

Language choice among the Foochows in Sarawak, Malaysia

SU-HIE TING AND ROLAND SUSSEX

Abstract

This paper investigates the factors affecting the language choices of the Chinese Foochows of Sarawak, focusing in particular on how the use of the Foochow dialect vis-à-vis English and other languages might potentially result in a shift in language allegiance away from Foochow. In the context of Sarawak, the Foochows are a substantial, cohesive and homogeneous Chinese ethnic group with a distinctive language and ethnic identity. One would predict that they would engage in extensive language maintenance behaviour. Instead, Foochows living in non-Foochow dominant areas do not seem to have sufficient attachment to the language to transmit it to the next generation. Is this because the Foochows consider that accommodating to communicative norms is more important than preserving their native language as an inherent symbol of their ethnic identity? Or is it the result of the Foochows' insecurity about the prestige of the dialect and the status of the Foochow people? These issues of accommodation and language allegiance are discussed, based on interview and questionnaire data from 11 Foochow participants. This data set is part of a larger study on the language use of different ethnic groups in multilingual organisational settings in Sarawak.

Introduction

In this paper we describe the language choice of the Foochows in Sarawak. The emphasis is on how they negotiate between upholding their ethnic identity through the use of Foochow, and conforming to social norms through the use of more socially and economically viable languages. We will show that the prevalence of the latter will potentially result in shift in language allegiance away from the Foochow dialect.

The sample size is modest, and we would not claim that the results reported here would necessarily hold for the wider Foochow community

in Sarawak. This is particularly so since the results show some intriguing variation. However, the experience of one of the authors (Ting), and the overall thrust of the subjects' responses, provide a sufficiently stable and rich basis for our fundamentally qualitative analysis.

One of the authors (Ting) is herself a Sarawak Foochow, and the initial observations which prompted this research come from her personal experiences in Sarawak. This case study on the language choice of the Foochows was prompted by the cohesion of the data in the subgroup of the Foochows. The larger group of participants in Ting's doctoral research was from different ethnic groups.

Like the other Chinese dialect groups, the Foochows migrated from China in the 19th and 20th centuries. They came from northern Fukien Province in South-East China; Foochow is a member of the Min dialect group of Chinese. The Sarawak Foochows left China for two principal reasons: religious persecution, and economic emigration. The first land settlement was negotiated between Charles Brooke and Wong Nai Siong, a pioneer Foochow Methodist minister, in 1880. The Sarawak Foochows settled in the Rejang River basin bordered by the towns of Sibul, Sarikei and Bintangor (Leigh 1964). This is still a Foochow-dominant area. The Foochows are currently the largest Chinese dialect group in Sarawak (34 percent of the Chinese population), with increasing numbers *vis-à-vis* other Chinese dialect groups (Malaysia Department of Statistics 1995). The Hakka follow closely with 32 percent, but the other Chinese dialect groups such as the Hokkien (13 percent), Teochew (8 percent) and Cantonese (6 percent) are smaller (Malaysia Department of Statistics 1995). However, general observations show that the Foochows exhibit an unusual language behaviour considering their numerical strength. The Foochows often learn and speak other Chinese dialects, but the reverse seldom occurs, as will be evident from the data. Yet the other Chinese dialect groups often comment that Foochows always speak Foochow when they meet other Foochows. The tendency to speak the shared dialect among Foochows is due to the insularity of the Foochow community in the days of the early Foochow migrants. They had their closed network of villages, schools and churches (see Chew 1990). Within their closed communities, the Foochows married Foochows, employed Foochow clan members, and had a Foochow clientele (see Tien 1953).

The early Foochow migrants were mostly monolinguals, speaking only Foochow. Only a handful educated in China could speak Mandarin Chinese. However, the present-day Foochows are mostly multilinguals. The trend away from monolingualism started when better transportation systems brought Foochows into contact with other ethnic groups. Later, educational facilities became available and the children of the Foochow

migrants learnt Mandarin Chinese and English. Some of them migrated into linguistically-heterogeneous towns in search of jobs, and learnt other languages out of necessity.

