

O le Gagana e Fa'avae ai le Poto ma le Atamai

(Language is the Foundation of Knowledge)

By Fa'atili Iosua Esera,

Sapi Ne'emia, Malo Sepuloni, Semeatu Iosefa

Sabbatical Report to the Ministry of Education, 2021

Upu Tomua

O le gagana e faavae ai le poto ma le atamai. O le loloto ma le lautele o le atamai, e fua lea i le loloto ma le lautele o le gagana, poo gagana a le tagata. O le tofā mau a Sāmoa mai lona foafoaga, mo le fafauina o le atamai; ‘fāfaga fanau i upu ma tala.’ E leai se atamai e āunoa ma upu, āunoa ma tala. O le tofā mau fo‘i lea o lo‘o i le Tusi Pa‘ia ma faatusa ai le Faaola i le ‘upu.’ Ua laututusa ai le sāliliga o le atamai ma le ola e fa’avavau. E na o le ‘Upu’ e te maua ai.

O lenei āutaluga ma lona lipoti, o se taumaf’āiga, e saili ni faatinoga i totonu o ā’oga, e lima ta’ita’ina ai le a’oa’oga o fanau i le gagana Sāmoa ina ia popoto ma ātamamai. O le naunauta’iga, ina ia i’u manuia a’oa’oga, a o tumau pea le gagana Sāmoa. O le ‘upu i le fagotaga o le gātaifale i le pogisā, o le tele o sulu, e tele ai figōta.’

Muamua, o le tele o gagana e ai le tagata, o le tele fo‘i lea o gagana e faavae ma fausia ai lona poto ma lona atamai. O le molimau a le tele o su’esu’ega, o le taumua tutusa o gagana e lua, pe tolu fo‘i a se tagata, e pito i maoa’e lea i le fausiaina o lona poto ma lona atamai. Ae ‘aua ne’i fāoaina ai lau gagana, o lou tofi sa foa’i fua mai e lo tatou Atua.

O lona lua, o gagana, o faitoto‘a e ‘auala mai ai aganu‘u, talitonuga ma faamoemoe ola, i totonu o ā’oga. O aganuu ma talitonuga ia e faavae ai aga’ifanua a ā’oga. O le atagia o tu ma aga faasāmoa i totonu o ā’oga, o lo‘o a’oa’oina ai alo ma fanau Sāmoa, e fesoasoani tele i le faufauga o le poto ma le atamai, o alo ma fanau. O tamaiti Sāmoa i Āotearoa Niu Sila, o i latou ia e ono vave ‘ausia le taumua tutusa o gagana e lua, pe sili a’e fo‘i.

O lona tolu, o le ola a’oa’oina, o le galuega e fau tele. O le fe’oe’oea’i o faiā’oga, pule’aga o ā’oga, malo, mātagaluega ‘ese’ese, matua ma tagata lautele, e mo’omia lea mo le faamausalīina, o le poto ma le atamai. O le manuia o fanau ma ‘āiga, nuu ma le atunuu, o manuia e faapogai mai, i le manuia o ā’oga a fanau. Ua molimauina i nei aso, ‘āiga Sāmoa, ua ola manuia i Āotearoa Niu Sila, i Sāmoa, ma atunu’u e mamao, ona o fanau ua a ‘oa’oina, popoto ma atamamai.

Prologue

Proficient productive bilingualism is found to be desirable for learning (Baker 1998, 2001. Bialystok 1987, Cummins 1981 and 1986). Other international studies (Hakuta and Diaz, 1985; May 2008; Ricciardelli, 1992) all found proficient productive bilinguals to be superior in a range of thinking, organisational and reasoning skills. There is a range of social and learning capabilities that proficient productive bilinguals acquire with ease, including learning languages. Sāmoan students in Āotearoa New Zealand can achieve this for a range of reasons. One of these is the fact that Sāmoan is the third most spoken language in the Āotearoa New Zealand and Sāmoan is spoken in many Sāmoan families. However, contrasting differences there are between English and Sāmoan pose challenges for this to be achieved. A well planned and supported approach, delivered by well-informed teachers, supported by the community, the public and government is necessary.

The growth of bilingual learning opportunities in Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland New Zealand, offers students in these learning environments, better chances of improved learning success. This study aims to identify critical components that lead to the attainment of proficient productive bilingualism and learning success across the curriculum. The focus on assessing proficiency in Sāmoan in this study, is because students in Sāmoan bilingual units, acquire proficiency in English, which then surpasses their competence in Sāmoan language.

Acknowledgements

We appreciate the helpful feedback to the draft of this report provided by Dr. Adrienne Alton-Lee, chief education advisor of the Ministry of Education, Dr Rae Si'ilata, director of Va'atele Education Consulting and Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi, and John McCaffery of The University of Auckland. Their peer review and guidance was invaluable. We are grateful to the support of the school principals involved in the study. We also appreciate Cathy Diggins of the policy division of the Ministry of Education and Dr Levi Tavita, director of Evaleon and Niupac Publishing for their valuable editing suggestions.

1.0 Introduction

Ia tatou faamuamua mea i Matāutu Sā, ma tatou faafetaia le alofa o le Atua ona o lana pule faasoifua, o lenei ua tatou saa i maa-o-mālie, ma tatou ‘oa‘oa i faleseu. Auā e ui i se tofā iinā, ma so matou manatu, o le foe e faaee i le tau, e fai ‘ae tafea. O le faasoa ma le puipuiga a le Atua i soifua ma ola, o le afioga e tu tasi. O lana pule o le maa e togi faatō, ae o le tao e velo i le māninoa. E fa‘i le moto, toli le matua. Ae faafetai o lea ua faasao mai le to‘atele o i tatou, e sālililimanū, auā se lumana‘i manuia o alo ma fanau. E lē gata i lea o le faatinoga o o tatou nafa ma tiute, ‘aemaise le faafailelega o alo ma fanau; o lumana‘i o ‘āiga, nuu ma le atunuu atoa.

Matou te faatulou atu i pa‘ia, o susuga i Āo o Faalupega ma o latou soātau seelua, o tauāsuina le vai o le ola, i mālumālu ma fata faitaulaga ‘ese‘ese. Ua outou fa‘afalelēmālu i tafa e fia o le lalolagi, ona o le tāla‘iga o le Talalelei. E‘e ia i le maupu‘epu‘e o Kolokota, ma momoli e le sau o Heremoni, o outou itū taulagi ma gafa tautupu, i le tumutumu mauga o Sinai.

Matou te faatulou atu fo‘i i sālililimanū ma tapu o fanua, maota ma malae, faapea le gataifale, mai le Tai Sāmasāma se ia pā‘ia le Tai ‘Ula‘ula. Faatulou atu i tupu ma ē‘e, tama ma o latou ‘āiga, o ‘āiga ma a latou tama, Tumua ma Pule, ‘Āiga i le Tai ma le Vaa o Fonoti. Faatulou i le pa‘ia o le Faleagafulu ma lo latou launiu na saelua, Faatuiolemotu ma tama a le Manu‘atele. Ou te faatulou atu i le lauga a Tumua ma Pule, Tautootoo ma Tootoo o le Fale‘ula. O pa‘ia ma mamalu o Sāmoa, e lē suia pe faaopoopoina e se faamatalaga a se tagata. O outou itu tetēle ma outou itu taulagi, e le gafa faamatuaofaiva e sa matou tala. O lea, o outou pa‘ia ma mamalu, o le a tofā i vaatapu, moe i vaaloo. Faatulou atu.

O le matua alofa, e moe ālaāla, moe mānatunatu mo si ana fanau, ina ia ola manuia. E lē gase le sa‘ilililimanū matagi e folau ai. O lenei su‘esu‘ega o le sa‘ililililiga matagi lelei, e ono folau ai le fanau, a o ola a‘e i le lofitū o peau o le olaga i atunuu ‘ese‘ese. Ua to‘atele e ua matagivaleina i le vasa, ona o le lē mautonu o mātua, faiā‘oga, malo ma ona mātagaluega, i le tapasāina o le a‘oa‘oga o fanau. E lē gata i lea, o le pogisā o tagata lautele, i auala e talafegai mo le faafailelega o le poto ma le atamai, o alo ma fanau Sāmoa i atunu‘u ‘ese e pei o Āotearoa Niu Sila.

The brief opening in Sāmoan would have conveyed to readers an appreciation, that learning in a language that you do not understand is most challenging, if not impossible. Those who are not speakers of Sāmoan, would have been denied understanding of the opening paragraphs, despite the academic ability of readers, who are not speakers of Sāmoan. Language is so fundamental to learning, that the use of the language that learners know or are proficient in, is essential. Learners who are proficient in the language used for learning, have a much higher likelihood of learning success, than those who are not. Those with two languages that can be used for learning, have an even greater likelihood of learning success. Pacific students are more likely than others in Āotearoa New Zealand, to be proficient productive bilinguals much earlier, if their heritage language, is the language for learning at school. Samoan children schooled in a Sāmoan bilingual/immersion learning environment will achieve. Sāmoan students who maintain their heritage language are considered to be in the ‘proficient productive bilingual’ category, and learning is assured if *Sāmoan* is the language for teaching and learning.

Contents

Upu Tomua	3
Prologue	4
Acknowledgements	4
1.0 Introduction	5
2.0 Literature Review	11
2.1 Te Reo Maori and Learning Success	11
2.2 Bilingual Education	13
2.3 Proficient Productive and Bilingual Education	15
2.4. Possible Pathways to Proficient Productive Bilingualism	16
2.5 Samoan for Learning	17
2.6 Minimal Learning Success for Samoan in Aotearoa New Zealand Education	18
2.7 Improved Learning Success for Samoan Students	19
2.8 Turning of the tide	19
2.8.1 The Silver Lining of the Covid19 Pandemic	20
2.8.2 New Education Initiatives	21
2.8.3 National Education Learning Priorities	22
3.0 Purpose	24
3.1 Objective	24
3.2 Participants	25
3.3 Research Team	25
3.3.1 Fa’atili Iosua Esera	26
3.3.2 Sapi Ne’emia	28
3.3.3 Malo Sepuloni	29
3.3.4 Semeatu Iosefa	30
4.0 Schools Involved	31
4.1 School 1	31
4.1.1 Approach	32
4.1.2 Core Culture	33
4.1.3 Management Structure	33
4.1.4 Curriculum Planning	33
4.1.5 Syndicate Planning	34
4.1.6 Monitoring Student Achievement	34

4.1.7 School Wide Pedagogy	35
4.1.8 Teaching as Inquiry	36
4.2 School 2	36
4.2.1 Samoan Bilingual Unit	37
4.2.2 Staff	38
4.2.3 Approach	38
4.2.4 Curriculum Coverage and Planning	39
4.2.5 Current Roll and Projected Growth	39
4.2.6 Management Structure	39
4.2.7 Annual Targets	40
4.3 School 3	40
4.3.1 Samoan Bilingual Unit	41
4.3.2 Management Structure	41
4.3.3 Curriculum Coverage	41
4.3.4 Curriculum Planning	41
4.3.5 Approach	42
4.3.6 Monitoring Student Achievement	42
5.0 Study Methodology	43
5.1 Assessing Speaking	43
5.2 Assessing Writing	44
5.3 Assessing Reading	44
5.4 Ongoing Collaboration	45
6.0 Study Constraints	46
6.1 Personal Positions	46
6.2 Lack of Credible Measures	46
6.3 Absence of Preservice Training	47
6.4 Context	47
6.5 Professional Development	49
6.6 Learning Resources	49
6.7 Cohorts	49
6.8 Comparability	49
7.0 Data gathering, Presentation and Analysis	50
7.1 Speaking	51
7.1.1 Analysis	51
7.2 Writing	52
7.2.2 Analysis	53
7.3 Reading	54

7.3.1 Analysis	54
8.0 Impressions	55
8.1 Speaking	56
8.2 Writing	57
8.3 Reading	57
8.3.1 Samoan Text	58
9.0 Findings	59
9.1 Planning Together	59
9.2 Early Immersion	59
9.3 Learning Systems	60
9.4 Class Pedagogies	61
9.5 Simultaneous Use	61
9.6 Ongoing Collaboration	62
9.7 School Management Structure	62
9.8 Family Practices	63
9.9 Expanded Leadership	63
9.10 Teachers Proficient in Samoan	64
9.11 School and Community Support	64
10.0 Recommendations	65
10.1 Teacher Education	65
10.1.1 Preservice Training	65
10.1.2 Professional Development	66
10.2 Resource Development	66
10.2.1 Staffing	66
10.2.2 Learning and Teaching Resources	67
10.2.3 Funding	67
10.2.4 Public Language Domains	68
10.3 Community Engagement	68
10.3.1 National Policy	68
10.3.2 School Policy	69
11.0 Conclusion	70
12.0 Upu Tomuli	71
<i>References</i>	72
<i>Glossary</i>	78

List of tables

Table 1: Time percentage allocated to Samoan and English as mediums of instruction – p.32

Table 2: Time percentage allocated to Samoan and English as mediums of instruction – p.38

Table 3: Time percentage allocated to Samoan and English as mediums of instruction – p.42

Table 4: Speaking Analysis of children’s proficient productive bilingual continuum – p.51

Table 5: Writing Analysis of children’s proficient productive bilingual continuum – p.52

Table 6: Reading Analysis of children’s proficient productive bilingual continuum – p.54

2.0 Literature Review

The privileging through power and control of the English language, culture and ways of being in Āotearoa New Zealand education from the early introduction of modern schooling, has had powerful impact on the learning achievement of Pākēhā students. Students from families who had access to resources, services, capital, power and how it is exercised in Āotearoa New Zealand education, did better. Learning success for Pākēhā students in Āotearoa New Zealand schools ever since, was heavily in their favour. The recent spike of Māori student achievement in Kura Kaupapa Māori and Māori-Medium Education, is due largely to the privileging of te reo Māori and Māoritanga for learning from kohanga reo, to kura kaupapa and wharekura. Customising learning through relevant contexts combined with language, culture, identity, belonging, and belief, brought about educational success for Māori students. Both the historical achievements of Pākēhā students in Āotearoa New Zealand education, and the recent success of Māori students in te reo Māori medium learning environments, should not be a surprise to anyone.

2.1 Te Reo Māori and Learning Success

The failure of schools to make learning happen for Māori students in Āotearoa New Zealand education, was due to legal manipulation and the passing of the Education Act of 1867. The named Act strictly prohibited te reo Māori and therefore, anything Māori in schools. A policy which was rigorously and brutally enforced by school leaders, and teachers, supported by other succeeding statutes and Acts of Parliament. Legalising the ban on te reo Māori and the eradication of things Maori from schools, traumatised Māori communities, and te reo Māori has been in sharp decline ever since across the country, and for generations. The neglect and ongoing marginalisation of te reo Māori led to poor education outcomes for Māori. Schools underserved Māori ākonga for generations for not delivering learning in te reo Māori and success was measured in ways unfamiliar to them. It was a recipe for failure and a large majority of Maori ākonga did.

Poor education success was associated with high representation in low family income, poor health, high unemployment, and castration rates. This inequity in education has manifested itself in ways that have harmed Māori families, communities and indeed, the whole nation.

The rejuvenation and revival of te reo Māori is credited to the drive for holistic learning through te reo me ngā tikanga from Māori whanau and communities. This was supported by the ongoing mobilisation of Māori communities and the insistence of many Māori education leaders. Learning in te reo Māori, was initiated in many areas of Aotearoa New Zealand, with the aim of providing immersion learning in Kōhanga Reo and schools with ākonga learning through the medium of te reo. The findings of the Waitangi Tribunal alleged that the education system in Aotearoa New Zealand, was in breach of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. This provided the needed legal framework and rationale to provide learning for Maori akōnga through te-reo me nga tikanga. Te reo Māori was made an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand in 1987 and was awarded legal status as an official language of the country. Crown support since then offered some surety to school governance, to offer learning in state schools through te reo Māori. The privileging of reo Māori and Māoritanga, offered relevant contexts for Māori ākonga learning. The use of te reo Māori allowed Māori parents to advocate for Māori specific outcomes for their children's learning, and Māori communities were more engaged.

This reversed the historical underachievement of Māori ākonga in Aotearoa New Zealand education. Recent education achievement data shows that Māori ākonga in te reo Maori medium secondary education, compares very favourably to the achievement of Pākēhā and Asian students in affluent suburbs. Ākonga in these te-reo Maori medium secondary schools outperform their Māori peers in English-medium secondary schools, significantly. The reversal is so significant that one wonders whether te reo Maori itself was the sole factor responsible. International indigenous education research using similar empowering and control processes, strongly indicate that the use of languages bring other cultural empowerment tools, community resources and strengths that are essential for learning success. The use of te reo Māori brought the Māori community into education conversations, their cultural capital and perspectives validated, and with that, the associated spike in success as tuturu Maori.

A comparative study (Murray, 2017), of te reo Māori-medium students and bilingual students (Levels 2-4) in 2005, found that 90 percent of both groups met the English literacy requirements for NCEA level one at Year 11. The majority of Year 11-13 students of both groups also gained credits in Māori, English and mathematics. A longitudinal study (Wang and Harkess 2007) compared Year 11-13 Māori-bilingual student achievement with Māori students in English-medium schools over a three-year period from 2004-2006. They found that Māori-bilingual students were more likely to pass NCEA at each level than their Māori peers in English-medium schools and were more likely to meet the University Entrance requirements by the end of Year 13. The continued use of te reo Māori, into the tertiary sector of education in Aotearoa New Zealand should be of serious consideration as the

qualification completion rate for Maori students in tertiary, across New Zealand continue to be below 50% and much lower than Pākēha and Asian students. The underperformance of tertiary institutions for Maori ākonga cannot be discussed fully in this report, other than to say it is disgraceful.

