pacific Bureau of Adult Education.
- Ekiert, M. 2007. The acquisition of grammatical marking of indefiniteness with the indefinite article 'a' in L2 English. *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 7 (1): 1-43
- Elley, W. and F. Mangubhai. 1983. The impact of reading on second language learning. *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 19 (1): 53-67
- Ellis, R. 1986. *Understanding Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1994. *The Study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

- and G. Barkhuizen. 2005. *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Engber, C.A. 1995. The relationship of lexical proficiency to the quality of ESL compositions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Vol. 4 (2): 139-155
- Eoyang, E.C. 2003. Teaching English as culture: paradigm shifts in postcolonial discourse. *Diogenes*, Vol. 50 (2): 3-16
- Epstein, S.D., S. Flynn and G. Martohardjono. 1996. Second-language acquisition: theoretical and experimental issues in contemporary research. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, Vol. 19 (4): 677-758
- Erickson, F. 1987. Transformation and school success: the politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, Vol. 18 (4): 335-356
- Ervin-Tripp, S. 1974. Is second language learning like the first? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 8 (2): 111-127
- Eubank, L. 1993/1994. Towards an explanation for the late acquisition of agreement in L2 English. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 10: 84-93
- Falk, Y.N. 1984. The English auxiliary system: a lexical-functional analysis. *Language*, Vol. 60 (3): 483-509
- Fasi, 'U-m-l. 2002. Issues and challenges: a personal statement, in Pene, Taufe'ulungaki and Benson.(eds): 31-35
- Fasold, R. 1987. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford/Malden: Blackwell.
- 1990. *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford/Malden: Blackwell
- Ferguson, C. 1959. Diglossia, in Bratt Paulston, and Tucker (eds). 2003: 345-357
- Ferguson, G. 2003. Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: functions, attitudes and policies. *AILA Review*, Vol. 16: 38-51
- Ferguson, P. B., R. Gorinski, T. Wendt Samu and D. Mara. 2008. *Literature Review on the experiences of Pasifika learners in the classroom: a report prepared for the Ministry of Education*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research
- Fernández-García, M. and Martínez-Arbeláiz. 2002. Negotiation of meaning in non-native speaker-nonnative speaker synchronous discussions. *CALICO Journal*, Vol. 19 (2): 279-294
- Fernando, C. 1982. English in Sri Lanka: a case study of a bilingual community, in Pride (ed): 188-207.
- 1989. Style range in Sri Lankan English fiction: an analysis of four texts. *World Englishes*, Vol. 8, 2: 119-131
- Ferris, D.R. 1994. Lexical and syntactic features of ESL writing by students at different levels of L2, *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 28 (2): 414-420
- Fillmore, L.W. and C.E. Snow. 2000. What teachers need to know about language. *Special report*. Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics

- von Finkel, K. and L. Matthewson. 2008. Universals in semantics. *The Linguistic Review*, Vol. 25: 139-201
- Fischer, S. R., 2002. *A History of the Pacific Islands*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Fishman, J. 1967. Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism, in Bratt Paulston and Tucker (eds). 2003: 359-366
- C.A. Ferguson and J. Dasgupta. 1968. *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- A.W. Conrad and A. Rubal-Lopez (eds). 1996. *Post-imperial English: status change in former British and American colonies 1940-1990*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Fletcher, J., F. Parkhill and A. Fa'afai. 2005. What factors promote and support Pasifika students in reading and writing? *Set 2*: 2-8
- , ---, ---, L. Taleni and B. O'Regan. 2009. Pasifika students: teachers and parents voice their perceptions of what provides supports and barriers to Pasifika students' achievement in literacy and learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 25: 24-33
- Fletcher, J., J. Greenwood and F. Parkhill. 2010. Are schools meeting their clients' expectations? Parents voice their perceptions about children learning to read in schools today. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol 26 (3): 438-446
- Fletcher, M. 1995. Pacific Islands peoples in the labour market. *Labour Market Review*, Vol. 1: 124-136
- Flynn, S. 1996. A parameter-setting approach to SLA, in Ritchie and Bhatia (eds): 121-158
- C. Foley and I. Vinnitskaya. 2004. The cumulative-enhancement model for language acquisition: comparing adults' and children's patterns of development in first, second and third language acquisition of relative clauses. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, Vol. 1 (1): 3-16
- Foley, J.A. (ed). 1988. *New Englishes: the case of Singapore*. Singapore: Singapore University Press
- T. Kandiah, Bao Zhiming, A.E. Gupta, L. Alsagoff, Ho Chee Lick, L. Wee, I.S. Talib and W. Bokhorst-Heng. 1998. *English in new cultural contexts: reflections from Singapore*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foley, W.A. 1997. *Anthropological linguistics; an introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Forrest, S.N. 2006. Three foci of an effective high school Generation 1.5 literacy program. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, Vol. 50 (2): 106-112

- Foster, P. 1998. A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 19 (1): 1-23
- and A.S. Ohta. 2005. Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 26 (3): 402-430
- Franken, M. and J. McComish. 2002. Improving English language outcomes for students receiving ESOL services in New Zealand schools with a particular focus on new immigrants. *A Report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education
- S.May and J. McComish. 2008. *Pasifika Languages Research and guidelines Project: Literature Review*. New Zealand Ministry of Education. Accessed 18. 1. 2010 from http://leap.tki.org.nz/research_links
- Fredrick, W.C. and H.J. Walberg. 1980. Learning as a function of time. *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 73 (3): 183-194
- Freire, P. 1971. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin Books
- Gannicott, K. and D. Throsby. 1992. Educational quality in economic development: ten propositions and an application to the South Pacific. *International Review of education*, Vol. XXXVIII (3): 223-239
- Garcia, S.B., C.Y. Wilkinson and A.A. Ortiz. 1995. Enhancing achievement for language minority students: classroom, school and family contexts. *Education and Urban Society*, Vol. 27 (4): 441-462.
- Gardner, R.C. 1968. Attitudes and motivation: their role in second-language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 2 (3): 141-150
- Gargesh, R. 2006. South Asian Englishes, in Kachru, B., Y. Kachru and Nelson (eds): 90-113
- Garrett, N. 1986. The problem with grammar: what kind can the language learner use? *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 70 (2): 131-148
- Gass, S. and J. Ard. 1980. L2 data: their relevance for language universals. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. XIV (4): 443-452
- and L. Selinker (eds).1983. *Language transfer in language learning: Issues in second-language research*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House
- C. Madden, D. Preston and L. Selinker (eds) 1989. *Variation in second language acquisition: discourse and pragmatics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- and U. Lakshmanan. 1991. Accounting for interlanguage subject pronouns. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 7: 181-203

- and L. Selinker (eds) 1992. *Language transfer in language learning (revised ed)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- A. Mackay and T. Pica. 1998. The role of input and interaction in second-language acquisition: introduction to the Special Issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 82 (3): 299-307
- Gee, J.P. 2001. Teenagers in new times: a new literacy studies perspective. [electronic version] *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, Vol. 43, 5.
- Genesee, F (ed).1994. *Educating second language children: the whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2004. What do we know about bilingual education for majority language students? In Ritchie and Bhatia (eds): 547-576
- Geraghty, P. 1984. Language policy in Fiji and Rotuma. *Duivosavosa: Fiji's languages - their use and their future*. Fiji Museum Bulletin No. 8: 32-84
- F. Mugler and J. Tent. 2006. *Macquarie Dictionary of English for the Fiji Islands*. North Ryde, NSW: Macquarie Library.
- Gettinger, M. 1984. Achievement as a function of time spent in learning and time needed for learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 21 (3): 617-628
- Geva, E. 1992. The role of conjunctions in L2 text comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 26 (4): 731-747
- Gilson, R. 1980. *The Cook Islands: 1820-1950*. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Giménez, E.L. 2001. Are first and second language acquisition comparable processes? Arguments for the non-equivalence of L1 and L2 learning. *RESLA*, Vol. 14: 259-270
- Glasgow, A., B. Ha'amori, J. Daiwo and V. Masala. 2011. The Solomon Islands Initiatives to support and enhance the use of vernaculars in early childhood education. *Journal of the Linguistic Society of Papua New Guinea*, Vol 29: 87-94
- Goldschneider, J.M. and R.M. deKeyser. 2001. Explaining the 'natural order' of L2 morpheme acquisition in English: a meta-analysis of multiple determinants. *Language Learning*, Vol. 51: 27-77
- Goldstein, L.M. 1987. Standard English: the only target for non-native speakers of English? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol 21 (3): 417-436
- Gordon, B. K. 1960. *New Zealand becomes a Pacific power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Görlach, M. 1988. English as a world language – the state of the art. *English World-Wide*, Vol 9 (1): 1-32
- 1991. *Englishes – Studies in varieties of English 1984-1988*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- 1994. Innovation in New Englishes. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 15 (1):101-126
- 1996. And is it English? *English World-Wide*. Vol. 17 (2): 153-174
- 1998. Varieties of English world-wide: where we stand. *Link and Letters* 5: 13-36
- and J. Holm (eds) 1986. *Focus on the Caribbean: varieties of English around the world G8*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Government of Cook Islands. 1965. *Constitution of the Cook Islands*
- Government of the Republic of the Fiji Islands. 1997. *Constitution of the Republic of the Fiji Islands*.
- Government of Kiribati. 1979. *Constitution of Kiribati*.
- Government of the Marshall Islands. 1979. *Constitution of the Republic of the Marshall Islands*.
- Government of Nauru. 1968. *Constitution of Nauru*.
- Government of New Zealand. 1974. *Niue Constitution Act*.
- Government of Western Samoa. 1960. *Constitution of the Independent State of Western Samoa*.
- Government of the Solomon Islands. 1978. *Constitution of the Solomon Islands*.
- Government of the Kingdom of Tonga. 1988. *Constitution of Tonga (revised)*.
- Government of Tuvalu. 1978. *Constitution of Tuvalu*.
- Government of Vanuatu. 1980. *Constitution of the Republic of Vanuatu*.
- (n.d.) *Vanuatu National Language Policy*. Accessed 17.4.2009 from: <http://www.vanuatuculture.org/documents/NasonallanwisPolisi.doc>.
- Graddol, D. 1997. *The future of English?* London: British Council
- 1999. The decline of the native speaker, in Graddol and Meinhof (eds): 57-68
- and U.H. Meinhof (eds). 1999. *English in a changing world*. Oxford: AILA Review.
- Graziano-King, J. and H.S. Cairns. 2005. Acquisition of English comparative adjectives. *Journal of Child Language*, Vol. 32: 345-373

