

NIKHAT SHAMEEM

Factors affecting language gain and loss in young immigrants and the case of the Wellington Indo-Fijians

Abstract

This paper outlines the factors that affect English language gain and first language loss among young immigrants. I argue that first language maintenance is necessary, not only for social justice, but also for long-term cognitive and educational benefits, since English language acquisition and use among young immigrants often results in the loss of their first language skills. This paper presents a form that schools, and in particular ESOL teachers, can use to collate information about bilingualism and multilingualism among young learners in order to provide more targeted support. I illustrate the use of the form with a group of Indo-Fijian teenage immigrants living in Wellington, New Zealand (NZ). This case study illustrates the importance of identifying ESOL students as members of specific speech communities rather than simply assuming that they constitute a homogenous group. I argue that to empower ESOL students, we need to find out about their specific backgrounds. Teachers should be wary of assuming that students who happen to share birthplace or ethnicity necessarily constitute a homogenous group within the same speech community. The more specific identification of students' backgrounds will not only allow their particular ESOL needs to be addressed more appropriately, and thus help them to function more competently in the host environment, but will also encourage and support their home language and culture.

Introduction

Although ESOL teachers in English-dominant countries are aware that students who are new immigrants are fluent users of one or more languages other than English, few realise how important the gathering of information about students' linguistic, cultural and historical background is for the effective learning of English as an additional language. Even fewer realise how damaging a lack of such knowledge can be to the survival of those languages and cultures in the country of immigration.

In this paper, I first discuss the social and educational reasons why

mother-tongue maintenance is important during host language acquisition, and why it is necessary to have an understanding of those factors in students' backgrounds that influence the maintenance of their native languages. I then illustrate how a form may be used to collate these details for a group of Indo-Fijian teenagers living in Wellington. The final section of the paper looks at the implications of this study for ESOL teaching.

First language maintenance social justice and educational benefits

Phillipson (1992) and Auerbach (1993) argue that an individual has the right to access support systems that will encourage and actively preserve and promote their value systems for future generations. They invoke Article 27 of the International Covenant of Human Rights, which maintains that the individual has the right to use their own language and practise their cultural and religious beliefs in freedom. This kind of active preservation entails the valuing and encouragement of the language and culture of linguistic minorities by the government, the institutions, the schools and the teachers in the host country. Auerbach (1993: 16) argues that the process of successfully acquiring a second language is to some extent contingent on the societally determined value attributed to the first language, and this can either be reinforced or challenged in the classroom.

In addition, the cognitive benefits of bilingualism have also been demonstrated. Several research projects have shown the success of second language acquisition programmes which encourage, develop and promote mother-tongue maintenance among children (Skutnabb-Kangas 1981; Cummins 1995). Hornberger (1996: 456) lists evidence from research studies which have found that a high level of proficiency and well-developed cognitive and literacy skills in the L1 are likely to enhance the effective learning of a second language (also see Bialystok and Cummins 1991; Cummins 1996). A 1994 empirical study in New Zealand of Samoan high school students with a limited proficiency in English showed that the students benefited from the opportunity to discuss their school work in Samoan, even though the instructions, tasks and tests were in English. In fact, those students in the experimental group who were allowed to use Samoan performed better on an English medium test than a matched group of bilinguals who used English (Lameta-Tufuga 1994). A growing body of research evidence also demonstrates that the maintenance of the first language among children has positive outcomes for the ultimate acquisition of literacy skills in both languages (Cummins 1996).

In order to promote bilingualism at school, ESOL teachers must find out about the backgrounds of their students in order to gauge current linguistic competencies and needs. Hall (1995: 22) suggests that exploring the backgrounds of students provides a meeting point between parents and the school by providing a framework for discussion with parents.

It also enables parents and teachers to work together to support the learning which takes place at school while encouraging first language development and support through storytelling and, in the case of literate languages, sharing books and reading in the home language. Moreover, teachers who are aware of the risks to the first language in English-dominant communities will be in a better position to offer support. They may be able to apply for relevant school/ government funding in order to equip students with language skills beyond the first three years when they have attained basic communicative skills in L2, but still need support with developing their cognitive abilities in both languages. Cummins (1984) uses the acronyms BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) to differentiate between the different kinds of language competence. He cites research evidence which shows that, after a three-year instructional period, students have basic communicative skills but may not necessarily be able to cope with the more cognitively demanding uses of language involved in writing essays or reading academic textbooks. This research has obvious policy and funding implications. For example, government funding for NESB students in NZ stops after three years, when students are, theoretically, supposed to have caught up with the English language proficiency of their counterparts in the school system (Kennedy and Dewar 1997: 274).

