

LANGUAGE STATUS PLANNING IN THE ASEAN COUNTRIES¹

Anthea Fraser Gupta

This paper is an examination of some possible links between the political motivations in articulated language policy and the sociolinguistic status of official languages. A distinction must be made first between linguistically homogeneous and linguistically heterogeneous states. The cut-off point for homogeneity is of course arbitrary, although the identification of such states is in fact easier in practice than in theory. In a linguistically homogeneous state, one language is spoken as a sole native language by the overwhelming majority of the nationals. Fishman (1968b:55) sets homogeneity at 85% given that there is no significant minority. Examples of such countries would be the United Kingdom or Japan. Linguistically heterogeneous states are diverse, and have been classified in a variety of ways, most interestingly for the purposes of this paper, by Kloss (1969). The ASEAN countries are all heterogeneous except Thailand. There, as in other 'homogeneous' states, the homogeneity in this sense does not preclude the existence of minority groups who may have an importance not suggested by their small size, while not all native speakers of the dominant language are speakers of the standard variety. Thus in homogeneous countries dialect differences become more important.

However, the language issues of linguistically homogeneous states and those of linguistically heterogeneous states will differ considerably (Fishman 1968a), linguistically heterogeneous states normally having more difficult decisions to make about language policy. The choice of official language(s), which is the aspect of language planning with which this paper is concerned, is characteristically more difficult, more hazardous, but more open to social engineering in a linguistically heterogeneous state.

WHAT IS AN OFFICIAL LANGUAGE?

For Garvin (1974) the defining characteristic of an official language is recognition by some governmental authority, i.e. a language is official because the government says it is. The official language or one of several official languages may in addition be designated as 'national language', and Garvin distinguishes two common usages of this term:

- (1) a national language is a language serving the entire territory of the nation (in contrast with a regional language)
- (2) the national language is the language which functions as a national symbol.

As several writers have pointed out however (Fishman 1969, Whiteley 1971, Conrad and Fishman 1977), there is tremendous variation from country to country

David Bradley, ed. *Papers in South-East Asian linguistics* No.9: *Language policy, language planning and sociolinguistics in South-East Asia*, 1-14. *Pacific Linguistics*, A-67, 1985.

in the use of these terms, and in the rigidity with which legally sanctioned languages are used to the exclusion of those without any overt official recognition. Nevertheless, whatever the *de facto* situation in a state may be, the *de jure* situation is in itself of interest, as being an articulation of intentions, wishful thinking, or direction of development. Formulae of the sort proposed by Stewart (1968), Ferguson (1966) or Kloss (1968) fall short of really characterising the situation in a given locality if an assumption is made of a match between the real situation and the legalistic one.

Governments designate languages by one or more of the following terms:

- (1) national (in either of the senses given by Garvin, but usually the second)
- (2) official (either countrywide or regional; either a sole official language or one of two or more equal or unequal official languages)
- (3) working (this is the status of English in Sri Lanka - this designation normally has about it a sense of being an unsatisfactory interim measure while a more suitable language, usually a national language, is being promoted).

These categories of course overlap (one language may be all three) and not all countries use all of these terms. A linguistically homogeneous country may even have *no* articulated language policy for the majority language. Typically, minority groups in such countries (especially indigenous minority groups, and particularly those who were or who feel they were there before the majority group) agitate for limited (often regional) areas of recognition for their own languages, and in particular for the promotion of education in their languages (e.g. Welsh in the UK, Breton in France, Basque in Spain). In this paper I have not distinguished between national and official language unless I have so specified.

Kloss (1968:79) further points out that *below* the level of legalistic official recognition, the relationship between a language and the government may be one of three further sorts:

- (1) "promoted"

A language may be to a limited extent promoted by the government, although not designated as official. It may be used in some official broadcasts, brochures, or other media used to reach the citizens, and it may be used in the early stages of education.

This latter use may allow most children to have their first education in their native language. This is usually felt to be educationally desirable, though in countries such as Singapore, or in the urban concentrations of many linguistically heterogeneous states, it is probably too involved and expensive to be feasible, owing to the multitude of small groups, their geographical dispersion (rather than concentration), and often the difficulty of ascertaining what a child's native language is in a situation of near-universal bi/multilingualism. Furthermore there are situations where the undesirable social consequences of giving every child an education in the native language would outweigh the possible educational benefits to the individual.

