

Different Medium of Instruction, Different Destiny of Language Shift? A Pilot Study in Kuala Lumpur¹

Wang Xiaomei

Department of Chinese, Translation and Linguistics

Language Information Sciences Research Centre

City University of Hong Kong

Abstract As a multiracial and multilingual society, Malaysia employs bilingual/trilingual education system. At secondary level, there are three different types of schools in terms of medium of instruction (hereafter MOI). To explore the relationship between MOI and language use, language attitude, and further language shift among Chinese students, two questionnaire surveys are designed. The 423 respondents come from Confucian Private Secondary School with Mandarin as MOI and SMJK Confucian which adopts Malay as MOI in Kuala Lumpur respectively.

The results show that students from the Chinese medium school maintain more Chinese dialects, such as Hakka and Minnan dialect, and hold more positive attitude towards them compared to those from Malay medium school. However, minor dialects such as Chaoshan dialect, Fuqing dialect, and Qiongwen dialect are losing ground for both groups. As for the use of Mandarin and Cantonese, the dominant dialect in the Chinese community in Kuala Lumpur, in family domain, no significant difference is found between the two groups.

To conclude, Chinese students from the Malay medium school are experiencing a rapid language shift towards Cantonese and Mandarin, while students from the Chinese medium school show a stronger degree of maintenance of Chinese major dialects.

Key Words Chinese independent school, language attitude, language shift, language use, national-type school

1.0 Introduction

Malaysia is a multi-lingual and multi-racial society. Its education system has experienced several stages of changes in the past hundred years. For the time being, at primary level, mother-tongue education is guaranteed. Chinese national type schools, Tamil national type schools and Malay national schools employ Mandarin, Tamil and Malay as mediums of instruction respectively. At secondary level, there are three different types of schools in the country: national schools with Malay as medium of instruction, national-type schools also with Malay as medium of instruction which were Chinese or English schools before they converted and Chinese independent schools with Mandarin as medium of instruction. In Kuala Lumpur, most Chinese parents send their children to national-type schools or Chinese independent schools because both types offer Chinese as a subject. Then a question arises: will different mediums of instruction lead to different language use, language attitude, and further language shift among Chinese students?

To answer this question, two questionnaire surveys are designed to explore the relationship between medium of instruction and language use and language attitude among the Chinese students in Kuala Lumpur, the capital of Malaysia. The 423 respondents come from Confucian Private Secondary School which takes Mandarin as medium of instruction and SMJK Confucian which adopts Malay as medium of instruction respectively. The two schools share the same history and

campus before 1963 when the latter changed its teaching medium from Mandarin to Malay.

The aim of this study is to reveal the relationship between medium of instruction and language use and language attitude. Furthermore, language shift of the Chinese students under two different education systems will be predicted. Due to the limited data, the result of this study may not be applicable to all the schools in Kuala Lumpur. However, it provides valuable and pilot data regarding this topic.

The paper is composed of seven parts: introduction, literature review, methodology, language situation of the Chinese community in Kuala Lumpur, background of the two schools, results and discussions.

2.0 Literature review

The relationship between language and education has drawn attentions from scholars in the field of the sociology of language in the past years(Edwards 1985; Spolsky 1986; Gopinathan , Pakir, Ho & Saravanan,1998). However, language teaching, bilingual/trilingual education (Appel & Muysken 1987; Aronin 2005) and language policy in education (Kennedy 1983; Ye 2002) have been paid more attentions than other issues, such as education and language maintenance and shift (Liang 2003).

Education is regarded as one of the key factors contributing to language maintenance and language shift (hereafter LMLS) (Appel & Muysken 1987) especially for the minor or immigrant groups in the society. For instance, the decline of Chinese schools and educations is possibly the single most important factor that causes the Thai Chinese to shift from Chinese to Thai (Liang 2003:488). A similar situation could be found in Singapore Chinese community. After all the Chinese medium schools are closed by the Singapore government, the Singapore Chinese have been shifting from Chinese dialects to English or Mandarin gradually (Li, Saravanan & Ng 1997). On the other hand, some scholars claim that schools can not affect the situation of language decline if the social forces lead to it, given the evidence of the unsuccessful revival of Irish through education in Ireland (Edwards 1985:129) and Andes (Hornberger & King 1996). Other attempts of reversing language shift through schools could be found in Scotland (Roberts 1991), Peru (Hornberger 1989) and elsewhere. Fishman (1990) contends that the school is the bridge between the 'weak side' and the 'strong side' approaches to reversing language shift (RLS).