Sociolinguistic research clearly shows that different communities react in different ways to linguistic change. In Australia, for example, Clyne (1991) predicts that the more recent immigrant language groups of Arabic and Chinese are likely to become the prominent community languages of the future, while younger members of Italian, German, Polish and Greek communities have experienced language shift. In NZ, too, some immigrant communities show a greater degree of language shift than do others. Some have shifted in their use of the first language over three generations while others have shifted much more rapidly. For example, Tongan, Samoan and Gujarati are being well maintained in the first and second generations, while many European languages, and Tokelauan, Niuean and Fiji Hindi are shifting, or have shifted, very rapidly, even in the home, which is usually the last bastion of mother-tongue use (Shameem 1995; Holmes 1996). The teenage population of the newly immigrant Indo-Fijian community shows signs of irretrievable language shift within four years of immigration.

While the first language skills of new and subsequent generations are at risk, the acquisition of the host language, at least in gaining basic interpersonal communication skills¹ (see Cummins 1984), is often a *fait accompli*, if not in the first few years following immigration, then certainly in later years and in subsequent generations. As research shows, in an overwhelming majority of cases, the host language does eventually replace all other languages used in the home (Fishman 1980; Holmes 1996). Therefore, it is crucial that, alongside ESOL teaching, we also promote those cultural and linguistic institutions which will enhance values and promote

mother-tongue maintenance among our students. For some students, this might include supporting and promoting their religion, which is a vehicle for use of their first language.

Factors influencing language proficiency and use in immigrant communities

Research shows that many of the factors which contribute to immigrant language maintenance during host language acquisition do not necessarily promote bilingualism in all speech communities. Each community, and indeed individuals within the community, will have particular influences on first language loss and second language acquisition. A study of the range of possible factors which influence the maintenance of a first language and the acquisition of an additional language can help us locate those which might be relevant to any particular group. For ESOL teachers, their students and their families, identifying these factors may also help them to recognise those specific factors, which influence language acquisition, language maintenance and additive bilingualism within their communities, and suggest positive ways of encouraging and sustaining all three in the individual student. In turn, this may encourage a general awareness of the family and even community language situation, and may encourage L1 maintenance efforts in the community.

Various writers and researchers have listed and categorised factors believed to contribute to first language maintenance during second language acquisition (for example, Giles, Bourhis and Taylor 1977; Grosjean 1982; Ellis 1994). Giles et al (1977) suggest that one can predict the likelihood of a language being maintained in a contact situation by using a theoretical model to establish the 'ethnolinguistic vitality' of the community. They suggest that the vitality of an ethnolinguistic group is that which makes the group behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in intergroup situations. They argue that ethnolinguistic minorities which have little or no group vitality would eventually cease to exist as distinctive groups. To determine the ethnolinguistic vitality of a community, they present a checklist of status, demographic and institutional support factors.

Grosjean (1982) also provides a useful categorisation of general factors, which have influenced language maintenance in minority groups in the world. Although the individual factors identified within this model are similar to those of Giles et al (1977), Grosjean arranges them differently under the broad headings of 'social', 'attitudes', 'use of languages', 'government policy' and 'other' factors, including the assimilative power of the majority group. In the specific field of language teaching, Hall (1995) presents a form entitled 'The bilingual pupil at home and in the community' which the teacher can use to locate certain important details related to the language and social background of the pupils. She also advocates the use of a 'hypothesis-testing' approach developed by educational psychologists in order to assess bilingual

children who have learning difficulties, and to assist teachers in locating any possible causes for these in the child's linguistic and cultural background. These could be, for example, a lack of basic proficiency or literacy skills in any language, the student's misleading ability to communicate orally (BICS) without necessarily having a corresponding linguistic ability to cope with the demands of academic work (CALP, see Cummins, 1984 and endnote 1 this paper), and the presence of environmental stress inside or outside the school.