- Green, G. 2004. Listening makes my brain hurt: issues of listening for students who are speakers of languages other than English. *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 26 (2): 57-71
- Greenbaum, S. and R. Quirk. 1990. *A student's grammar of the English language*. Hongkong: Longman.
- Greenberg, J.H. 1969. Language Universals: a research frontier. *Science (new series)*, Vol. 166, October: 473-478.
- 1975. Research on language universals. *American review of Anthropology*, Vol. 4: 75-94
- 1987. The present status of markedness theory: a reply to Scheffler, *Journal of Anthropological Research*, Vol. 43 (4): 367-374.
- Gregg, K.R. 1996. The logical and developmental problems of second-language acquisition, in Ritchie and Bhatia (eds): 51-81
- Gunderson, L. 2007. *English-only instruction and immigrant students in secondary schools: a critical examination*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Gunson, N. 1966. On the incidence of alcoholism and intemperance in early Pacific missions. *The Journal of Pacific History*, Vol. 1: 43-62.
- Gupta, A. F. 1986. A standard for written Singapore English. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 7 (1): 75-99
- 1997. Colonisation, migration and functions of English, in Schneider (ed): 47-58
- 1997b. When mother-tongue education is *not* preferred. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 18 (6): 496-506.
- 1998. Singapore colloquial English or deviant Standard English? In Tent and Mugler (eds): 43-57
- 2001. Realism and imagination in the teaching of English. *World Englishes*, Vol. 20 (3): 365-381
- Gupta, R.S. 2001. English in post-colonial India, in Moore (ed): 148-164.
- Gyasi, I.K. 1991. Aspects of English in Ghana. *English Today*, Vol. 26, April: 26-31
- Haegeman, L. 1987. Register variation in English: some theoretical observations. *Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 20 (2): 230-248
- and T. Ihsane, 2001. Adult null subjects in the non-pro-drop languages: two diary dialects. *Language Acquisition*, Vol. 9 (4): 329-346

- Hakuta, K. 1974. A report on the development of grammatical morphemes in a Japanese girl learning English as a second language, in Hatch (ed) 1978: 132-147
- 1981. Some common goals for second and first language acquisition research, in Andersen (ed): 1-9
- and H. Cancino. 1977. Trends in second-language-acquisition research. *Harvard Educational review*, Vol. 47 (3): 294-316
- Y.G. Butler and D. Witt. 2000. How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency? *University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute Policy Report 2000-1*.
- Hammond, R.M. 1988. Accuracy versus communicative competency: the acquisition of grammar in the second language classroom. *Hispania*, Vol. 17 (2): 408-417
- Han, Z-H. 2003. Fossilisation: from simplicity to complexity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 6 (2): 95-128
- Hancock, I.F. and R. Angogo. 1982. English in East Africa, in Bailey and Görlach (eds): 306-323
- Hang, D.L. and M. Barker. 1997. "We need to use both": the place of the indigenous language in science lessons in Western Samoa. *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies*. Vol. 19 (1): 100-121
- Hansen, L. 1984. Field dependence-independence and language testing: evidence from six Pacific Island cultures. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 18 (2): 311-324
- Hatch, E.M. (ed) 1978. *Second language acquisition: a book of readings*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House
- 1981. Discussion of 'Input from the inside: the role of a child's prior linguistic experience in second-language learning', in Andersen (ed): 104-108
- J.W. Gough and S. Peck. 1985. What case studies reveal about system, sequence, and variation in second-language acquisition, in Celce-Murcia (ed): 37-59
- Hattie, J. 2003. Teachers make a difference: what is the research evidence. Paper presented at Australian Council for educational Research Annual Conference, Auckland. October 2003.
- Hawk, K., E.T. Cowley, J. Hill and S. Sutherland. 2002. The importance of the teacher/student relationship for Maori and Pasifika students. Paper presented at NZARE Conference, Christchurch. December 2001
- Hawkins, R. 1989. Do second language learners acquire restrictive relative clauses on the basis of relational or configurational information? The acquisition of

- French subject, direct object and genitive restrictive relative clauses by second language learners. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 5: 156-188
- 2001. The theoretical significance of Universal grammar in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 17 (4): 345-367
- 2008. The nativist perspective on second language acquisition. *Lingua*, Vol. 118: 465-477
- Haynes, L.M. 1982. Caribbean English: form and function, in Kachru, B. (ed): 210-226
- Heath, J. G. 1984. Language contact and language change. *Annual review of Anthropology*, Vol. 13: 367-384
- Heck, R.H. 2007. Examining the relationship between teachers quality as an organisational property of schools and students' achievement and growth rates. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 43 (4): 399-432
- Heine, H.C. 2002. A Marshall islands perspective, in Pene, Taufe'ulungaki and Benson (eds): 84-90
- Hempenstall, P. and N. Rutherford. 1984. *Protest and dissent in the colonial Pacific*. Suva, Fiji: University of the South Pacific.
- Hendrick, R. 2005. Resumptive and bound variable pronouns in Tongan. *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics*, No. 12 (September): 103-115
- Henly, J. 2005. The primary education improvement project of Vanuatu: a model for teacher development in the Pacific. *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 27 (2): 25-36
- Herat, M. 2005. BE variation in Sri Lankan English. *Language Variation and Change*, Vol. 17: 181-208
- Herrman, I. 2005. The current situation: the case of the Cook Islands. *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 27 (1): 123-133
- Hickey, R. 2003. How do dialects get the features they have? On the process of new dialect formation, in Hickey (ed): 213-239
- (ed). 2003. *Motives for language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Higgins, C. 2003. Ownership of English in the Outer Circle: an alternative to the NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 37 (4): 615-644
- Hill, J. and K. Hawk. 1998. Aiming for student achievement: how teachers can understand and better meet the needs of Pacific Island and Maori students. *SET 2*, Vol. 4: 1-4

- Hinkel, E. 1992. L2 tense and time reference. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 26 (3): 557-572
- 1995. The use of modal verbs as a reflection of cultural values. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 29 (2): 325-343
- 1997. Indirectness in L1 and L2 academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 27: 361-386
- 1997b. The past tense and temporal verb meanings in a contextual frame. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 31 (2): 289-313
- 2003. Simplicity without elegance: features of sentences in L1 and L2 academic texts. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 37 (2): 275-301.
- 2004. Tense, aspect and the passive voice in L1 and L2 academic texts. *Language Teaching Research*, Vol. 8 (1): 5-29
- Ho Mian Lian. 1992. The Language Bioprogram Hypothesis and Singapore English. *RELC Journal*, Vol. 23 (1): 1-14
- and J.T. Platt. 1993. *Dynamics of a contact continuum: Singaporean English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Holborow, M. 1999. *The politics of English*. London: Sage Publications.
- Holm, A. and B. Dodd. 1996. The effects of first written language on the acquisition of English literacy. *Cognition*, Vol. 59: 119-147
- Holmes, J. 1982. Expressing doubt and certainty in English. *RELC Journal*, Vol. 13 (2): 9-28
- Holyoak, S. and A. Piper. 1997. Talking to second-language writers: using interview data to investigate contrastive rhetoric. *Language Teaching Research*, Vol. 1 (2): 122-148
- Hornberger, N.H. 2002. Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: an ecological approach. *Language Policy*, Vol. 1: 27-51
- 2004. The continua of biliteracy and the bilingual educator: educational linguistics in practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 7 (2&3): 155-171
- Houma, L. 2006. An error analysis of Solomon islands students' written English. *Research project*, School of Language, Arts and Media, University of the South Pacific
- Housen, A. 2000. Verb semantics and the acquisition of tense-aspect in L2 English. *Studia Linguistica*, Vol. 54 (2): 249-259
- Howarth, P. 1998. Phraseology and Second language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 19 (1): 24-44

- Hudson-Kam, C.L. and E.L. Newport. 2005. Regularising unpredictable variation: the roles of adult and child learners in language formation and change. *Language Learning and Development*, Vol. 1 (2): 151-195
- Huffer, E. 2006. Cultural rights in the Pacific: what do they mean for children. Paper prepared for a seminar on "Children's Rights and Culture in the Pacific". October 2006. Suva, Fiji.
- Hughes, R. and M. McCarthy. 1998. From sentence to discourse: discourse grammar and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 32 (2): 263-287
- Human Rights Commission. 2008. Pacific peoples in New Zealand: review of the public controversy about a discussion paper on immigration policy and the economic contribution of Pacific migrants to New Zealand. Accessed 11.5.10 from <http://www.hrc.co.nz/Pacific-Peoples-in-NZ.doc>
- Hundt, M. 2006. The committee has/have decided...: on concord patterns with collective nouns in Inner-and Outer-Circle varieties of English. *Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 34 (3): 206-232
- Ielemia, K. 1996. Tuvaluan in the schools, in Mugler and Lynch (eds): 102-110
- Igboanusi, H. 2006. Syntactic innovation processes in Nigerian English. *Studia Anglica Ponaniensia*, Vol. 42: 393-404
- Intaraprawat, P. And M.S. Steffenson. 1995. The use of metadiscourse in good and poor ESL essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. Vol. 4 (3): 253-272
- Ionin, T. and K. Wexler. 2002. Why is 'is' easier than '-s': acquisition of tense/agreement morphology by child second language learners of English. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 18: 95-136
- H.J. Ko and K. Wexler. 2004. Article semantics in L2 acquisition: the role of specificity. *Language Acquisition*, Vol. 12 (1): 3-69
- Irujo, S. 1986. Don't put your leg in your mouth: transfer in the acquisition of idioms in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 20 (2): 287-304
- Itoh, H. and E. Hatch. 1978. Second language acquisition, in Hatch (ed) 1978: 76-88
- Izumi, S. 2003. Processing difficulty in comprehension and production of relative clauses by learners of English as a second language. *Language Learning*, Vol. 53 (2): 285-323
- Jackson, G.W. 2001. *Tuvaluan Dictionary*. Suva: Jackson.
- Jain, M.P. 1974. Error analysis: source, cause and significance, in Richards (ed): 189-215
- Jarvis, S. and T. Odlin. 2000. Morphological type, spatial reference and language transfer. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 22: 535-556

- Jenkins, J. 2006. Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 40 (1): 157-181
- 2006b. Global intelligibility and local diversity: possibility or paradox? In Rubdy and Saraceni (eds): 32-39
- 2009. English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, Vol. 28 (2): 200-207
- Jiang Yajun and Zhou Chenggang. 2006. World Englishes and contrastive rhetoric. *World Englishes*, Vol 22 (2): 11-22
- Jibril, M. 1982. Nigerian English, in Pride (ed): 73-84
- Johns, A.M. 1986. Coherence and academic writing: some definitions and suggestions for teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 20 (2): 247-265
- Johnson, J.S. and E.L. Newport. 1991. Critical period effects on universal properties of language: the status of subadjacency in the acquisition of a second language. *Cognition*, Vol. 39: 215-258
- Johnston, R.J., M.F. Poulsen and J. Forrest. 2003. The ethnic geography of New Zealand; a decade of growth and change 1991-2001. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, Vol. 44 (2): 109-130
- Jolly, M. 1991. 'To save the girls for brighter and better lives': Presbyterian missions and women in the south of Vanuatu: 1848-1870. *The Journal of Pacific History*, Vol. 26 (1): 27-48
- Jones, A. 1991. *At school I've got a chance: culture/privilege: Pacific Islands and Pakeha girls at school*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press
- Jourdan, C. 1990. Solomons Pijin: an unrecognized national language, in Baldauf, Jr. and Luke (eds): 166-181.
- Jowitt, D. 1997. Nigeria's national language question: choices and constraints, in Bamgbose, Banjo and Thomas (eds): 34-56
- Ju, M.K. 2000. Overpassivisation errors by second-language learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 22: 85-111
- Juffs, A. 1998. Main verb versus reduced relative clause ambiguity resolution in L2 sentence processing. *Language Learning*, Vol. 48 (1): 107-147
- Kachru, B.B. 1981. The pragmatics of non-native varieties of English, in Smith, L.E. (ed): 15-39
- (ed). 1982a. *The Other tongue: English across cultures*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- 1982b. Meaning in deviation: toward understanding non-native English texts, in Kachru, B. (ed): 325-350