There are many examples of 'limited government promotion' - for example the use of Urdu in the UK. There are TV and radio programs in Urdu, and brochures about such things as post office services for distribution to readers of Urdu.

(2) "in no way promoted by the state ... but ... [not] restricted"

A language not promoted in any way may nevertheless be tolerated, and is to be found in use between citizens in private clubs, in films, in religion, in private schools, or simply between persons in public.

Examples of this are innumerable: Punjabi in Singapore, for instance.

(3) "proscribed"

A language may be proscribed and its very use in public dangerous: examples of this, the reverse of official, are luckily rare; so rare in fact that I am unable to give a modern example, and even the historical ones (e.g. Scots Gaelic in late 18th century Britain) are dubious. Limited areas of proscription are however very common, especially the proscription of non-standard varieties in school (e.g. the imposition of a small fine for the use of Chinese varieties other than Mandarin in Singapore schools).

The choice of official language(s) in countries where the choice of official language is not made obvious by the demographic structure can be a powerful tool in social engineering, and there is thus a link between the choice of official language and the political decisions. Quite apart from the actual success of official language policy in terms of its achieving its aims in social engineering, the choice of official language has various legal and political implications, notably those concerning the leaders' perceptions of their country and their ambitions for it.

TYPES OF DECISIONS

A the government wishes to satisfy the articulated demands of its people

This may seem an obvious political goal, but a number of countries find that they have other goals which override it, e.g. B (Malaysia) or F/G (South Africa). Depending on the philosophy of the government, the dissatisfied section of the population may be wooed, pacified, ignored, or oppressed.

B fostering a national identity through language

For many countries language is a main medium for the expression of national unity. However, although many countries in which "the geographical boundaries are far in advance of sociocultural unity" (Fishman 1968a:43) feel it is desirable to promote a national identity through language, and may adopt unpopular and in fact unfeasible schemes to promote it (e.g. India), language is not necessary for the expression of national unity (e.g. Switzerland) and in fact the promotion of a language for this purpose may in some cases be divisive (e.g. India again).

C improving inter-group communication

In a fragmented state, communication between disparate groups may be improved by the careful choice and promotion of an official language. A widely used lingua franca may already be available (e.g. Malay in the Malay Archipelago, Swahili in East Africa), but over the years the lingua franca function of a language may increase, especially in a situation of universal or near universal elementary education (e.g. English in Singapore).

D increasing or maintaining differences between separate groups

In some societies, different groups wish to be identified as different, and given special linguistic recognition (Wales, Singapore, etc.). If the government were not to maintain these differences this might be seen as an attempt to wipe out the culture. In other societies (South Africa is the best example), diverse groups (Zulu, Xhosa, etc.) wish to see themselves primarily as united vis a vis a shared other, and may see government attempts to emphasise their separateness as an attempt to prevent the formation of a larger power base. The Soweto riots were for the teaching of English (the language of intra-group unity) and against the emphasis on Afrikaans (the language of the opposing group) and on African languages (the languages of disunity and of disadvantage). Similarly, there is currently a dispute in the Indian state of West Bengal, where the Marxist state government wishes to abandon the teaching of English in state primary schools, in order to reinforce the separateness of West Bengal from the rest of India, and from the non-Marxist central government, while the opposing faction wishes to maintain the sense of Indianness as embodied in this case in the common use of English. Another effect of the loss of English teaching in state primary schools will be to further enlarge the gulf between rich and poor, as private schools will not be affected.

E aiding a currently or historically downtrodden group

There are of course different perceptions of downtroddenness depending on the group membership of the individual. This motivation often involves either a shift in power, or a differential manifestation of power. The important thing may be the government's avowed intention, though there is normally some element of truth (e.g. Malaysia, Sri Lanka). See also G below.

F keeping a downtrodden group downtrodden

Normally linked with G below. South Africa is the clearest example (see van den Berghe 1968) but this motivation may be deeply hidden behind a variety of official language policies more frequently than might at first be thought.

G promoting the interests of the ruling group

This is often linked with F as in the case of South Africa, but in the case of Malaysia and Sri Lanka it is linked with E.