The sharp rise in achievement of ākonga in te reo Maori medium education has been such that there is now a call for making learning in te reo Māori available nationwide for Māori students. Unfortunately, the marginalisation and relegation of te reo Māori to lower social status for over a hundred years, has meant that the Āotearoa New Zealand education system is unable to make this possible. There are minimal targeted resources in te reo or in te āo Māori, and the number of teachers of Māori ancestry, proficient in te reo Māori, to deliver all curriculum areas across the compulsory sector, is scarce. These are major priority areas to develop if current learning success for Māori is to continue and increase.

2.2 Bilingual Education

A wide range of research regularly reported and reviewed (Baker, 2006, 2011), continues to report positive findings on bilingualism and biliteracy. Multiple studies concluded that bilingualism and multilingualism do not interfere with, but rather facilitate cognitive, linguistic and academic skills, while at the same time developing the ability to acquire an additional language. The major domains in which bilinguals have advantage over monolingual peers are concept formation, metalinguistic awareness, cognitive flexibility and developing analytic ways of thinking (Peal and Lambert, 1962; Bialystok & Craik, & Luk, 2012; Hakuta & Diaz, 1985).

Proficient productive bilingualism as espoused in this report, is the attainment of proficiency in two languages so that the person's language and academic skills match, as closely as possible, those of a native speaker. It includes the ability to speak, write, present and read in two languages to the same level of competence. In high quality, well designed and empowerment focussed programmes, achievement reaches and often exceeds native speakers of the same ethnicity in English medium programmes. Proficient productive bilingualism is found to be most facilitative in the attainment of higher results on tests of verbal and non-verbal abilities, as well as being more skilled in tasks that required manipulation, reorganization and flexibility (Hakuta & Diaz, 1985).

Seeking to achieve proficient productive bilingualism is preferred, in the achievement of superior meta-cognitive skills in literacy and numeracy while limited bilinguals usually show the lowest scores in literacy and numeracy domains tested. Limited bilinguals are often those who speak and understand

varying degrees of two languages, but are more proficient in the majority language, than the community or the heritage language. Ricciardelli (1992; 1993), conducted a comparative study in the United States between proficient productive bilingual Italian students and monolingual English students, and Italian students proficient in English with conversational fluency in Italian. The proficient productive bilingual Italian students, outperformed others significantly. Proficient productive bilinguals outperform less balanced bilinguals, limited bilinguals and monolinguals in all the cognitive skills measured, in a range of studies.

The neglect of students' heritage languages in Aotearoa New Zealand, and reliance on the time and methods to teach standard 'School English' in isolation settings have been ineffective. The neglect of Pacific and Māori students' lives and lived experiences has been found to be the major cause behind these students' under achievement in English literacy. Pacific and Māori students have for many years been highly represented in the 'literacy and academic achievement tail' of Aotearoa New Zealand education. This highlights the disparity in achievement between those students whose language, culture, values and ways of being are privileged in schools, and those whose languages cultures values and ways of being, are not.

The out of context approach in teaching English and other languages as subjects is now under scrutiny. This is found to be the main cause behind poor achievement in English literacy by non-English speaking students. The continued use of this approach for teaching languages to students in school needs serious consideration. There is now the need to use findings from international and local research into the use of community languages as mediums of instruction, and for teaching and learning languages in Aotearoa New Zealand. This must be considered a priority as the population is fast becoming ethnically and linguistically more diverse.

There are now 160 languages spoken in Tamaki Makaurau Auckland alone (ERO Report 2019), as more migrants arrive and the Aotearoa New Zealand population becomes very multi-ethnic. New approaches are needed for acquisition of English while maintaining, rejuvenating and developing heritage languages. This is critical for communication, social cohesion, connections and for learning. To speak only one language in Aotearoa New Zealand, in the next twenty years will hinder nationhood, be uneconomic and socially absurd. Language opens doors to other cultures and other worlds. Promoting proficient productive bilingualism for Aotearoa New Zealand will make for a more just, fair, harmonious and profitable Aotearoa New Zealand society.

2.3 Proficient Productive Bilingualism and Learning Success

To learn through two languages is often referred to as a blessing! I can recall the challenges of learning in Sāmoan and trying to make sense of content worded in English. My sense making was predominantly in Sāmoan. Aligning newly constructed knowledge in English for tutors and assessors to read and assess, was often challenging. The challenge was not just in sense making itself but framing new knowledge in two languages that are significantly different. As my command of English was closely aligned with Sāmoan, the learning process and understanding of new knowledge from both languages was made easier. Likewise, when accessing new knowledge is not possible in one language, the use of the other language to bridge the gap, enables one to overcome that barrier, before further sense making continues. To be in a position where you can choose to switch languages when the context, content or audience allow, is a position that many proficient productive bilinguals can elect to do. The ability to continue sense-making in the other language when the other falters, is a privilege. This allows people like myself and the research assistants to vouch that learning in two languages is not only a blessing but a real privilege. In the literature, this is referred to by Cummins (1981) as the common underlying proficiency where all languages operate out of the same central processing think tank in the brain; all languages contribute to cognition and meaning making is transferrable across languages.

From this perspective, this study loosely defines proficient productive bilingualism as *the ability to manipulate one language independently or two languages simultaneously to comprehend, communicate, participate and appreciate*. Proficient productive bilinguals often encounter barriers to comprehension and sense making in one language. These people have the ability to seamlessly switch to their other language before continuing learning, either in the bridging language or in two languages simultaneously. Proficient productive bilinguals have the privilege of choosing which language to use depending on what to learn, how best to communicate and to collaborate. They have been referred to by other commentators as ‘elective bilinguals’ because of their ability to elect which language is best for the task or the audience. They are able to participate fully in further elaboration, collaboration and construction of new knowledge. Appreciation comes when languages open doors for one to learn, experience, and to fully participate in further knowledge building or problem solving. Language opens doors to other worlds and ways of being.

2.4 Possible Pathways to Proficient Productive Bilingualism

Numerous research studies suggest that there are many pathways to proficient productive bilingualism, just as there are many people who are proficient productive bilinguals. The most aspirational pathway is to maintain one's heritage language and acquire a second to the same level of control. The other is to acquire the dominant language and learn a second to the same level of proficiency. To become a proficient productive bilingual requires deliberate acts of engaging critical people, a well-founded coordinated approach and the political will. Aotearoa New Zealand education can do much more to make education accessible to many through the use of children's languages and the use of language abilities students bring to school. This serves two main purposes. One for learning, and another to acquire proficiency in English to a similar level of command. To create new knowledge in two languages, and to learn a second language using your heritage language is possible with commitment and support. Critical to this, is commitment from the government, the Ministry of Education and the teaching profession itself. The acceptance of heritage languages from the wider society, parents and students themselves are considered essential. To be a proficient productive bilingual, as many studies found out, is the most desirable position for learning. To be in any other category of bilingualism is considered ineffective and, in fact, damaging. Poorly designed bilingual education can produce graduates illiterate in both languages, with disastrous academic and social outcomes.

Retaining a language that is not the dominant language or an elite international language is difficult owing to the domination of the linguistic landscape of that country, by its elite language or languages. English dominates the visual, aural and physical landscape of Aotearoa New Zealand, as it does in many other English-speaking countries. Its availability and accessibility make it easier for people, to acquire different levels of proficiency for their purposes. It is the language with the most economic and academic value. Every citizen of Aotearoa New Zealander needs to have a good command of English for further education, employment and access to many resources and services. With the availability of resources, support, and opportunities to use English, language minority students' acquisition of English is assured, be it with different levels of proficiency.

Sāmoans and Tongans have a higher likelihood to be proficient productive bilinguals much earlier than most students in Aotearoa New Zealanders. This is due to these languages being spoken in many homes of these ethnic communities. Children in these communities grow up navigating themselves through their home languages and English. Their ability to manage their lives in two worlds when they start school is admirable, and playing with two language is, for many of them, a way of life. This study is

strong that being a proficient productive bilingual, is comparatively most effective for learning purposes.

2.5 Sāmoan for Learning

Sāmoan is not an official language of Āotearoa New Zealand and has not enjoyed Crown support over the years. Like te reo Māori, the use of Sāmoan for learning in early childhood was initiated by mothers and community leaders. The lobby from many Sāmoans and educators led to the establishment of the Sāmoan language curriculum for Āotearoa New Zealand from preschool to senior secondary. *Ta'iala mo le A'oa'oina o le Gagana Samoa*, the Sāmoan language curriculum was gazetted in 1996, and Sāmoan language became a subject for the School Certificate in 1998. Sāmoan was offered as part of undergraduate degrees at Victoria University in Wellington, and Tamaki Makaurau Auckland University in the late 1990s. Victoria continued to offer this in 2021, while it is no longer an option at The University of Tamaki Makaurau Auckland. A few primary schools offered learning through Sāmoan language at lower primary in the mid-1990s, and a few secondary schools offered Sāmoan as a subject option.

According to the Education Review Report (2019), there are eight contributing primary schools, eight full-primary schools, and four intermediate schools, offering Sāmoan as the medium for learning at different levels of immersion and using different approaches. There were eight secondary schools offering Sāmoan as a subject option. Mangere is one of the regions in Āotearoa New Zealand where Sāmoan is offered as a language for learning to students from preschool to primary school and as a subject discipline at two of the state secondary schools.

There is now the need to consider Sāmoan as a language for learning in other parts of the country. Sāmoan students make up around 4% of the entire student population in Āotearoa New Zealand. Approximately half of the Pacific student population in Āotearoa New Zealand, are Sāmoans, and Sāmoan language is the third most spoken language behind English and te reo Māori. Census data suggest that the Sāmoan population is one of the fastest growing ethnic population, and sixty percent (60%) were born in Āotearoa New Zealand. The average age of the Sāmoan population (Census, 2018) is just twenty-three years, making it one of the youngest demographics. The Education Review Report (2019) also states that the population of Pacific Island people is increasing across provincial Āotearoa New Zealand. This same pattern is true of the distribution of Sāmoans across the country.

Sāmoan is not an official language, and is not a language under government protection, but there are enough speakers of Sāmoan currently in Āotearoa New Zealand schools to warrant offering it as a language for learning. There are more speakers of Sāmoan across the country, and with better planning, coordination and support, a Sāmoan language learning pathway can become a reality. This is necessary for education, community engagement, purposeful participation and national economic prosperity. The income levels of most Sāmoan households are in the lower socio-economic status, with the average wage for Sāmoans (Census 2018) to be \$24,300. Many parents do not have capital or assets to support their children to start a business or to pursue a career when they fail at school. The youth become easy prey for organised crime, and Samoans are becoming more visible, in the senior hierarchy of many gangs across Āotearoa New Zealand, including the newly established ones.

2.6 Minimal Learning Success for Sāmoan in Āotearoa New Zealand Education

It is cited in many study findings, locally and abroad, that the performance of the Āotearoa New Zealand education system, for students from language minority background is poor. Elley (1992) concluded that the disparity in the achievement of students for whom English is their second language, and Pākēhā students, was greater in Āotearoa New Zealand than other countries in his study. Pākēhā students out-perform Māori and Pacific in every measure in literacy significantly. International literacy evaluations (cf. Wilkinson, 1998; PISA, 2000) have for some years identified this to be a fact in Āotearoa New Zealand education. The apparent contradictions implicit here is how an emphasis on English at the expense of heritage languages, can entrench rather than mitigate negative educational outcomes for language minority students.

Sāmoans who have done well in the Āotearoa New Zealand education system, have done so at the cost of full participation in things Sāmoan owing to their inability to speak and fully understand Sāmoan. The majority of them were born here. They have ‘ears’ for their heritage language but not the ‘tongue.’ Many can understand well when spoken to but are unable to speak and cannot participate fully in things Sāmoan. They are receptive, but not proficient productive bilinguals. There have been many Sāmoans who have been promoted to senior executive positions in their chosen profession, and some all the way to the House of Parliament, who struggle to speak Sāmoan to the level that befits their positions and social status.

The learning success of Sāmoan students in Āotearoa New Zealand education has been very low. The current Ministry of Education data and census (2018) suggests that, of everyone hundred (100) Sāmoan students enrolled in Āotearoa New Zealand schools, only around four (4) of them ended up with a

tertiary qualification or trade. Tertiary Education Commission reports in recent years consistently show that qualification completion rates for Sāmoans is below 50% of the few that make it that far. The ongoing neglect of Sāmoan as a language for learning for Sāmoan students has had huge negative impact on the educational success of these students. This in turn has had poor impact on the Āotearoa New Zealand economy and society at large.

Sāmoans will be more functional in New Zealand society, and the economy, if they are given the opportunity to learn. Years of learning neglect have transpired to low income, poor health, high representation in unemployment and penal statistics among this community. Census statistics suggest that only eight percent (8%) of this population are homeowners. The inherent capital waste from an education system unable and/or unwilling to educate Sāmoans, is an economic travesty that Āotearoa New Zealand society can ill afford. May (2019) stated that educating Sāmoan and others poorly served by our schooling system, needs to be considered an educational and an economic priority. It is believed that if student achievement in Āotearoa New Zealand education was increased to the level of the highest performing OECD countries, gross domestic products would be 3-15% higher by 2070. Āotearoa New Zealand may yet, be truly the land of milk and honey, for all.

2.7 Improved Learning Success for Sāmoan Students

The underachievement of Pacific students in Āotearoa New Zealand education is well documented and is rivalled only by the historical underachievement of Māori students. This is unsurprising owing to the insistence of successive governments and the Ministry of Education that learning in Āotearoa New Zealand schools is through the medium of English only. The English only medium for learning in Āotearoa New Zealand schools has served heritage language speakers of English well, but not Māori and Pacific students. Their underachievement is of no surprise.

The opportunity to provide learning through privileging Sāmoan in schools, is a welcome opportunity for Sāmoans. This study, though small, aims to find possible way forward for Sāmoan students in learning environments where Sāmoan is the language for teaching and learning. It aims to find school systems, management structures, school environment and pedagogical approaches that are facilitative in providing learning success for Sāmoan students, while maintaining Sāmoan to a level that is comparable to English.

2.8 Turning of the Tide

The report to the Ministry of Education on bilingual education and possible models and practices to adopt (May, Hill, and Tiakiwai 2004) is explicit on the significant advantages of proficient productive bilingualism to students' learning. The report provides great guidance for school policies, school systems, community engagement, classroom practices and possible national guidelines. It also proposes national funding models that were realised almost twenty years later. The report made a mention of the vast number of research studies abroad on the educational, economic and social benefits of proficient productive bilingualism.

2.8.1 The Silver Lining of the Covid-19 Pandemic

The Covid-19 pandemic highlighted the economic disparities that exist in Aotearoa New Zealand between those with education qualifications and those without. Aotearoa New Zealand was largely spared the devastating impact of the virus compared to other countries. The pandemic made the public sharply aware of years of an ineffective and an unequal education system. Māori and Pacific communities felt the brunt of it. Reimer (2021) and the OECD (2021) found that the profound negative impact of Covid-19, was felt more by communities ill-served by the education system in their home countries across the globe. This was the experience of many families in the Sāmoan community. Many secondary schools reported high dropout rates among senior secondary Sāmoan students after the first lockdown in 2019. These students replaced their parents in the workforce as income earners, when their parents' employment was either downgraded or terminated. Hanushek & Woessman (2020) as cited by Reimer (2021) had estimated a decrease of 3% in lifetime income for these students resulting from the learning losses caused by the pandemic. This income loss is an international calculation with variability according to economy size and mean income levels.

As the virus mutates into different variants and continues to spread, increased lockdowns are expected. OECD (2021) reported that the range of lockdown duration across thirty-one countries was from 20 days in Denmark and Germany, to a hundred and fifty for Columbia and Costa Rica. We can expect longer lockdowns with the Delta Variant as we have in 2021. Schools are often the first to close and the last to open. This is the approach many countries follow, and New Zealand is no exception. The longest period of the 2021 lockdown was in Tamaki Makaurau Auckland where around 64% of all Pacific people reside. The biggest clusters which lead to the 2020 and 2021 lockdowns were in areas with high Pacific populations. The Pacific community had the lowest vaccination rate, and yet are employed in areas and employment, most at risk of infection. 88% of those hospitalised when the Delta

variant found its way to Āotearoa New Zealand in 2021, were Sāmoans. Yet they make up under 5% of the general population. The impact of Covid-19 and its new Delta variant, on Sāmoan in New Zealand has been severe. This community will continue to feel the negative impact of this pandemic, into the next two generations. The full impact of the Covid19 pandemic on education let alone, health and wellness of the Sāmoan community in Āotearoa New Zealand cannot be fully explained in this report.

The lockdown highlighted the need to deliver learning on-line and the opportunity to learn anywhere at any time. It did highlight the inability of Āotearoa New Zealand education to deliver bilingual learning owing to poor on-line resources and the majority of Pacific families having poor devices for learning. Many Pacific families had varied access to the internet. Learning on-line for Pacific students in bilingual units is exacerbated by the lack of professional development for teachers in bilingual units to use on-line tools and to access the little resources there are, for teaching and learning in Pacific languages.