- 1982c. South Asian English, in Moore (ed): 353-383
 - 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds) 2006. Vol. II: 241-269
 - 1986. *The Alchemy of English: the spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
 - 1988a. The sacred cows of English. *English Today* 16: 3-8
 - 1988b. The spread of English and sacred linguistic cows, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds) Vol. III: 484-500.
 - 1990. World Englishes and Applied Linguistics. *World Englishes*. Vol. 9 (1): 3-20
 - 1991. Liberation Linguistics and the Quirk concern. *English Today* 25: 3-13
 - 1996a. World Englishes: agony and ecstasy. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*. Vol. 30 (2): 135-155
 - 1996b. The paradigms of marginality, *World Englishes*, Vol. 15 (3): 241-255
 - 1997. English as an Asian language. *Links and Letters*, Vol. 5: 89-108
 - 2006. English in South Asia, in Bolton and Kachru, B. (eds): 255-310.
 - 2008. Symposium on intelligibility and cross-cultural communication in World Englishes: introduction. *World Englishes*, Vol. 27 (3/4): 293-296
 - ,Y. Kachru and C.L. Nelson. 2006. *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell
- Kachru, Y. 1993. Review of R. Mesthrie: English in language shift: the history, structure and sociolinguistics of South African Indian English. *World Englishes*, Vol. 12 (2): 265-275.
- 1994. Monolingual bias in SLA research. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 28 (4): 795-800
 - 1997. Cultural meaning and contrastive rhetoric in English education. *World Englishes*, Vol. 16 (3): 337-350
 - 2003. On definite reference in World Englishes. *World Englishes*. Vol. 22 (4): 497-510
 - and C.L. Nelson. 2006. *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hongkong: Hongkong University Press.
 - and L.E. Smith. 2009. The karmic cycle of World Englishes: some futuristic constructs. *World Englishes*, Vol. 28 (1): 1-14

- Kamwangamalu, N.M. 2003. When $2+9=1$: English and the politics of language planning in a multilingual country: South Africa, in Mair (ed): 235-246
- Kandiah, T. 1981. Disinherited Englishes: the case of Lankan English Part II. *Navasilu*, Vol. 4: 92-113
- 1991. South Asia, in Cheshire (ed): 271-287.
- 1998. "Why New Englishes?" , in Foley, Kandiah, Bao Zhiming, Gupta, Alsagoff, Ho Chee Lick, Wee, Talib and Bokhorst-Heng: 1-40
- 1998b. The emergence of new Englishes, in Foley, Kandiah, Bao Zhiming, Gupta, Alsagoff, Ho Chee Lick, Wee, Talib and Bokhorst-Heng: 73-105
- Kaplan, R.B. and R.B. Baldauf, Jr. 1998. The language planning situation. *Journal of Multilingual; and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 19 (5): 358-368
- --- 2003. *Language and Language-in-education planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kaye, A. S. 2001. Diglossia: the state of the art. *International Journal of Society and Language*, Vol. 152: 117-129.
- Keesing, R.M. 1990. Solomons Pijin: colonial ideologies, in Baldauf Jr. and Luke (eds): 149-165
- Keller-Cohen, D. 1981. Input from the inside: the role of a child's prior linguistic experience in second language learning, in Andersen (ed): 95-103
- Kelly, Sister F. 1975. The English spoken colloquially by a group of adolescents in Suva. *Fiji English Teachers Journal*, Vol 11: 19-43.
- Kembo-Sure, 2003. The democratisation of language policy: a cultural-linguistic analysis of the status of English in Kenya, in Mair (ed): 247-264.
- King, M. 2003. *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin Books.
- Kioko, A.N. and M.J. Muthwii. 2001. The demands of a changing society: English in education in Kenya today. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, Vol. 14 (3): 201-213.
- Kirk-Greene, A. 1971. The influence of West African languages on English, in Spencer (ed): 123-144
- Kirkpatrick, A. 2006. Which model of English: native-speaker, nativised or lingua franca, in Rubdy and Saraceini (eds): 71-83
- Klaus, D. 2003. The use of indigenous languages in easy basic education in Papua New Guinea: a model for elsewhere? *Language and Education*, Vol. 17 (2): 105-111

- Klein, W. 1990. A theory of language acquisition is not so easy. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 12 (2): 219-231
- 1998. The contribution of second language acquisition research. *Language Learning*, Vol. 48 (4): 527-550
- and C. Perdue. 1997. The basic variety (or: couldn't natural language be much simpler?) *Second Language Research*, Vol. 13 (4): 301-347
- de Klerk, V. 2002. Part 2: the teachers speak. *Perspectives in Education*, Vol. 20 (1): 15-27
- 2006. The syntactic features of Xhosa English. *Corpus linguistics and world Englishes: an analysis of Xhosa English*. London: Continuum. Chapter 9
- Kobayashi, H. 1984. Rhetorical patterns in English and Japanese. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 18 (4): 737-738.
- Kortmann B., E. Schneider, K. Burrige, R. Mesthrie and C. Upton (eds). 2004. *A Handbook of varieties of English Vol 2: Morphology and syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Kortmann, B. and B. Szmrecsanyi. n.d. Parameters of morphosyntactic variation in World Englishes: prospects and limitations of searching for universals. Accessed 6.3.09 from:
http://www.benszm.net/omnibuslit/KoSz_Siemund_Webversion.pdf
- Kramersch, C. 1986. From language proficiency to interactional competence. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 70 (4): 366-372
- Krashen, S. D. 1977. The Monitor model for adult second language performance, in Burt, Dulay and Finocchiaro (eds): 152-161
- M.A. Long and R.C. Scarcella. 1979. Age, rate and eventual attainment in second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 13 (4): 573-582
- Kroll, J.F., E. Michael, N. Tokowicz and R. Dufour. 2002. The development of lexical fluency in a second language. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 18 (2): 137-171
- Krupa, V. 1982. *The Polynesian languages: a guide*. London/Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Kuczaj III, S.A. 1989. On the search for universals of language acquisition: a commentary on Cziko. *First Language*, Vol. 9: 39-44
- Kujore, O. 1997. Whose English? In Bamgbose, Banjo and Thomas (eds): 367-380
- Kuroda, S-Y. 1968. English relativisation and certain related problems. *Language*, Vol. 44 (2): 244-266

- Kwon, E-Y. 2005. The 'natural order' of morpheme acquisition: a historical survey and discussion of three putative determinants. *Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 5 (1): 1-21
- Labov, W. 1982. Objectivity and commitment in linguistic science: the case of the Black English trial in Ann Arbor. *Language in Society*, Vol. 11 (2): 165-201
- 1994. *Principles of linguistic change: Vol. 1*. Cambridge, MASS: Blackwell.
- Ladd, H.F. and E.B. Fiske. 2001. The uneven playing field of school choice: evidence from New Zealand. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Vol. 20 (1): 43-63
- Lado, R. 1957. *Linguistics across cultures: applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
- Lakshmanan, U. and L. Selinker. 1994. The status of CP and the tensed complementiser in the developing L2 grammars of English. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 10 (1): 24-48
- Lakshmanan, U. 2001. Analysing interlanguage: how do we know what learners know? *Second Language Research*, Vol. 17 (4): 393-420
- Lal, B. 2004. *Bittersweet: an Indo-Fijian experience*. Canberra: Pandanus Books
- Lameta, E. 2005. Language policy: the case of Samoa. *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 27 (1): 43-76
- 2005b. *Pacific regional overview of progress towards EFA since Dakar*. Apia: UNESCO
- Larsen-Freeman, D. 1975. The acquisition of grammatical morphemes by adult learners of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 9 (4): 409-419
- 1978. An explanation of the morpheme accuracy order of learners of English as a second language, in Hatch (ed): 371-379
- 2000. Second language acquisition and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of applied Linguistics*, Vol. 20: 165-181
- Larson, R.K. 1987. "Missing prepositions" and the analysis of English free relative clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 18 (2): 239-266
- Lawson, S. 1996. *Tradition versus democracy in the South Pacific: Fiji, Tonga and Western Samoa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Leki, I. 1991. Twenty-five years of contrastive rhetoric: text analysis and writing pedagogies. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 25 (1): 123-143
- Leow, R.P. 1997. Simplification and second language acquisition. *World Englishes*, Vol. 16 (2): 291-296

- Leung, C., R. Harris and B. Rampton. 1997. The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 31 (3): 543-560
- Liceras, J. M. (ed). Proceedings of the 6th Generative approaches to second Language Acquisition Conference. (GASLA 2002). Somerville MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Liddicoat, A. 2004. Language planning for literacy: issues and implications. *Current issues in language planning*, Vol. 5 (1): 1-17
- Lieb, H-H. 1975. Universals of language: quandaries and prospects. *Foundations of Language*, Vol. 12 (4): 471-511
- Lightbown, P. and N. Spada. 1990. Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative teaching: effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 12: 429-448
- Lim, L. and N. Gisborne. 2009. The typology of Asian Englishes: setting the agenda. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 30 (2): 123-132
- Limbrick, L. 2001. New Zealand's response to the literacy issues of the 1990's. *ACE Papers*, Issue 9: 8-25
- Liu, D. 2008. Intransitive or object deleting? Classifying English verbs used without an object. *Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 36 (4): 289-313
- Llamas, C., L. Mullany and P. Stockwell. 2007. *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Llurda, E. 2004. Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an international language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 14 (3): 314-323
- Lo Bianco, J. 1996. Institutional responses: empowering minority children. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 30 (3): 586-590
- Long, M. 1983. Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of research. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 17 (3): 359-382
- 1990. The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 24 (4): 649-666
- 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition, in Ritchie and Bhatia (eds): 413-468
- 1997. Construct validity in SLA research: a response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 81 (3): 318-323
- 2005. Problems with supposed counter-evidence to the critical Period Hypothesis. *IRAL*, Vol. 43: 287-317.