A survey of factors identified by sociolinguists as contributing to mother-tongue maintenance and use during the learning of the host language shows us that these come from both within and outside these speech communities. These factors invariably act and react on each other, causing each community to react in its own unique way, whether towards language maintenance and additive bilingualism, or towards language shift and monolingualism.

In the appendix, I present a form that can be used to assess the factors influencing bilingualism among young immigrants. The form distinguishes internal and external factors. Research suggests that language proficiency and use may be influenced by factors *internal* to the community, such as group dynamics² and size, age at immigration, age of speakers, length of residence, number of community events, the presence of community support networks and the nature and status of the first language within the group. Bilingualism is also influenced by *external* factors arising from the wider community and the nation at large. These include political issues, language policy, institutional support, a colonial past and extensive exposure to English, similarity to the language being shifted to, relative status of the languages and school-based bilingual and first language programs (Shameem 1995: 34).

I believe that knowledge of the factors contributing to language maintenance and shift among young immigrants can help ESOL teachers support their students in a more targeted way. In the second part of this paper, I look at how such knowledge can contribute to the maintenance of Fiji Hindi (FH) among young Indo-Fijian immigrants living in Wellington, NZ. A survey was conducted with 53 Indo-Fijian teenagers to identify the factors which seem to have contributed to the shift away from their use of the L1 in a range of public and private situations towards an increased use of English. Factors which are internal are distinguished from those which are external to the Wellington Indo-Fijian speech community. Survey data were collected using structured interviews based on self-report questionnaires.

Factors internal to the Indo-Fijian community in Wellington

Language proficiency and group dynamics

The Wellington survey showed that the teenagers had lost some FH proficiency, and that age at time of migration, and length of residence had the

closest relationship with this. Those teenagers who had arrived in NZ before the age of ten, who were in the younger age bracket (13–15), and those who had lived in NZ for a longer period of time (4–10 years), reported a significantly lower spoken FH proficiency than older teenagers (aged 16–20), those who had left Fiji after age ten, and those who had lived in NZ between 0–4 years.³

The survey results showed an equal FH-English listening proficiency, and a higher spoken proficiency in English than FH among the teenagers. As FH is a pre-literate language,⁴ literacy was, as expected, highest in English.

The particular group dynamics of the Wellington Indo-Fijian community had helped teenagers to maintain FH. Enclosure⁵ of the community is high, which means that regular religious and social gatherings ensure Indo-Fijians meet and use FH informally.⁶ The adults speak mainly FH on these occasions, while the children speak mainly English.

Teenage visits to Fiji (which might renew language skills) were rare. Moreover, since Fiji immigration figures to NZ have fallen to pre-coup levels in the last few years, there has been little chance of language renewal through chain migration. However, members of the Wellington Indo-Fijian community continue to arrange marriages with other Indo-Fijians in New Zealand, in Australia, in Canada and in Fiji.

Language use

The Wellington Indo-Fijian teenagers preferred to use English in all domains except religion. At home, the teenagers used English most to communicate with younger siblings. Respondents who had immigrated to NZ before the age of ten chose to use English at home almost all the time. The data also showed a significantly increased amount of English being used by parents to communicate with children than was used in Fiji. This was markedly more so with fathers than with mothers. The greatest amount of FH was being used to speak to grandparents, but they were not always around.

Language attitudes

The survey data showed that Indo-Fijians identified strongly with their ethnicity, history and culture. For some, language seemed to be an important symbol of this 'groupness'. For others, identity was realised by their strong sense of belonging to this particular community over other communities of Indian origin in NZ. Most teenagers deliberately distanced themselves from the local Indians and other Indian immigrants, and clearly liked hearing FH on informal occasions. For formal community speechmaking and prayers, they expected the use of either Shudh Hindi or Urdu, in which they had limited proficiency.

The language attitudes of this community showed that it was their common Indo-Fijian background and their ability to network within it, rather than the language itself, which served as their badge of identity. Although

historical and social ties were strong, it seemed that in some families the replacement of FH with English was already accepted among the children, although family members still felt that a passive knowledge of FH was desirable. This may partly be because of the political nature of Indo-Fijian immigration and the desire of the members of the community to integrate quickly into the new environment.