However, there has been the opportunity to introduce provisions to mitigate the inequities in education, through improving education success for Pacific students. Funding provisions were made available to schools during lockdown, to initiate learning support for students was helpful. Many schools were creative in providing support for their communities and students. It must be said that most of these innovations were improvised and were not well planned. The centrally manufactured learning packs, education programmes through television and radio, improvised by the Ministry of Education, helped occupy children. The full impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on education, health and wellness of the Pacific community is best left to another conversation.

Covid-19 provided the opportunity to deliver learning differently and teachers reported positive interactions with students and families through teaching on-line. Many students in my own school commented how good it was to learn at home with their parents present, using their language and within their cultural contexts. Teachers reported much higher engagement of parents and whanau in our education conversations on student learning (September 2021). There is always a silver lining in every dark cloud.

2.8.2 New Education Initiatives

Recent initiatives in education to improve Pacific learning success had largely entrenched rather than mitigated Pacific students' underachievement. Many studies had highlighted the failure of past

education initiatives to lift the achievement of Pacific and Māori students. After many years of inequity in Aotearoa New Zealand education for Pacific people, recent Ministry of Education proposals ('Action Plan for Pacific Education 2020-2030', *Tapasā: Cultural Competencies for teachers of Pacific learners* (Ministry of Education, 2018) suggest needed changes for these students are about to be actioned. These connect with other system level documents like the 'Leadership Strategy for the Teaching Profession of Aotearoa New Zealand' (2018) and their Educational Leadership Capability Framework (2018). All suggest a slow turning of the tide for Sāmoans and other language minority students. The budget of 2020 and 2021 offered increased funding allocation to support the use of Pacific languages for teaching and learning in schools. These funds were made available to schools for the 2022 school year.

The Education Review report (*Current Provision of Bilingual Education*, 2019) on the state of bilingual education in Aotearoa New Zealand and the many recommendations on the benefits of proficient productive bilingualism, on the heels of the Covid19 pandemic, was very timely. The report highlighted the 'trial and error' approach used so far by schools, the lack of funding, resources, preservice training and professional support for Pacific bilingual education. The report picked up on earlier recommendations for Pacific students' learning that informed the original 'Ko e Kakai Ako Pasifika Document' focus on providing bilingual learning opportunities for Pacific students. The Ko e Ako e Kakai Pasifika (1995) is largely reflected in the goals and aspirations of earlier Pasifika Education Plans (PEP 2006-2010 and PEP 2009-2012). This plan had clear bilingual goals and targets for Pacific students and communities. These goals were later *discarded* by the government at the time, to be replaced with the National Standards for English and Mathematics. This was central in the 2010-2013 and the 2013-2017 Pacific Education Plan. The goals of these documents were minimalistic for Pacific students and had an ill-founded political agenda. This revised Pacific Education Plan was not mandated, and many schools ignored it. Schools committed to improving education for Pacific students, designed their own instead.

In short, the 2019 ERO report recommends the need to develop an overarching strategy for supporting Pacific bilingual education. It recommends that the level of unmet demand for Pacific bilingual education be evaluated, and that work is done to ensure that public data about provision of Pacific bilingual education is up to date. It asked that development of resources, particularly Pacific language assessment tools to support those working in Pacific bilingual education. Despite the scepticism that many of us who have worked and led in bilingual and multilingual learning environments felt, there was affirmation of bilingualism in the report that one cannot help but be optimistic about.

2.8.3 National Education Learning Priorities

The release of the National Education Learning Priorities (NELP: Ministry of Education, 2020) sets out the government's priorities to ensure the wellbeing and success of all learners. The wording of the NELP was on highlighting components critical to learning. Wellbeing, equity and inclusion were prioritised for all learners and their whānau. The NELP specifies seven priorities designed to guide school leaders in developing a rich local curriculum to support learners to achieve their aspirations. The wording was less offensive compared to previous documents out of the Ministry of Education profiling Pacific students as 'priority learners' and the need for schools to be 'culturally responsive' to help these students.

The NELP document instead, asks for the creation of education environments that are learner-centred, and where more learners, especially Pacific learners, are successful. This is mandated to be fully implemented in 2023. Priorities 1, 2, 3, and 6 in this document as cited by Si'ilata (2021) in her *Tautai o le Moana* Project report, suggest that these priorities are specifically worded to allow schools to be deliberate in promoting learning success for all learners including Pacific students. Surely the use of Pacific languages for learning in schools must be a top priority.

These recent government and Ministry of Education intentions, suggest that there is an appetite for providing education opportunities for Sāmoans and other Pacific students through their languages. The use of language affirms identity, creates the feeling of being valued and enhances learning success. It is better late than never.

3.0 Purpose

This is an evaluative study of three Sāmoan bilingual approaches in different schools, to identify the language pedagogies that are considered critical to the maintenance, development and command of Sāmoan among students. It examines ways that are facilitative in acquiring and maintaining proficiency in Sāmoan relevant to the age of students. Focussing on assessing the students' command of Sāmoan was seen to be a matter of consideration as students appear to use English more often than Sāmoan. There are many factors affecting the students choosing to use English ahead of Sāmoan. It is not our intention to look into these reasons. There is a shared understanding among the research team that the students' achievement of English proficiency grows exponentially compared to their maintenance of Sāmoan.

Experimental approaches used to revitalise te reo Māori have been most useful in revitalising the indigenous language of Aotearoa New Zealand. The prevalent use of full immersion approaches has been the key feature of this approach. The approach was necessary as te reo Māori was at risk of becoming extinct. The dominant use of sequential bilingual approaches where English was often not introduced until much later (at year 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or even 9) brought te reo Māori back from this precipice. Just as important was the fact that it reversed the underachievement of Māori students in immersion settings in Aotearoa New Zealand education. Much can be learnt from the successes of this approach, but there are other studies to suggest that other bilingual and multilingual pedagogies are just as effective and worthy of consideration for the attainment of proficient productive bilingualism.

3.1 Objective

This study does not expand on different types of bilingualism. Its main objective is to identify system changes, policy direction, school strategies, class pedagogies and support mechanisms to develop proficient productive bilingualism among students. The privilege of learning in two or more languages is found to be more powerful than learning monolingually. English will continue to be the language that will lead to further education and employment opportunities in New Zealand but should not be at the expense of one's heritage language or the opportunity to learn a third language. There is still merit in earlier studies, Cummins (1976) and Toukomaa and Skutnabb-Kangas (1977) Duncan and De Avila, 1979; Kessler and Quinn (1982) that found in favour of first or heritage language proficiency being facilitative in the acquisition of proficiency in the second language. My own study (Esera, 2002) found

that Sāmoan students who were competent in Sāmoan, made better progress in acquiring proficiency in English, than Sāmoan students who were not.

Esera's (2002) study, titled, *Acquisition of English Proficiency by Students from Sāmoan Speaking Homes* identified system shifts, structural changes, policy direction, practices and pedagogies that lead to the acquisition of English by students from Sāmoan speaking homes at Year 6. They were:

- i. Ongoing use of Sāmoan was facilitative in the acquisition of English proficiency.
- ii. Avoidance of language switching, and mixing was necessary.
- iii. Collective teacher reflection and collaboration was essential.
- iv. Understanding of the vision and purpose was shared.
- v. Teacher proficiency in Sāmoan was useful.
- vi. School leadership support was critical.
- vii. Parental engagement and commitment were essential and
- viii. Professional development for teachers had to be ongoing.

3.2 Participants

This 2021 study involved Sāmoan students with Sāmoan being spoken at home. The students in this study started their learning in Sāmoan bilingual learning environments and remained in the same learning environment for their entire primary education. Sāmoan as mentioned elsewhere is the third most spoken language in Aotearoa New Zealand and students in this study have Sāmoan spoken in their homes, and at school. All the teachers in the three bilingual units are fluent speakers of Sāmoan.

3.3 Research Team

It is necessary to mention that those involved in the study brought different experiences in teaching and leading in bilingual Samoan/English learning environments. The four include myself and three assistants, who are native speakers of Sāmoan with years of classroom experiences in both Samoa and Aotearoa New Zealand. We have all been part of the Aotearoa New Zealand education for many years. There is a brief description of each of the research team, their background, knowledge and their experiences.

3.3.1 Fa‘atili Iosua Esera

I am a ‘matai tulafale’ from the district of Lotofaga; Upolu. The bestowment of this ‘orator’ title Fa‘atili, is a vote of confidence from my village and my extended family, that I can speak in formal cultural occasions. I have played a leadership role within my family and community events that involved Samoan language and culture. I have connections to the villages of Ta‘elefaga (Fagaloa), Satitua (Aleipata), Satalo (Falealili), Sapapāli’i (Fa‘asāleleaga; Savai’i), and Poloa (Falelima; Tutuila).

I was the National President of the nationwide organisation of teachers of Sāmoan language from preschool to tertiary; the FAGASA Incorporated, from 2005 to 2009. This organisation was established in 1991 to advocate for the use of Sāmoan language in Āotearoa New Zealand preschools, schools in the compulsory sector, and tertiary. The organisation worked collaboratively with the Ministry of Education to co-design the Ta‘iala mo le Gagana Sāmoa originally gazetted in 1996. It assisted in the review of this document in 2009. The organisation collaborated with the Ministry of Education in the publication of the *Mua O*, the *Folauga* series to support the learning and teaching of Samoan. The organisation also provided professional development for teachers throughout the country through its branches. FAGASA Incorporated initiated the celebration of Samoan language week in 2006, and the national annual Samoan speech contests for students from Year 5 to Years 13 in 2007. Both initiatives continued and is widely supported by the community and schools.

I was re-elected as national president again in 2014 which is a position I continued to hold until the time of this study; 2021. I am the current Āotearoa New Zealand representative on the Sāmoan Language Commission established in Sāmoa. This is the privilege that comes with being the National President of this association.

I have been a principal continuously and in different schools since 1986. I principal of Mangaweka School in the Taihape area from 1986 to 1990, Strathmore Park School in Miramar Wellington from 1991 to 1997, Raetihi School in the Ruapehu district, from September 1997 to July 2005, and Petone Central School in Lower Hutt Wellington until August 2014. I was appointed to the principal position at Sutton Park School in Mangere Tamaki Makaurau Auckland, where I started in September 2014. At the point of doing this study in 2021, I have been the principal of Sutton Park School for six years and two terms.

The Māori immersion class at Strathmore Park School was the first in the Eastern Suburbs of Wellington city. The Sāmoan immersion class I established at Strathmore Park School in 1995 was the first and only Sāmoan immersion class in the wider Wellington region. I dedicated my 2002 thesis to the students of the Sāmoan immersion class at Strathmore Park, as their exceptional achievements became the motivation to continue to advocate for privileging Sāmoan in Aotearoa New Zealand schools. Both the te reo Māori immersion class and the bilingual Sāmoan classes in this school, were disestablished when I left this school, through poor resourcing, minimal support from government and change of personnel at senior management and governance of the school.

At Raetihi School there was a bilingual te reo Māori unit with two classes, and the achievements of the students, and their successes as Māori has been motivational. Despite the lack of resources, poor professional development for teachers in Māori bilingual settings at the time, student achievements were considered extraordinary. This assertion took into consideration, that many Māori students were from families where learning resources were lacking, and te reo Māori was not the language of many Maori homes in the district.

The Māori immersion approaches used in Nga Rito; the Māori Immersion Unit in Petone Central, was most facilitative in acquiring and revitalising te reo Māori among students in the Unit. The achievement of students in acquiring both te reo Māori and English was exemplary. Most of the students in the te reo Māori unit were from well learned and well-resourced families. In my years as principal of the school, the years seven and eight students in te reo Maori unit outperformed their Maori and Pacific peers in English medium classes in both English literacy and numeracy. The immersion approach used at Petone Central was largely replicated in Sutton Park School for the Rumaki Unit, matched by the ‘whanau’ structure set up.

At the point of conducting this mini-evaluative study, I have been a principal for thirty-six consecutive years, and in schools where te reo Māori, Sāmoan, or English have been used for teaching and learning with very good results for Maori and Samoan students. At Sutton Park, learning is delivered through the medium of te reo Māori, Tongan, Sāmoan and English. In 2021, there were three hundred and seventeen children learning in their heritage languages.

I am a husband, a father of two, a grandfather of one and an uncle to many.

3.3.2 Mrs Sapi Ne'emia

Ms Ne'emia was 'the' assessor of the team, and she assessed all the students in the three bilingual units. Ms. Ne'emia spent one year at Leulumoega Fou College. She then went to Samoa College and passed the New Zealand entrance exam, after which she moved to New Zealand and enrolled at Aorere College from 1981 to 1983. She returned to Samoa and worked at the Treasury Stores Department. She returned to NZ in 1988 with her family. In 1998 she attended Auckland Teachers College and graduated in 2000. She was appointed to a fixed-term position at Sutton Park in 2001. The position was made permanent in 2003, and she taught in the Year 1 to Year 3 in the English medium part of the school. She moved to teach the Year 5 to 6 class in the Samoan Bilingual in 2015. She was also appointed the **leader** of the unit owing to her strengths in curriculum leadership and leading learning.

Ms Neemia is a member of the Samoan Language Teachers' Association (FAGASA), where she served as Treasurer for the Auckland branch. She assisted in the organising inter-school Samoan speech competitions for Year 5 to Year 8. Ms Neemia has been a member of the Samoan Assembly of God in Mangere for many years, serving and working in the church alongside her family. She is an active member of the women's church group and has taught in this church Sunday school for many years.

Ms Neemia is one of the lead teachers for the Talanoa Ako programme, a Ministry of Education contract to provide information and practical support for Pasifika parents, families and communities on how to best advocate for their children's education. She is working collaboratively with the principal, the deputy principals and the Samoan teachers in the unit to encourage parents to be part of this conversation. Ms Neemia is currently collaborating with other school leaders on the Measina Project, which aims to produce literacy learning resources for reading and writing in Gagana Samoa. She is also a part of the Vaka Leo project and is working alongside leaders and instructors from other bilingual units at other schools on how to best provide professional development for teachers in bilingual units on bilingual education.

Ms Neemia is from the villages of Leulumoega Tuai and Tanugāmanono, as well as Salelologa and Salelavalu in Savai'i. Ms Ne'emia was born and raised in the village of Leulumoega Tuai. She was brought up in an environment strong in Christianity and Samoan culture. She is a proud mother of three sons and a devoted grandmother.

3.3.3 Mrs Malo Sepuloni

Mrs Malo Sepuloni was born in Samoa and immigrated to Aotearoa New Zealand in 1973. She attended Aorere College in South Tamaki Makaurau Auckland for her sixth form year and worked in the public service for 16 years before returning to formal studies in 1992. She graduated with a Diploma of Teaching and a Bachelor of Education from the University of Tamaki Makaurau Auckland in 1995. She later gained a Diploma in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (Dip TESSOL) in 2002. Mrs Malo Sepuloni is currently the team leader of the Samoan bilingual unit at School 2. Since the beginning of her teaching career in 1996, she has been actively involved with initiatives to promote, develop and improve bilingual education in Aotearoa New Zealand. Mrs Malo Sepuloni currently represents Samoan teachers in primary schools in *Lalagaina*, the Education Review Office Pacific bilingual education approach. The aim of *Lalagaina* is to develop a Pacific Bilingual Education Quality Framework (PBEQF) to guide, support, and evaluate quality practices in Pacific bilingual education programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand. She is the lead teacher for the *Measina Project*, a Ministry of Education contract to collectively develop a Literacy Learning Framework and Literacy Learning Pathways for students in Samoan language. She works with leaders of other bilingual units in this study for this project.

Mrs Malo Sepuloni has been working collaboratively with bilingual unit leaders of other schools in the Auckland Samoan Bilingual Education Cluster (ASBEC), where she was part of the writing group for the *Anofale Tool* to assess reading comprehension in Samoa. It was through her work with ASBEC that she was selected to work with *Pasifika Success - Teuila Consultancy*, as a facilitator for a day per week over 2 years, to work alongside selected teachers in ASBEC to improve their teaching inquiry practices. Mrs Malo Sepuloni was a Within School Communities of Learning Leader (COL) for 5 years and is actively involved in COL's bilingual hub in the development of Samoan literacy resources. She is also currently involved with the *Vaka Leo Voices Bilingual Education Project* to improve teacher practice in bilingual education and develop the bilingual education learning pathway. Malo was the lead teacher for the bilingual education hub under the umbrella of the *Strengthening Education in Mangere and Otara Initiative* (SEMO) in 1997, which led to the inception of *O Lou Ala i Malo*, the Samoan bilingual unit at Mangere East School, in 1999.

Mrs Malo Sepuloni hails from the villages of Satapuala and Toamua on her father's side, and Sa'anapu and Iva on her mother's side. She was born and raised in Magiagi, where her parents were *Faife'au* of the Ekalesia Faapotopotoga Kerisiano Samoa church for 32 years. Malo is happily married with 3 adult children and 6 grandchildren. She resides in Papatoetoe South, Auckland and continues to serve her

community through her work in education and her church. She and her family have been actively involved in their church; Ekalesia Faapotopotoga Kerisiano Samoa Otahuhu, for 46 years.

3.3.4 Mrs Semeatu Iosefa

Mrs Iosefa attended Vaipouli College in Savai'i, Faleata High School and George Brown College. She attended Sāmoa Teacher College in Malifa, Sāmoa where she gained her teacher qualification in 1987. She taught in Sāmoa for eleven years and started her teaching career at Apia Primary and later Vaivase Primary before she migrated to Āotearoa New Zealand. Mrs Iosefa gained her diploma on teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESSOL) from the University of the South Pacific in Samoa in 1994. Mrs Iosefa taught at the Ao'ga Amata associated with the Pacific Island Presbyterian Church in Manukau in 1998. She retrained at Auckland Teachers College; Epsom for two years and graduated with a Bachelor of Education degree in teaching, before she joined the staff at School 3 in 2005. She has been there ever since.