- Lotherington, H. 1996. A consideration of the portability and supportability of immersion education: a critical look at English immersion in Melanesia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 17 (3): 349-359
- 1997. Bilingual education in the South Pacific, in Cummins and Corson (eds): 87-95
- 1998. Trends and tensions in post-colonial language education in the South Pacific. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 1 (1): 65-75
- 2008. Bilingual education in the South Pacific, in Cummins and Hornberger (eds): 267-280
- Lotherington-Woloszyn, H. 1993. Is there an easy solution to bilingual education in the Pacific? *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 15 (2): 28-39
- Lowenberg, P.H. 1986. Non-native varieties of English: nativisation, norms and implications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 8 (1): 1-18
- 1991. Variation in Malaysian English: the pragmatics of languages in contact, in Cheshire (ed): 364-375
- Lui, I.B. 1996. Niuean as a medium of instruction in primary school in Niue, in Mugler and Lynch (eds): 111-119
- Lynch, J. 1998. *Pacific languages: an introduction*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press
- and F. Mugler. 1999/2001. English in the South Pacific. Accessed 30.8.06 from: http://www.vanuatu.ac.fj/paclangunit/English_South_Pacific.htm
- M. Ross and T. Crowley. 2002. *The Oceanic Languages*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press
- McArthur, T. 1992. Models of English. *English Today*, Vol 32 (October): 12-21
- 1997. The printed word in the English-speaking world. *English Today* 49, Vol. 13 (1): 10-16
- 1998. *The English Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2001. World English and World Englishes: trends, tensions, varieties and standards, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds): 89-124
- 2002. *Oxford Guide to World English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- 2004. Is it world English or international or global English, and does it matter? *English Today* 79, Vol. 20 (3): 3-15

- McCarthy, C. 2008. Morphological variability in the comprehension of agreement: an argument for representation over computation. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 24 (4): 459-486
- McDaniel, D. and W. Cowart. 1999. Experimental evidence for a minimalist account of English resumptive pronouns. *Cognition*, Vol 70: B15-B24
- Macdonald, B. 2001. *Cinderellas of the Empire*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.
- McDonald, J.L. 2000. Grammaticality judgments in a second language: influences of age of acquisition and native language. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, Vol. 21: 395-423
- Mackey, A. 1999. Input, interaction and second language development: an empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 21: 557-587
- McKee, C. and D. McDaniel. 2001. Resumptive pronouns in English relative clauses. *Language Acquisition*, Vol. 9 (2): 113-156
- McLean D. and K. McCormick. 1996. English in South Africa 1940-1996, in Fishman, Conrad and Rubal-Lopez (eds): 303-337
- McMahon, A.M.S. 1994. *Understanding Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- McNaughton, S., G. Phillips and S. MacDonald. 2007. Profiling teaching and learning needs in beginning literacy instruction: the case of children in 'low decile' schools in New Zealand. *Journal of Literacy Instruction*, Vol. 35 (2): 703-730
- McNaughton, S. and M.K. Lai. 2009. A model of school change for culturally and linguistically diverse students in New Zealand: a summary and evidence from systematic replication. *Teaching Education*, Vol. 20 (1): 55-75
- Macpherson, C., R. Bedford and P. Spoonley. 2000. Fact or fable? The consequences of migration for educational achievement and labor market participation. *The Contemporary Pacific*, Vol. 12 (1): 57-82
- McWhorter, J. 1996. A deep breath and a second wind: the substrate hypothesis reassessed. *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 38 (3): 461-494
- 2003. Pidgins and creoles as models of language change: the state of the art. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 23: 202-212
- Madjar, I., E. McKinley, M. Deynzer and A. Van der Merwe. 2010. Stumbling blocks or stepping stones? Students' experiences of transition from low-decile schools to university. Auckland: Starpath Project, University of Auckland.

- Madraiwiwi, Ratu J. 2008. *A personal perspective: the speeches of Joni Madraiwiwi*. Suva: University of the South Pacific
- Mafu, S.T.A. 2003. Postcolonial language planning in Tanzania: what are the difficulties and what is the way out? In Mair (ed): 267-278
- Maglen, L.R. 1990. Impact of bilateral aid on educational development. *Comparative Education*, Vol. 26 (1): 83-93
- Mair, C. (ed). 2003. *The Politics of English as a world Language: new horizons in postcolonial cultural studies*. ASNEL Papers 7. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi
- Makoni, S.B. 1993. Is Zimbabwean English a type of new English? *African Study Monographs*, Vol. 14 (2): 97-107
- Maneipuri, J. 2002. Solomon Islands education: issues and challenges, in Pene, Taufe'ulungaki and Benson (eds): 102-103
- Mangubhai, F. 1987. Literacy in Fiji: its origins and its development. *Interchange*, Vol. 18 (1/2): 124-135
- 2003. Language-in-education policies in the South Pacific: some possibilities for consideration. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 23 (6): 490-511
- and F. Mugler. 2006. The language situation in Fiji, in Baldauf and Kaplan (eds): 22-113
- Marinis, T., L. Roberts, C. Felser and H. Clahsen. 2005. Gaps in second language sentence processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 27: 53-78
- Martinez Insua, A.E. and I.M.P. Martinez. 2003. A corpus-based approach to non-concord in present-day English existential *There*-constructions. *English Studies*, Vol. 3: 262-283
- Matras, Y. 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics*, Vol. 36 (2): 281-331
- Matsuda, P.K., A.S. Canagarajah, L. Harklau, K. Hyland and M. Warschauer. 2003. Changing currents in second language writing research: a colloquium. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Vol. 12: 151-179
- Matusov, E. and J. St. Julien. 2004. Print literacy as oppression: cases of bureaucratic, colonial, and totalitarian literacies and their implications for schooling. *Text*, Vol. 24 (2): 197-244
- Mauranen, A. 2003. The corpus of English as a lingua franca in academic settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 37 (3): 513-527

- May, S. 2000. Uncommon languages: the challenges and possibilities of minority education rights. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 21 (5): 366-385
- Mazrui, A.M. and A.A. Mazrui. 1996. A tale of two Englishes: the imperial language on post-colonial Kenya and Uganda, in Fishman, Conrad and Rubal-Lopez (eds): 271-302
- Mehrotra, R.R. 1982. Indian English: a sociolinguistic profile, in Pride (ed): 150-173
- Meierkord, C. 2004. Syntactic variations in interactions across international Englishes. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 25 (1): 109-132
- 2009. It's kuloo tu: recent developments in Kenya's Englishes. *English Today* 97, Vol. 25 (1): 3-11
- Meisel, J. 2000. Revisiting universal grammar. *DELTA*, Vol. 16 Special: 129-140
- Meleisea, Malama, 1987. *Lagaga: a short history of Western Samoa*. Apia: University of the South Pacific.
- 1987b. *The Making of Modern Samoa: traditional authority and colonial administration in the history of Western Samoa*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.
- Mesthrie, R. 1992. *English in language shift: the history, structure and sociolinguistics of South African Indian English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- 1993. English in South Africa. *English Today* 33, Vol. 9 (1): 27-33
- 2003. The world Englishes paradigm and contact linguistics: refurbishing the foundations. *World Englishes*, Vol. 22 (4): 449-461
- 2006. World Englishes and the multilingual history of English. *World Englishes*, Vol. 25 (3/4): 381-390
- 2006b. Contact linguistics and world Englishes, in Kachru, B., Y. Kachru and Nelson (eds): 272-288
- J. Swann, A. Deumert and W.L. Leap. 2000. *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- and R.M. Bhatt. 2008. *World Englishes: the study of new linguistic varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Middleton, S. 2008. Beating the filters of failure: engaging with the disengaged in higher education. *Proceedings of the HERDSA Conference 2008*.
- Milner, G.B. 1966. *Samoan dictionary*. Auckland: Pasifika Press.

- Mitchell, R. and F. Myles. 2004. *Second Language Learning Theories*. (2nd ed) London: Arnold.
- Mittwoch, A. 1988. Aspects of English aspect: on the interaction of perfect, progressive and durational phrases. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, Vol. 11: 203-254
- Moag, R.F. 1982. The life cycle of non-native Englishes: a case study, in Kachru, B. (ed): 270-288
- 1982b. English as a foreign, second, native and basal language: a new taxonomy of English-using societies, in Pride (ed): 11-50
-
- Modiano, M. 1999. International English in the global village. *English Today* 58, Vol. 15 (2): 22-34
- 1999b. Standard English(es), and educational practices for the world's lingua franca. *English Today* 60, Vol. 15 (4): 3-13
- Mohan, B.A. and W.A-Y Lo. 1985. Academic writing and Chinese students: transfer and developmental factors. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 19 (3): 515-534
- Mollin, S. 2007. New variety or learner English: criteria for variety status and the case of Euro-English. *English Today*, Vol. 28 (2): 167-185
- Montrul, S. 2009. Re-examining the Fundamental Difference Hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language acquisition*, Vol. 31 : 225-257
- Moore, B. (ed) 2001. *Who's Centric now? The present state of Post-colonial Englishes*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Morrow, L.M. 1992. The impact of a literature-based program on literacy achievement, use of literature and attitudes of children from minority backgrounds. *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 27 (3): 251-275
- Mufwene, S.S. n.d. Creoles, pidgins and the evolution of languages. *Fathom Sessions*, Cambridge University Press, Accessed 18.9.07 from: <http://www.fathom.com/course/21701718.html>
- 1994. New Englishes and criteria for naming them, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds): 55-65
- 1997. The legitimate and illegitimate offspring of English, in Smith and Forman (eds): 182-203
- 2001. *The Ecology of Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- 2006. Pidgins and Creoles, in Kachru, B., Y. Kachru and Nelson (eds): 313-327

- 2008. Colonisation, population contacts and the emergence of new language varieties: a response to Peter Trudgill. *Language in Society*, Vol. 37 (2): 254-258
- 2008b. *Language evolution: contact, competition and change*. London/ New York: Continuum International.
- Mugler, F. 1996 'Vernacular' language teaching in Fiji, in Mugler and Lynch (eds): 273-287
- and J. Lynch (eds). 1996. *Pacific Languages in Education*. Suva: University of the South Pacific
- and J. Tent. 2004. Fiji English: morphology and syntax, in Kortmann, Schneider, Burridge, Mesthrie and Upton (eds). Vol. 2: 770-788
- Mühlhäusler, B. and Mühlhäusler, P. 2005. Simple English in the South Seas Evangelical Mission: social context and linguistic attributes. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, Vol. 29 (1): 1-30
- Mühlhäusler, P. 1974. *Pidginisation and simplification of language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics Series B-26: Australian National University
- 1987. The changing Pidgin languages of the Pacific. *Diogenes*, Vol. 35: 52-72
- 1996. *Linguistic ecology: language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific region*. London: Routledge.
- 2000. Language planning and language ecology. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, Vol. 1 (3): 306-367
- Mukherjee, J. 2007. Steady states in the evolution of New Englishes: present-day Indian English as an equilibrium. *Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 35: 157-187
- and S. Hoffmann. 2006. Describing verb-complementational profiles of New Englishes. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 27 (2): 147-173
- and S.T. Gries. 2009. Collostructional nativisation in New Englishes: verb-construction associations in the International Corpus of English. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 30 (1): 27-51
- Mwangi, S. 2004. Prepositions vanishing from Kenya. *English Today* 77, Vol. 20 (1): 27-32
- Myles, J. 2002. Second language writing and research: the writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESL-EJ*, Vol. 6 (2). Accessed 31.3.10 from: [mhtml:file:///H:/second Language Writing and research](mhtml:file:///H:/second%20Language%20Writing%20and%20research).