Significance of the study

Thus far, the language choice of the Foochows in Sarawak has not been researched. The available literature on the Foochows has focused more on their social life, and has mentioned language use only in passing. The only specific study on the Foochows is that of Diu (1972) on the diffusion of Foochow settlement in the Sibu-Binatang area, and Chew's (1990) study of the life of the new Foochow colonists from 1901 to 1941. The other literature has described the social structure of the Sarawak Chinese migrants in general, with snippets of information on the Foochows: Chin (1981); Harrison (1959); Leigh (1964, 1974); Morrison (1993); and Tien (1953). In fact, the only other language choice study in Sarawak is that of McLellan (1994, 1996) on the Bau-Jagoi speakers of Bidayuh, one of the native groups in Sarawak. There were language choice studies conducted in West Malaysia (e. g. Ali 1998; Attan 1998; Dass 1998; Morais 1998; Nair-Venugopal 1997), but the findings cannot be generalised to Sarawak because several factors give this state its unique character.

First, Sarawak is more ethnically heterogeneous than West Malaysia. In West Malaysia, the Malays are a large homogeneous group comprising 61.5 percent of the total population (Malaysia Department of Statistics 2000) whereas in Sarawak the Malays constitute only 21.39 percent of the state population (Malaysia Department of Statistics 1998). The Malays are not numerically dominant enough in Sarawak for their language to become the common language for interethnic communication. But neither are other ethnic languages, as both the natives (48.04 percent) and the Chinese (29 percent) comprise at least ten major groups with mutually incomprehensible languages (Malaysia Department of Statistics 1998). The ethnic diversity in Sarawak gives rise to greater complexity in language choice.

Second, Malay was fully implemented as the official language in Sarawak only recently, whereas it had had this status in West Malaysia for four decades. Although both parts of Malaysia had been under British rule, West Malaysia was able to make a quick transition from English to Malay as the official language because Malay had been the *lingua franca* and a language of trade since the early nineteenth century. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, there was a large Malay-speaking population in West Malaysia. However, in Sarawak there was no common language before the British introduced English as the administrative language. During the rule of the Brooke family (1841–1946) and the East India Company

(1946–1963), the people of Sarawak became literate in English through English-medium education. The need for a common language made it necessary to retain English as an official language until the people's literacy in Malay could be built up. In fact, English was used as an official language alongside Malay until 1986. As English was the medium of education until 1988 at Upper Sixth level, most of the people in Sarawak above the age of 31 (in the year 2001) are English-educated. The retention of the official status of English for a longer duration in Sarawak created a richer English-speaking environment in the State as compared to West Malaysia.

Finally, the different ethnic groups have had greater opportunities for social interaction in Sarawak than in West Malaysia, where the British had practised 'divide and rule'. The Malays, Chinese and Indians had minimal social interaction because of 'the division of labour along ethnic lines' (Nagata 1975: 118), the segregation by place of residence, and in 'educational policies' (Abraham 1986: 12). The ethnic intolerance culminated in a racial riot in May 1969. However, ethnic conflicts in Sarawak were localised to the people involved in specific disputes. For example, there was animosity among the Malays towards the Chinese in certain towns because of the Chinese displacement of Malay commerce (Chew 1990: 222). However, there was 'no evidence of ethnic group conflict in Sarawak between the Chinese trading minority and the non-Muslim Natives' (Chew 1990: 221). As for the Chinese involved in agriculture, there were some land disputes between the Foochows and Ibans, but these did not develop into widespread racial dissent. Chew (1990: 153) noted that the Brooke government had policies concentrating the Chinese within towns to uphold Iban interests, but these policies did not succeed in segregating the Chinese and the Natives because the Brookes' policy of recruiting Foochows for agricultural activities caused the Foochows to be scattered among the Natives in the rural areas. Although there was not much integration because of the insularity of the Foochows (as explained in the 'Introduction'), there was more integration between the Natives and the Chinese groups involved in trading. Chew (1990: 223) described some of the Chinese traders as being 'acculturated to the extent of having a local wife, learning to speak the local languages, and possibly adopting local dress and eating local food'. Chew attributed the lack of ethnic group conflict in Sarawak to a lack of economic competition. This relatively peaceful co-existence laid the foundation for the contemporary racial harmony in Sarawak.

The study

This case study was conducted in Kuching, Sarawak, in 1998. The participants consisted of eleven Foochows living and working in Sarawak.