Based on the existing literature and practice, such a conclusion could be drawn that education is an important factor, but not a single factor contributing to LMLS.

In the context of Malaysia, the existence of different education systems provides us a good opportunity to explore the relationship between medium of instruction and LMLS in the Chinese community. The languages in question are Mandarin and Chinese dialects. The research question is: will different medium of instruction in schools lead to different outcomes of LMLS in the Chinese community in Kuala Lumpur?

The Chinese community in Malaysia is unique compared to their counterparts elsewhere Chinese education is maintained at primary, secondary, and even at college level. As a result, it does not suffer the same LS as the Chinese in Thailand, Indonesia, Singapore and other countries. However, some minor Chinese dialects have been experiencing a shift to Mandarin or prestigious dialects. Apart from social-economic factors, this paper attempts to analyze the interaction between education and LMLS.

3.0 Language situation in the Chinese community in Kuala Lumpur

Ethnic Chinese have been playing a crucial and important role in the exploitation and development of Kuala Lumpur. According to 1980 census data, Chinese is the largest ethnic group in the Capital city (Asmah 1992:23), occupying 52.9% of the total population. However, Chinese become the second largest group in census 2000, which accounts for 43.5% of the total population in Kuala Lumpur. Within the Chinese community in Kuala Lumpur, Cantonese is most prestigious due to its status in trade and commerce, although its population is smaller than Minnan group. Therefore, Cantonese is chosen as the lingua franca among the Chinese people in Kuala Lumpur (hereafter KL). As a major dialect in the Chinese community, Cantonese also receives support from mass media, such as radio broadcasting and TV. It is not uncommon that even Indian and Malay could speak Cantonese in KL.

In addition to Cantonese, Minnan dialect, Hakka, and other Chinese dialects are also found in use in KL, especially in home domain. Besides, Malay and English are also frequently spoken for inter-group communication with Malay and Indian. English, as the second most important language in Malaysia (Asmah 1992:84), is rather popular in KL, especially in business circle.

Many scholars contend that multilingual situation is unstable. It is also true for the Chinese community in KL. Some changes have been observed during the past years. Cantonese has been gaining popularity continuously. As a result, language shift has been taking place in minor dialect groups, such as Qiongwen group, Chaoshan group, and etc. in KL. The trend of language shift is quite obvious: from minor Chinese dialects to Cantonese and Mandarin. There are also some Chinese who shift to English, especially those with English education background.

In this paper, Babas, Nyonyas, and peranakan (assimilated) Chinese would not be discussed.

4.0 Background of the schools in survey

Two secondary schools in KL are chosen for this study: Confucian Private Secondary School (hereafter CPSS) and SMJK Confucian (hereafter SMJKC). The former is a Chinese independent school with Mandarin as medium of instruction, English and Malay as compulsory subjects; the latter is a national type school with Malay as medium of instruction, English and Chinese as compulsory subjects. Both schools share a common campus with the same history before 1963, when SMJKC converted its medium of instruction from Mandarin to Malay. The students of these two schools almost are Chinese who come from different dialect groups. With a long history of one hundred years, the two schools have formed a strong tradition and school culture. Thus they are the ideal research targets for this comparative study.

Three language subjects are offered in both schools. The distribution of teaching hours of the three language subjects are shown in table 1 below.