- Nabobo, U. 2002. Computer tigers and coconut trees, in Pene, Taufe'ulungaki and Benson (eds): 36-47
- Nair, R. n.d. Critical analysis of the Australia-Pacific Technical College (APTC). Accessed March 7, 2011 from: www.aidreview.gov.au/publications/Robin%Nair.doc
- Nakhid, C. 2003. Intercultural perceptions, academic achievement and the identifying process of Pacific Islands students in New Zealand schools. *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 72 (3): 297-317
- Nash, R. 2000. Educational inequality: the special case of Pacific students. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, Issue 15: 69-86
- Nayar, P.B. 1997. ESL/EFL dichotomy today: language politics or pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 31 (1): 9-37
- Nemser, W. 1971. Approximative systems of foreign language learners, in Richards (ed) 1974: 55-64
- Nero, S. 2000. The changing faces of English: a Caribbean perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 34 (3): 483-510
- Newbrook, M. 1997. Malaysian English: status, norms, some grammatical and lexical features, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds) 2006: 390-417
- 1998. Which way? That way? Variation and ongoing changes in the English relative clause. *World Englishes*, Vol. 17 (1): 43-59
- Niroa, J. 2002. Reflections on Vanuatu's education system, in Pene, Taufe'ulungaki and Benson (eds): 107-111
- Nkemleke, D.A. 2006. Some characteristics of expository writing in Cameroon English. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 27 (1): 25-44
- Norrish, J. 1997. English or English? Attitudes, local varieties and English language teaching. *TESL-EJ*, Vol. 3 (1). Accessed 26.7.10 from: <http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/Volume3/ej09/ej09a2>
- Northey, J.F. 1965. Self-determination in the Cook Islands. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Vol. 74: 112-118
- Nunan, D. 2003. The impact of English as a global language on the educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 37 (4): 589-613
- O'Brien, D.G., R.A. Stewart and E.B. Moje. 1995. Why content literacy is difficult to infuse into the secondary school: complexities of curriculum, pedagogy and school culture. *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 30 (3): 442-463

- Odlin, T. 1992. Transferability and linguistic substrates. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 8: 171-202
- Ogbu, J.U. 1999. Beyond language: Ebonics, proper English and identity in a Black-American speech community. *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 36 (2): 147-184
- O'Grady, W. 1996. Language acquisition without Universal Grammar: a general nativist proposal for L2 learning. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 12: 374-397
- 2007. The emergentist program. *Lingua*, Vol. 118: 447-464
- Ohanessian, S., C. Ferguson and E.C. Polomé. 1975. *Language surveys in developing countries: papers and reports on sociolinguistic surveys*. Arlington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Olsen, M. B., A. Weinberg, J.P. Lilly and J.E. Drury. 1998. Acquiring grammatical aspect via lexical aspect: the continuity hypothesis. Accessed 21.5.09 from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu>
- Ooi, V. B. Y. 2001. Globalising Singaporean-Malaysian English in an inclusive learner's dictionary, in Moore (ed): 95-121
- Oshita, H. 2000. What is happened may not be what appears to be happening: a corpus study of 'passive' unaccusatives in L2 English. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 16: 293-324
- Otsuka, Y. 2007. Making a case for Tongan as an endangered language. *The Contemporary Pacific*, Vol. 19 (2): 446-473
- Otunuku, M. and G.T.L. Brown. 2007. Tongan students' attitudes towards their subjects in New Zealand relative to their academic achievement. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, Vol. 8 (1): 117-128
- Pakir, A. 1997. Standards and codification of World Englishes, in Smith and Forman (eds): 169-181
- 1999. Connecting with English in the context of internationalisation. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 33 (1): 103-114
- Parasher, S. V. 1983. Indian English: certain grammatical, lexical and stylistic features. *English World-Wide*, Vol. IV (1): 27-42
- Park, J. S-L. and L. Wee. 2009. The Three-circles redux: a market-theoretic perspective on World Englishes. *Applied Linguistics*, March: 1-18
- Payne, T.E. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax: a guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Pene, F., A.M. Taufe'ulungaki and C. Benson.(eds). 2002. *Tree of Opportunity: rethinking Pacific education*. Suva, Fiji: University of the South Pacific
- Pene, F. and F. Mugler. 2005. The language context of Pacific countries: a summary. *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 27 (1 & 2): 134-143
- Penland, D., M. Low, P. Sataua and E. Ruluked. 2004. Language policies: oral traditions and English in Pacific classrooms. Accessed 15.4.09 from: http://www.prel.org/products/paced/oct04/re_language.htm
- Pennycook, A. 1994. *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.
- Phan, H.P. and B. Deo. 2008. 'Revisiting' the South Pacific approaches to learning: a confirmatory factor analysis study. *Higher Education Research and Development*.Vol. 27 (4): 371-383
- Phan Le Ha. 2005. Towards a critical notion of appropriation of English as an international language. *Asian EFL Journal*, Vol. 7 (3). Accessed 12.10.09 from: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/September_05_plh.php
- Phillips, G., S. McNaughton and S. Macdonald. 2004. Managing the mismatch: enhancing early literacy progress for children with diverse language and cultural identities in mainstream urban schools in New Zealand. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. Vol. 96 (2): 309-323
- Phillipson, R. 1988. Linguicism: structures and ideologies in linguistic imperialism, in Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (eds): 339-358
- 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1996. Linguistic imperialism: African perspectives. *ELT Journal*, Vol. 50 (2): 160-167
- and T. Skutnabb-Kangas. 1996. English only worldwide or language ecology? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 30 (3): 429-452
- Pica, T. 1994. Review article: Research on negotiation: what does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes and outcomes? *Language Learning*, Vol. 44 (3): 493-527
- 1991. Do second language learners need negotiation? *WPEL*, Vol. 7 (2): 1-12
- Pierce, B.N. 1995. Social identity, investment and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 29 (1): 9-31
- Platt, J. 1982. English in Singapore, Malaysia and Hongkong, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds). 2006. Vol III: 384-414
- 1989. The nature of indigenised Englishes: interference-creativity-universals. *Language Sciences*, Vol. 11 (4): 395-407

- , H. Weber and M.L. Ho. 1984. *The new Englishes*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Portes, A. and M. Zhou. 1993. The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 530: 74-96
- Portes, A. and R. Schaufler. 1994. Language and the second generation: bilingualism yesterday and today. *International Migration Review*, Vol. 28 (4): 640-661
- Prendergast, D. 1998. Views of Englishes: a talk with Braj B. Kachru, Salikoko Mufwene, Rajendra Singh, Loreta Todd and Peter Trudgill. *Links and Letters* 5: 225-241
- Prévost, P. and L. White. 2000. Missing surface inflection or impairment in second-language acquisition? Evidence from tense and agreement. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 16 (2): 103-133
- Pride, J. (ed). 1982. *New Englishes*. Rowley, MASS: Newbury House
- PRIDE Project. 2005. *Country status reports: main features and issues*. Language Policy workshop, Feb. 2-9. University of the South Pacific
- Prodromou, L. 2007. Is ELF a variety of English? *English Today* 90, Vol. 23 (2): 47-53
- Puamau, P. 1999. Understanding Fijian under-achievement: an integrated perspective. *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 21 (2): 100-112
- 2002. Rethinking education in Fiji: issues and solutions in the 21st century, in Pene, Taufe'ulungaki and Benson (eds): 61-72
- 2005. Rethinking Education in the Pacific. Lecture given to ED352 students, September 13. University of the South Pacific.
- 2006. Pacific voices: teacher education on the move. *Directions: Journal of Educational studies*, Vol. 28 (1 / 2): 56-62
- and G.R. Teasdale (eds). 2005. *Education Planning in the Pacific: principles and guidelines*. Suva, Fiji: the PRIDE project, University of the South Pacific
- Quirk, R. 1988. The question of standards in the international use of English, in Bolton, and B. Kachru (eds). 2006. Vol. III: 474-483
- 1990. Language varieties and standard language. *English Today*, Vol. 21: 3-10
- S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Harlow: Longman.

- Raimes, A. 1985. What unskilled ESL students do as they write: a classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 19 (2): 229-258
- Rajadurai, J. 2005. Revisiting the Concentric circles: conceptual and sociolinguistic considerations. *Asian EFL Journal*, Vol. 7, Issue 4. Accessed 25.3.08 from: http://www.asian-e-fl-journal.com/December_05_jr.php
- 2007. Sociolinguistic perspectives on variation in non-native varieties of English: the case of Malaysian English. *Multilingua*, Vol. 26: 409-426
- Rajagopalan, K. 1997. Linguistics and the myth of nativity: comments on the controversy over 'new/non-native Englishes'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 27: 225-231
- 2004. The concept of 'World English' and its implications for ELT. *ELT Journal*, Vol. 58 (2): 111-117
- Rampton, M.B.H. 1990. Displacing the native speaker: expertise, affiliation and inheritance, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds) 2006. Vol. IV: 131-135
- Ravem, R. 1968. Language acquisition in a second language environment, in Richards (ed) 1974: 124-133
- 1978. Two Norwegian children's acquisition of English syntax, in Hatch (ed): 148-154
- Rehg, K.L. 2004. Linguists, literacy, and the Law of Unintended Consequences. *Oceanic Linguistics*, Vol. 43 (2): 498-518
- Ricento, T. 2000. Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 4 (2): 196-213
- and N.H. Hornberger. 1996. Unpeeling the onion: language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 30 (3): 429-452
- Richards, J.C. 1971. A non-contrastive approach to error analysis, in Richards (ed) 1974: 172-188
- (ed). 1974. *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman
- 1982. Singapore English: rhetorical and communicative styles, in B. Kachru (ed) 1982a: 154-167
- 1982b. Rhetorical and communicative styles in the new varieties of English, in Pride (ed): 227-248
- and G.P. Sampson. 1974. The study of learner English, in Richards (ed): 3-27
- Ritchie, W. and T. Bhatia (eds). 1996. *Handbook of second language acquisition*. San Diego: Academic Press