Six of the Foochow participants worked in the same organisation, referred to as Organisation A in this paper (see Appendix for demographic variables). The other five Foochow participants were from a pilot study which was carried out to validate the questionnaire and interview protocol before the actual study on language use in multilingual organisations in Sarawak (Ting 2001). The five pilot study participants worked in different towns: two in Kuching, two in Sibu and one in Miri (see Appendix for demographic details). As we will see, the different work environments of the pilot study participants produced more varied language choices as compared to the six participants in Organisation A.

The data were collected by means of interviews and questionnaires. The interview was semi-structured, with the main question being, 'What are your language choice considerations?'. This question was worded in everyday language, and prompts were given to encourage participants to talk about various aspects of language choice, particularly in their workplace. The interview was audio-taped when the participants agreed. Otherwise, notes were taken during the interview. The interview data were from ten participants who consented to be interviewed.

The interviews were conducted in English, or English and Foochow, according to the choice of the participants. Language proficiency was not an issue, since both the researcher and the participants were fluent in both languages, and the choice had to do most of all with communicative comfort. The researcher was happy to accommodate to the participants' choices of language, which mainly followed the language choice at the first meeting between the researcher and each participant.

The questionnaire was designed on the basis of Baker's (1992) survey on the use of English and Welsh in Wales. Welsh is a language currently under pressure from English. The questionnaire was adapted to suit the Malaysian language use scenario, where the use of Malay is both mandated and encouraged by the government, and where the use of English is supported by the remnants of British colonial rule and the international appeal of English in business and tertiary education. The language use questionnaire surveyed language choice in various domains, perception towards importance of English for various activities, and attitudes towards the use of English *versus* Malay in Malaysia. The questionnaire data were from the ten participants who returned their questionnaires.

For the purposes of this case study, data from selected parts of the first section on language choice were used for the analysis, as follows:

1. The languages and dialects spoken;
2. Self-perception of English and Malay proficiency;
3. Frequency of following the interlocutor's language choices;

4. Languages used in various domains, and with various people in the family domain; and
5. Language choice with colleagues and members of the public.

The data were analysed to find out the overall patterns of language use in a restricted sample, and to examine in detail the interrelations between language choice, the ethnicity link and compliance with social norms governing language choice.

Results and discussion

In this section, the factors affecting the language choice of the Foochows in Sarawak are described as answers to four research questions. Pseudonyms are used to ensure the anonymity of the participants.

1. Do their language repertoires permit flexibility in language choice?

This section is based on data from ten questionnaires. All the ten Foochow participants could speak Foochow. Two listed Foochow as the most important language. Both incidentally were from Sibü, a Foochow-dominated town. However, three did not regard Foochow as important: they were from Kuching, where the Hokkien dialect prevails. Only one out of the ten participants could not speak Hokkien, and he was from Sibü, but was working in Miri at the time of the data collection.

All the participants had a good command of English. Two rated their English proficiency as near the top, five as above average, and three as average. The importance of English was evident from the fact that eight out of ten participants ranked English as the most important language, for example, Pau used 'English 90 percent of the time' at his workplace in Kuching. The two who did not rank English as the most important language were both working in Sibü. One of them ranked English as second most important, after Foochow. Another ranked English as third most important, after Foochow and Mandarin. The data suggest that there is some competition between English and Foochow for place of importance, and the language which has institutional support is the one perceived as more important by the Foochow participants.

The data showed that Malay was of marginal importance to the Foochow participants. Four ranked English as more important than Malay. In fact, for the seven participants who could speak both Malay and Mandarin Chinese, six ranked Mandarin Chinese as more important than Malay. Three even ranked Chinese dialects as more important than Malay. The Malay referred to is the standard Malay learnt formally in school. In view of the marginal importance of Malay, the limitations in

Malay proficiency might not be felt as they could use colloquial Malay for basic transactions. Only four participants reported better than average proficiency in standard Malay, three reported average proficiency, and three had below average proficiency. This poor command of Malay is not surprising because people in Sarawak above the age of 44 did not learn Malay formally as it was taught for the first time as a subject in school in 1969 simultaneously in primary school and Form One.