Table 1: Teaching hours of language subjects per week in the two schools (hour)

	MALAY		ENGLISH		CHINESE	
	CPSS	SMJKC	CPSS	SMJKC	CPSS	SMJKC
Form1	6	3.5	9	2.92	6	2.92
Form2	6	3.5	7	2.92	6	2.92
Form3	7	3.5	7	2.92	6	2.92
Form4	6	3.5	9	2.92	6	2.92
Form5	7	3.5	7	2.92	6	2.92

Table 1 shows that the teaching hours of the three languages in CPSS are longer than that in SMJKC. As for the language policy on campus, the two schools also show some differences. Chinese dialects are forbidden in CPSS lest they will degrade the students' performance of Chinese. However, Malay and English are not restricted. As for SMJK Confucian, Malay is used as administrative language on every Tuesday and Thursday and English on every Wednesday and Friday. The languages used among students are not regulated. Obviously, in terms of language policy on campus, CPSS promotes Mandarin rather than dialects, while SMJKC gives priority to Malay and English.

5.0 Methodology

Questionnaires are the main instrument employed in this study. Since the two schools come from different education systems, the questionnaires are slightly different. It is composed of four parts: (1) personal information, such as age, gender, parent's dialect group and education, and etc; (2) language competence, such as the most fluent language and self-reported language competence; (3) language use, such as language choice at home, for mass media and code-mixing; and (4) language attitude towards Mandarin and Chinese dialects.

The field works in the two schools have been carried out separately, CPSS in year 2002 and SMJKC in year 2006. Judgement sampling is employed for both field works. One class from each grade is drawn. The class which is chosen is the average class in terms of academic performance. Since there are six grades in CPSS, six classes (N=254) are drawn as the sample. Five classes (N=169) are chosen in SMJKC for there are only five grades there.

The questionnaires are distributed to the students by the author and research assistants in CPSS. A short explanation is given to the students before they fill in the questionnaires. By doing so, the return rate is guaranteed. In SMJKC, the 192 questionnaires are handed out by the school teachers, out of which 175 copies are returned. The return rate is 91%. After all the questionnaires are returned, the author checks and eliminates those invalid questionnaires. For the case in SMJKC, there are 169 valid questionnaires after filtering out those incomplete and invalid questionnaires.

SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) is employed to do the statistical analysis. To explore the difference between the two education systems, Chi-square tests and Phi or Cramer's V are calculated.

6.0 Results

This part focuses on the group difference between the students from CPSS and SMJKC in terms of language competence, language use and language attitude.

6.1 Background of the respondents

The respondents come from Mandarin-medium school (N=254) and Malay-medium school (N=169) respectively. Their personal information, such as age and gender, and parents' background, such as dialect group and education degree are investigated in the questionnaire. The respondents' age ranges from 12 to 20; more male students are investigated in both schools, 58.7% males from CPSS and 62.5% from SMJKC; most of the parents from both schools graduated from secondary school, 72.4% for fathers from SMJKC and 64.2% for fathers from CPSS. Below is the detailed information regarding the dialect group of the respondents' parents, which may influence the language choice of the respondents.

Table 2: Distribution of dialect group of respondents' parents (%)

	FATHERS' DIALECT GROUP		MOTHERS' DIALECT GROUP	
	CPSS(N=254)	SMJKC(N=169)	CPSS(N=254)	SMJKC(N=169)
Hokkien	25.0	24.1	27.2	25.9
Hakka	32.5	27.1	29.6	28.4
Cantonese	29.4	34.9	27.6	32.7
Teochew	6.0	8.4	7.2	7.4
Hainan	4.0	4.2	3.6	2.5
Others	3.1	1.3	4.8	3.1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Based on table 2, Hokkien, Hakka and Cantonese are three largest dialect groups which the parents belong to. To check if there is significant difference between the two samples in terms of parents' dialect group, Chi-square test is employed. The result shows that the two samples are not significantly different in terms of parents' dialect group, which guarantees the validity of comparison between the two groups.

6.2 Linguistic repertoire

Languages that the respondents could speak are investigated. The results show that the linguistic repertoire of the Chinese students from both language streams is multilingual. Mandarin, Cantonese, English, and Malay are the four languages that the respondents could speak based on their self-report. However, the students from the two language streams show significant difference in terms of their linguistic repertoire. Table 3 reflects this difference in detail.