- Roberts, C. 1994. Transferring literacy skills from L1 to L2: from theory to practice. *Journal of Educational Issues of Minority Students*, Vol. 13, Spring: 209-221
- Robinson, M. 2003. Teacher education policy in South Africa: the voice of teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, Vol. 29 (1): 19-34
- Robison, R.E. 1995. The Aspect hypothesis revisited: a cross-sectional study of tense and aspect marking in interlanguage. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 16 (3): 344-369
- Roebuck, R.F. , M.A. Martínez-Arbelaiz and J.I Pérez-Silva. 1999. Null subjects, filled CPs and L2 acquisition. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 15 (3): 251-282
- Romaine, S. 1988. *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. London: Longman.
- 1991. The Pacific, in Cheshire (ed): 619-636
- (ed). 1991. *English around the world: sociolinguistic perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1994. *Language in society: an introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- 1996. Bilingualism, in Ritchie and Bhatia (eds): 571-604.
- Routledge, D. 1985. *Matanitu: the struggle for power in early Fiji*. Suva: University of the South Pacific
- Rowe, K.J. 2003. The importance of teacher quality as a key determinant of students' experiences and outcomes of schooling. *Context paper prepared on behalf of Interim Committee, NSW Institute of Teachers*. Accessed 14.7.10 from: [http://www.Nswteachers.nsw.edu.au/Rowe-IgnitionSuite/uploads/docs/Rowe-The Importance of teacher quality. pdf](http://www.Nswteachers.nsw.edu.au/Rowe-IgnitionSuite/uploads/docs/Rowe-The%20Importance%20of%20teacher%20quality.pdf).
- Rubdy, R. 2008. Diffusion of innovation: a plea for indigenous models. *TESL-EJ*. Vol. 12 (3): 1-34
- and M. Saraceni (eds). 2006. *English in the world: global rules, global roles*. London: Continuum.
- Rubie-Davies, C., J. Hattie and R. Hamilton. 2006. Expecting the best for students. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 76 (3): 429-44
- Rutherford, W.E. 1982. Markedness in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, Vol. 32 (1):. 85-107
- and M. Sharwood-Smith. 1988. *Grammar and second language teaching*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House

- Sabourin, L., L.A. Stowe and G.J. de Haan. 2006. Transfer effects in learning a second language grammatical gender system. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 22 (1): 1-29
- Sala, B.M. 2006. Does Cameroonian English have grammatical norms? *English Today*, Vol. 22 (4): 59-64.
- Sand, A. 2004. Shared morpho-syntactic features in contact varieties of English: article use. *World Englishes*, Vol. 23 (2): 281-298
- Sanga, K.F. 2002. Beyond access and participation: challenges facing Pacific education, in Pene, Taufe'ulungaki and Benson (eds): 52-58
- Sankoff, G. 2001. Linguistic outcomes of language contact, in Trudgill, Chambers and Schilling-Estes (eds): 638-668
- Schachter, J. 1974. An error in error analysis. *Language Learning*, Vol. 24 (2): 205-214
- 1990. On the issue of completeness in second language acquisition. *Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 6: 93-124
- 1992. A new account of language transfer, in Gass and Selinker (eds): 32-46
- 1993. Second language acquisition: perceptions and possibilities. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 9: 173-187
- 1996. Maturation and the issue of UG in second language acquisition, in Ritchie and Bhatia (eds): 159-193
- 1998. Recent research in language learning studies: promises and problems. *Language Learning*, Vol. 48 (4): 557-583
- Schaub, M. 2000. English in the Arab republic of Egypt. *World Englishes*, Vol. 19 (2): 225-238
- Schell, M. 2008. Colinguals among bilinguals. *World Englishes*, Vol. 27 (1): 117-130
- Schleppegrell, M.J. 1996. Conjunction in spoken English and ESL writing. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 17 (3): 271-285
- Schmid, C.L. 2001. Educational achievement, language-minority students and the new second generation. *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 74 (extra issue): 71-87
- Schmied, J. 1991. *English in Africa: an introduction*. Harlow: Longman
- 1996. English in Zimbabwe, Zambia and Malawi, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds) 2006. Vol II: 181-199
- Schneider, E. W. (ed). 1997. *Englishes around the world: studies in honour of Manfred Görlach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin

- 2000. Feature diffusion vs contact effects in the evolution of New Englishes: a typological case study of negation patterns. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 21 (2): 201-230
 - 2003. The dynamics of new Englishes: from identity construction to dialect birth. *Language*, Vol. 79 (2): 233-281
 - 2004. How to trace structural nativisation: particle verbs in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, Vol. 23 (2): 227-249
 - 2007. *Postcolonial English: varieties around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Schoeffel, P. and M. Meleisea. 1994. Pacific Islands Polynesian attitudes to child training and discipline in New Zealand: some policy implications for social welfare and education. Accessed 24.3.10 from:
<http://penelopeschoeffelmeleisea.net/samoa/socialisation%20NZ.pdf>
- Schumann, J.H. 1974. The implications of interlanguage, pidginisation and creolisation for the study of adult second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 8 (2): 145-152
- 1977. Second language acquisition: the pidginisation hypothesis. *Language Learning*, Vol. 26 (2): 391-408
 - 1986. Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 7 (5): 379-392
 - 1990. Extending the scope of the Acculturation/pidginisation model to include cognition. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 24 (4): 667-684
- Schwartz, B. 1998. The second language instinct. *Lingua*, Vol. 106: 133-160
- Schwartz, G.G. 2004. Coming to terms: Generation 1.5 students in mainstream composition. *The Reading Matrix*, Vol. 4 (3): 40-57
- Scott, D. 2005. Retention, completion and progression in tertiary education in New Zealand. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. Vol. 27 (1): 3-17
- Seidlhofer, B. 2001. Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 11 (2): 133-158
- 2009. Common ground and different realities: world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes*, Vol. 28 (2): 236-245
 - and J. Jenkins. 2003. English as a lingua franca and the politics of property, in Mair (ed): 140-153
- Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage, in Richards (ed) 1974: 31-54

- and U. Lakshmanan. 1992. Language transfer and fossilisation: the 'Multiple Effects principle', in Gass and Selinker (eds): 197-216
- Shameem, N. 2002. Multilingual proficiency in Fiji primary schools. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 23 (5): 388-407
- Sharma, D. 2005. Dialect stabilisation and speaker awareness in non-native varieties in English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 9 (2): 194-224
- 2005b. Language transfer and discourse universals in Indian English article use. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 27: 535-566
- 2009. Typological diversity in New Englishes. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 30 (2): 170-195
- Shaw, P. and E. T-K. Liu. 1998. What develops in the development of second-language writing? *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 19 (2): 225-254
- Siegel, J. 1987. *Language Contact in a plantation environment: a sociolinguistic history of Fiji*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1996. The use of Melanesian Pidgin in education, in Mugler and Lynch (eds): 154-175
- 1997. Formal vs non-formal vernacular education: the education reform in Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 18 (3): 206-222
- 1997b. Pidgin and English in Melanesia: is there a continuum? *World Englishes*, Vol. 16 (2): 185-204
- 1998. Literacy in Melanesian and Australian Pidgins and Creoles. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 19 (1): 105-121
- 1998b. Stigmatised and standardised varieties in the classroom: interference or separation? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 33 (4): 701-728
- 2003. Substrate influence in creoles and the role of transfer in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 25: 185-209
- 2007. Recent evidence against the language Bioprogram hypothesis. *Studies in Language*, Vol. 31 (10): 51-88
- Siilata, R. and G. Barkhuizen. 2004. Pasifika students' perceptions of their L1 maintenance at home and school: language to climb a coconut tree? *TESOLANZ Journal*, Vol. 12: 22-38
- Silva, P. (n.d.) South African English: oppressor or liberator. Accessed 19.2.07 from: <http://www.ru.ac.za/affiliates/dsae/MAVEN.html>

- Silva, T. 1993. Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: the ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 27 (4): 657-677
- Silva-Corvalán, C. 1990. Current issues in studies of language contact. *Hispania*, Vol. 73 (1): 162-176
- Simmons-McDonald, H. 2003. Decolonising English: the Caribbean counter-thrust, in Mair (ed): 179-201
- Simo Bobda, A. 2001. English in the sub-Saharan linguistic landscape: beginning of millennium observations. *Anglia*, Vol. 1119 (4): 579-595
- 2004. Linguistic apartheid: English language policy in Africa. *English Today*, Vol. 20 (1): 19-25
- Singh, G. 2001. Literacy impact studies in the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. *International Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 35 (1): 227-236
- Singh, R. 1995. 'New/non-native' Englishes revisited: a reply to my colleagues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 24: 323-333
- J. D'Souza, K.P. Mohanan and N.S. Prabhu. 1995. On 'new/non-native' Englishes: a quartet. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 24: 283-294
- Singhal, M. 2004. Academic writing and Generation 1.5: pedagogical goals and instructional issues in the college composition classroom. *The Reading Matrix*, Vol. 4 (3): 1-13
- Singleton, D. 2001. Age and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 21: 77-91.
- Siteine, A. 2010. The allocation of Pasifika identity in New Zealand classrooms. *MAI Review*, Vol. 1. Accessed 19.1.2011 from <http://review.mai.ac.nz>
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1981. *Bilingualism or not: the education of minorities*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- 1988. Multilingualism and the education of minority children, in Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (eds): 9-44.
- and R. Phillipson (eds) 1988. *Minority Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Smith, L.E. (ed). 1981. *English for Cross-cultural Communication*. Honolulu: Macmillan Center for Cultural and Technical Exchange between East and West.
- 1991. Spread of English and issues of intelligibility, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds). 2006. Vol. IV: 75-90
- and K. Rafiqzad. 1979. English for cross-cultural communication: the question of intelligibility. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 13 (3): 371-380

- and J.A. Bisazza. 1982. The comprehensibility of three varieties of English for college students in seven countries, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds) 2006. Vol. IV: 58-67
- and M.L. Forman (eds). 1997. *World Englishes 2000*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Snow, C.E. and M. Hoefnagel-Höhle. 1978. The critical period for language acquisition: evidence from second language acquisition. *Child Development*, Vol. 49 (4): 1114-1128
- Sorace, A. 2000. Syntactic optionality in non-native grammars. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 16: 93-102
- C. Heycock and R.S. Shillcock. 1998. Introduction: trends and convergences in language acquisition research. *Lingua*, Vol. 106: 1-21
- South Pacific Commission. 2010. Pacific Population Figures. Accessed 12.3.11 from: www.spc.int/sdp/index.php?
- Spack, R. 1997. The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 31 (4): 765-774
- Sparks, R. and L. Ganschow. 1993. Searching for the cognitive locus of foreign language learning difficulties: linking first and second language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 77 (3): 289-301
- Spence, G.P. 2004. The practice of policy in New Zealand. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. Vol. 5 (4): 389-406
- Spencer, J. (ed). 1971. *The English language in West Africa*. London: Longman
- Spencer, M.L. 1996. And what of the languages of Micronesia? In Mugler and Lynch (eds): 10-35
- Spolsky, B. 1988. Bridging the gap: a general theory of second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 22 (3): 377-396
- 2003. Religion as a site for language contact. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 23: 81-94
- Sridhar, K. 1982. English in a South Indian urban context, in Kachru, B. (ed): 141-153
- 1991. Speech acts in an indigenized variety: sociocultural values and language variation, in Cheshire (ed): 308-318
- Sridhar, K.S. and S.N. Sridhar. 1982. Bridging the paradigm gap: second language acquisition theory and indigenised varieties of English, in Bolton and B. Kachru (eds) 2006. Vol. II: 398-412