Overall, all the participants could speak Foochow and English. Most of them knew Mandarin Chinese, Malay and Hokkien. Even those who did not speak these languages could understand them. One of them could also speak the Sarawak Malay dialect and Melanau (a Native language). Data from another part of the questionnaire showed that three out of the ten participants followed the language choice of their interlocutors all the time, six most of the time, and only one did so sometimes. This flexibility in language choice was possible because of their extensive language repertoire.

2. When is Foochow spoken?

The data on the language choice in various domains showed that the Foochow participants spoke Foochow only if they were sure that their interlocutors were Foochows, and could speak Foochow. This included family members (details in Research Question 4), and Foochow friends and neighbours.

The use of Foochow with neighbours was mainly limited to the three participants from Sibü because it is a Foochow-dominant town. Two of them were working in Sibü. Another (Moh) had just started working in Miri at the time of the data collection, so it was the Sibü neighbours that he had in mind. As for the seven participants from Kuching, Hokkien was the most popular choice as it is widely understood in Kuching. Only two of the participants had neighbours with whom they could speak Foochow.

As for friends, nine out of the ten Foochow participants spoke the shared dialect with Foochow friends. For example, Tang said, 'With Foochow people, then I speak Foochow. Very quickly, almost everyone becomes like friends.' The exception was Lee, who reported speaking only English and Hokkien with friends. Throughout the entire duration of the fieldwork in the organisation, Lee did not speak Foochow with the author (Ting) although both were Foochows. Lee also did not speak Hokkien because the author was not fluent in Hokkien. Instead, English was used. The questionnaire data on language use with friends showed the use of at least one Chinese dialect (Hokkien or Foochow) and one

standard language (English, Mandarin Chinese or Malay). The ultimate choice depended on the friends' ethnicity and language repertoire. When language proficiency was not a limitation, the choice depends on their language preference.

Based on the data on language use with friends and neighbours, it is clear that the Foochow participants refrained from using Foochow with those who were not Foochows. It is very likely that they could not understand the dialect, thus defeating the purpose of the communication. However, it is likely that the Chinese friends and neighbours in Sibü can understand Foochow even if they are not Foochows.

3. *When are socially and economically viable languages chosen over Foochow?*

The questionnaire data on language choice in the transactional and employment domains indicated that the participants favoured other languages and dialects, even in Sibü. First, the transaction domain is subdivided into small shops, supermarkets and airport (Platt and Weber 1980). The locality influenced the dialect chosen. The two participants working in Sibü used Foochow, whereas those working in Kuching used Hokkien. The participant working in Miri (Moh) used Mandarin Chinese in both small shops and supermarkets to comply with the social norm in Miri. Mandarin Chinese became the language of wider communication within the Chinese community in Miri because of the great diversity of Chinese dialect groups.

There is a shift from the use of dialects in the local sub-transactional domain to the use of standard languages in wider contexts such as airports. In small shops, the dialect prevailing in the town was commonly used. However, at the airport all the ten participants spoke English, a strategic choice for a setting with an international image. Nevertheless, Hokkien, Malay and Mandarin Chinese were also used occasionally. Note that the language choice at supermarkets showed a transition between these two sub-transactional domains. Both dialects and standard languages were used as the latter are widely understood by the ethnically-diverse employees, and are also more appropriate for impersonal interactions – unlike those in small shops where the shopkeepers usually know their regular customers.

We now turn to the employment domain. The questionnaire data on language choice in government departments, the private sector, and in the participants' own workplace showed that socially and economically viable languages were chosen in preference to Foochow. In government departments all the ten participants spoke English, but only seven spoke Malay despite the government's directive to use Malay as the official

language. The three (Moh, Chieng and Yii) who did not speak Malay at government departments were English-educated. Yii was the only participant who spoke Hokkien and Foochow occasionally in government departments. The absence of the use of Chinese dialects is due to the predominance of Malay and Native government officers who do not understand Chinese.

In privately-owned companies all the Foochow participants again reported using English. However, Malay was now the least used language, and Foochow, Hokkien and Mandarin Chinese became more prominent. The participants did not hesitate to use varieties of Chinese to establish their shared Chinese identity due to the larger proportion of Chinese employees in the private sector.