Responses to attitude questions showed that both internal and external group attitudes have an effect on language shift. A majority of the teenagers, when talking about their arrival and early years in NZ, described the prejudice directed towards their accent and language by their schoolmates and other host community members (Shameem 1995). Their choice to use English in public domains was a result of this.

Factors external to the Indo-Fijian community in Wellington

Social, political and economic history

While internal factors have greatly influenced language shift in the Wellington community, their history and background have also contributed. Population dynamics, race politics and access to inalienable farmland have been at the heart of Fiji's political problems. In 1986, a year before two military coups polarised the two ethnic groups, the Indo-Fijian population was 3 per cent larger than the ethnic Fijian population (Fiji Bureau of Statistics 1989, 1997). Most Indo-Fijians left Fiji in 1987 out of fear of a post-coup, racially biased constitution which would further curtail Indo-Fijian rights. At the time of the 1996 census, the ethnic Fijian population exceeded the Indo-Fijian by 7 per cent.

Educational and linguistic history

While the first language of the Indo-Fijians is a pre-literate, low status Overseas Hindi⁷ which developed as a result of plantation language contact late last century, English has played a powerful role as the medium of instruction in Fiji schools. It is also perceived as the key to academic success and subsequent escape from the political and economic problems Indo-Fijians face in Fiji. English is used widely in all spheres, particularly in urban areas. Its use increases with level of education, and code switching between FH and English is commonplace (Siegel 1989; Shameem 1995; Mugler 1996; Tent and Mugler 1996; Rao and Harrington 1997).

While there was little support for FH in Fiji at the institutional level, and none at the school level, there is even less in NZ. At least in Fiji, FH is used regularly in informal contexts by almost half the population, and is therefore well maintained. Therefore, while regular FH-English code-switching with little risk to FH may be indicative of stable bilingualism in Fiji (see Mugler and Tent 1998), in the group of Indo-Fijian immigrants studied in Wellington, the need to perform in English as 'natively' as possible across a wide range of functions seems to have caused an unstable bilingual⁸ situation.

Institutional and host community support in NZ

In NZ, a community language is a language recognised by community members as their first language. The two official languages of NZ — English and Maori are not considered to be community languages. In recent years NZ has tried to encourage cultural and linguistic diversity by encouraging Maori-English bilingualism and the standardisation of Maori. It has supported the establishment of Maori as well as Pacific Island language pre-schools, developed curriculum statements and unit standards for a number of community languages, and commissioned a research study on the programs and support available for NESB students in primary and high schools. Minority groups have had the opportunity to display their cultural and linguistic uniqueness publicly in various ways, and this has helped to strengthen links and encourage proficiency and mother-tongue use in these communities. However, for some communities, like the Indo-Fijian community, these efforts are inadequate as they face losing their language and culture at an unprecedented rate within the first generation of immigration.

In the wider environment, the relationship between immigrants and the host country is not healthy, and immigration was one of the most debated issues in the pre-run to the 1996 general elections. In the two subsequent years, New Zealand First, the political party which called for measures to curtail the influx of new immigrants as part of its electioneering platform, formed a governing coalition with the NZ National Party.

At present in NZ, most community groups generally provide their own support networks for group members, and some communities also provide language classes. Little funding is available for community-run language classes or school-based bilingual programs, which often lack continuity. Policy priorities indicate that certain speech communities have a greater chance of obtaining language funding and support. As Benton (1985: 225) states:

Past and present social policies would suggest the number of people involved and their political sophistication guarantee the primacy of Maori claims. After this would probably come Pacific Island groups, in part because they are concentrated in the two major urban areas, thus contributing a high proportion of the pupils to a significant number of schools, and because of historical associations with New Zealand.

In their conference paper on Pacific Island bilingual education in NZ, McCaffery and Tuafuti (1998) lamented that any initiative for Pacific Island languages continues to be at the local school and community level. They felt this was a direct result of the absence of a NZ National or Educational language policy with specific guidelines for the maintenance and use of minority languages in education.