- Sridhar, S.N. 1994. A reality check for SLA theories. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 28 (4): 800-805
- Starks, D. 2008. National and ethnic identity markers: New Zealand short front vowels in New Zealand Māori *English* and Pasifika Englishes. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 29 (2): 176-193
- and L. Thompson. 2009. Agreement patterns in existential constructions in the New Zealand Niuean community. *World Englishes*, Vol. 28 (3): 319-335
- J. Christie and L. Thompson. 2007. Niuean English: initial insights into an emerging variety. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 28 (2): 133-146
- Statistics NZ. 1998. *New Zealand now: children*. Wellington: Department of Statistics
- 2008. Quick-stats about Pacific peoples (full reports not yet available). Accessed 13.5.10 from: <http://www.Stats.govt.nz/Census/2006CensusHomePage/QuickStats/quickstats-about-Pacific-peoples/>
- 2010. Education and Pacific Peoples in New Zealand. Accessed 13.5.10 from: <http://www.stats.govt.nz/pacific-progress>
- Stekauer, P. 2002. On the theory of neologisms and nonce-formations, *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 22 (1): 97-112
- Strang, B. M. H. 1970. *A History of English*. London: Methuen
- Strathdee, R. 2003. The Qualifications Framework in New Zealand: reproducing existing inequalities or disrupting the positional conflict for credentials. *Journal of Education and Work*, Vol. 16 (2): 147-164
- Street, B. 1994. What is meant by local literacies? *Language and education*, Vol. 8 (1/2): 9-17
- 2003. What's new in New Literacy studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, Vol. 5 (2): 77-91
- Stevens, P. 1981. What is 'standard' English? *RELC Journal*, Vol. 12: 1-9
- 1982. The localised forms of English, in Kachru, B. (ed): 23-30
- Swain, M. 1981. Target language use in the wider environment as a factor in its acquisition, in Andersen (ed): 109-122
- 1993. The output hypothesis: just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, Vol. 50: 158-164
- Swales, J. 1990. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Szmrecsanyi, B. and B. Kortmann. 2009a. The morphosyntax of varieties of English worldwide: a quantitative perspective. *Lingua*, Vol. 119: 1643-1663
- 2009b. Vernacular universals and angloversals in a typological perspective. Accessed 4.2.10 from: http://www.benszm.net/omnibuslit/Szmrecsanyi_Kortmann_Mekrijarvi_proofs.pdf
- (n.d.) Parameters of morphosyntactic variation in World Englishes. Accessed 8.09.09 from: www.benszm.net/omnibuslit/KoSz_Siemund_webversion.pdf
- Takano, S. 1993. The transfer of L1 rhetoric in L2 texts and its implication for second language teaching. *EI Two Talk*, Vol. 1 (1): 56-83
- Talu, Sister A. 1993. Towards quality in education, in van Trease (ed): 237-249
- Tamata, A. 1996. Code-switching in Fiji's schools, in Mugler and Lynch (eds): 92-101
- Tan, C. 2005. English or Singlish? The syntactic influences of Chinese and Malay on the learning of English in Singapore. *Journal of Language and Learning*, Vol. 3 (1): 156-179
- Tarone, E. and M. Bigelow. 2005. Impact of literacy on oral language processing: implications for second language acquisition research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 25: 77-97
- Taumoeofalau, M., D. Starks, K. Davis and A. Bell. 2002. Linguists and language maintenance: Pasifika languages in Manukau, New Zealand. *Oceanic Linguistics*, Vol. 41 (1): 15-27
- Tay, M. 1982. The uses, users and features of English in Singapore, in Pride (ed): 51-72
- 1991. Southeast Asia and Hongkong, in Cheshire (ed): 319-332
- Teaero, T.F. 2002. Old challenges, 'new' responses to educational issues in Kiribati, in Pene, Taufe'ulungaki and Benson (eds): 73-83
- Teasdale, B., E. Tokai and P. Puamau. 2005. Culture, literacy and livelihoods: reconceptualising the reform of education in Oceania. *Literacy and Livelihoods: Learning for Life in a changing world*. International Experts Meeting, Vancouver, 2004. Vancouver: Commonwealth of Learning.
- Teleni, V. 1990. Language planning and education in Melanesia and Polynesia: an annotated bibliography, in Baldauf Jr. and Luke (eds): 277-291
- Tent, J. 2000a. *The dynamics of Fiji English: a study of its use, users and features*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Otago, Dunedin.
- 2000b. English lexicography in Fiji. *English Today* 63, Vol. 16 (3): 22-28

- 2001. The present status of English in Fiji, in Moore (ed): 241-268
- 2004. Lexical borrowing in Fiji English, in Tent and Geraghty (eds): 307-330.
- and F. Mugler. 1998. Some aspects of language use and attitudes in Fiji, in Tent and Mugler (eds): 109-134.
- and F. Mugler (eds) 1998. *SICOL Proceedings of the second international conference on oceanic linguistics Vol. 1: Language contact*. Canberra, ANU: Pacific Linguistics Series C-141
- and P. Geraghty (eds). 2004. *Borrowing: a Pacific perspective*. Canberra, ANU: Pacific Linguistics.
- Tetreault, J.R. and M. Chodorow. 2008. The ups and downs of preposition error detection in ESL writing. *Proceedings of the 22nd international Conference on Computational Linguistics*. Manchester: August: 865-872
- Thaman, K.H. 1980. Community expectations of secondary education in Tonga. Accessed 26.4.10 from:
www.Directions.usp.ac.fj/collect/direct/index/assoc/D769835.dir/doc.pdf
- 1993. Culture and curriculum in the South Pacific. *Comparative Education*, Vol. 29 (3): 249-260
- 1994. Cultural democracy for whom? A view from the Pacific Islands. *Keynote address at Conference of the International Association for Intercultural Education*. Adelaide, May 19-25.
- 1996. The Tongan Studies programme, in Mugler and Lynch (eds): 120-136
- 2003. Decolonising Pacific studies: indigenous perspectives, knowledge and wisdom in Higher Education. *The Contemporary Pacific*. Vol. 15 (1): 1-17
- Thimmappa, P.R. and S. Sharma. 2003. Implications of School-Based assessment for the Pacific. *Directions: Journal of Educational Studies*. Vol. 25 (1 & 2): 40-55
- Thomas, W. and V. Collier. 2002. A national study for school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. *Report for Center for research on education, Diversity and Excellence*. Berkeley: University of California. Accessed 13.7 10 from:
<http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/65j213pt>
- Thomason, S.G. 2001. *Language Contact: an introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- and T. Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolisation and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press

- Thompson, S.A. and A. Mulac. 1991. The discourse conditions for the use of the complementiser *that* in conversational English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 15 (2): 237-251
- Tickoo, A. 2001. Re-examining the developmental sequence hypothesis for past tense marking in ESL: transfer effects and implications. *Prospect*, Vol. 16 (1): 17-34
- 2005. The selective marking of past tense: insights from Indian learners of English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 15 (3): 364-378
- 2005b. Text building, language learning and the emergence of local varieties in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, Vol. 24 (1): 21-38
- Todd, L. 1982. The English language in West Africa, in Bailey and Görlach (eds): 281-305
- Tongan Ministry of Education. 2004. *Tongan Education Policy Framework 2004-2019*. Government of Tonga.
- Toohey, K. 1986. Minority educational failure: is dialect a factor? *Curriculum Inquiry*, Vol. 16 (2): 127-145
- Topping, D.M. 1987. Literacy in the Pacific Islands. *Interchange*, Vol. 18 (1/2): 48-59
- Towell, R. and R. Hawkins. 1994. *Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon; Multilingual Matters.
- van Trease, H. (ed). 1993. *Atoll Politics: the Republic of Kiribati*. Christchurch/Suva: University of Canterbury/ University of the South Pacific
- Trenkic, D. 2007. Variability in second language article production: beyond the representational deficit vs processing constraints debate. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 23 (3): 289-327
- Trudgill, P. 1983. *On dialect: social and geographical perspectives*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- and J.K. Chambers (eds). 1991. *Dialects of English: studies in grammatical variation*. London: Longman
- E. Gordon, G. Lewis and M. Maclagan. 2000. Determinism in new-dialect formation and the genesis of New Zealand English. *Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 36: 299-318
- J.K. Chambers and N. Schilling-Estes (eds). 2001. *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- and J. Hannah. 2002. *International English: a guide to the varieties of Standard English (4th ed)*. London: Arnold

- Tsui, A.B.M. and S. Andrews. 2002. Setting standards and language variation: a dilemma for language education. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, Vol. 12 (1): 1-11
- Tuafuti, P. and J. McCaffery. 2005. Family and community empowerment through bilingual education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 8 (5): 480-503
- Tu'inukuafe, E. 1992. *A simplified dictionary of modern Tongan*. Auckland: Pasifika Press
- Tyson, R. 1994. Pidginisation, creolisation, interlanguage and language fossilisation. *SLAT Student Association Working Papers*, Vol. 2 (1): 50-59
- Ullman, M.T. 1999. Acceptability ratings of regular and irregular past-tense forms: evidence for a dual-system model of language from word frequency and phonological neighbourhood effects. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, Vol. 14 (1): 47-67
- University of the South Pacific. 2006. *Statistics. 2006*.
- 2009. *University calendar*.
- Vainnikka, A. and M. Young-Scholten. 1996. Gradual development of L2 phrase structure. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 12 (1): 7-39
- Valdés, G. 2004. Between support and marginalisation: the development of academic language in linguistic minority children. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 7 (2): 102-132
- 2005. Bilingualism, heritage language learners and SLA research: opportunities lost or seized? *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 89 (3): 410-426
- van der Walt, J.L. and B. van Rooy. 2002. Towards a norm in South African Englishes. *World Englishes*, Vol. 21 (1): 113-128
- Vann, R.T., D.E. Meyer and F. O. Lorenz. 1984. Error gravity: a study of faculty opinion of ESL errors. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 18 (3): 427-440
- Vavrus, F. 2002. Postcoloniality and English: exploring language policy and the politics of development in Tanzania. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 36 (3): 373-397
- Verma, S.K. 1982. Swadeshi English: form and function, in Pride (ed): 174-187
- Vigliocco, G. and J. Nicol. 1998. Separating hierarchical relations and word order in language production: is proximity concord syntactic or linear? *Cognition*, Vol. 68: B13-B29