Language choice in the employment domain, thus far, has been from the perspective of the participants *as* members of the public. We now address the participants' language choices *with* members of the public, in their roles as employees at their respective workplaces. With members of the public all the ten participants used English. Two did not use any other language (Moh and Chieng). Moh emphasised the need to speak English to project a good image for the organisation. With non-Chinese members of the public either English or Malay was used. However, with Chinese members of the public four participants did not hesitate to speak Foochow with Foochows. With Chinese who were not Foochows, five participants chose Mandarin and two participants chose Hokkien. The choice depended on their proficiency in these languages. The language use with members of the public was similar to their own language choices in the private sector, as members of the public. The consistency in the data suggests that social norms governing language choice in the private sector were well-defined, and usually adhered to.

The participants' language choices with colleagues showed that seven out of ten participants considered both ethnicity and hierarchical status in their language choices. One participant (Chieng), however, spoke English with all colleagues, indicating that neither factor had an influence on her language choice. The remaining two participants considered only one of the factors. Hierarchical status was important to Lee who spoke only English with her colleagues who were department heads and executives, possibly to establish a co-professional identity. However, she sometimes spoke Malay with supporting staff to bridge the status gap. This pattern is widespread, and is best expressed by Moh as follows:

With the boss, I use English although I do mix Hokkien and Cantonese when we are joking during discussions ... English is more to executive style, the top. ... At executive level, English breaks down barriers. We don't have to consider whether the other person is an

Indian or a Chinese. Don't have to think whether they know the language.

Moh's language choices showed signs of two linguistic environments in his workplace. This was caused by the monopoly of the top management and executive level by Chinese (90 percent), and the concentration of Malays and Natives at the clerical and support level.

On the other hand, the colleagues' ethnicity was important to Yii in making language choices. With Chinese colleagues, Yii spoke Hokkien most of the time, and Foochow occasionally. The shared Chinese identity overcame the hierarchical differences. To Yii, his colleagues were either Chinese or non-Chinese as he spoke English to Malays, Natives and Indians. Four other participants shared his perception of this ethnic categorisation. While Yii restricted the use of English to non-Chinese, other participants did not, for example, Pau said, 'I speak English 90 percent of the time, and Hokkien 10 percent of the time.' For Pau, English was the main language, and dialects were supplementary. However, an interesting finding is that none of the Foochow participants spoke Malay to another Chinese, as for Sarawak Chinese 'Malay' signifies Malay identity.

Is Foochow used at all in the employment domain? Yii was the only Kuching participant who spoke Foochow occasionally with Foochow colleagues. However, the two Sibü participants (Tiong and Wong) spoke Foochow extensively. Tiong did so regardless of their colleagues' hierarchical status because Foochows constituted the majority in his workplace. He said, 'even in front of the *Bumiputeras* [Natives and Malays], they [the managers] still use Foochow. Then there are many question marks on the *Bumiputeras*' faces.' With these Foochow colleagues, Tiong used English occasionally for technical terms and jokes. This scenario would not have happened in Kuching where Foochows were found in small numbers.

On the other hand, Wong was more selective in his use of Foochow. He often started off speaking English, the official language of his workplace, but adapted to his colleagues' language preferences. Wong said:

On the telephone, most of the time it's English, followed by Foochow because some of the staff like to communicate in Foochow. ... The [timber] camp workers speak in Foochow. ... With the top managers who are not so conversant in Foochow, then we will use [Mandarin] Chinese.

Wong's workplace was also located in Sibü, but there were fewer Foochow employees in his workplace – a likely reason why Wong did

not impose the use of Foochow upon colleagues who were not conversant in this dialect.

The data on the participants' language use with colleagues showed that English has maintained its role as the language of business communication, with other languages being used mostly for affiliative purposes. Even in Sibü (a Foochow-dominant town) where there is institutional support for the use of Foochow, English reigned supreme. These language choice patterns suggest that the use of Foochow might decrease when Foochows are no longer the majority in the workplace, even in Sibü – a possible situation in view of the greater mobility of the workforce at the present time.

4. *How do the language choices of the Foochows indicate a shift in language allegiance away from Foochow?*

The questionnaire data showed that there is a generational shift in language allegiance away from Foochow towards Mandarin Chinese and English in the home domain, the bastion of dialect use. The most Foochow was used with parents, less with siblings, and the least with children. All the participants spoke Foochow with their parents. However, Kong also spoke Mandarin Chinese with her mother. Two participants (Kong and Pau) also spoke English with their fathers.