In 2018 she was appointed as one of the *Within School Leaders* for the Mangere Central Kahui Ako. Semeatu ia actively working collaboratively with Bilingual teachers from other school to develop Sāmoan structured literacy assessment and resources. She was at the point of this study the leader of the Sāmoan Bilingual Unit at the school. She is from the villages of Paia; Gagaifomauga and Lelepa; Gaga'emauga. She was brought up in Lālovaea, Apia after the passing of her father.

4.0 Schools Involved

This study involved three state primary schools in Mangere, Tamaki Makaurau Auckland that have delivered learning for Sāmoan students in Sāmoan for many years. All are co-education, full primary schools with students from Year 1 (5 years of age) to Year 8 (12-13 years of age). They are identified in the study as School 1, 2 and School 3. The three schools have worked together on a Ministry of Education funded professional programme on the use of Sāmoan oracy to enhance learning, as well as maintaining Sāmoan language. They have been working together as part of the same Community of Learning Kāhui Ako, and had shared conversations on their approaches, successes, and challenges three years prior to this study. The three bilingual units will continue to work together in professional development for 2022 and 2023. All three schools have been very active in hosting and promoting things Samoan in Tamaki Makaurau Auckland.

The principals of the other two schools were approached prior to the study. They both gave their approval and support for the involvement of the lead teacher in their Sāmoan Bilingual Unit in this study. Each of the three lead teachers agreed to be research assistants and agreed to being cited in the report. The students and schools are confidential. Permission from parents was sought for children's participation in this study, with assurance that their children's identity would be kept confidential.

Each school, their management structure, intended pedagogical approach and systems are documented. The study assesses the graduates' (Year 8 students) levels of competence in speaking, writing and reading Sāmoan. Only the students who started their learning journey from Year 1 and stayed in the Sāmoan Bilingual Units for their entire primary education, were selected. The majority of those in the study were born Aotearoa New Zealand and all have Sāmoan spoken at home mainly by the elders.

4.1 School 1

The school provides learning in Tongan, Sāmoan, te reo Māori and English. Students from the bilingual units and the rumaki, have gained favourable results in recent years, since the introduction of their revised approach in 2015. At the end of 2020, the top academic student in the school, started her education in the Tongan Bilingual Unit and remained there until Year 8. She out-performed all other students in all curriculum areas, and the assessment of these areas are in English. The top

academic student in 2020 was selected out of sixty-nine Year 8 students in English medium, Sāmoan and Tongan medium learning. There were four runner-up candidates. One started her learning in the reo Māori medium unit up to Year 6, one is from the Sāmoan bilingual unit and the other two in English medium.

All of the tests were in English. The achievement of students in the bilingual units at School 1, compliments and supports the findings of many studies that found in favour of the many benefits of learning in a bilingual environment.

The Sāmoan Bilingual Unit in School 1 has been in existence for over twenty years. There is no documentation available to categorically confirm when it was originally established. There are teachers and staff at the school who believe that it has been part of the school for over twenty years. The Sāmoan Bilingual Unit was named after one of the teachers who was there from the beginning but has since passed.

4.1.1 Approach

There were professional conversations about using languages for learning and means of developing students who are twin proficient in two languages. There were extensive professional conversations about immersion, dual medium and translanguaging approaches (input in one language, and output in another) before the school introduced a sequential immersion/ bilingual or incremental dual medium approach in 2015. The goal of the programme was to have graduates at Year 8 proficient in both their heritage language and English. Language use for learning was apportioned as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Time percentage allocated to Samoan and English as mediums of instruction

Year Level	Sāmoan	English
Year 1	100%	0%
Year 2	80%	20%
Year 3	60%	40%
Year 4-8	50%	50%

This school is very prescriptive in its approach with emphasis on productive language functions. Extensive conversations on immersion by location, time, person, subject and occasions gave teachers an appreciation of this approach. Likewise, the idea of dual medium, translanguaging and simultaneous bilingual approaches were explored.

4.1.2 Core Culture

The school revised its core culture in 2015 through conversations with parents, the community, parents and students. The main aim was to develop a schooling environment that is safe for all students, and that the students' learning and wellbeing are the basis for all decisions made at the school. The community revisited its vision, developed a new mission, agreed on its values, shared beliefs, shared understandings, goals, graduates' attributes, rites and rituals. This was necessary in the development of its approaches for learning, including learning in their heritage language and of English. Likewise, the school reconfirmed its commitment to expanded leadership to include the students, parents and the community.

The school at the time was delivering learning through te reo Māori, Tongan, Sāmoan and English. The school is explicit on the place of te reo Māori as the 'reo rangatira' of the school and is privileged not only for learning in the rumaki, but for its use in its rites and rituals. The parents, staff and students work daily on strengthening the culture of the school and have it as the lived life of the school. The culture of the school is very visible and observable to those who visit.

4.1.3 Management Structure

The revised management structure of the school resembles that of a 'mat' with its horizontal syndicate structure across the school maintained. The syndicates were Year 1 to Year 2, Year 3 to 4, Year 5 to 6 and a Year 7 to 8 syndicate. The vertical structures were the bilingual units from Year 1 to 8, and for the Rumaki from Year 1 to 6. The English medium part of the school has Year 1 to 4 and Year 5 to 8. The four syndicates, two bilingual units, and the Rumaki had a curriculum leader each. The syndicates and the bilingual units and Rumaki met in alternative weeks, following a collective agreement on what was to be discussed in each meeting. The bilingual units and the Rumaki were each relocated to new locations where their rooms were next to each other. The Sāmoan Bilingual Unit was extended from Year 1 to Year 8 as it was only up to Year 6 in 2014.

The revised management structure made the school formal leadership structure more representative of the ethnicities at the schools. It increased the leadership capacity across the school and the number of curriculum leaders from three to eleven.

4.1.4 Curriculum Planning

The school had, since 2015, been very deliberate in setting realistic goals for all students to achieve by the end of each year. Once the end of year data is collated, staff review, reflect and collaboratively set

targets for the following year. The end of year data is used to identify areas of strength, weaknesses and identify students who had not achieved and areas of weaknesses to be targeted the following year.

Planning for the following year is done at the end of the year before. Student achievement data at the end of each year was used for setting targets for the following year. The strategies for achieving the targets set are agreed to by the teachers, as part of the end of year self-review conducted by staff. Once agreed, the target and the strategies are agreed to, become non-negotiable for teachers. However, teachers are given the permission to use other strategies they professionally see fit for their students.

As part of planning for the following year, the information from staff review, the strategies agreed to are put together in an annual curriculum plan designed collectively by the Team Leaders and board members. The Team Leaders include the syndicate leaders, the leaders of the bilingual units, the rumaki, the two deputy principals and the principal. The planning has been done off school site to avoid the normal distractions at school.

The plan includes the targets for the year, the curriculum coverage and the main concepts to guide the teaching the following year. It includes the genres for writing, reading comprehension and particular focus for numeracy coverage. It outlines the events throughout the year, the assessment schedule for the year, reporting to parents and reporting to the Board of Trustees. The annual plan contains the main and minor focuses for professional development for teachers.

4.1.5 Syndicate Planning

Each syndicate contextualises the topics selected, genres, comprehension strategies, numeracy strands and topics, in the school annual curriculum plan to suit their levels. The Sāmoan Bilingual Unit compliments and are expected to follow what was agreed to at each syndicate meeting. The only difference is that the teaching is in Sāmoan for the time and place designated to use Sāmoan and likewise when the medium of instruction is English.

4.1.6 Monitoring Student Achievement

Students are assessed in weeks three and four each term. Standardised assessment tools are administered, and the results are triangulated against teachers' running records and other data collection for each student. These are overall teacher judgements, and each student is placed on the curriculum continuum by the end of week 4. The school wide data is collated by the Deputy Principals to show all the students across the school and their achievements. These form the basis of conversations

with parents, written reports to the parents and reporting to the Board of Trustees. The whole school report is discussed with teachers to know where the school is at in terms of meeting the annual targets.

The Sāmoan Bilingual unit would hold target meetings from the sixth week until the end of the term. At these meetings, student achievement data are analysed, conversation on strategies and resources used are held and collaboration on means of accelerating student achievements are done. Teachers reflect on the spread of student achievement across curriculum levels, identify any patterns and trends, and possible causes. Resources and support for children underachieving are discussed, and new plans for lifting performance are agreed to. There is an icon link on each year group that names the children when it is clicked. This puts students' names to the data and learning approaches can be customised for each child.

Target meetings have been part of the school wide practice after five years of in-depth professional development on Assessment for Learning. The insistence that children know why, what and how to learn was very much part of managing learning school wide. There was and still is the need for learning to be made visible, and that children know where they are, where to next and how to get there.

4.1.7 School Wide Pedagogy

The school has a structure that has many parts that can exist together and operate on their own. There are therefore many tools used to make sure the school operates as one unit. One of these tools is its school wide pedagogy that is negotiated and agreed on. The critical parts of this pedagogy include its demand to be student centred. The contexts and content seek to be expansive, to increase the likelihood of engaging every student. The learning process to be adopted consistently school wide minimises student confusion over learning processes between classrooms, teachers and years.

Using students' prior learning, strengths, achievement data to inform new and further learning are part of this approach. Understanding the learning intention, success criteria and how these are to be assessed are made known. Feedback is stated as essential and is to be provided regularly to students. Assessment tasks need to be varied, relevant and known at the start of each lesson. The school pedagogy expects every learning to be from the school curriculum, which is informed by the Aotearoa New Zealand school curriculum and other related curriculum documents. The school's core culture is made up of its vision, mission, values, shared understandings and beliefs to be incorporated and reflected in the way teachers and leaders develop relationships essential for learning across the school. Every teacher is expected to adhere to the school wide pedagogy and is reviewed regularly.

4.1.8 Teaching as Inquiry

Inquiry has been part of our learning and development at Sutton Park School and the teachers have become familiar with the different types of inquiry models. The Spiral of Inquiry by Timperley, Halbert and Kaser (2014) was a model that we used to deepen the understanding and knowledge of our teachers. It was new learning for our teachers where they individually inquired about their children's literacy knowledge. A lot of work was done in the Scanning phase of the inquiry until they formed inquiry questions from their scanning data. We went through with the different phases in the Spirals of Inquiry and made teachers reflect deeply about their own teaching and how their teaching impacted on the children's learning in literacy, we aligned the teachers' inquiry with the 7 principles of learning by Dumont to explore further what teachers were doing to strengthen their inquiry question. After two years of using the Spirals of Inquiry the teachers decided to move into a collaborative inquiry model after reflecting on a lot of commonalities of inquiries that teachers did, it was fitting to move into a Collaborative inquiry model. The Collaborative inquiry model by Jennifer Donohoo (2013) was the one followed.

Teachers have been working collaboratively in syndicates when analysing writing data, observations, 'talanoa' with children and 'talanoa' amongst the teachers themselves. Teachers had found this more beneficial working collaboratively on a common inquiry as rich 'talanoa' was happening amongst the teacher and the inquiry was more meaningful to them. In 2021 the focus was on the needs of the teachers and what they want to inquire more about in their learning with their children. One of the areas for the staff collective inquiry focus in 2021 was on bilingual education. This was aligned with one of our Kāhui Ako (Community of Learning) focus areas as the other three Sāmoan Bilingual Units in this study are in our Kāhui Ako. The other areas of collective inquiry are student agency, numeracy, leadership, cultural responsiveness, writing and digital technologies.

4.2 School 2

School 2 is a full primary state school with an annual roll of around 600. The school has a Sāmoan Bilingual Unit for Sāmoan students, whose parents agree that their children be offered the opportunity of learning in and of Sāmoan.

The establishment of the *Sāmoan Bilingual Unit* was the community response to the implementation of what was known as Strengthening Education in Mangere and Otara (SEMO). Strengthening Education in Mangere and Otara (SEMO) was a Ministry of Education intervention designed to

increase the capacity of the schools and communities of Mangere and Otara to offer high quality learning environments for children. It was one of several area-wide initiatives being coordinated under the national school support policy of the Ministry of Education at the time. One of the special features of SEMO was the commitment to a three-way partnership between the Ministry, the schools and the communities to strengthen education in the two districts. The Education Review Office reports of school performances in the area since Tomorrow's School legislation that started in 1989, highlighted the need for all schools in the area to improve their performances in improving learning for students. This was obviously an acceptable request from the Sāmoan community.

The SEMO project funded the establishment of the *Sāmoan Bilingual Unit* and continued to do so while it (SEMO) was in existence. There was much community consultation and there was strong community support then for the establishment of the *Sāmoan Bilingual Unit* and that support has continued up to the time of this study in 2021. The Unit was named the *Sāmoan Bilingual Unit* after much community consultation. It suggests community aspirations of the parents for the school to provide a pathway for their children to achieve education success.

4.2.1 Sāmoan Bilingual Unit

The vision of the *Sāmoan Bilingual Unit* was that of the community. Parents had asked that the *Sāmoan Bilingual Unit* aimed to increase their children's success academically, culturally, socially, physically and spiritually, and that their children were able to participate fully in the life of the school. There was and still is strong commitment from parents in having their children enrolled in the *Sāmoan Bilingual Unit*.

The vision is a holistic Sāmoan view of success through Sāmoan language and culture. This is and has been the energy behind the unit. The teachers have a strong commitment to partnership with families through home visits, parent meetings, literacy and numeracy workshops, open mornings, class trips, encouraging parent help and support with resource making.

At the point of this study the *Sāmoan Bilingual Unit* has been in existence for 23 years. It has a maximum roll of 130 with enrolment criteria for each child to meet before entry is approved.

4.2.2 Staff

There were five teachers in the *Sāmoan Bilingual Unit* at the time of this study and all are Sāmoans. Four of them are native speakers of Sāmoan with one who is Āotearoa New Zealand born and is considered proficient in Sāmoan language. All of the teachers did not have any specific training in bilingual learning environments, except for two who took special post graduate papers on Bilingual Education. Two teachers including the leader had specialised training on acquiring English as a second language and were each awarded the Diploma of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Three of the teachers were trained in Sāmoa, started their teaching career in Sāmoa, and were retrained in different teacher training institutions in Āotearoa New Zealand before practicing in Āotearoa New Zealand classrooms. Two including Mrs Sepuloni were trained in Āotearoa New Zealand.

The teachers participated in a Pacific Bilingual Cluster (AUSAD), a bilingual teacher's network (Ulimasao), ESOL Literacy Groups and the Numeracy Project. They are currently member of the Tamaki Makaurau Auckland Sāmoan Bilingual Education Cluster (ASBEC) and are working with other teachers on developing their Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM) programmes through the use of Lego and professional development in the Digital Curriculum. In 2020 the *Sāmoan Bilingual Unit* was in a project with other Sāmoan Bilingual Units on oracy and the role that oracy contributes to growing proficiency in Sāmoan.

4.2.3 Approach

The current Sāmoan-medium pathway is a maintenance strategy and is in line with the school's cultural responsiveness priority. By having this pathway at school, our students have the opportunity to maintain and strengthen their language, culture and heritage through their everyday learning experiences at school. The use of Sāmoan for learning follows as described in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Time percentage allocated to Samoan and English as mediums of instruction

Year Level	Sāmoan	English
Year 0-2	80-100%	0-20%
Year 3-6	50-80%	20-50%
Year 7-8	30-50%	50-70%

4.2.4 Curriculum Coverage and Planning

The topics are used as foci for learning and are agreed by the whole staff. Each syndicate as well as the Sāmoan Language Unit finds ways of integrating the topics selected, across the curriculum. There is flexibility for each unit to select the genre, comprehension strategies and other means of learning the topic. Resources to be used to support the topic are agreed to at syndicate levels. As indicated, the bulk of our planning is through syndicates. There is a cycle of topics, ensuring good coverage of the curriculum. Their mathematics plan follows a similar approach so that the mathematics strands are covered. The school follows the DMIC (Developing Mathematical Inquiry Communities) with the focus on collective and culturally located problem solving. The school plan together and the entire curriculum coverage including topics (Science, Social Science, The Arts, Physical Education and Health, Literacy, Numeracy) is decided. From there, each syndicate plans together, and so does the whole of the Sāmoan Bilingual Unit.

4.2.5 Current Roll and Projected Growth

Prior to 2018, the Sāmoan Bilingual Units catered for students from Year 1 to Year 6. After consultation the programme was extended to Year 7 in 2018 and to Year 8 in 2019 (moving from 4 to 5 classes). Student numbers fluctuate between 100 and 125. We need approximately 115 students by July each year to make 5 classrooms viable. We are planning and expect to be able to maintain 5 classes into the future and do not plan to add any additional classes.

In August 2019, Sāmoan students made up 30% of the total school roll (603), very similar to the percentage in 2003. The Sāmoan Language Unit currently has a roll of 122 students (88 of whom live in zone), all of whom identify as Sāmoan, although many also identify with other ethnicities and cultures.

4.2.6 Management Structure

The Management Structure is akin to that of a ‘mat’ with the horizontal syndicate structure, and the vertical whanau structure. The cross pollination of ideas using this structure appears to create a better professional environment across the school. This is helped by having all the classes in the Sāmoan Bilingual Unit in the building with classrooms beside each other. This allows for ongoing collaboration, sharing of ideas and ease of communication.