Table 3: Comparison between the students from two language streams in terms of linguistic repertoire

<i>Languages they could speak</i>	<i>Significant difference or not</i>	<i>Result</i>
Mandarin	No	-
Hokkien	Yes	$\chi^2=6.99$, $df=1$, $N=423$, $p<.001$, $\phi=.129$
Hakka	Yes	$\chi^2=20.35$, $df=1$, $N=423$, $p<.001$, $\phi=.219$
Cantonese	No	-

To explore the difference between the two samples in terms of their linguistic repertoire, Chi-square test is employed. Table 3 shows that there is no significant difference between the students from Mandarin and Malay stream in their competency of speaking Mandarin and Cantonese. However, they are significantly different in their ability of speaking Hokkien and Hakka, especially the latter (Phi indicating the strength of the association between language use and school stream, whose effect size is considered to be medium). The data shows that more students from Mandarin stream could speak Hokkien and Hakka than those from Malay stream.

A six-scale² language proficiency is used to investigate the respondents' proficiency of Mandarin, English and Chinese dialects. The key point is whether there is significant difference

between the students from Mandarin-medium school and Malay-medium school in terms of their self-report language proficiency, especially Mandarin and their own dialect³ To achieve this goal, independent samples *t* Test is used. The results are shown in table 4.

Table 4: comparison between Mandarin-stream students and Malay-stream students on spoken Mandarin level, spoken English level, and spoken dialect level

<i>Languages</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
spoken Mandarin level					
CPSS	5.35	1.03	-.68	416	.497
SMJKC	5.28	1.03			
spoken English level					
CPSS	3.12	1.18	2.51	309.8	.012
SMJKC	3.45	1.37			
spoken dialect level					
CPSS	4.64	1.63	-3.98	403	.000
SMJKC	3.96	1.79			

Based on table 4, we could find that the students from the two language streams are significantly different in their spoken English ($p=.012$) and dialect ($p=.000$) competence. The inspection of the two group means indicates that students from Mandarin-stream claim a higher spoken dialect level ($M=4.64$) than those from Malay-stream ($M=3.96$); students from Malay-stream show a higher spoken level ($M=3.45$) than their counterpart ($M=3.12$). However, the two groups do not show any significant difference in their spoken Mandarin competence ($p=.497$). The following table 5 gives the details of the dialect proficiency by the two groups.

Table 5: Comparison between students from the two language streams in terms of proficiency in their own dialects

<i>Language proficiency scale</i>	<i>Mandarin-medium school</i>		<i>Malay-medium school</i>	
(1) To be able to understand a few words	21	8.5%	17	10.7%
(2) To be able to understand simple sentences	12	4.9%	27	17.0%
(3) To be able to understand and speak simple sentences	22	8.9%	19	11.9%
(4) To be able to conduct casual speech	37	15.0%	33	20.8%
(5) To be able to appreciate TV programs, movies and so on	41	16.7%	9	5.7%
(6) To be able to talk any topics fluently	113	45.9%	54	34.0%
Total	246	100%	159	100%

6.3 Language use in family domain

Languages used among family members, such as grandparents, parents and siblings are

investigated. In this section, we focus on the difference between the two groups. The following table shows the detailed comparison between the students from Mandarin-stream and Malay-stream.

Table6: Language use in family domain by the respondents

	HOKKIEN	HAKKA
Paternal grandparent	$\chi^2=5.17$, $df=1$, $N=410$, $p<.05$, $\phi=.112$	$\chi^2=13.30$, $df=1$, $N=410$, $p<.001$, $\phi=.180$
Maternal grandparent	-	$\chi^2=10.71$, $df=1$, $N=407$, $p<.001$, $\phi=.162$
Father	-	$\chi^2=6.42$, $df=1$, $N=420$, $p<.05$, $\phi=.124$
Mother	-	$\chi^2=11.68$, $df=1$, $N=420$, $p<.001$, $\phi=.167$
Elder sibling	-	$\chi^2=7.71$, $df=1$, $N=374$, $p<.05$, $\phi=.144$
Younger sibling	-	$\chi^2=6.08$, $df=1$, $N=368$, $p<.05$, $\phi=.129$

To investigate whether students from Mandarin-medium school and Malay-medium school differ on language choice at home, a chi-square statistic is used. The results show that no significant difference is found for the use of Mandarin and Cantonese among the respondents and their family members no matter which language stream they come from. For the case of Hokkien, the respondents show significant difference when talking with their paternal grandparents. Students from Mandarin stream use more Hokkien with their grandparents compared to those from Malay stream. However, this difference does not extend to other family members. The most consistent significant difference is found in the use of Hakka. Students from the two language streams show significant difference when talking with all family members in terms of the use of Hakka. The strength of the association between language use at home and schools which the value of phi shows descends along generations. Students from Mandarin stream speak more Hakka with their family members than students from Malay stream, especially when talking with their grandparents and mother. Further explanations will be provided in the section of discussions.