With siblings, the tendency to use other languages in addition to Foochow is increasing. Wong was an only child, so the data were based on nine participants. Five participants spoke only Foochow to their siblings. Another three also used English (Pau), Mandarin Chinese (Hii) and Hokkien (Yii). An advanced case of language shift was shown by Lee, who was reported speaking only English to her siblings. Lee's language behaviour was not surprising because she had listed English as the only important language.

In communication with children, English was chosen over Foochow. The data were based on the five participants with children, all of whom were living in Kuching. All of them spoke English frequently with their children, but only occasionally with their spouses. The two participants with Foochow spouses also spoke Foochow with their children, and with their spouses. However, the three participants with Hokkien spouses used their spouses' dialect in the home. These participants' preference for Hokkien, Mandarin Chinese, or Malay would result in their children not knowing Foochow unless they learn it from older family members, as illustrated in Lee's description of her family's language choices with her nephew:

I speak English with my nephew. [...] He] speaks Chinese to his grandparents because they purposely speak Chinese with him. ... The only

person who can't speak English or Chinese is my grandmother [his great grandmother]. So he got no choice at home when he mingles around with the grandmother, so he picks up the Foochow from her.

In this case, Lee's nephew was exposed to Foochow because this is the only language his great-grandmother can use to communicate with him. The other family members clearly regarded English and Chinese Mandarin as having higher utilitarian value than Foochow. English was valued for facilitating access to tertiary education and employment opportunities. Chinese Mandarin was valued for symbolising Chinese identity, and Hokkien for wider communication in Kuching.

Since Foochow loses out on utilitarian grounds, does it have value as a carrier of the Foochow identity? This is an interesting question which could not be explored within the scope of this study. The extensive use of Foochow within the Foochow community supports the identity value of using Foochow. This would suggest Foochow identity is less important in non-Foochow dominant areas, where Foochow is less used in favour of outgroup languages. Other markers of Foochow identity then become more important: surnames (e. g. Ting, Wong and Ling), place of origin, customs and food. At present, there are already Foochows who cannot speak Foochow, but still identify themselves as Foochows by virtue of their patriarchal ancestry.

Conclusions

The Foochow participants showed bi- or multidirectional accommodation as described by Van Den Berg (1988: 251):

The *internal* norm can be called 'ethnic speech'. It is created through an on-going process of accommodation between family members, elaborated and strengthened through various wider contacts including peer group relationships. The *external* norm is set by the society and includes language preferences as determined by the educational system and government bodies.

Strong personal interests and emotions involved in maintaining the use of Foochow within the Foochow community bring about ingroup distinctiveness and solidarity, a characteristic for which the Foochows of Sarawak are well known. While accommodation to the internal norm may perpetuate the ethnolinguistic vitality of the Foochow dialect in Foochow-dominant areas, this vitality is being eroded by accommodation to the external norm. In non-Foochow dominant areas, outgroup languages are chosen over Foochow for utilitarian reasons such as ensuring communicative efficiency, compliance with institutional and national

language policies, and gaining acceptance from outgroups. When Foochows are outnumbered, accommodation to external norms far outweighs the effect of internal norms.

Eventually, the mechanics of everyday interpersonal convergences in important social networks are likely to lead to longer-term shifts in individual as well as group-level language usage (Giles, Coupland and Coupland 1991: 20). Accommodating to other Chinese dialects such as Hokkien shows a shortfall in both ethnolinguistic vitality and in the perceived status and prestige of Foochow itself. Numbers and demographic concentration, while recognised as key factors promoting language maintenance (Fishman 1985), have not proved sufficiently potent to support Foochow in its interaction with English, Malay and other Chinese languages in Sarawak. Nevertheless, Sarawak is still a long way from the situation in Brunei and Singapore, where the younger generation of the Chinese have subordinated their dialect group identity to a higher-order Chinese identity.