H improving or maintaining international standing

Although given much importance by politicians in countries which are contemplating the abandonment of a language of wider communication in favour of an indigenous language (usually in the interests of motivation B), this is in fact a very minor consideration. In most countries - Singapore is one of the exceptions - very few members of the society interact with foreigners or work in areas where a non-indigenous language is essential. Furthermore even if a language is not designated as official, it can still be valued, and be taught in schools as national policy (e.g. English in the Netherlands, Sweden, Indonesia).

Official languages can be classified in a variety of ways. Official languages must normally be standard languages (Garvin 1974). If a language is selected to be an official language which at the time of selection is not a fully developed modern standard language, then the government must be prepared to invest time,

money and propaganda into making it so (Hebrew, Bahasa Indonesia, Somali). With this proviso in mind, an official language may have one or more of the following characteristics. (Note that an indigenous language is a language spoken as a native language by a group of individuals who regard themselves as of a country - government policy can of course change citizenship patterns in such a way as to effectively remove from actual citizenship particular ethnic groups, as in South Africa):

1 OVERWHELMING MAJORITY: the language is spoken as a native language by the overwhelming majority of the population of the country

Quantification of the size of the overwhelming majority is less important than its impressionistic assessment (see above).² The geographical dispersion or concentration of the minorities is often an important factor in determining their importance or power. However, where there is this type of language available for use as official language, it is typically the only official language, although a representative language (Type 3) may be used regionally (e.g. Welsh in the United Kingdom). If the Type 1 language has no historical standard variety, the government may feel it necessary to combine this with one or even more than one LWCs (Type 6), at least as an interim measure, as was the case in Somalia. The astonishing speed of the transfer to Somali (Andrzejewski 1980) was helped by a number of linguistic and non-linguistic factors, among which were the dominance of Somali colloquially and the existence of a standard speech form despite the absence of a standard written variety.

2 NUMERICAL MAJORITY: the language is the native language of the largest linguistic group in the country

The group speaking the language may be, or may be presented as being, a numerical majority of the population (Mandarin in China, Sinhala in Sri Lanka, Malay in Malaysia), or it may be the largest single group in a very fragmented country (Hindi in India).

The existence of sometimes sizable minorities can make the choice of a numerical majority language a more controversial one than the choice of an overwhelming majority language (Type 1), but the emotive force of size is such that a government can have as a sole official language a language which is taken to be that of a numerical majority, and can invest that decision with a legitimacy implausible if the language is not the language of the largest group. The constellations of decisions and language types operating under this principle are especially variable. In the case of Chinese, for example, Standard Chinese³ is a variety long felt to be the standard form of a wide range of varieties, although spoken as a native variety mainly in the north. Hindi in India, however, and especially in Southern India, has had little special status at all until after independence, although the distribution of native speakers is superficially comparable to that of Chinese in PRC. Even in areas of India where languages historically related to Hindi are used, Hindi is not of course seen as the standard variety of languages which have their own standard forms. Malay in Malaysia is the native language of an ethnic group which, like most ethnic groups in Malaysia, is spread more or less throughout the country, and has been used for centuries (in a pidginised form) as a lingua franca. Thus in assessing local interpretation of this type of official language, features particular to the country must be taken into account, and especially the link between the language as that of a numerical majority and its function as a representative language (Type 3), an indigenous prestige language (Type 4) and an indigenous lingua franca (Type 5).

3 REPRESENTATIVE: the language can be seen as being representative of a group of citizens

The language is seen as being closely connected with a particular cultural group, and can be seen as representative of that group's participation in the *civitas*. A government that uses languages of this type always has more than one official language, and cannot be said to be "actively pursuing the socio-cultural unification that befits those whose common nationality is manifest" (Fishman 1968a:43). The group thus represented is significant in terms of its position in terms of the power structure (or at least in terms of apparent governmental recognition of its place in the power structure), but not necessarily in terms of size. Representative languages may be regional, where geographical distribution permits, as in the Indian states. Even if actual geographical distribution would not normally suggest regional official languages, this may be achieved *de jure* (South Africa).

If only two or three languages are spoken in a country, it may be easy to satisfy everyone at the national level. In more complex situations selective groups may be satisfied at national level (Afrikaans and English in South Africa).