4.2.7 Annual Targets

The targets set are for the whole school and the Sāmoan Language Unit follows the same targets. The data from the current year are used to set targets for the following year. There are regular meetings on analysing data, and agreement on strategies to achieve desirable progress. The practice has been for each teacher to select six students to target. The teachers are expected to stick to the six targeted students. The practice of setting targets and associated goals, strategies to use and revisit after a set timeline for another critical analysis of student progress.

Schoolwide target students are identified from the data at the end of the previous year. The Sāmoan Bilingual team, like all other teams, meet early in the year to map out a plan and set targets to ensure that all of their target students progress towards meeting their projected levels by the end of the year.

Target Student Review Meetings are held every three weeks. Teachers are expected to reflect and select six students to particularly target in Reading, Writing and Maths. Teachers are to report back on the intervention implemented and the achievement and progress of these target students. The team of teachers collectively analyse the data and against the strategies used and agree on the next step or steps. This is a cyclic process, and the three weeks cycle runs throughout the year.

4.3 School 3

The school established the Sāmoan Bilingual Unit in 1994 and celebrated its twenty first anniversary in 2015. It started off with three mixed year level classes until 1996 when another two classes were added that range from Year 0 - Year 8. The Sāmoan Bilingual Unit retains its original vision and aspiration of Samoan children retaining Samoan while acquiring English and other languages. Every attempt has been made to make sure, this is a reality for Samoan students in the bilingual unit at the school.

The support from parents in privileging Sāmoan in their children for learning was the main catalyst for its establishment. That strong support remains up to 2021. There are five classes in the unit each with a teacher fluent in Sāmoan as all had taught previously in Sāmoa. All the teachers are working with facilitators from the Developing Mathematics in the Community (DMIC) and another for Structured Literacy in English. School 3 was part of my original study, Esera (2001).

4.3.1 Sāmoan Bilingual Unit

The unit has done well for its students and they perform well in Samoan language. In the opening of Samoan Language Week 2017, their students played a major role in the ‘ava ceremony, and from 2019 to 2021 the Year 7 and 8 students from this unit had performed well in the Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland inter-school Sāmoan speech contests. In the 2021 speech contest, the Year 7 contestant from this school came third out of nine speakers and their Year 8 contestant came second out of 14 speakers. The confidence students exhibit suggest the confidence they have in being Sāmoan. Speaking Sāmoan publicly requires much thinking and preparation as the language used is formal with requirements for precision. Formal Sāmoan includes the selection and use of verbs, nouns, pronouns, adverbs, the structure of sentences and the whole speech, customized to suit the audience and the occasion. The experience can be daunting for anyone including adults. These contests have judges with authority on Sāmoan language and all are carefully selected.

4.3.2 Management Structure

The unit operates as a unit, and they plan independently of the mainstream. The school has five syndicates. The English medium has four syndicates in year levels; Year 1 and 2, Year 3 and 4, Year 5 and 6 and Years 7 and 8. The Sāmoan Bilingual is a Multilevel Year 1 -8 vertical syndicate with five classes, Years 0 to 2, Years 2 to 3, Year 4 and 5, Year 6 and 7, and Year 7 and 8. There were 108 in the unit at the time of this study and the classes are spread out across the school. Sāmoan students in the whole school make up 37% of the June 2021 school roll.

4.3.3 Curriculum Coverage

The curriculum is designed under the overarching inquiry ‘Turangawaewae;’ a place to stand by the whole school at the end of the current year for the year that follows. The annual curriculum plan is decided by the whole school based on the data analysis from the previous year. Each team follows the school annual plan, when planning the learning for the students in the team. Each team contextualises its own, reading plans, mathematics plans and genres for writing to support the learning of the topic selected. Team Leaders collaborated to ensure there is alignment across the school. Teaching and learning inquiry are always the drive for planning in teams as all the other curriculum areas have to align and integrate with the student inquiry.

4.3.4 Curriculum Planning

Each Team Leader checks the planning of teachers in her or his team. Feedback is provided to teachers and likewise, conversations are held with teachers to clarify their planning. Teachers in the Sāmoan

Bilingual Unit use the same planning template, and this ensures that teachers follow the agreed process. The template follows the requirements expected of all teachers across the school. The Bilingual Unit team deliberately incorporates aspects of Sāmoan culture and associated Sāmoan keywords, phrases and language when they contextualise learning across all curriculum areas for students.

4.3.5 Approach

The approach follows an incremental immersion approach and is apportioned as in the table below. Dual medium starts from Year 3 onwards with a 50% split between Sāmoan and English from Year 5 to Year 8. Dual medium is a big part of the delivery of learning in the unit.

Table 3: Time percentage allocated to Samoan and English as mediums of instruction

Year Levels	Sāmoan	English
Years 0-2	100%	0%
Years 3-4	60%	40%
Years 5-8	50%	50%

The school has worked collaboratively with a literacy Community of Learning leader in establishing a structured approach to teaching of and acquiring proficiency in English. The Sāmoan Bilingual Unit has been part of the development of the ‘Measina Model’ that maximises competence in oracy to enhance and improve writing in Sāmoan.

4.3.6 Monitoring Student Achievement

Students are assessed in Term 1 and Term 3 starting from Week 3. Formative assessment is ongoing and is evaluated regularly. The target area is agreed with the teachers. This involves checking teacher planning, action plans and support is provided for teachers who need it. Teachers are expected to reflect on their students’ achievements, student engagement and learning strategies used whereas teachers reflect on their own practice as part of their Inquiry. Feedback to teachers follows a template and this is provided on-line to teachers. Target meetings follow the staff schedule, and the Sāmoan Bilingual Unit teachers meet fortnightly. Teachers have turns to chair the team meeting following an agreed protocol, and so far, it has worked well. Student achievement data is the basis of the target setting and meetings. Targeted students are identified out of the data and targeting students to support their learning is on-going.

5.0 Study Methodology

This study involved visits to the three schools mentioned. The lead teachers selected graduates (Year 8 students) for the study. Only students who started at the bilingual unit and were in their last year of primary education while still in the unit were selected. The students selected were assessed in reading, writing and speaking Sāmoan against the benchmarks set by the Sāmoan Language curriculum in Āotearoa New Zealand; the Ta‘iala. The Ta‘iala, has been available to Āotearoa New Zealand schools since 1997 to provide guidelines for the teaching of and the use of Sāmoan. It was written as a second language document, so therefore Sāmoan students from Sāmoan speaking homes should achieve above the age-related objectives in this document. Achievement is aligned against the pedagogies used in each school to gauge the approaches that are considered facilitative in growing age-related proficiency in Sāmoan. There is also a wider search in the literature from Āotearoa New Zealand and abroad on language learning approaches considered facilitative in maintaining heritage language competence.

The absence of established standardised assessment tools to assess speaking, reading and writing in Sāmoan, is mitigated by the fact that the whole research team are native speakers of Sāmoan and have been in leadership positions of the three schools in the study, for some years. One research assistant was tasked to assess each student individually on their reading, writing and speaking in Sāmoan. This ensured that the assessments were administered consistently for all students. The rubric for assessment was crafted out of the achievement objectives of the Ta‘iala. There was collaboration and agreement on the benchmarks selected for each language function.

5.1 Assessing Speaking

There was agreement on the way the conversations were to be conducted when assessing speaking. The use of the talanoa method (Halapua, 2004; Vaioleti, 2006) as cited in other Polynesian research literature, was used to ensure the students were comfortable and were free to speak. The use of oral language allowed the assessor to gain understanding of each student’s ability to attend to Sāmoan cultural formalities when conversing with an adult. This involved correct selection of words and sentence structure suitable to the occasion. There were affirmations, prompts and probing from the assessor to ensure that the conversations were dialogic and not a citation or one dimensional. This would indicate the control each student had in the use of Sāmoan to convey information.

The collection of the data for this study was done straight after the celebration of Sāmoan Language Week 2021, based on the belief that the children had much to talk about. There were ongoing prompts to ensure that the children described events, moods, colours, people and atmosphere well. The assessment focussed on correct use of structure, verbs, adverbs, nouns, pronouns, prepositions and different forms of comparative languages. Correct pronunciation was listened for, as many Sāmoan words that have the same letters have different pronunciation depending on the context and these are considered different words.

5.2 Assessing Writing

There was agreement on the students being asked to write on what was talked about. There was the expectation that students would write in the ‘past tense’ as events that had to be written about had already occurred. Using correct singular, dual and plural structures, punctuation, and different sentence starters were expected. Writing correct sentences leading to paragraphs was to be criteria expected. As in speaking the assessment criteria for writing were from Level 4 (‘Competent’) of the Ta‘iala. Uncertainties surrounding the reliability and validity of the Anofale tool had already been established. This uncertainty was the reason this tool was not used for this study. The use of personnel with authority on Sāmoan language, expertise in language acquisition and ground-up experience in Sāmoan bilingual learning environment was considered more appropriate. Collectively their parts in the study mitigated the impact of having no standardised assessment tool used for assessing proficiency in writing in Sāmoan.

5.3 Assessing Reading

The same agreed text was used for assessing reading across the three bilingual units. The reading assessment was conducted using the running record approach with comprehension checks at the end. There were conversations and peer reviews of the data and aligning the data to achievement objectives of the Ta‘iala. Pronunciation was also important as it indicates comprehension of text. A student has to achieve all the criteria selected to be judged to be at that level of the Ta‘iala. The commentary on why a participating student was allocated to a curriculum level is mentioned.

5.4 Ongoing Collaboration

There was ongoing collaboration with research assistants on the history of their respective unit, their approach, practice guidelines, setting of targets, curriculum planning and design. Each unit and its pedagogical approaches were discussed. Research assistants and school principals at each school edited and made sure that what is stated about each school and the Sāmoan Bilingual Unit is accurate. There is a brief description of each Bilingual Unit in this study.

6.0 Study Constraints

6.1 Personal Positions

The most challenging are the many positions that each of the research team brought to this study. We have good understanding of school cultures in Āotearoa New Zealand through years of being in schools, and the value good leadership contributes to students' achievements, family and community successes. We have observed the ill effects of poor leadership on student learning, especially for Pacific and Māori students. We have been part of many teachers' and principals' networks and appreciate the success good schools and teachers make for language minority students. Likewise, we understand the harm many teachers and schools have done to Pacific and Māori students, and their families.

We also have good a understanding of the Ministry of Education and the ambiguities, ill directed initiatives and associated ailments of political agendas, it had been asked to manage. There has been unwillingness of successive governments to invest in educating all, in Āotearoa New Zealanders, and a teaching profession that appears oblivious to the plight of Pacific students in school. The frustration of being part of a system that has underserved Pacific families and seeing them being subjected to inequities that they are ill equipped to mitigate, has been disappointing. We each have observed the slow denigration of Pacific people through high rates of educational under-achievements, displacement, low income and poor political participation. Covid19 had put the spotlight on the impoverished position many in Pacific communities have to live with.

We each had personal positions that we brought to the study. Managing these personal positions was addressed through collaboration, following Sāmoan 'talanoa' protocols, ongoing peer and expert reviews before the final report was finalised. Three expert reviewers with years of leadership in Āotearoa New Zealand education, are revered authorities on leading learning and bilingual education, were engaged.

6.2 Lack of Credible Measures

There is a lack of credible assessment tools to measure proficiency in Sāmoan for students who have come through immersion learning environments compared to those in mainstream. The team decided in favour of establishing a rubric for each of the language functions assessed. Even though I consider myself an authority on Sāmoan, I deliberately collaborated with other research assistants throughout this study. All of them are native speakers of Sāmoan, are in leadership positions in their respective schools, and are considered proficient productive bilingual in both Sāmoan and English. Each of these leaders assisted in gathering, collating and collaborating on the data. There were other Sāmoan school leaders to assist in collating, analysing and presenting the data. The draft report was subjected to a peer review before the final copy was submitted. Those used were considered ‘experts’ for the tasks they were asked to do.

6.3 Absence of Preservice Training

The teachers in these bilingual units are teaching there because they are proficient in Sāmoan, many of them are native speakers of Sāmoan. All are bilingual in Sāmoan and English and offered to teach in these units with the knowledge and beliefs that they can make a difference for Sāmoan students. All did not get any specialised training in using two languages for learning and using heritage language to accelerate the acquisition of English and maintenance of Sāmoan.

6.4 Context

To conduct this study in isolation of socio-economic related factors, political landscape, wider Āotearoa New Zealand schooling system and community support is problematic. To maintain Sāmoan in this environment has its obstacles. Schools also do have varied definitions of students’ success and attributes they aspire to, for their graduates. The achievement of proficient productive bilingualism cannot be measured in isolation of socio-economic, family based, student based, school based and environmental factors that impact on overall students’ learning successes.

There have not been many studies, if any at all, of proficient productive bilingualism involving Sāmoan and English in Āotearoa New Zealand. The status of the two languages is vastly different and Sāmoan does not enjoy any official status, other than it is a language brought into Āotearoa New Zealand by migrants from this island nation. English on the other hand is the elite language and attempts over the years to have it as the only language of Āotearoa New Zealand has given it the dominant status, support, and resources. The many studies on proficient productive bilingualism involve elite language

binaries like English-Spanish in the United States of America and French-English in Canada, Italian-English in the United States, and Dutch-Turkish in the Netherlands. English, Spanish and French are international elite languages while Italian and Turkish are significant international languages. All these languages have value and capability that are different from the perceived status of Sāmoan. The motivation to learn Spanish, French and English is understandable. The motivation among many young Turks and Italians of maintaining their heritage language, is most likely higher than young Sāmoans in New Zealand and abroad, maintaining theirs. There is also the English obsession many Sāmoans have that their children's best way to a better future is through English only.

It is a known fact, identified by many commentators, of the aim of education in Sāmoa to fast track the acquisition of English by discouraging the use of Sāmoan on school sites in Sāmoa. Three of us have had many detentions for speaking Sāmoan on Sāmoan College school grounds. Sāmoan College compound was much cleaner for having many like us who were often heard, uttered Sāmoan while at school. Detention often involved weeding, planting or *pruning* the grass with a machete. The mindset of exiting Sāmoan is still common among many Sāmoans, and many do not see learning in Sāmoan or of Sāmoan in school as an option. The maintenance of Sāmoan in their view, is the responsibility of the family not the school.

Sāmoans who were encouraged to migrate to New Zealand from late 1950s to early 1960s, did so with little formal education. Many had to 'catch English on the hoof' when they arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand as some English was needed for their employment. A high percentage of these early migrants worked on assembly lines at Ford and Todd Motor industries, Fisher and Paykel, manual work on waterfronts, plant pine forests, or on killing chains in many slaughterhouses across the country, to name a few. Almost all were repetitive manual employment that did not require much inquiry or interaction. The English needed to survive these types of employment largely revolved around understanding orders and commands, following, obeying and getting paid. These Sāmoans migrants survived, they acquired conversational English accumulatively, built their lives in New Zealand and saw little value in retaining Sāmoan. In many of these families, Sāmoan is spoken mainly by the elders.

Sāmoan and English differ markedly in their phonemes, sentence structure, semantics, syntax, verb forms to name a few. These differences need to be well managed to achieve proficient productive bilingualism. The literature on proficient productive bilingualism has been dominated by Spanish-English, French-English, German-English and other elite international languages. Many of these have

common links with their Greek, Romanic and Teutonic origins. Sāmoan is a Polynesian language with features and vocabulary that are vastly different from English.

6.5 Professional Development

There has been minimal professional development support for teachers in bilingual education to allow them to acquire pedagogies on immersion, dual medium, translanguaging, and ways of managing learning in two languages. This is essential for teachers to build on the language strengths that students bring to maintain Sāmoan, and to use their language repertoire in Sāmoan to acquire English. Teacher knowledge of the strengths and benefits of proficient productive bilingualism, and how to best achieve this, is poor.

6.6 Learning Resources

Learning and teaching resources in these units for maintaining and/or revitalising Sāmoan are grossly inadequate. Those available are inadequate to meet the language diversity there is among students. Many of the resources used for learning in Sāmoan are developed on school sites. The Covid19 pandemic highlighted the scarcity of resources in these bilingual units, and the lack of support from the Ministry of Education.

6.7 Cohorts

The low number of cohorts is factored into any conclusion out of the report. The low number is due to some parents relocating their children to English medium education after Year 6, often through the lack of understanding of the value of bilingual education. We did not gain parental permission for some students who could have been in the study. Some of them, as teachers commented, would have made a difference to the test scores gathered. The inclusion of only students who have been in Sāmoan bilingual learning for their entire primary education, made this partially a longitudinal study, as each participant is a case study on her or his own.

6.8 Comparability

To conduct an evaluative study within an education environment where market forces have been promoted for some years is considered a constraint. The impact of market forces minimised the needed collaboration between schools to work collaboratively to share practices, expertise and resources. Care is exercised through careful triangulation and cross referencing of students' achievement data, to make sure that it is not as great a limitation as it might have been.

7.0 Data Gathering, Presentation and Analysis

The data is presented in table format showing the stage of growth to proficient productive bilingualism for ease of understanding. The stages of Emerging, Developing, and Competent were from levels of the Ta'iala where those assessed to be at Level four to be 'competent' and those below to be either *emerging* if a level too far off 'competent' or '*developing*' if just below. Students are given placings on the continuum for speaking, reading and writing. There is a table for each language function assessed. All the participants' data is put together in one table, to maintain the anonymity of students and school. There are comments on why each student was given that placement.