6.4 Language attitude

Seven statements regarding attitudes towards Mandarin and Chinese dialects are set in the questionnaire. A five scale instrument is used to measure the attitudes of the respondents. The following are the seven statements on language attitudes.

1. *I prefer to speak Mandarin rather than Chinese dialects.*
2. *I feel that speaking Mandarin implies a higher level than speaking Chinese dialects.*
3. *I think any Chinese from any dialect background should be able to speak Mandarin.*
4. *I think any Chinese should be able to speak his own dialect, such as Hakka.*
5. *I feel more intimate to speak dialects with family members and relatives.*
6. *If I were a parent, I would like to speak dialect with my children at home.*

7. That many children could not speak dialects nowadays worries me a lot.

The five scale instrument is as follows:

disagree very much, disagree, indifferent, agree, agree very much

To investigate if there is significant difference between the respondents from the two language streams in terms of language attitudes, independent samples *t* Test is used. Table 7 shows the results.

Table 7: Comparison of language attitudes between the respondents from the two schools

<i>Statements/school</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
1: M	3.34	1.13	-1.84	421	.067	0.18
C	3.54	1.07				
2: M	3.39	1.02	-2.58	416	.010	0.26
C	3.65	1.01				
3: M	3.42	1.22	1.87	416	.062	0.19
C	3.19	1.25				
4: M	3.16	1.09	-1.92	420	.056	0.19
C	3.37	1.13				
5: M	3.46	1.06	-2.14	421	.033	0.21
C	3.67	0.94				
6: M	2.69	1.10	-1.57	421	.109	0.15
C	2.85	0.98				
7: M	3.02	1.01	-1.60	420	.116	0.15
C	3.18	1.07				

(1-7: seven statements on language attitudes; M: Malay as medium of instruction, C: Mandarin as medium of instruction.)

Significant difference is found between the school streams for statement 2 ($p=.01$) and 5 ($p=.033$), however, the effect size is smaller than typical ($d=0.26$ for statement 2 and $d=0.21$ for statement 5). This result indicates that students from both language streams hold similar attitude towards Mandarin and Chinese dialects, i.e. a more positive attitude towards Mandarin and a more negative attitude towards Chinese dialects. The difference is students from Chinese schools attach more sentiments to Chinese dialects, which is shown in Statement 5. The following table lists the distribution of frequencies of choices for statement 5, i.e. *I feel more intimate to speak dialects with family members and relatives*.

Table 8: Responses to statement 5

<i>responses</i>	<i>Students from Mandarin-medium school</i>	<i>Students from Malay-medium school</i>
Disagree very much	2 (0.8%)	8 (4.7%)
Disagree	18 (7.1%)	21 (12.4%)
Indifferent	102 (40.2%)	55 (32.5%)
Agree	73 (28.7%)	56 (33.1%)
Agree very much	59 (23.2%)	29 (17.2%)
Total	254 (100%)	169 (100%)

Based on Table 8, we could see that more students from Malay-medium school disagree

with the intimacy of Chinese dialects. However, the difference between the two-group students is not significantly large enough. Similar situations are found for other six statements.

6.5 Summary

Based on the statistic results above, the following conclusions could be drawn.

1. Students from the two language streams do not show significant difference in their proficiency in speaking Mandarin and Cantonese, however, students from Malay-stream school claim a lower proficiency in other Chinese dialects.
2. In family domain, students from Mandarin-stream school use more Chinese dialects, such as Hakka and Hokkien, than those from Malay-stream school.
3. In terms of language attitude towards Mandarin and Chinese dialects, there is a tendency that students from Mandarin stream hold more positive attitudes toward them.