4 INDIGENOUS PRESTIGE: the language is the native language of some of the citizens, and has high prestige within the country

The language may be felt to be the standard variety of related varieties (Standard Chinese in PRC). It is often the language of the elite or ruling group (English and Afrikaans in South Africa). Often the language was once the language of a colonial power which has been indigenised (Spanish in many South American countries). There is certainly a tendency for LWCs (Type 6) to turn into indigenous prestige languages over the course of years, as an elite group become native speakers. In this case the language may not be associated with a particular ethnic group but with an elite group whose membership is at least in part determined by use of the language. The situation may well be a complex one, as it is in some South American situations, where there may be an assumption of actual Spanish ancestry linked with fluency in the language, but where membership of the elite group is in fact potentially available through the language given an appropriate appearance.

5 INDIGENOUS LINGUA FRANCA: the language is an indigenous language widely used as a lingua franca in the country

The language may or may not be the native language of a numerically large or politically powerful group. In any case the language which is used as a lingua franca is likely to be pidginised and to have become distinct from its ancestor still being spoken by the engendering ethnic group. A language used widely as a lingua franca is often not a standard language, but is well worth developing into one, especially if it is not also the language of the ruling or dominant group. Indonesia is the classic example of this, along with those East African countries where Swahili was widely used (e.g. Kenya, see Parkin 1974:208). Countries having this kind of language available may be able to have only one official language at national level, or may combine an indigenous lingua franca with an LWC (Kenya, Tanzania).

- 6 LWC: the language is not a native language of any single ethnic group within the country, and is not felt to be indigenous, but it has a historical association with the country and is used as a lingua franca especially among the elite

This is typically the language of former colonial masters and an LWC (language of wider communication, or international language). It is often seen as ethnically neutral and functions as a bridge language between disparate ethnic groups (English in Nigeria, India, etc.). Equally typically, an LWC successfully promoted as an official language tends to move towards being an indigenous prestige language - the nativisation of LWCs is a gradual process, and it is impracticable to attempt to identify a cut-off point. By the same process, as the use of the LWC gets extended to sections of the population other than the elite, it becomes nativised as an indigenous lingua franca normally in a somewhat pidginised, creolised, or mixed variety.

The table below gives some indication of the likely links between political motivation and type of language chosen. It will be noted that in most cases the impact of the type of language chosen will be contingent on local factors. However, an indication of the force of a particular government's official language policy can usually be gained from an examination of the total pattern of language choice.

Motivation	TYPES OF LANGUAGE CHOICE		
	Likely to achieve the motivation ^a	Effect on motivation highly dependent on local contingencies	Unlikely to achieve the motivation ^a
A (SATISFYING DEMANDS)	Overwhelming Majority (1); Representative (3); Lingua Franca (5)	Numerical Majority (2); Indigenous Prestige (4); LWC (6)	
B (NATIONAL IDENTITY)	Overwhelming Majority (1); Lingua Franca (5)	Numerical Majority (2); Indigenous Prestige (4)	Representative (3); LWC (6)
C (COMMUNICATION)	Lingua Franca (5)	Numerical Majority (2); Indigenous Prestige (4); LWC (6)	Representative (3)
D (DIFFERENTIATION)	Representative (3)	Numerical Majority (2); Indigenous Prestige (4); LWC (6)	Lingua Franca (5)
E (RAISING)		Numerical Majority (2); Representative (3); Lingua Franca (5); LWC (6)	Indigenous Prestige (4)
F (REPRESSION)	Overwhelming Majority (1); Indigenous Prestige (5)	Numerical Majority (2); Representative (3); Lingua Franca (5); LWC (6)	
G (SELF-INTEREST)	Overwhelming Majority (1); Indigenous Prestige (4); LWC (6)	Numerical Majority (2); Representative (3)	Lingua Franca (5)
H (INTERNATIONAL STANDING)	LWC (6)	Overwhelming Majority (1); Numerical Majority (2); Representative (3); Indigenous Prestige (4); Lingua Franca (5)	

Table 1: The reflection of political motivations in official language choice

THE ASEAN COUNTRIES

Indonesia

LANGUAGE	TYPE OF LANGUAGE	MOTIVATION
Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian)	Lingua Franca (5)	B (NATIONAL IDENTITY) C (COMMUNICATION)