ESOL support, however, has been made widely available. In my study, for example, many of the mothers of the respondents spoke gratefully of the ESOL support that their children received at school to help them adapt

to the school environment by improving their English proficiency. A majority of the mothers also spoke about helping their children at home by using English in all forms of communication. None of the respondents interviewed knew of any relationship between first language maintenance and second language acquisition. All favoured the acquisition and use of English over and above any other language, principally because of the demands of the host environment.

Research shows that the most effective bilingual programs are late-exit ones where students are educated and instructed in both L1 and L2 for as long as possible in the school system (Cummins 1995; Hornberger 1996). It is therefore crucial to continue first language learning and use alongside English, and to extend bilingual support to all language groups at all levels of schooling in school-based language programs. The form included with this paper (see appendix) should help to identify non-visible minority groups like the Indo-Fijian among the student population. It should also help in isolating the unique set of ethnic, historical and linguistic background factors, which are related both to first language maintenance and successful host language acquisition in such communities.

Summary of factors influencing the shift from FH to English

It seems that several factors have influenced the shift from FH to English in the Wellington Indo-Fijian community. These are both internal and external: the status and nature of the language, community doubts about its future usefulness, the prevalence of code-switching, the political nature of immigration, a lack of awareness in the community of the support needed for language maintenance, and a lack of institutional and host community support. Moreover, peer pressure for native-like production of English, the absence of functions for which an exclusive use of FH is desirable, the irregular use of FH at home, and the comparatively higher profile and perceived importance of English language teaching over any first language maintenance efforts at individual, community and national levels, have also been powerful factors.

Implications for ESOL teaching

For ESOL teachers, the recognition of each student both as an individual and as a member of a particular speech community is essential. Moreover, their speech communities should be accurately and sensitively identified rather than assumed on the basis of a student's apparent social, ethnic or linguistic links with other communities. For the Wellington Indo-Fijians, primary loyalty to their own community was a cohesive force. Yet, in the past in New Zealand and in Fiji, the community has been labelled 'Indian', and its existence as a close group has been either ignored or linked to a broad Indian identity which few Indo-Fijians have any loyalty towards. This community has, therefore, had no support, because members are perceived to be part

of a great historical, linguistic and literate tradition originating from India. If ESOL teachers are to help Indo-Fijian students succeed, the recognition of the community as a distinctive linguistic and cultural group is essential.

The factors identified as contributing to language shift among Indo-Fijian teenagers show that schools need to assess the background of their non-English speaking background (NESB) students immediately, and subsequently deliver the most appropriate learning programs. It is clear that the younger members of some immigrant communities need greater help and immediate support if their language and culture are to be maintained and used to help second language acquisition and cognitive development. This is a basic human right. In order for this to happen, their specific needs have to be addressed and this will include looking at, and encouraging, competencies in their first language. In addition, parents must be made aware of the issues surrounding the successful learning of the host language while (vitaly) maintaining and enriching the home language.

Conclusions

This paper presents the social and educational justification for having first language maintenance and enrichment goals alongside SLA goals in ESOL programs. Before ESOL programs are developed and delivered in class, teachers need to identify those features in the students' backgrounds which will help them acquire an additional language without losing the languages already in their repertoire. The form included in this paper allows the gathering of such specific linguistic information on the individual in relation to their national and ethnic background. This will enable teachers to identify the nature of the risk to the L1 of their students during second language acquisition so that they can design programs which will help students use and maintain their first language in appropriate situations while learning the host one — thereby facilitating additive (rather than subtractive) bilingualism.

Ideally, support for bilingualism needs to come from policy-making at a national level through a languages policy which systematically assesses research findings, addresses issues, and identifies the support needed in this area. Given the current absence of any such policy in NZ, it would be difficult to provide school-based bilingual education programs for all multilingual children. Therefore schools need to have a system in place where the potential for bilingual language development is maximised in the individual, not just in the language classes, but also in the content areas. The ESOL teacher who is aware of the issues surrounding cognitive development in bilinguals is ideally suited to give advice and support in this area. First language support can be given in various ways in the classroom, in planning essays, practising repair strategies, having role plays which reflect functional language use among bilinguals, in drama classes, and in discussing unfamiliar topics to reduce classroom anxiety (also see Auerbach 1993). Schools can also support bilingual language development by encouraging children and parents to use

their first language in as many domains as possible at home. This can include homework.