University of Queensland

Appendix

Table 1. *Demographic variables of Foochow participants*

Participants	Sex	Age	Medium of Education	Level of Education	Job status	Location of company	
Pilot study	Tiong	M	20's	Chinese, Malay	Degree	Credit officer	Sibu
	Wong	M	20's	English	MBA	Management Trainee	Sibu
	Moh	M	20's	English	Degree	Accountant	Miri
	Pau	M	20's	Malay	Degree	Accountant	Kuching
	Ngieng	F	40's	Chinese	Degree	Teacher	Kuching
Organisation A	Kong	F	30's	English	'O' level equivalent	Accounts Supervisor	Kuching
	Lee	F	30's	English	'O' level equivalent	Senior Clerk	Kuching
	Chieng	F	30's	English	Diploma	Accounts Officer	Kuching
	Yii	M	40's	English	Degree	Engineer	Kuching
	Hii	F	40's	English	Degree	Administrative Head	Kuching
	Tang	F	40's	English	Degree	Administrative Head	Kuching

References

- Abraham, Collin (1986). Manipulation and management of racial and ethnic groups in colonial Malaysia: A case study of ideological domination and control. In Lee, Raymond (ed.), *Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Malaysia*. De Kalb: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University, 1–27.
- Ali, Jamaliah Mohd (1998). Strategic communication and linguistic choices in a Malaysian student seminar. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 130, 107–128.
- Atan, Atan (1998). English in Industry: A Study of Language Choice in Two Electronic Firms in Malaysia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Universiti Malaya, Malaysia.
- Baker, Colin (1992). *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chew, Daniel (1990). *Chinese Pioneers on the Sarawak Frontier 1841–1941*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Chin, John M. (1981). *The Sarawak Chinese*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Oxford University Press.
- Dass, Laura Christ (1998). The Role of English in Malaysia as Reflected by the Language Choice of Newspaper Advertisers. Unpublished master's thesis, Universiti Malaya, Malaysia.
- Diu, Mee-Kuok (1972). The Diffusion of Foochow Settlement in the Sibiu-Bintang Area, Central Sarawak, 1901–1971, Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii, Hawaii.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Michael H. Gertner, Esther G. Lowy and William G. Milán (1985). *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Giles, Howard, Nikolas Coupland and Justine Coupland (1991). Accommodation theory: Communication, context, and consequence. In Giles, Howard, Justine Coupland and Nikolas Coupland (eds.), *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–68.
- Harrison, Tom (ed.) (1959). The peoples of Sarawak (Radio programme). Sarawak, Malaysia: The Curator, Sarawak Museum.
- Leigh, Michael B. (1964). *The Chinese Community of Sarawak: A Study of Communal Relations*. Malaysia: University of Singapore.
- (1974). *The Rising Moon: Political Change in Sarawak*. Sydney: University of Sydney Press.
- Malaysia Department of Statistics (1995). *Population and Housing Census of Malaysia 1991: State Population Report Sarawak*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Malaysia Department of Statistics.
- (1998). *Monthly Statistical Bulletin Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Malaysia Department of Statistics.
- (2000). *Population Projections Malaysia 1980/2000*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Malaysia Department of Statistics.
- McLellan, James (1994). Questions of language choice for speakers of Bau-Jagoi Bidayuh: A micro-analysis. In Martin, P. W. (ed.), *Shifting Patterns of Language Use in Borneo*. Virginia, USA: The Borneo Research Council, 195–208.
- (1996). Code-mixed language use in developing multilingual contexts in Borneo. Paper presented at 4th Biennial gathering of the Borneo Research Council, Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam.
- Morais, Elaine (1998). Language choice in a Malaysian car-assembly plant. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 130, 89–106.
- Morrison, Alastair (1993). *Fair Land Sarawak: Some Recollections of an Expatriate Official*. New York: Cornell Southeast Asia Program.

- Nagata, Judith A. (1975). Perceptions of social inequality in Malaysia. *Contributions to Asian Studies* 7, 111–136.
- Nair-Venugopal, Shanta (1997). The Sociolinguistics of Code and Style Choice in Malaysian Business Settings: An Ethnographic Account. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wales, Cardiff.
- Platt, John and Heidi Weber (1980). *English in Singapore and Malaysia: Status, Features, Functions*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Oxford University Press.
- Tien, Ju-Kang (1953). *The Chinese of Sarawak: A Study of the Social Structure*. London: The London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Ting, Su-Hie (2001). Language Choice in Multicultural Organisational Settings in Sarawak, Malaysia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Queensland, Australia.
- Van Den Berg, Marinus E. (1988). Long-term accommodation of (ethno)linguistic groups toward a societal language norm. *Language and Communication* 8 (3/4), 251–269.