Table 2: Motivation and language choice in Indonesia

Bahasa Indonesia (*Indonesian language*: bahasa means *language*) has been the subject of much corpus planning to convert it into a standard language. It was based on the somewhat pidginised lingua franca form of a language (Malay) which is the native language of some citizens, but not of the largest group which is the Javanese. Other languages are actively promoted in Indonesia, education normally being given in the native language up to the third year of primary school and in Bahasa Indonesia. English has replaced Dutch as the first foreign language. The considerable success of Bahasa Indonesia has been helped by a variety of factors, foremost among them being, of course, its widespread use as a lingua franca, not just in Indonesia, but throughout the Malay archipelago. The language became associated with the independence movement, and its success as a modern egalitarian language has been helped by the multifarious social difficulties of speaking Javanese.

Malaysia

LANGUAGE	TYPE OF LANGUAGE	MOTIVATION
Bahasa Malaysia (Malaysian)	Numerical Majority (2); Lingua Franca (5)	B (NATIONAL IDENTITY) C (COMMUNICATION) E (RAISING) G (SELF-INTEREST)

Table 3: Motivation and language choice in Malaysia

Bahasa Malaysia is the modern standard version of Malay, various varieties of which (none of them identical to the codified Bahasa Malaysia) are spoken natively by the largest single group in this ethnically heterogeneous country, claimed to be just over 50% of the population. Like Bahasa Indonesia, Malaysian has been planned at all levels. Since 1972 some of this planning has been in conjunction with the planning of Bahasa Indonesia (Asmah 1979:61). Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Malaysia are mutually intelligible, and the modern forms of both are now normally written in the Roman script, although the Jawi (Arabic) script continues to be used for Bahasa Malaysia, non-officially (see Asmah 1979: 67).

The strengths and weaknesses of the Malaysian language policy can easily be inferred from Table 3. The choice of a lingua franca would normally be incompatible with motivation G, certainly in the case of a country like Malaysia with efficient and extensive primary education. In fact, motivation G cannot be, and

has not been achieved through the adoption of Malay as the sole official language. In Malaysia, mastery of Bahasa Malaysia is necessary, but may not be sufficient, to gain access to the ruling group. Under the bumiputera (*son of the soil*) policy, a proportion of places at universities, in government jobs, in businesses and so on, are reserved for members of groups officially designated as indigenous. Although the proportion of reserved places is actually less than the proportion of people so designated in the country as a whole, the effect on the Chinese and Indian sectors is disproportionate, the aim being to increase access to the bumiputeras in areas where traditionally they have not participated (Motivation E).

Although English is no longer de jure an official language in Malaysia, it continues to be promoted. For example English is a compulsory school subject, and there is considerable investment in its teaching. English is also used in several areas normally associated with official languages, for example in law, and even in parliament. Other native languages are also promoted, Chinese, Tamil, Iban and Kadazan being taught to concentrations of their speakers in addition to Malaysian and English (Asmah 1979:26).

Philippines

LANGUAGE	TYPE OF LANGUAGE	MOTIVATION
Filipino/Pilipino	Numerical Majority (2); Lingua Franca (5)	B (NATIONAL IDENTITY)
English	LWC (6)	A (SATISFYING DEMANDS) C (COMMUNICATION) H (INTERNATIONAL STANDING)

Table 4: Motivation and language choice in the Philippines

Filipino or Pilipino has been and still is the subject of much language corpus and status planning, and there have been many changes of direction, not to mention changes of name, in the process of converting it to a modern standard language, and of promoting it as a national language and lingua franca. According to the 1973 constitution, the national language is Filipino, but the initial F refers to a language which is an ambition rather than a reality. The language which perhaps emerged as something other than Tagalog in the 1960s (Lumbera in Gonzales and Bautista 1981:152) continues to be referred to as Pilipino (Bautista in Gonzales and Bautista 1981:316), a term used in a Ministry of Education and Culture Order of 1975. The choice of initial letter, and the relationship between the referents, and between the referents and Tagalog, is contentious (Perez in Gonzales and Bautista 1981:316). One reason for non-Tagalog speakers to prefer the F is that Tagalog supposedly does not use /f/ unlike many other of the languages of the Philippines which do. Most Philipinos however use /f/ if only in common personal names of Spanish origin (Llamzon, personal communication).