The analysis of the data for each language function follows the table for that language function for ease of analysis and understanding. The analysis is from both a contextualised and that of a praxis position. The focus on specific events allowed the children to speak and write particularly about the selected event. This context provided the opportunity for all participants to be selective of language, structures, and other communicative language repertoires resources that they may use. When analysing the participants' comments orally and in writing, words selected and how they are used is specific to the theme and the cultural protocols to attend to.

To analyse the data from a native speaker of Sāmoan perspective, as well as that of a language teacher, helped align the data with school systems, class pedagogies, language acquisition processes and other related factors. To ascertain language control from that of a native speaker perspective with understanding of translanguaging, translation, dual languages practices that students may engage in, allowed the team to collectively reflect on school systems, pedagogies, practices, and a range of possibilities that may or may not have influenced the children's growth to be proficient productive bilinguals. The thorough analysis was collectively done before the student achievement data was put together into one table per language function.

This study assumes a position that all the children in the bilingual units will, if given certain opportunities at school and in the community, are on a growth pathway to be fully proficient productive bilinguals. Each student in this study is a case study on her/his own after being in these bilingual learning environments for their entire primary education. Hence the distribution of the data, to reflect

their position for their age in the proficient productive bilingual continuum. Some are *emerging*, *developing*, or *competent*. There are some students assessed to be at different stages of this continuum in the three language functions assessed.

7.1 Speaking

Table 4

Students	'Emerging' 	Developing 	Competent 
Student A			
Student E			
Student I			
Student O			
Student U			
Student F			
Student G			
Student L			
Student M			
Student N.			
Student P.			
Student S.			
Student T.			

Student A is communicating at 'Developing'. Understands the pronunciation of words and how to use them in sentences when speaking.

Student E is communicating at 'Competent'. He pronounced words clearly and spoke accurately and fluently.

Student I is communicating at 'Competent'. He pronounced words clearly and spoke accurately and fluently.

Student O is communicating at 'Developing'. Understands the pronunciation of words and how to use them in sentences when speaking.

Student U is communicating at 'Developing'. Speak slowly with occasional pauses and hesitations.

Student F is communicating at 'Competent'. There is evidence of verbs, adverbs, and descriptive words used correctly in speaking.

Student G is able to communicate at 'Competent'. She pronounced words clearly and spoke accurately and fluently.

Student L is able to communicate at 'Developing'. She speaks fluently, with occasional pauses and hesitation.

Student M is able to communicate at 'Developing'. She speaks clearly and slowly, and she is able to use pronouns.

Student N is communicating at 'Developing'. Speak slowly with occasional pauses and hesitations. Some evidence of adjectives used.

Student P is communicating at 'Emerging'. Have limited vocabulary to express ideas.

Student S is communicating at 'Developing'. Speaks slowly with occasional pauses and hesitations.

Student T is communicating at 'Emerging'. Understands and responds well to the questions when asked in English.

7.1.1 Analysis

Four of the students spoke clearly with accuracy and fluency and were assessed to be speaking competently for their age and curriculum level. There was a good selection of verbs, adverbs and describing words, used correctly and appropriately. There was accuracy in the pronunciation of words including Sāmoan words that are visually the same but pronounced differently and are considered different words. The dialogic nature of the conversation suggests that these four students were able to process inquiries or probing questions and instantly gave correct responses in Sāmoan. These students were asked to elaborate on several occasions and they responded well.

Seven of the students who were adjudged to be at ‘Developing’ spoke correctly with prolonged time lapses and pauses. They appear to require time to consciously think about their responses, and the interaction was not as fluid. They largely used most words correctly, but misuse possessive, subjective and objective pronouns and adjectives. Their command of sentence structure was weak.

Two of the students at ‘Emerging’ lacked command of structure and vocabulary. Their responses were largely in English. Interestingly, the focus of the conversation remained intact. They were able to process the inquiries in Sāmoan and responded in English instantly. It was questionable whether they engaged in some form of translation prior to their responses as the time lapse was very minimal. These students were able to navigate themselves in the conversation and respond accurately in English.

The distribution of the scores among the three bilingual programmes was interesting considering all the participants are from homes where Sāmoan is the language spoken. There was not time to inquire into their homes to see how much time they shared with their parents. Most of the parents with children in the bilingual units have varied employment and it is not uncommon that many work at different times.

7.2 Writing

Table 5

Students	Emerging 	Developing 	Competent 
Student A.			
Student E.			
Student I.			
Student O.			
Student U.			
Student F.			
Student G.			
Student L.			
Student M			
Student N.			
Student P.			
Student S.			
Student T.			

Student A is writing at ‘Competent’. Organises ideas in paragraphs. Used a variety of sentence starters. Understands the use of punctuation marks. Communicate ideas clearly and correctly use some connecting words.

Student E is writing at ‘Developing’. There is evidence of some use of connecting words and adjectives in sentences. Ideas are organised in paragraphs.

Student I is writing at ‘Competent’. Organises ideas in paragraphs. Uses a variety of sentence starters. Use punctuation marks correctly. Communicate ideas clearly and the correct use of some connecting words. Some descriptive words used.

Student O is writing at ‘Competent’. Organised ideas in paragraphs. Used a variety of sentence starters. Understands the use of punctuation marks. Communicate ideas clearly, and correctly use some connecting words.

Student U is writing at ‘Developing’. There is evidence of some use of connecting words and adjectives in sentences.

Student F is writing at 'Competent'. Organises ideas in paragraphs. Provides reasons why something has to be done. Correct used of adjectives

Student G is writing at 'Competent'. Knows how to choose and use verbs, adverbs, punctuations to improve the story. Organises and expresses ideas clearly.

Student L is writing at 'Developing'. She used a variety of sentence structures. Learning to organise ideas in the correct order.

Student M is writing at 'Developing'. She used a variety of sentence structures. Learning to organise ideas in the correct order.

Student N is writing at 'Developing'. Thoughts and ideas are organised in paragraphs. Starting to elaborate on one idea.

Student P is writing at 'Competent'. Communicate ideas clearly and the correct use of some connecting words. Some descriptive words used.

Student S is writing at 'Competent'. Organises ideas in paragraphs. Uses a variety of sentence starters.

Student T is writing at 'Developing'. Evidence of simple compound sentences used. Beginning to organise ideas in paragraphs.

7.2.1 Analysis

The writing samples from seven students were assessed to be meeting the assessment criteria selected for 'Competent'. The sentences were constructed well and there were more complex sentences and a variety of sentence starters being used. The ideas were connected well through the use of conjunctions and other connective techniques. Texts were constructed into paragraphs and ideas were communicated well. The use of correct descriptive words, adjectives with the appropriate text format help convey ideas well. Correct use of punctuation marks was a feature of the writing samples from students. Who were assessed to be writing at 'Competent'.

Six students were assessed to be writing at 'Developing'. Simple sentences were used predominantly, and a few sentence starters were used. Though one can gauge the meaning of the writing, the organisation of ideas into paragraphs was at an early stage. The text format from introduction to follow-up description and a conclusion was not obvious. Correct use of connectives and descriptive language was minimal.

The visible improvement in the participants' performance in *writing* compared to *speaking* may be attributed to the time students had to think, process and put their thoughts on to paper. We did not have the luxury of recording the conversations with the participants to allow us to find out other possible reasons behind the shift. The improvement in the *writing* of students in School 3 compared to their levels of achievements in *speaking* was most noticeable. The overall positive shift in writing from all participants from the three schools, is an area that requires further research.

7.3 Reading

Table 6

Students	Emerging 	'Developing' 	'Competent' 
Student A.			
Student E.			
Student I.			
Student O.			
Student U.			
Student F.			
Student G.			
Student L.			
Student M.			
Student N.			
Student P.			
Student S.			
Student T.			

Student A is reading at 'Developing'. Understands the main idea in the story but needs to elaborate more on it.

Student E is reading at 'Competent'. Very confident in oral reading. Good and clear retelling of the main ideas in sequence and able to elaborate on it.

Student I is reading at 'Competent'. Excellent summarising of the texts with main ideas from beginning, middle, and end. Makes deep understandings of text to text and text to self.

Student O is reading at 'Developing'. Very confident in reading skills and is showing good understanding of reading comprehension.

Student U is reading at 'Developing'. Speaks fluently and is able to comprehend some parts of a text very well.

Student F is reading at 'Competent'. Shows increased awareness of vocabulary and precise meaning. Makes logical predictions before and after reading. Makes clear connections of text to self.

Student G is reading at 'Competent'. Clear reading and pronunciation of words. Explains the text clearly in her own words.

Student L is reading at 'Developing'. Very confident in her reading skills and is showing good understanding of reading comprehension.

Student M is reading at 'Competent'. Clear reading and pronunciation of words. Explains the text clearly in her own words.

Student N is reading at 'Developing'. Fair reading and good understanding of text.

Student P is reading at 'Competent'. Good and clear retelling of the same ideas in sequence. Makes connections of text to self.

Student S is reading at 'Emerging'. Good oral reading skills. Responding to simple questions.

Student T is reading at 'Emerging'. Good oral reading skills but comprehend the text better if asked the questions in English.

7.3.1 Analysis

Six participants were assessed to be reading at 'Competent'. These participants were able to retell the story in their own words, in the right sequence in which events happened, and were able to elaborate on ideas in the text. They were able to correctly predict events and words, and were able to summarise what was explained. The understanding of words and their contexts in the text, and their correct pronunciation of words in the context in which they are used suggest their good command of Sāmoan in print. Five students were assessed to be at 'Developing' as their understanding of the text used was low. They struggled to elaborate ideas in the text into their own words, they understood some parts of the text in isolation, but struggled to comprehend the full meaning of the text. Their decoding was fair,

and they understood some of the less frequent words. Those performing at ‘Emerging’ had poor comprehension and responded better to questions in English. They exhibit low vocabulary and possibly lower than expected exposure to text in Sāmoan language.

8.0 Impressions

Student achievements in the language functions assessed are considered remarkable, despite poor resources and little support. The teachers in the three bilingual units had not had any preservice training in biliteracy and the professional development they had been given had been inadequate. Parents of students were poorly informed of the benefits of using their heritage language for learning, and there has been little support from government and the Ministry of Education. We were surprised at the confidence the students exhibit, and their willingness to have themselves tested. Some were clearly challenged but had the confidence to give it a go.

As native speakers of Sāmoan, we were disappointed that not all of the students after eight years of Sāmoan bilingual learning were at ‘Competent’ or above. We were also mindful of the scarcity of resources, lack of professional support for teachers and ill developed school systems and structures. Likewise, we were acutely aware of Samoan parents, who are products of a monolingual education system, and new migrants, who believe that English only, is the best way forward for their children. Most are ill informed of the value of proficient productive bilingualism and are not encouraging their children to speak Sāmoan at home.

8.1 Speaking

The overall performance in speaking is considered fair owing to the quick responses expected in any dialogue. The deliberate use of talanoa (Halapua, 2004; Vaioleti, 2006) as a data collection method minimised one-dimensional delivery as assessment and gathering of data were done after Sāmoan Language Week. Students often did studies around the theme and the annual speech contest in Sāmoan took place the week after. Students often learnt speeches on the theme, and could ‘parrot’ their speech, poem, story or presentation instead of listening to a question and responding. The use of the talanoa method (Halapua, 2004; Vaioleti, 2006) put the students at ease and they were willing to converse. As the topic was fresh in their minds, they had a lot to talk about, and even with students who responded in English, the conversations despite slight delay, had not lost focus and meaning. Some took a little longer to process the questions and probing helped elicit responses but the comments in both Sāmoan and English were appropriate. The children appear to be using a variety of language processes, translanguaging, and other communicative language repertoires to smoothly *morph* from Sāmoan to

English while maintaining the conversation. The thinking and mean making were possibly done in either Samoan or English independently or both simultaneously, as the conversations flowed.

8.2 Writing

The visible shift in the participants' performance in writing was positive and the time accorded to the students enabled them to produce good writing samples. The children had a lot of material to write about, with vocabulary and structures learnt and practised during Sāmoan language week. The context and the time were appropriate, and the participants were in a position to display some command when constructing written pieces in Sāmoan. The use of different sentence starters, connectives, descriptive languages and appropriate sentence structures, showed that the language and ideas were recently learnt. The significant improvement in the performance of one of the participants who was at the Developing stage for speaking to performing 'competently' in writing, was a surprise. This child who responded mainly in English during the conversation, when given time and space, was able to construct a piece of writing that was assessed to be 'competent' at where s/he should be in Samoan. There were some inquiries for assistance, but the piece of writing produced was better than expected.

8.3. Reading

The text selected was new to many participants and this would have had an impact on the achievement of some of them. The material in the text was considered relevant to city students, and for early teens and would have been helpful in comprehending. This was obviously not the case with some of the participants. Comprehension of Sāmoan text is problematic. Fluency when reading does not often mean full comprehension. Decoding Sāmoan language appears easy owing to the phonetic nature of Sāmoan language. Every letter when reading Sāmoan is voiced, and there are not any blends or silent letters. However, reading Sāmoan is problematic as each vowel had *'four'* distinct sounds with both the long and short vowels having normal and accented sounds. At the same time, there are only two diacritical marks used to write Sāmoan text, and this has been a historical problem. There have been and still are tensions regarding the use of these diacritical marks, glottal stop and macron. The Education Department of Sāmoa in the past made a ruling that these marks were not to be used when writing text in Sāmoan, and this has been the cause of many debates over the years. This position caused tension with many as the Sāmoan Bible, which is a widely read text in Sāmoa, does use diacritical marks. This position was changed in early 2000s when the diacritical marks were overused causing more confusion. Comprehending Samoan text is compounded by the precise nature of the language where one English verb, noun or pronoun has multiple equivalents in Samoan language.

Some common English pronouns can have as many as eight Samoan equivalents. There is a formal register of Samoan that many students have not mastered and is one of the barriers to full comprehension of Samoan text. The formal register means that verbs and nouns when used are dependent on the social status of the person you are conversing with. There is also a distinctive dual structure of Samoan and associated vocabulary for that, which can be challenging for students, especially those who do not speak the language at home.

8.3.1 Samoan Text

I have been privileged to be part of conversations over many years about the use and the non-use of diacritical marks, when to teach them and who to teach them to. There has been a strong lobby for the use of diacritical marks from diaspora Sāmoan communities in Āotearoa NZ, Australia and the United States to name a few, without agreement. Teachers teach them as the need arises, but there is no consistent classroom practice. There are words in Sāmoan with the same letters that have different pronunciations, depending on how that word is used in the sentence or paragraph. These words with the same letters are different words, enunciated differently conditional to its meaning and use. There are many Sāmoan words with the same letters that have multiple meanings determined by context. This is one of the biggest challenges when teaching reading comprehension of Sāmoan texts. The future of Samoan language is dependent on the accessibility of its print literature. There is the need to standardise the writing of Samoan as well as the way it is taught and learnt. This is another conversation all together and there is not the space to discuss this in this report.

9.0. Findings

The findings are part of the approaches that some or all the schools have been following, that were adjudged to be facilitative in the maintenance and or acquisition of age-related competence in Samoan. There were thorough conversations between the research team and much triangulation of student achievement, the pedagogy, learning systems and the literature, to justify the selection of each finding. The academic review process we went through with peer reviewers offered much support for identifying the components of each programme that were considered critical in maintaining and growing competence in Samoan.

9.1 Planning Together

The teachers planning together avoided unnecessary repetition, so that when they switch languages, there is no repetition of work covered. Expectations of the teachers are similar throughout when English is introduced and dual immersion becomes a feature of teaching and learning in the bilingual units, with the only difference being the language used. The emphasis, especially for the younger age groups, is speaking for most of the time throughout the week in the selected language. They cover the same curriculum contents in one language and continue in a different language when they change classrooms in School 1. For the other schools in the study, the teachers remain the same for both English and Sāmoan, and the change is when it is time to change. The teaching of the target language whether is English or Sāmoan, the emphasis may be different owing to the uniqueness of the language used and the need to meet the diversity there is between students in that language. Planning with teachers across the school avoided the Bilingual Units operating in isolation. Following a school wide system ensures that what is learnt in the Bilingual Units is similar with what is expected across the school. This provided the opportunity for teachers in the Bilingual Units and those in other parts of the school to have teaching and learning conversations.

9.2 Early Immersion

This is the feature of the three bilingual units in the study and it appears to have had a huge impact on maintaining Sāmoan as well as learning. There are differences in levels of proficiency in Sāmoan, but the majority of students in the study have maintained Sāmoan to a level where they can interact with

others and use Sāmoan for learning. Early immersion also appears most facilitative in gaining age related proficiency for those who spoke and wrote to levels where they are considered to be 'competent'. Even though students were at different levels of proficiency, every participant in the study is on a pathway to proficient productive bilingualism, and early immersion in Sāmoan language appears facilitative in gaining control of its use when speaking as well as writing.

Early immersion allows both the children and teachers to access the children's prior knowledge better. Accessing prior knowledge is essential for teachers to manage learning effectively. Learning can be problematic if it is not connected to prior knowledge and retaining such knowledge is not guaranteed. Students in the study were very animated with the relevancy of the topic and had a lot to talk and write about. The connection to prior knowledge allowed them to recall events well. Those who chose to speak in English for some of the conversation did so with accuracy.

The continuation of learning in Sāmoan greatly supports transitioning from Sāmoan speaking homes, and for many who attended Ā'oga Amata to formal schooling. The immersion approach allowed teachers to know aspects of Sāmoan and English to scaffold. As mentioned in so many studies overseas and a few in Āotearoa New Zealand, it allowed children to acquire English through the use of their heritage language, and it was seen to be the same in this study.