The long-term effects of additive bilingualism cannot be over-estimated. Cummins (1996) for example, believes that a classroom situation which affirms diversity has the power to overturn sociohistorical patterns of exclusion. For the Indo-Fijians in ESOL classrooms around the world, it would certainly contribute to their self-worth, and subsequently, perhaps, to the survival of their language.

Notes

- 1 Cummins (1984) differentiates between the time and effort it takes to gain BICS (Basic interpersonal communicative skills) and CALP (Cognitive academic language proficiency) for ESOL students. The former takes between 2–4 years, while proficiency in the latter is gained after 5–7 years of instruction.
- 2 Giles et al (1977) write that renewal and the use of L1 skills will be influenced by the dynamics of the group such as the number of speakers of a language, their distribution, continued migration from the country of origin, and the number and frequency of immigrants' visits home.
- 3 See Shameem (1994; 1998) for detailed proficiency results. Test used: Kruskal Wallis with a p-value of 0.05 as the standard measure for statistical significance.
- 4 On the Kloss taxonomy of language types (1968), which assesses the capability of a language to serve in a modern technologically developed society.
- 5 In Schumann's (1978) notion of 'enclosure', communities with high enclosure maintain separate social institutions from the majority of the population. Subsequently, these communities have a greater chance of maintaining their language and culture. (See also Clyne 1991)
- 6 For formal use, Shudh Hindi and Urdu, in which Indo-Fijians have limited proficiency, are preferred.
- 7 Overseas Hindis are shift- and loss-prone languages which developed on plantations in the British colonies (Trinidad, Guyana, Surinam, Mauritius, Fiji, South Africa) during the indenture period (1830–1920).
- 8 Fishman (1972) calls this a situation of bilingualism without diglossia, where known languages do not serve distinctive functions.

Appendix: Factors influencing bilingualism among young immigrants

Name of student:	
Internal factors	External factors
<p>Linguistic background</p> <p>TEACHER SUMMARY</p> <p>Most important home language:</p> <p>Most important school language:</p> <p>What languages does student know:</p> <p>Personally, how important is each language for them at home and at school? Tick</p> <p>Home language Very important Important Unimportant</p> <p>L1</p> <p>L2</p> <p>L3</p> <p>School language Very important Important Unimportant</p> <p>L1</p> <p>L2</p> <p>L3</p> <p>Language use</p> <p>Domains, functions, home use</p> <p>TEACHER SUMMARY: Trends in use</p> <p>Home language: School language:</p> <p>Peer group language: Religious language:</p> <p>Which language does student use? Circle</p> <p>To talk to: About home matters About schoolwork</p> <p>Parents L1 L2 L3 L1 L2 L3</p> <p>Grandparents L1 L2 L3 L1 L2 L3</p> <p>Siblings L1 L2 L3 L1 L2 L3</p> <p>Relatives L1 L2 L3 L1 L2 L3</p> <p>Class teacher L1 L2 L3 L1 L2 L3</p> <p>ESOL teacher L1 L2 L3 L1 L2 L3</p> <p>Classmates L1 L2 L3 L1 L2 L3</p> <p>(host)</p> <p>Classmates L1 L2 L3 L1 L2 L3</p> <p>(own group)</p> <p>For religious L1 L2 L3</p> <p>prayer</p>	<p>Support for L1 in social and historical background of community</p> <p>TEACHER SUMMARY</p> <p>Social and historical support for L1:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">HIGH MEDIUM LOW</p> <p>Country of origin:</p> <p>Official language:</p> <p>Major languages of population (>25% of population)</p> <p>Language of colonisation:</p> <p>Lingua franca:</p> <p>Language of instruction:</p> <p>Language of higher education:</p> <p>Policy support for L1?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES NO</p> <p>Reasons for migration:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Business</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Free</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Family reunion</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Political</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Economic</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Humanitarian</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Refugee</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Other (?)</p>