The use of Pilipino as a lingua franca and as a native language is increasing, due at least in part to the popular television programs and films which use Pilipino, and aided by in-migration to Metropolitan Manila. Pilipino is based on Tagalog, a language which is spoken natively by about a quarter of the population, in the Western Philippines, including the area around the capital, Manila.

The major languages of the Philippines are closely related members of the Malayo-Polynesian group, one factor which makes the identification of putatively distinct languages particularly difficult. In recent years, as we see in the invention of the names Pilipino (1957) and Filipino, there has been an effort to de-emphasise the association of the national language, Pilipino, with the regional language, Tagalog, thus trying to make the national language 'neutral' not only affectively, but linguistically, coming to be based on a 'fusion of languages' (Constantino 1981:34). As can be seen from the table, the success of Pilipino as a national language could be said to depend on this hope becoming a reality, as it might become with a liberal official attitude to the degree of pidginisation that is now taking place. Malay underwent its processes of pidginisation through many previous centuries, so that when Indonesia and Malaysia were developing their national languages they already had a well-established lingua franca on which to base their corpus planning. In the case of Pilipino the corpus planning has preceded the development of the lingua franca, and now the language must absorb the linguistic results of becoming a lingua franca.

Although at present Pilipino is still seen as linguistically very close indeed to Tagalog - perhaps the same - it is seen as politically different, and the power implications of the use of a regional language, the language of Metropolitan Manila, have been defused by the fact that President Ferdinand Marcos, an enthusiastic propagator of the national language, is not a native speaker of Tagalog, being from a northern Ilocano speaking group (Llamzon, personal communication). The first president, Manuel L. Quezon, was a Tagalog speaker. His promotion of Pilipino could have been seen, as it was by some, as potentially due to the divisive Motivation G, especially when linked with the economic power and potential for dominance normally attached to communities associated with the main urban area. President Marcos's promotion of Pilipino however cannot be seen in this way. The undesirable effects of a language which is not a lingua franca and is closely linked with one group (a group too of high prestige, especially in 1957 when the president was a Tagalog speaker) are also diminished by the continuing use of English.

English has become indigenised, as a variety known as "mix-mix", and is used as a lingua franca, especially in urban areas. Other native languages are also promoted, for example, in the schools.

Singapore

LANGUAGE	TYPE OF LANGUAGE	MOTIVATION
English	Representative (3); Indigenous Prestige (4); LWC (6)	A (SATISFYING DEMANDS) C (COMMUNICATION) H (INTERNATIONAL STANDING)
Mandarin (Chinese)	Representative (3); Indigenous Prestige (4)	A (SATISFYING DEMANDS) C (COMMUNICATION) D (DIFFERENTIATION)
Malay (i.e. Bahasa Malaysia)	Representative (3)	A (SATISFYING DEMANDS) D (DIFFERENTIATION)
Tamil	Representative (3)	A (SATISFYING DEMANDS) D (DIFFERENTIATION)

Table 5: Motivation and language choice in Singapore

The lingua franca situation in Singapore, as might be expected, is very complex, and several non-official languages function as *lingue franche*, notably Hokkien/Teochew and Cantonese, of the official languages; English is widely used as a lingua franca, in an indigenised variety, and the pidginised form of Malay is also used, particularly between Malays and Indians, but the role of Malay as a lingua franca has not been actively promoted, since Singapore's separation from Malaysia in 1965. The Chinese community is linguistically very diverse, the Southern Chinese varieties being commonly used, especially Hokkien, Teochew and Cantonese. These varieties in indigenised forms have been, and are, widely used, especially but not exclusively among the Chinese, as *lingue franche*. Varieties of Chinese other than Mandarin are known as 'dialects'. The government has in recent years been actively promoting the use of Mandarin as a lingua franca (the *Speak Mandarin* campaign from 1978 onwards), and as a native language. The use of Mandarin (indigenised of course) in all functions is indeed increasing, mostly at the expense of 'dialects', from which 'partial promotion' (Kloss 1967) has been withdrawn. The *Speak Mandarin* campaign however has yet to cope with the fact that Singaporeans think that Mandarin is elegant, but Cantonese is more witty, racy, and full of idiom. This is because in Singapore there has not been a full social range of Mandarin. In the case of both Chinese and English, the government is not tolerant of the indigenisation of the languages. Chinese TV programs are all in standard Chinese, thus removing the verisimilitude of a full range of varieties. To date, folk culture has been expressed through the dialects. Thus in order to maintain the vitality of Chinese culture in Singapore, the government must demonstrate to the population that Mandarin can be just as effective in telling jokes, playing with a baby, and so on, as Hokkien or Cantonese. Mandarin could also be described as an LWC, and certainly functions as one in business sectors. However, so little is it promoted as an LWC in Singapore, that much publicity was given to the fact that Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew, who learnt to speak Mandarin as an adult, spoke by choice to Hua Guo Feng through an interpreter in English at a meeting on his visit to China on 12 May 1976.