9.3 Learning Systems

Each of the three bilingual units are part of the whole school curriculum plan, and their planning is based on the school wide curriculum. They follow the same topics, writing genre, reading comprehension strategy and numeracy programme, with the only difference being the delivery in both Sāmoan and English. All the three bilingual units assess students, collate and analyse student achievement data, report to parents, the Board of Trustees, and to the community at the same time as the rest of the school.

All of the units follow the same practices of having target meetings as the rest of the school, with School 2 having it on a shorter cycle, with specific children targeted. These target meetings aligned student achievement data against strategies used, resources and support. Targets, strategies, resources and support are realigned and students in need of extra support are targeted. These meetings appear very facilitative in monitoring students' achievements in both English and Sāmoan, and changes made in classroom programmes, pedagogies and resources needed to lift student achievement.

9.4 Class Pedagogies

There are many similarities in teacher practices largely through professional development over the years. The impact of assessment for learning and literature around visible learning are two of the main reasons behind the similarity. School 1 follows the same pedagogical approach that is expected of every classroom at the school with the opportunity for teachers to build on that. The predominant use of dual medium approaches provided the children with the opportunity to maximise their language repertoire and translanguageing by default.

The variability in student achievement data suggest that there is a disconnect between what the school espoused to deliver, the approach they are using, and what happens in bilingual classes to achieve their goals. Leaders of the unit confirm the inconsistency of practices between classrooms for a variety of reasons. Two of the reasons for the inconsistency and non-delivery are lack of critical resources and teacher capability. Deeper understanding on dual medium, teaching for transfer, interdependence of languages, and the whole area of biliteracy would have made a big difference. Teachers' knowledge of effective scaffolding to include all of the linguistic and literacy modes of input (listening, reading and viewing) and output (speaking, writing and presenting) is also of benefit.

9.5 Simultaneous Use

The constant use of the dual medium, immersion approaches and translanguageing have allowed the students in the units to develop meta-language competence and cognitive flexibility that comes with being bilingual. The opportunity to practise the same learning processes, and the same language strategies often, have produced better results for students, in growing proficiency in Sāmoan. Simultaneous use of Sāmoan and English, deepens the children's understanding of language processes. The children's ability to predict, summarise and infer was stronger among students, consolidated through repetition in both Sāmoan and English.

The children appear to switch freely between Sāmoan and English when processing information. Their immediate and yet accurate responses in both Sāmoan and English appear to suggest that they are processing information simultaneously with success. It was not a surprise that they were able to switch to English with little time and effort. It was a matter for consideration that some decided to speak English instead of Sāmoan and appear to speak better in English than Sāmoan.

The introduction of English at Year 2 allowed students more competent in English to use English to support further learning of new knowledge that they were less able to access in Samoan. The early use of English also allowed students more competent in Samoan to paint their knowledge and express this in English. Teachers need to be cautious to ensure that students become proficient productive bilinguals instead of being competent in English at the expense of Samoan.

9.6 Ongoing Collaboration

The performance of the bilingual units that are in the same part of the school appear to be superior compared to the one where the classrooms are dispersed across the school. Having the classroom close to each other assisted in the sharing of resources, ongoing reflection, networking and sharing of ideas. It made it easier for the leader to be visible and staff to have access to each other. Parents have also found it easier to communicate with staff in the bilingual units when they are together in one part of the school. The units where the classrooms are close to each other, have better means of storing and accessing learning resources.

There also appear to have been benefits from the three bilingual units collaborating and sharing ideas. They were given opportunities as part of the same Community of Learning, to meet once a term. These were often welcome opportunities to share and the more they met, the better the quality of the sharing became, as they came to know each other better.

9.7 School Management Structure

Team Leaders of the bilingual units in the study are part of the management structure of the school. The bilingual units are therefore represented at the table when decisions are made. They were aware of what was happening across the school and did not feel that they are separate from the rest of the school. Most importantly, they firmly believe they are supported. The bilingual units had access to resources and are given financial support and responsibilities to purchase resources specific to the bilingual units. Two schools confirmed that they have budgets designated specifically for the bilingual units that are used to purchase resources and services needed. They feel supported in achieving the goals and targets set annually for students in the bilingual units. All the bilingual units claim to have support of the senior management especially the principal. The results appear to reflect the strength of the support from principals, emphasising the importance of the ways in which school leaders enable quality teaching and learning to happen in their schools.

9.8 Family Practices

As mentioned elsewhere in this report, all the participants were from homes where Sāmoan is spoken. Students from homes where Sāmoan is spoken by all including the children, did well in the language functions assessed in this study. There are clearly differences in family practices regarding the use of Sāmoan. It appears that in some families, Sāmoan is spoken by the parents and grandparents but is not an expectation of the children. These children can understand Sāmoan when they are spoken to, but have difficulties in responding. Speaking any language, needs on-going use and practice for mastery. If Sāmoan children are not speaking Sāmoan at home, it is highly likely that Sāmoan will not be the language of those homes in the future.

Better information on the value of proficient productive bilingualism needs to be shared with parents. Parents need to be fully convinced of the advantages and benefits of proficient productive bilingualism for ongoing learning and participation. Knowledge of proficient productive bilingualism needs to be shared with parents who speak their heritage language. They need to alter their language practices at home, to greatly benefit their children and future generations, at no cost at all. Time is a scarce resource for many Sāmoan families as many parents are on shift employment and often do not have a lot of family time together. Parents need to be very deliberate in encouraging their children to speak Sāmoan, and continuously support the acquisition of Sāmoan as they grow. The precision of Sāmoan language that must be used in different occasions and spoken to older people, needs monitoring and ongoing support.

9.9 Expanded Leadership

The three schools have management structures that allow for the voice of Sāmoan teachers, students and parents represented at decision making. All the three units are part of the school and their curriculum, delivery of learning and associated pedagogies reflect that is expected across the school. The curriculum leaders of the units are part of the curriculum leadership of the school. Advocacy for the learning success of students in the units are represented on the school governance body. Students in the three units are very visible in student leadership, in the three schools.

9.10 Teachers Proficient in Sāmoan

This study found in favour of having teachers who are proficient in Sāmoan. Having in-depth knowledge of Sāmoan language allows teachers to gauge strengths and weaknesses in Sāmoan. In the absence of resources and assessment tools in Sāmoan language, teachers in proficiency allows them to customise and collaborate on the most appropriate pedagogy of their language strength.

9.11 School and Community Support

The three bilingual units in this study all have a good level of support and commitment from school management, other staff and the community. All the three units deliver learning in two languages, assess, collect data and report on student achievement and progress in two languages. Resources to learn and assess Samoan are inadequate and these teachers do receive extra release time to prepare the resources needed and meet school learning requirements.

10.0 Recommendations

Recommendations are from this study alone and are primarily from the perspectives of classroom practising teachers and school leaders. Bilingual Education in New Zealand involving Sāmoan has been a ground-up endeavour, as many were established without proper support mechanism, resources, funding or staffing. Almost all of the Sāmoan bilingual units in Tamaki Makaurau Auckland and the one in Wellington in the mid-1990s, were established as a response from principals to the underachievement of Sāmoan students in New Zealand education. Some were disestablished as it was in the case at Richmond Road School in Central Tamaki Makaurau Auckland and Strathmore Park in Miramar Wellington, with the change of personnel at these schools. The success of Sāmoan language in many secondary schools is also dependent on school governance and leadership. The following recommendations are made with careful consideration of what will sustain the development of proficient productive bilingual education in New Zealand, with the aim of achieving twin proficiency in the heritage language and English.

10.1 Teacher Education

This study found that the variability in teacher practices is due to their lack of understanding on how to best manage the learning of students at different levels of proficiency in both the heritage language and the target language. Many were unable to make the best use of the audible and visible evidence of proficiency or lack there-of, that students exhibit daily in Sāmoan and English. The strengths and weaknesses in both languages are heard and seen daily in immersion learning environments. Competent teachers, knowledgeable in making students proficient productive bilinguals is critical.

10.1.1 Preservice Training

To have Bilingual Education as part of pre-service training, will equip teachers with basic understanding of how to manage learning in two languages. This study found that there were opportunities that teachers could have used to build on language strengths that children bring to school. Deeper teacher knowledge of translanguaging, manipulating the interdependence of Sāmoan and English and the use of a dual medium pathway, and others, would have a profound impact on student learning. The knowledge of how to use languages simultaneously to learn, and to learn a second

language through knowledge of the first, would have been most useful. Using Sāmoan to strengthen the students' command of English is an added bonus that has been missing in schools and classrooms.

It was obvious with conversations that the misuse of common pronouns, connectives and structure, suggest that training on how to best address these needs would have helped the students' command of spoken Sāmoan. There was little suggestion on proper analysis of miscues when reading Sāmoan text. There are complications with Sāmoan phonemes, structures and formalities to attend to, that teachers need to look out for and deliberately plan to improve them. Preservice training would have helped immensely.

10.1.2 Professional Development

Professional development for teachers in bilingual units in New Zealand education is a must. As this option becomes the best option for Pacific students, ongoing professional development is needed. The use of Sāmoan for learning purposes and for learning English changes as circumstances or national priorities change. Covid19 and the ongoing lockdown is an example where approaches need to be customised quickly to meet students' learning needs. Like any approach to learning, teachers need to be able to improvise and use the resources available to continue delivering learning. Current professional development provision for Bilingual Education is not available. There has not been the needed political commitment to make it happen. Schools have had to provide their own and there has not been the desire to grow expertise in this area.

10.2 Resource Development

The under-resourcing of Sāmoan Bilingual Education cannot be overstated. As Sāmoan students enrolled in Sāmoan bilingual schools come with varied levels of proficiency of Sāmoan, a wide range of learning and teaching resources are needed. Schools need to have access to a pool of resources needed for them to achieve fully productive bilingualism for their students. Resources needed to grow biliteracy in Sāmoan and English are scarce, as the drive has been on deliberate attempts to develop resources for English only. There is a need to consider structured biliteracy teaching and learning materials. Delivering learning online is an exciting opportunity to look at developing resources for structured biliteracy in both Sāmoan and English.

10.2.1 Staffing

Schools with bilingual units have limited capability to staff Bilingual Education units in Pacific languages effectively. Staffing of New Zealand schools is calculated and provided centrally, and there

are no provisions for staffing bilingual education in Pacific languages. Schools need to be very strategic and deliberate when they look at consistently staffing their bilingual units. This is compounded by the absence of any government or Ministry of Education plan to increase the pool of teachers who can teach in bilingual learning environments.

English is still the measuring stick for teachers to teach in Aotearoa New Zealand. Qualified teachers who can teach in Sāmoan bilingual units, had to prove their command of English by scoring well in the international assessment of English examination. Many teachers who can teach effectively in the bilingual units are denied the opportunity if they cannot achieve the pass mark from this assessment. The injustice is that many of these teachers, with good classroom practices and experiences, do not use English in the approach some schools use.

10.2.2 Learning and Teaching Resources

The demand for appropriate learning and teaching resources has increased as the diversity of Sāmoan students in these units increases. There are third generation Sāmoans with limited Sāmoan, and those from families who are new migrants with age related competence in the language. Sāmoan language has its own unique features that require a range of resources for the teaching and learning of it. The resources currently available on the Ministry of Education website, for learning in and of Sāmoan need substantial review. Resources to teach, learn and assess Sāmoan on-line, need to be established. There are not the resources that can be used for assessing speaking, writing, listening and reading Sāmoan. These need to be established associated with professional development on how to administer, analyse and make sense of the results to improve teaching and learning. There is the need to develop resources aimed at growing Sāmoan as an Aotearoa New Zealand language, with vocabulary customised for its country of residence. There is the opportunity to cross pollinate commonalities with other Polynesian languages and develop its own vocabulary, written and spoken text corpus specific to Aotearoa New Zealand.

10.2.3 Funding

Schools have to accommodate as best they can, the needs of their bilingual units with the funds that are provided. New Zealand schools are funded centrally, and currently have no special provisions for funding bilingual units involving Pacific languages. Funding provisions to support bilingual units need to be considered as their access to resources is limited. Many had to have projects that incorporate Pacific communities to make learning relevant and authentic. Funding these projects is problematic and needs careful and deliberate planning. Many schools use lack of funding as a reason not to fund

programmes that involve minority languages and cultures such as Sāmoan. The funding formula needs to be considered in programmes that schools deliver. Funding that leads to graduates of these units becoming balanced bilinguals is highly recommended. Funding for secondary schools to offer Pacific languages as a subject discipline needs to be urgently reviewed.

10.2.4 Public Language Domains

Provision for establishing public domains for Pacific languages needs to be established with clear guidelines for the use of public money. Provisions to grow current public outlets for Pacific community languages like radio, newspaper, television and other on-line options, need to be available. Opportunities of having programmes on national television in Pacific languages need to be a reality, with associated funding and support. Likewise, the opportunity to have information on current matters of public interest available in Pacific languages on-line, on air and in hard copies. The value of hearing one's language publicly affirms the value of that language and does a lot for speakers of that language. There is a need for Sāmoans to hear their language spoken publicly on radio, television, and in public places. This will change public and personal perception regarding the status of the Samoan language.

10.3 Community Engagement

Community involvement and engagement is essential in students' learning success. This is very much the case of communities like Sāmoan, and especially so with the use of Sāmoan for teaching and learning of Sāmoan. There is the need for the wider Aotearoa New Zealand society to be involved in community conversations on bilingual education. The anxiety and objection we have observed from English speaking citizens in the last two decades, in the attempt to make reo Māori part of the Aotearoa New Zealand vernacular, suggest the need for a national conversation. Language has been a vote grabber by political parties, and often surfaced at critical phases of the election cycle. Having Aotearoa New Zealand as a bilingual or multilingual nation is the 'divide and rule' position that a few political leaders, past and present, often elect to assume close to elections.

10.3.1 National Policy

The absence of a national language policy for Aotearoa New Zealand is indicative of the fact that no political party is willing to risk having the needed conversation to establish one. The courage needed to establish a national policy that acknowledges and supports other languages, is too big an ask of any political party, in a country where English has ruled the waves unquestionably, for over a hundred years. To replicate the political courage exercised by the former president of the United States of America, may be a step too far for many political leaders in Aotearoa New Zealand. President Obama

in his pre-election speech (Obama, 2008), acknowledged the value of bilingualism in the United States of America, learning other languages and especially holding on to your heritage language. It is time to have this conversation that can be facilitated by the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Pacific People, Te Puni Kokiri or Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori.

The Ministry of Pacific People can have conversations with Pacific communities about aspects of each Pacific language and gain community agreement on the use and writing of each language. As mentioned earlier, the use of diacritical marks when writing Sāmoan has been an area of public conversation. The Samoan Language Commission has made a ruling in this area, and its relevance to Āotearoa New Zealand may be an area for further conversations. The teaching and learning of Sāmoan in schools, need to meet the learning and language needs of Sāmoans, in Āotearoa New Zealand. The Ministry of Pacific People is the right body to initiate, facilitate and make a firm position on the writing of Sāmoan for Āotearoa New Zealand.

There is also the opportunity to develop vocabulary mentioned in 10.2.2. The possibility of establishing a Sāmoan dictionary that includes vocabulary specific for the Sāmoan language in Āotearoa New Zealand. Language development of this nature is critical, if the Ministry of Pacific People is to achieve its first goal of the Lalanga Fou (2018) on thriving *Pacific Languages, Cultures and Identities*.

10.3.2 School Policy

It is essential for each school to be explicit about its own bilingual and language policy. Parents do need to be part of the dialogue in the development of the school's language and bilingual policy. Clarity of the goals and means of achieving proficient productive bilingualism needs to be shared with parents, teachers and students. It is important for parents to know before enrolling their children in the units of the goals of school, the intent of the bilingual and the overall language policy of the school. Parents' role in achieving the school goals need to be understood, especially what is expected of them at home in the growth of their children, and changes they need to make in their language and learning practices, if needed. A clear policy is necessary for teachers to facilitate and manage learning accordingly, and to work collaboratively with parents. Students need to know of these expectations and to be committed to learning experiences and processes to allow them to reach the goals at the age expected.

11.0 Conclusion

The three bilingual units, each have components of their structure, practices and leadership responsibilities facilitative to the maintenance and acquisition of Sāmoan. The use of Sāmoan for learning in each of the units have produced a range of favourable academic and social successes. It also brought the Sāmoan community into the schools, and parents actively involved in supporting students' learning. Ongoing provisions and support for proficient productive bilingualism is needed for Sāmoan students to achieve their academic, social and economic potential. It will enrich the development and maintenance of Sāmoan as well as English. As Āotearoa New Zealand becomes more linguistically diverse, proficient productive bilingualism needs to be a priority goal for education. This approach can be extended to other ethnicities and will be of benefit to that ethnic group and the country as a whole. It will make Āotearoa New Zealand more equitable and inclusive. We believe so.