<p>Type/nature of first language (L1)</p> <p>TEACHER SUMMARY: STRONG WEAK</p> <p>Literature (has writing script) YES NO</p> <p>Standardised YES NO</p> <p>Formal YES NO</p> <p>Dictionary available YES NO</p>					<p>Institutional & host community support for L1:</p> <p>TEACHER SUMMARY</p> <p>Government support: HIGH MEDIUM LOW</p> <p>School support: HIGH MEDIUM LOW</p> <p>Host community support: HIGH MEDIUM LOW</p> <p>Cultural and linguistic dissimilarity with host community: HIGH MEDIUM LOW</p> <p>Own community support for L1: HIGH MEDIUM LOW</p>				
<p>Language proficiency</p> <p>TEACHER SUMMARY: How well does the student know each language?</p> <p>L1 Very well Well So-so A little</p> <p>L2 Very well Well So-so A little</p> <p>L3 Very well Well So-so A little</p>					<p>Government funding for:</p> <p>Community language schools: YES PARTIAL NO</p> <p>School based bilingual programs: YES PARTIAL NO</p> <p>Provision of interpreting services: YES PARTIAL NO</p> <p>Other support (non-language, for example resettlement programs, education allowance, education programs):</p> <p>Government YES PARTIAL NO</p> <p>Other agencies YES PARTIAL NO</p> <p>Which agencies?</p>				
<p>Can they do the following things in each language? Tick</p> <p>Functions L1 L2 L3</p> <p>Listening:</p> <p>Understand simple, personal questions</p> <p>Understand at slow speech rate</p> <p>Understand all conversations</p> <p>Understand formal speeches</p> <p>Speaking:</p> <p>Greet people and say thank you</p> <p>Give basic information about themselves</p> <p>Describe familiar people and places</p> <p>Contribute easily to a conversation</p> <p>Give a brief formal speech</p>					<p>National language policy: YES DRAFT NO</p> <p>Educational language policy: YES DRAFT NO</p> <p>Availability of bilingual literature in service centres, doctor's surgery, etc: YES SOME NO</p>				
<p>Reading: Stories L1 L2 L3</p> <p>Comics L1 L2 L3</p> <p>Holy book L1 L2 L3</p>									
<p>Writing: Personal (letter, diary) L1 L2 L3</p> <p>Formal (essay, letter) L1 L2 L3</p>									

<p>Language attitudes</p> <p>TEACHER SUMMARY</p> <p>Attitudes to L1</p> <p>POSITIVE NEUTRAL NEGATIVE</p> <p>Attitudes to L2</p> <p>POSITIVE NEUTRAL NEGATIVE</p> <p>Language carrying core value in community:</p> <p>This section may be filled out by parent or by student.</p> <p>1 Agree (High status) 2 Neutral 3 Disagree (low status)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Status of language in community</th> <th style="text-align: center;">L1</th> <th style="text-align: center;">L2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>This language is useful to me</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>This language sounds beautiful</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>It is important to know this language</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I like to speak this language</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>For my culture/religion I must know this language</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>For my future I need to know this language</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 2 3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Core value</p> <p>This language is the most important in the teaching and keeping of culture in my community:</p> <p>I use this language to say my prayers:</p> <p>This language is used at our community gatherings for formal speeches:</p> <p>This language is used at our community gatherings for information conversations:</p>	Status of language in community	L1	L2	This language is useful to me	1 2 3	1 2 3	This language sounds beautiful	1 2 3	1 2 3	It is important to know this language	1 2 3	1 2 3	I like to speak this language	1 2 3	1 2 3	For my culture/religion I must know this language	1 2 3	1 2 3	For my future I need to know this language	1 2 3	1 2 3	<p>Own community support for language (L1):</p> <p>Language(s) studies in community language school:</p> <p>YES NO</p> <p>Frequency of classes:</p> <p>Languages Reason for attendance:</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">Religion Culture Other</p> <p>1.</p> <p>2.</p>
Status of language in community	L1	L2																				
This language is useful to me	1 2 3	1 2 3																				
This language sounds beautiful	1 2 3	1 2 3																				
It is important to know this language	1 2 3	1 2 3																				
I like to speak this language	1 2 3	1 2 3																				
For my culture/religion I must know this language	1 2 3	1 2 3																				
For my future I need to know this language	1 2 3	1 2 3																				