There are in Singapore officially four races (Benjamin 1976), the Chinese (about 75%), the Malays (about 15%), the Indians (about 8%) and the Eurasians (about 2%). One language has been selected to represent each of these, in order (Motivation A) that all citizens may feel that they are equally (but separately) participants in the country. However, sheer demographic facts prevent this equality of citizenship from being reflected in the equality of the languages. Obviously, as Kloss has remarked (1967:42), in a state where there are more than three official languages, they cannot all be equal. The inequality is to some extent spelt out, in the position of English, the only lingua franca that transcends ethnicity, and which is widely used even between speakers of the same native language. English is the language of law, and of government. Circulars, memos, and so on in government offices are all in English, as are road signs and innumerable other external and internal evidences of government. The special status of English is reinforced in the education system, where English is the only language all children must study, and where English is now the language of all further education. Not surprisingly, the use of English as a native language - but seldom as a sole native language - is increasing. Of the other three official languages, Tamil is the least equal, simply because the size of the community (less than 5% of the total population) is so small. Such a small community cannot sustain a significant degree of officialness. The size of the Chinese community ensures that Chinese is the most commonly seen of these three languages. Until 1981 school children could choose which of the official languages other than English they had as their other medium of instruction. Although most Chinese children studied Mandarin, the proportion who elected to study Malay

was sufficiently large to cause a ruling to be made that, at least initially, all officially Chinese children must study Chinese. An increasing number of non-Chinese children are studying Chinese, skill in which is increasingly being seen by the non-Chinese as advantageous.

Exoglossic varieties of all four official languages are the official models for all teaching, standards supposedly emanating from Britain, PRC, Malaysia and India. However, the extensive indigenisation of all the languages of Singapore, where there is on a large scale something very like the situation described by Gumperz and Wilson in Kupwar (Gumperz and Wilson 1971), gives rise to a discrepancy between practice and precept especially in the case of English and Chinese.

Thailand

LANGUAGE	TYPE OF LANGUAGE
Thai	Overwhelming majority (1)

Table 6: Motivation and language choice in Thailand

Varieties of Thai are spoken natively by around 91% of the population (Rustow 1968), thus Thai is an obvious choice as a sole official language. Thailand has never been under the dominion of a colonial power, another factor removing languages from competition. Speakers of languages other than Thai, mostly members of ethnic groups in specific regions (e.g. Malays in the south or Khmer in the north-east), or hill tribes, are normally educated in standard Thai; some Malays do attend Malay-medium schools. Members of urban minorities (especially the Chinese) also learn Thai; many of them speak it natively, in addition to a variety of Chinese.

NOTES

1. I am grateful to Professor R.B. LePage and to Dr Ian Smith for their many valuable comments on this paper. The faults in the paper are likely to be in areas where I disregarded their advice. My thanks are also due to Dr Teodoro A. Llamzon for factual information on the Philippines. My interpretations are of course my own responsibility.
2. In any case, quantification of this sort is notoriously difficult, especially if governments have a vested interest in seeing particular results.
3. The term *Putonghua* is now used to refer to the normal modern standard variety in the PRC. This is to all intents and purposes the same variety as the one which in Singapore is called *Mandarin*, where Singapore preserves the earlier general usage of *Mandarin* to refer to standard Chinese irrespective of specific variety.
4. It is not impossible to construct scenarios or even to find actual examples which illustrate that even language types that I have placed in these two