- de Villiers, J. and de Villiers, P. 1973. A cross-sectional study of the acquisition of grammatical morphemes in child speech. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, Vol. 2: 267-278
- Vinnitskaya, I., S. Flynn and C. Foley. 2003. The acquisition of relative clauses in a third language: comparing adults and children, in Licerias (ed): 340-345
- Wade, R. 1997. Arguments for Black South African English as a distinct 'new' English. Accessed 4.3.09 from <http://www.und.ac.za/und/ling/archive/wade-03.html>
- Wagner, J. 1996. Foreign language acquisition through interaction – a critical review of research on conversational adjustments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 26: 215-235
- Waite, J. 1992. *Aotearoa: speaking for ourselves. Part A: Overview and Part B: the Issues*. Wellington: New Zealand Ministry of Education.
- Walqui, A. 2006. Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: a conceptual framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and bilingualism*, Vol. 9 (2): 150-180
- Warren, P. and D. Britain. 2000. Intonation and prosody in New Zealand English, in Bell and Kuiper (eds): 146 - 172
- Watson-Gegeo, K.A. 1987. English in the Solomon Islands. *World Englishes*, Vol. 6 (1): 21-32
- and D. Gegeo. 1991. The impact of church affiliation on language use in Kwara'ae (Solomon islands). *Language in Society*, Vol. 20 (4): 533-555
- Wee, L. 1998. The lexicon of Singapore English, in Foley, Kandiah, Bao Zhiming, Gupta, Alsagoff, Ho Chee Lick, Wee, Talib and Bokhorst-Heng: 175-200
- 2002. When English is not a mother tongue: linguistic ownership and the Eurasian community in Singapore. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 23 (4): 282-295
- Weinreich, U. 1964. *Languages in Contact: findings and problems (2nd ed)*. The Hague: Mouton and Co.
- White, L. 1987. Markedness and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 9: 261-286
- 1990. Second language acquisition and universal grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 12 (2): 121-133
- 1991. Adverb placement in second language acquisition: some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 7: 133-161

- 1992. Universal grammar: is it just a new name for old problems, in Gass and Selinker (eds): 217-232
- 1996. Universal grammar and second language acquisition: current trends and new directions, in Ritchie and Bhatia (eds): 85-120
- 1998. Universal grammar in second language acquisition: the nature of interlanguage representation. Paper presented at GASLA, Pittsburgh. Accessed 13.3.09 from: www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/networks/nw09/white.pdf.
- 2003. *Second language acquisition and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- and F. Genesee. 1996. How native is near-native? The issue of ultimate attainment in adult second language acquisition. *Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 12: 233-265
- Widdowson, H.G. 1994. The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 28 (2): 377-389
- Wiglesworth, A.K. 1998. Bilingualism in Rarotonga. *Link and Letters 5*: 201-206
- Wijesinha, R. 2003. Bringing back the bathwater: new initiatives in English policy in Sri Lanka, in Mair (ed): 367-374
- Wiley, T.G. and M. Lukes. 1996. English-only and the standard English ideologies in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 30 (2): 511-535
- Wilkinson, I.A.G. 1998. Dealing with diversity: achievement gaps in reading literacy among New Zealand students. *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 33 (2): 144-167
- Williams, J. 1987. Non-native varieties of English: a special case of language acquisition. *English World-Wide*, Vol. 8 (2): 161-199
- 1989. Language acquisition, language contact and nativised varieties of English. *RELC Journal*, Vol. 20: 39-67
- 1989b. Pronoun copies, pronominal anaphora and zero anaphora in second language production, in Gass, Madden, Preston and Selinker (eds): 152-189
- Winford, D. 1987. Re-examining Caribbean English Creole continuum. *World Englishes*, Vol. 16 (2): 233-279
- 2007. Some issues in the study of language contact. *Journal of Language Contact – Thema 1*. Accessed 21.9.09 from: www.jlc-journal.org
- Wolfe-Quintero, K. 1996. Nativism does not equal Universal Grammar. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 12: 335-373
- Wolfram, W. 1985. Variability in tense marking: a case for the obvious. *Language Learning*, Vol. 35 (2): 229-253

- Wong, I. 1982. Native-speaker English for the Third World today, in Pride (ed): 261-286
- Wong, J. 2006. Contextualising *aunty* in Singaporean English. *World Englishes*, Vol. 24, 3-4: 451-466
- Wong, John. 1990. Learnability of relative clauses: a Hong Kong case. Accessed 27.7.09 from: <http://www.sunzil.lib.hku.hk>
- Wong, S.D. 1996. Institutional policies and language minority students in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 30 (3): 583-586
- Wong, W. 2001. Modality and attention to meaning and form in the input. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 23: 345-368
- Woods, N. 2000. New Zealand English across the generations: an analysis of selected vowel and consonant variables, in Bell and Kuiper (eds): 84-110
- Woolman, D. 2001. Educational reconstruction and post-colonial curriculum development: a comparative study of four African countries. *International Education Journal*, Vol. 2 (5): 27-46
- www.indexmundi.com: Literacy figures Pacific 2005. Accessed 3.3.10
- www.search.com/reference: Literacy figures Pacific 2005. Accessed 3.3.10
- www.talktalk.co.uk/reference/encyclopaedia: Literacy figures Pacific 2005. Accessed 3.3.10
- Yahya-Othman, S. and H. Batibo. 1996. The swinging pendulum: English in Tanzania 1940-1990, in Fishman, Conrad and Rubal-Lopez (eds): 373-400
- Yano, Y. 2001. World Englishes in 2000 and beyond. *World Englishes*, Vol. 20 (2): 119-131
- Yates, R. and J. Kenkel. 2002. Responding to sentence-level errors in writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Vol. 11: 29-47
- Yoneoka, J. 2002. Englishes in Asia. Accessed 21.3.07 from: www2.kumagaku.ac.jp/teacher/~judy/gyoseki/30AsianEnglish.doc
- Zamel, V. 1993. Questioning academic discourse. *College ESL*, Vol. 3, (1). Accessed 29.9.05 from: <http://education.nyu.edu/teachlearn/ifte/zamel2.htm>
- Zhou, M. 1997. Segmented assimilation: issues, controversies and recent research on the new second generation. *International Migration Review*, Vol. 31 (4): 975-1008
- Zobl, H. 1980. Developmental and transfer errors: their common bases and (possibly) differential effects. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 14 (4): 469-479

- 1992. Prior linguistic knowledge and the conservation of the learning procedure: grammaticality judgements of unilingual and multilingual learners, in Gass and Selinker (eds): 176-196
- and J. Liceras. 1994. Functional categories and acquisition orders. *Language Learning*, Vol. 44 (1): 159-180
- Zuengler, J.E. 1982. Kenyan English, in B. Kachru (ed): 112-124
- Zyzik, E.C. 2008. Null objects in second language acquisition: grammatical vs performance models. *Second Language Research*, Vol. 24 (1): 65-110.

APPENDIX I

Examination questions provided in LL114.

SEMESTER 1, 2006

PROMPT:

Traditional social systems in most parts of the world usually follow an extended family structure. This means that people generally live close to other family members, such as aunts, uncles, grandparents and so on, and that at least three generations are involved in family discussions. In such situations, problems are often resolved by consensus (or general agreement).

As societies become increasingly urban, and as young people leave their villages in search of wider employment opportunities, family structures tend to become nuclear in form with a father, mother and their children. While this might limit family ties, it appears to offer greater freedom to pursue individual options.

QUESTION:

Choose ONE:

a) discuss the advantages of ONE type of family,

OR

b) discuss the disadvantages of ONE type of family,

OR

c) discuss BOTH the advantages and disadvantages of ONE type of family.

Write between 600 and 800 words.

You must include your PLAN and ABSTRACT.

SEMESTER 2, 2006

You have TWO choices of topic. Read both and decide which one interests you more. Read the question choices for that prompt, and choose ONE.

PROMPT 1: TRADITIONAL MEDICINE.

Traditional medicine is an ancient medical practice that existed in human societies before the application of modern science to health. It reflects different cultural belief systems. Although modern medicine is widely spread, traditional medicine still exists in all countries and areas in the Western Pacific region. Interest in traditional medicine has increased over the last decade and seems likely to continue. People in many countries are now more prepared to look for alternative approaches to protect their health. Demands for traditional medicine from the public and the growing economic importance of traditional medicines have led to increased interest on the part of governments and academic communities all over the world, as well as in the Pacific region.

Traditional medicine can be defined as the health knowledge, skills and practices based on indigenous theories, beliefs and experiences of healing that are handed down from generation to generation.

Adapted from WHO, regional office for the Western Pacific, "traditional medicine" [online]. Available: http://www.wpro.who.int/health_topics/traditional_medicine/ (11.9.06)

QUESTION:

Choose ONE:

a) discuss the advantages of traditional medicine,

OR

b) discuss the disadvantages of traditional medicine,

OR

c) discuss BOTH the advantages and disadvantages of traditional medicine.

Write between 700 and 900 words.

You must include your PLAN and ABSTRACT.

PROMPT 2: MIGRATION

People of one country may emigrate, move to another country, for a variety of reasons. Why would people who have often lived the whole of their lives in a country, usually the country of their birth, move bag and baggage to another country?

‘There are now about 192 million people living outside their place of birth, which is about three percent of the world’s population.’ The implications for both countries, the one being left and the one where people are immigrating, are important. Some countries are asking if there are benefits for each side, but today migration is a phenomenon all over the world, including the Pacific.

Source: International Organization for Migration

QUESTION:

Choose ONE:

d) discuss the advantages of migration,

OR

e) discuss the disadvantages of migration,

OR

f) discuss BOTH the advantages and disadvantages of migration.

Write between 700 and 900 words.

You must include your PLAN and ABSTRACT.

SEMESTER 2, 2007

PROMPT 1:

Throughout the world, women face obstacles to their participation in politics. Even though women have risen to become political leaders in countries as different as Sri Lanka, New Zealand and Pakistan, they continue to face barriers to their attempts to enter political life. These barriers can be found in the social and economic systems of their societies, as well as in existing political structures. In 2007, the rate of female representation in national parliaments stands at only 18 per cent across the world. Although this figure has increased in recent years, very little real progress has been made. Men and women are still not equal in national legislatures.

QUESTIONS:

Choose ONE.

EITHER:

- 1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of having women in parliament?**

OR:

- 2. What are the main reasons why some societies have prevented women from entering parliament?**

If you choose either of these questions, do NOT choose one from the next page.

Hand in ONE essay, the plan and the abstract.

If you choose either of these questions, do NOT choose one from the previous page.

PROMPT 2:

Everyone deals with stress. Stress can arise from family, from work or school, or from any outside source, and it is a part of our daily lives. As our lives have become busier and more varied, so stress has increased. In small doses, stress can be helpful: it can help us to focus and can provide energy to deal with everyday life. But if it continues without relief, stress is a genuine health issue that can lead to more serious health problems if not properly managed. No matter what our backgrounds, we all need to learn ways of handling stress.

QUESTIONS:

Choose ONE:

EITHER:

1. Compare and contrast TWO ways of dealing with stress.

OR

2. What appropriate ways can a person use to deal with stress?

Hand in ONE essay, the plan and the abstract.