References

- Auerbach, E R 1993. 'Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 1: 9–31
- Benton, R 1985. Language and pluralism. In J Codd, R Harker and R Nash (eds). *Political issues in New Zealand education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore
- Bialystok, E and J Cummins 1991. Language, cognition and education of bilingual children. In E Bialystok (ed). *Language processing in bilingual children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Clyne, M 1991. *Community languages: The Australian experience*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press
- Clyne, M 1976. *Australia talks: Essays on Australian immigrant and Aboriginal languages*. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Australian National University
- Cummins, J 1984. Wanted: A theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students. In Rivera, C (ed). *Language proficiency and academic achievement*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Cummins, J 1995. The discourse of disinformation: The debate on bilingual education and language rights in the United States. In Skutnabb-Kangas, T, R Phillipson and M Rannut (eds). *Linguistic human rights*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Cummins, J 1996. *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario: California Association for Bilingual Education
- Davies, K 1998. *Cook Islands Maori language in Auckland and the Cook Islands: A study of reported proficiency, patterns of use and attitudes*. M.A. thesis. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Ellis, R 1994. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Fiji Bureau of Statistics 1989. *Report of the 1986 census*. Suva: Government Printery
- Fiji Bureau of Statistics 1997. *Report of the 1996 census*. Suva: Government Printery
- Fishman, J 1980. 'Bilingualism and biculturalism as individual and societal phenomena'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1, 1: 3–15
- Giles, H, R Y Bourhis and D M Taylor 1977. Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H Giles (ed). *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press
- Grosjean, F 1982. *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Hall, D 1995. *Assessing the needs of bilingual pupils: Living in two languages*. London: David Fulton Publishers
- Holmes, J 1996. 'Community language research in New Zealand: Reflections on methodology'. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 2, 1–32
- Hornberger, N H 1996. Language and education. In McKay, S L and N H Hornberger (eds). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Kennedy, S and Dewar, S 1997. *NESB students: A study of programmes and support in New Zealand schools*. Wellington: Ministry of Education
- Kloss, H 1968. Notes concerning a language nation typology. In J.A. Fishman (ed). *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hague: Mouton
- Lameta-Tufuga, E 1994. 'Using the Samoan language for academic learning tasks'. Unpublished Masters thesis. Victoria University, Wellington

- McCaffery, J and P Tuafuti 1998. The development of Pacific Island bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Paper presented at the *Community Languages and ESOL Conference 1998*, Palmerston North 25–28 September
- Mugler, F 1996. Vernacular language teaching in Fiji. In F Mugler and J Lynch (eds). *Pacific languages in education*. Suva, Vanuatu: Institute of Pacific Studies
- Mugler F and J Tent 1998. 'Some aspects of language use and attitudes in Fiji'. In J Tent and F Mugler (eds). *SICOL: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics, Language Contact, Pacific Linguistics*, 1, C-141: 109–34
- Phillipson, R 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Rao, C and M. Harrington 1997. 'The relationship between vernacular language study and academic English proficiency in Fiji'. *RELC Journal*, 28, 1: 161–74
- Schumann, J H 1978. Social and psychological factors in second language acquisition. In J Richards (ed). *Understanding second and foreign language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House
- Shameem, N 1994. 'The Wellington Indo-Fijians: Language shift among teenage new immigrants'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 15, 4: 399–418
- Shameem, N 1995. *Hamai log ke boli. Language shift in an immigrant community: The Wellington Indo-Fijians*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Victoria University, Wellington
- Shameem, N 1998. 'Validating self-reported proficiency by testing performance in an immigrant community: The Wellington Indo-Fijians'. *Language Testing*, 15, 1: 86–108
- Shameem, N and J Read, 1996. 'Administering a performance test in Fiji Hindi'. In C Elder and G Wigglesworth (eds). *The Language Testing Cycle: Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, Series S: 105–36
- Siegel, J 1989. 'English in Fiji'. *World Englishes*, 8, 1: 47–58
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T 1981. *Bilingualism or not? The education of minorities*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Smolicz, J J 1992. Minority languages as core values of ethnic cultures — a study of maintenance and erosion of Polish, Welsh and Chinese languages in Australia. In Fase, W, K Jaspaert and S Kroon (eds). *Maintenance and loss of minority languages: Studies in bilingualism 1*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Co.
- Tent J and F Mugler 1996. Why a Fiji corpus? In S Greenbaum (ed). *Comparing English worldwide*. Oxford: Clarendon Press