12.0 Upu Tomuli

O tagata e taumualua pe taumualasi a latou gagana, ma tutusa malosiaga i gagana, e āsa mamao ma maoa'e o latou tomāi ma agava'a. Sa fua i luma ma tua, a'e mauga ma ifo vanu, fetuuna'i tofā ma le ūta a le vasega a le 'au su'esu'e. Sa fesiligia puleā'oga ma faiā'oga, ma i latou e loloto le tofā i le sailiga o le atamai, faapea le i le a'oina o gagana e tele. Sa sopo vasa i atunu'u mamao, mo ni manatu o ē sa latou asaina autaluga, ma su'esu'ega faapenei i atunuu ese ma gagana 'ese'ese. Ua tasi ai le tofā ma le moe i le 'au su'esu'e. E tele ni itū e 'ausia ai e fanau o lo'o a'oa'oina i totonu o vasega, o loo fa'aaogā ai le gagana Sāmoa le taumua tutusa o le gagana Sāmoa ma le Igilisi. Ae o itū pito i sili ona tāua nei;

- i. O le tapenapena faatasi o faiā'oga, ina ia o gatasi polokalame i totonu o vasega e fa'aaogā ai le gagana Sāmoa mo le a'oa'oina o fanau, i le ā'oga atoa.
- ii. O le faaāogaina o le gagana Sāmoa mai le tausaga muamua mo le a'oa'oina o fanau.
- iii. O tapula'a e mulimulita'ia mo le a'oa'oina o fanau.
- iv. O metotia ma fa'atinoga o nafa a faiā'oga.
- v. O le fa'aaogāina o gagana e lua ina ia felagolagoma'i gagana e lua.
- vi. O le galulue fe'oe'oea'i o faiā'oga.
- vii. O le pule faamalumu ma le lagolago a le ā'oga atoa ma mātua.
- viii. Faaāoga le gagana Sāmoa i totonu o 'āiga.
- ix. O le soa fa'atasi o le pule e ā'oga, matua ma 'āiga.

E tele ni isi o fautuaga ma tima'iga ua faatagi atu ai i ā'oga ina ia mata'itu i ai. Ua faapea fo'i ona tatalo faatauānuu i le atunuu atoa, le mamalu o Sāmoa, le malo ma mātagaluega, i ni atina'e, fa'atinoga ma fesoasoani e moomia, ina ia manuia fanau, 'āiga ma le atunuu atoa.

Ua i'u le matou faasoa. O se upu sa pā'o papa, mālū ave i fale i o outou finagalo. Talosia sa maua se oso o lau malaga, faapea si ou 'āiga, poo si au vasega mai lenei sa'ili'iliga. Tatalo ia pei o le taape a le lauāmanu, e lele le manu ma si ana i'a. Ia agalelei atu le Atua ia te outou ma o outou soifua sā'ili. Alofagia fo'i e le Atua o matou tagata faatauva.

Soifua ma ia manuia.

References

- Alton-Lee, A.G., Nuthall, G.A. (1998). *Inclusive instructional design; theoretical principles emerging from the understanding teaching and learning project*. Report to the Ministry of Education. Understanding Teaching and Learning Project 3. Wellington: Āotearoa New Zealand.
- Baker, C. (1988). *Key Issues in bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (Third ed.): Multilingual Matters.
- Bialystok, E. (1987). *Metalinguistic dimensions of second language proficiency*. Paper presented at a symposium on Language Acquisition and Processing by Bilingual Children at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development.
- Bishop, R. (1999) *Investigating relevant pedagogies for Māori*. Paper presented to the Innovation for Effective Schooling Conference. Lakeside Convention Centre, Tamaki Makaurau Auckland 25 – 28 August.
- Burgess, F (1990) *Recent Development in Pacific Islands Language Nest*. A paper presented to the second national conference on community languages and English to speakers of other languages.
- Burgess, F (2003) *Expansion of meaning during book experiences in two Ā'oga Amata*. A paper presented at a Ministry of Education forum on second language acquisition. First published in 2004, Ministry of Education, Wellington, Āotearoa New Zealand.
- Coxon, E., Foliaki, L., and Mara, D. (1994) *Politics of learning and teaching in Āotearoa New Zealand*. Palmerston North, Dunmore Press.
- Cummins, J. (1981). 'The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority children.' In *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework*. Los Angeles: National Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Centre, California State University.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students; a framework for intervention. *Harvard Education Review* 56(1).
- Dickie, J. (1996). *Cultural influences on Sāmoan learners in Āotearoa New Zealand schools: A literature review for EDUC 533: Action Research for Educators*. (unpublished) Victoria University. Wellington, Āotearoa New Zealand.
- Donohoo, J. (2013). *Collaborative Inquiry for Educators. A Facilitator's Guide to School Improvement*, Corwin, Australia.
- Education Review Office (2006) School Education Review Reports.
- Education Review Office (2019) Current Provision of Bilingual Education

- Esera, I. F., (1996) “*Leading learning to promote Pacific Islands students’ achievements.*” Paper presented at the National Symposium on Pacific Islands Learning, 15-16 February.
- Esera, I. F. (1996) *Successful Sāmoan Students in Āotearoa New Zealand; Parents’ Stories*. EDUC 533: Action Research for Educators. (unpublished) Victoria University, Wellington, Āotearoa New Zealand.
- Esera, I. F., (2002). *Acquisition of English proficiency by students from Sāmoan speaking homes: An evaluative study*. A thesis for the fulfilment of a Master of Education. Victoria University, Wellington: Āotearoa New Zealand.
- Elley, W.B. (1992) *How in the World Do Students Read?* IEA study of reading literacy. The international Association for the evaluation of Educational Achievements. Cited by Alton-Lee, A and Praat, A. (1990). Explaining and addressing gender difference in Āotearoa New Zealand compulsory school sector: 152.
- Field, M. M (2004) *Comparing Young Children’s Reading Miscues in English and Sāmoan Text Reading*. A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education, University of Tamaki Makaurau Auckland.
- Fillmore, Lilly Wong, (1989) *Bridges or barriers? The role of the school in culturally diverse societies*. In Philips.; Lealand, G & MacDonald, G. (Eds.) *The impact of American ideas on Āotearoa New Zealand’s educational policy, practice and thinking*. Wellington: NZ-US Educational Foundation & Āotearoa New Zealand Council for Education Research.
- Hakuta, K., & Diaz, R. (1985). The relationship between degree of bilingualism and cognitive ability: A] critical discussion and some new longitudinal data. In K. E. Nelson (Ed.), *Children’s language* (Vol. 5, pp. 320–344). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harker, R. (1990) *Schooling and cultural reproduction*. In Codd, J. Harker, R., and Nash, R. (eds). *Political issues in Āotearoa New Zealand education*, 2 Ed. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Hattie, J (2003) *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence?* Paper presented to the Australian Council of Education Research annual conference on Building Teacher Quality.
- Helu-Thaman, K., (1999) *A matter of life and death: Schooling and culture in Oceania*. A keynote address at Innovations for Effective Schooling Conference. Lakeside Convention Centre, Tamaki Makaurau Auckland, 25 – 28 August.
- Hunkin, A. (1996) “*A possible missing factor? The role of Pacific Island Languages in the education of Pacific Islands children in Āotearoa New Zealand.*” Paper presented at the National Symposium on Pacific Islands Learning, 15-16 February.
- Lameta-Tufuga, E.U., (1994) *Using Sāmoan language for academic learning tasks*. A thesis for the fulfilment of a Master of Applied Linguistic. Victoria University. Wellington, Āotearoa New Zealand.

- Lemalu-Aukuso, S. (2002) *O le Taiala Sāmoan Bilingual Unit: A Case Study of the Dual Medium Programme in the Āotearoa New Zealand Context*. A dissertation in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the Master of Arts in Language Teaching. University of Tamaki Makaurau Auckland, Āotearoa New Zealand.
- Lloyd, M. (1989) *Bridging the cultural gap: A literature review on factors influencing Sāmoan students acculturation to Western education*. Many Voices 1995.
- May, S. (2019) *Research to understand the features of quality Pacific bilingual education: Review of best practices*. Faculty of Education and Social Work. University of Tamaki Makaurau Auckland.
- May, S., Hill, R., & Tiakiwai, S. (2004). *Bilingual/Immersion education: Indicators of good practice*: Final report to the Ministry of Education. Wellington, Āotearoa New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- May, S. (2005) Introduction: *Bilingual/immersion education in Āotearoa/Āotearoa New Zealand: setting the context*. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8(5), 365-376.
- May, S., Hill, R. & Tiakiwai, S. (2006). *Bilingual/Immersion education: Indicators of good practice*. Report to the Ministry of Education. Āotearoa New Zealand: the Ministry of Education
- May, S. (2008). *Bilingual/Immersion Education: What the Research Tells Us*. In K. Cummins, & Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd ed., Vol. Bilingual Education): Springer Science+Business Media LLC.
- May S., Hill R. (2008) *Māori-medium Education: Current Issues and Challenges*. In: Hornberger N.H. (eds) *Can Schools Save Indigenous Languages?* Palgrave Studies in Minority Languages and Communities. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- McCaffery, J. & Tuāfuti, P. (1998). *The development of Pacific Islands bilingual education in Āotearoa New Zealand*. Many Voices 13, 11-16 in R. Barnard & T. Glynn (Eds.), *Bilingual children's language and literacy development*. (pp. 80-107). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- McCaffery, J (2008) *Models and approaches to Bilingualism*. Unpublished doctoral work. Faculty of Education, University of Tamaki Makaurau Auckland.
- McCaffery J.& McFall-McCaffery J. T. (2010). "*O tatou O Aga'i i fea? /Oku Tau O Ki Fe?/Where are we heading? Pacific languages in Āotearoa New Zealand*". An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples (86-121).
- Ministry of Education (1995) *Pacific Islands People in Āotearoa New Zealand Education. Education Trends Report Volume 7 No. 3*. Wellington, Āotearoa New Zealand.
- Ministry of Education (1995) *Ko e Ako e Kakai Pasefika; A Plan for Developing Pacific Islands Education in Āotearoa New Zealand*.

- Ministry of Education (1996) *Samoan in the New Zealand Curriculum: Ta'iala mo le A'oa'oina o le Gagana Sāmoa i Niu Sila*. Wellington, New Zealand. Learning Media Limited.
- Ministry of Education (2005) *Pasifika Education Overview*. Wellington Āotearoa New Zealand
- Ministry of Education (2009) *Samoan in the New Zealand Curriculum: Ta'iala mo le A'oa'oina o le Gagana Sāmoa i Niu Sila*. Wellington, New Zealand. Learning Media Limited.
- Ministry of Education (2006) *Pasifika Education Plan 2006-2010*. Wellington Āotearoa New Zealand.
- Ministry of Pacific People (2018) *Lalanga Fou Languages and High Tech Fono Report*.
- Murray, S. (2007). *Achievement at Māori Medium and Bilingual Schools*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Obama, B. (2008 July 8). Barak Obama in Powder Spring, GA. Retrieved from <http://my.barakobama.com/powderspringsvid>
- PIRLS. (2016). *Student achievement*. Retrieved from: <http://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2016/international-results/pirls/student-achievement/pirls-achievement-results/>
- Rau, C. (2003) *A snapshot of the literacy achievements in 1995 and 2002-2003 as an indicator of Māori language acquisition for Year 2 students in 80-100% Māori immersion programmes*. A paper presented at a Ministry of Education forum on second language acquisition. First published in 2004, Ministry of Education, Wellington, Āotearoa New Zealand.
- Reimer, F. (2021). Learning from a Pandemic. *The impact of Covid-19 on education around the world*. In F. Reimer (Ed). *Primary and Secondary Education during Covid-19*. Springer.
- Ricciardelli, L. (1992). *Bilingualism and cognitive development in relation to threshold theory*. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 21, 301-316.
- Royal Society of New Zealand. (2013). *Languages of Āotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Royal Society of New Zealand.
- Sauvao, L. M. (1999). *Transition from Aoga Amata to School: Case studies in the Wellington region*. Unpublished MEd thesis. Victoria University of Wellington, Āotearoa New Zealand.
- Si'ilata, Rae. (2006). *Supporting Pasifika bilingual teacher-aides in mainstream primary classrooms*. Final report to the Ministry of Education. Auckland UniServices.
- Si'ilata, R. (2014). *Va'a Tele: Pasifika learners riding the success wave on linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogies*. University of Auckland: Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Si'ilata, R., Dreaver, K., Parr, J., Timperley, H., & Meissel, K. (2012). *Tula'i Mai! Making a Difference to Pasifika Student Achievement in Literacy*. Final Research Report on the Pasifika Literacy Professional Development Project 2009 – 2010. Auckland UniServices Ltd.

- Spolsky, B. (1988). *The Sāmoan language in the New Zealand educational context*. Unpublished report presented to the Department of Education, Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Statistics New Zealand (2014). *2013 Census: QuickStats about income*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Statistics New Zealand (2017). *National ethnic population projections: 2013 (base) – 2038 (update)*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Statistics New Zealand (2019). *2018 Census totals by topic – national highlights*. Retrieved from: <https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/2018-census-totals-by-topic-national-highlights>
- Stoll, L. (1998) *School Culture*. Department of Education, University of Bath. School Improvement Network Bulletin No. 9.
- Stoll, L. (1999) *Enhancing schools' internal capacity for learning*. Paper presented at Innovation for Effective Schooling Conference, Lakeside Convention Centre, Tamaki Makaurau Auckland, 25-28 August.
- Tago'ilelagi-Leota, F., McNaughton, S., MacDonald, S., and Farry, S, (2003) *The precious threads: Bilingual and biliteracy development over transition to schools*. A paper presented at a Ministry of Education forum on second language acquisition. First published in 2004, Ministry of Education, Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Taumoeofolau, M., Starks, D., Bell, A., and Davis, K. (2003) *The role of second language acquisition and practice in Pasifika language maintenance in Aotearoa New Zealand*. A paper presented at a Ministry of Education forum on second language acquisition. First published in 2004, Ministry of Education, Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Toloa, M., McNaughton, S., & Lai, M. (2009). Biliteracy and language development in Sāmoan bilingual classrooms: The effects of increasing English reading comprehension. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(5), 513–531.
- Tuāfuti, P. (1994) *Heritage language – Medium for Learning*. A dissertation in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the diploma in the education of children with special needs. Tamaki Makaurau Auckland College of Education.
- Tuāfuti, P., & McCaffery, J. (2005). Family and community empowerment through bilingual education. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(5), 480-503.
- UNICEF. (2018). *Innocenti Report Card 15: An unfair start: Inequality in children's education in rich countries*. Retrieved from https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/an-unfair-start-inequality-children-education_37049-RC15-EN-WEB.pdf
- Ūtumuapu, T. (1992) *Finau i mea sili: attitude of Sāmoan families to Aotearoa New Zealand education*. A Master of Education thesis. University of Tamaki Makaurau Auckland, Tamaki Makaurau Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand.

Van Hees, J (2003) *Partnerships at the interface: Classroom, whanau and community-based language and learning, for linguistically and culturally diverse learners*. A paper presented at a Ministry of Education forum on second language acquisition. First published in 2004, Ministry of Education, Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.

Wang, H., & Harkess, C. (2007, Senior Secondary Students' Achievement at Māori- Medium Schools 2004-2006.

Glossary for vocabulary used in this report

‘ako:	Te reo Māori for learning.
ā’oga:	Sāmoan for a place of learning.
‘amata:	Sāmoan for start or begin.
ā’oga ‘amata:	Preschool that uses Sāmoan for learning
Āotearoa:	Te reo Māori for New Zealand.
atamai:	Sāmoan for wisdom.
‘e:	A Sāmoan connective/conjunction suggesting rationale or reason.
ekalesia:	Christian church: Samoan transliteration of <i>ecclesiaste</i> .
‘ia:	Sāmoan for ‘may you’ or ‘may I.’
faapotopotoga:	Samoan for gathering and grouping.
faavae (n):	Foundation.
faavae (v)	Building / construction starting from the foundation.
FAGASA:	Short for the national organisation of teachers of Sāmoan in Āotearoa New Zealand.
faife’au	Church minister.
gagana:	Sāmoan for language
Igilisi:	Sāmoan transliteration of English
kaupapa:	Te reo Māori for theme or rationale behind an initiative, idea or event.
kerisiano:	Samoan for Christianity.
kohanga:	Te reo Māori for nest.
kohanga reo:	Preschool that uses Māori language only for learning: nest for te reo Maori.
korero:	Te reo Māori for speak.
kuia:	Te reo Māori for a woman leader.
kura kaupapa:	State funded schools that uses only reo Māori for learning.
kura:	Te reo Māori place of learning.
ma:	Sāmoan for conjunction ‘and’
manuia:	Wellness or good life.
moana:	The deep ocean.
o le:	Definite article in Sāmoan
Pākēhā:	Te reo Māori for a white person.
Pālagi:	Sāmoan for a white person.
poto:	Sāmoan for clever or intelligent.
rāngatira:	Te reo Māori for chief or leader.
reo:	Te reo Māori for the indigenous language of Āotearoa New Zealand.
soifua:	Formal Sāmoan for life, or farewell.
Ta‘iala:	Sāmoan language in New Zealand curriculum.
talanoa:	Sāmoan for conversation.
tapasā:	Sāmoan for guide.
tau:	Sāmoan for read or triangulate.
tai:	Sāmoan for seaward; or tide.
tautai:	Sāmoan for navigator, sea captain, or reader of ocean currents, condition etc.

tomua:	Opening address or phrases.
tomuli:	Final statements.
tula'i:	Formal Sāmoan for 'stand up.'
upu:	Sāmoan for word.
whaea:	Formal / Polite address in te reo Māori for a woman.
whanauga:	Te reo Māori for extended family.
whanaungatanga:	Māori concept of inclusiveness and collaboration.
whare:	Te reo Māori for house.
whare kura:	Tertiary institutions that privilege Māori language and culture for learning. House for learning.

¹© Esera

¹©