columns are dependent on local contingencies; hence the use of *likely* and *unlikely* rather than more positive terms. For example, where Motivation G is concerned in the situation of a conquering power, the language of the overwhelming majority might not be the language of the ruling group, thus invalidating the placement of this language type in this column. Similarly, the presence or absence of active promotion of the official languages, and in particular, the extent of access to educational facilities, are important factors which can mitigate or exacerbate the effects of particular choices, for example the effect on Motivation F of the choice of an indigenuous prestige language.

REFERENCES

ANDRZEJEWSKI, B.W.

- 1980 The implementation of language planning in Somalia: a record of achievement. *Language Planning Newsletter* 6:1.

ASMAH HAJI OMAR

- 1979 *Language planning for unity and efficiency*. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Universiti Malaya.

BENJAMIN, Geoffrey

- 1976 The cultural logic of Singapore's 'Multiracialism'. In Riaz Hassan, ed. *Singapore: society in transition*, 115-133. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

BERGHE, Pierre L. van den

- 1968 Language and "nationalism" in South Africa. In Fishman et al, eds 1968:215-224.

CONRAD, Andrew W. and Joshua A. FISHMAN

- 1977 English as a world language: the evidence. In Joshua A. Fishman, Robert L. Cooper and Andrew W. Conrad, eds *The spread of English*, 3-76. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

FERGUSON, Charles A.

- 1966 National sociolinguistic profile formulas. In William Bright, ed. *Sociolinguistics*, 309-324. The Hague: Mouton.

FISHMAN, Joshua A.

- 1968a Nationality-nationalism and nation-nationism. In Fishman et al, eds 1968:39-51.
- 1968b Some contrasts between linguistically homogeneous and linguistically heterogeneous polities. In Fishman et al, eds 1968:53-68.
- 1969 National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing nations. *Anthropological Linguistics* 11:111-135; reprinted in Joshua A. Fishman *Language in sociocultural change: essays*, selected by Anwar S. Dil, 1972. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- FISHMAN, Joshua A., Charles A. FERGUSON and Jyotindra Das GUPTA, eds
 1968 *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: John Wiley.
- GARVIN, Paul L.
 1974 Some comments on language planning. In Joshua A. Fishman, ed.
 Advances in language planning, 69-78. The Hague: Mouton.
- GONZALES, Andrew and Lourdes S. BAUTISTA, eds
 1981 *Aspects of language planning and development in the Philippines*.
 Manila: Linguistic Survey of the Philippines. (Contributions by
 Alejandro Q. Perez, Lourdes S. Bautista, Bienvenido Lumera and
 Ernesto A. Constantino.)
- GUMPERZ, John J. and Robert WILSON
 1971 Convergence and creolization: a case from the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian
 border in India. In Dell Hymes, ed. *Pidginization and creolization
 of languages*, 151-167. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KELMAN, Herbert C.
 1971 Language as an aid and barrier to involvement in the national system.
 In Joan Rubin and Björn H. Jernudd, eds *Can language be planned?*,
 21-51. Hawaii: University Press of Hawaii.
- KLOSS, Heinz
 1967 Bilingualism and nationalism. *The Journal of Social Issues* 23/2:
 39-47.
 1968 Notes concerning a language-nation typology. In Fishman et al, eds
 1968:69-85.
- PARKIN, D.J.
 1974 Language switching in Nairobi. In W.H. Whiteley, ed. *Language in
 Kenya*, 189-216. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- RUSTOW, Dankwart A.
 1968 Language, modernization and nationhood: an attempt at typology. In
 Fishman et al, eds 1968:87-105.
- STEWART, William A.
 1968 A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism.
 In Joshua A. Fishman, ed. *Readings in the sociology of language*,
 531-545. The Hague: Mouton.
- WHITELEY, Wilfred H.
 1971 Language policies of independent African states. In Thomas A.
 Sebeok, ed. *Current trends in linguistics*, vol.7:548-558. Reprinted
 in Joshua A. Fishman, ed., 1974, *Advances in language planning*, 177-
 189. The Hague: Mouton.