7.0 Discussions

Now it is the time to answer the research question: *Will different mediums of instruction in schools lead to different language use, language attitude, and further language shift among Chinese students?*

This study reveals that students from both language streams show the same pattern in the use of Mandarin and Cantonese and different tendency in the use and attitude of other Chinese dialects, such as Hokkien and Hakka. This result implies the maintenance or spread of Mandarin and Cantonese, and shift of Hokkien, Hakka and other Chinese dialects.

Among the factors contributing to the spread of Mandarin, education is the most important one. Chinese education is maintained at primary, secondary, and even college level. Given the chance, Chinese parents would send their children to Chinese primary school⁴ where Mandarin is used as medium of instruction since 1920s (Asmah, 1992). After six-year education in Mandarin, most Chinese students obtain the competency in spoken and written Chinese. At secondary level, Chinese is taught as a subject in National-type schools. Therefore students still have the opportunity to promote their language proficiency and competence in Chinese literature. For students in Chinese private secondary schools where Mandarin is medium of instruction, they definitely have more chances to be exposed to Mandarin. As a contrastive case, Chinese in Thailand are not able to maintain their language after all the Chinese schools are shut down by the government (Liang 2003). Apart from education, the spread of Mandarin also benefits from its higher status and economic value. It is widely used at formal meetings among Chinese and mass media (radio broadcasting and TV programmes). It is estimated that 70% of the members of MCA, a major Chinese party in Malaysia, are mandarin-speaking (Lee 1997: 95). Mandarin as a wider communication language has been receiving a higher and higher economic value in recent years, which helps the spread of the language.

Cantonese in KL deserves the title of language for wider communication. Chinese from different dialect groups use it as a lingua franca in daily life. Different from Mandarin, the spread of Cantonese is not influenced by education, but economic factor and its wide use in mass media, such as radio broadcasting and TV. While the Hokkien and the Hakka who come first to KL are miners and farmers, the Cantonese are mainly merchants and housing developers (Asmah 1992: 27). Therefore, Cantonese is attached with a higher value. Economic status of a language will be an important factor for LMLS; mass media, as an institutional support, will also contribute a lot to LMLS (Giles 1977).

As for the situation of language shift, the result shows that students from Malay-medium school tend to shift from Hokkien and Hakka to Mandarin and Cantonese more than their counterpart from Mandarin-medium school. 62.5% of the students from Hokkien dialect group and 55.6% of the students from Hakka dialect group claim Mandarin as their first language, while 54.0% and 44.4% respectively for students from Mandarin-medium school. The difference between the two language-stream schools could be explained by the cultural factor. Mandarin-medium schools promote the Chinese identity and culture more than Malay-medium schools. Mandarin as a lingua franca across dialect groups is represented as the symbol of Chinese identity by the Chinese educators. It is also understood as the necessary component of Chinese culture. Lee (1997:83) contends that the major cleavage within the Chinese community was ever that between the Chinese- and the English-educated. The main difference lies in the culture they prefer. Although an entire generation of Chinese born after independence in 1957 have gone through the national education system, namely Malay-medium education, it is not possible yet to identify an essentially Malay-educated group (Lee 1997:101). The main aim of Malay-medium school is to promote Malay, not Chinese. As a result, the identity of Chinese is not emphasized by the school. Consequently, Chinese dialects as part of Chinese culture do not receive much recognition except for Cantonese. This could also explain why students from Mandarin stream hold more positive attitudes towards Chinese dialects. To break into detail, Hokkien is reported to shift to Mandarin more easily compared to other Chinese dialects. Mandarin is the superior language in the Chinese community. By shifting to Mandarin rather than Cantonese, Hokkien people could upgrade their social status.

Although medium of instruction in education is of importance for LMLS for the Chinese community in Kuala Lumpur, it is not the single factor that influence the process of LMLS. As Edwards (1985: 52) points out, no single cause explains language loss. Various factors, such as status, demographic factors, institutional support factors and cultural (dis-)similarity as Appel and Muysken (1987) claim, will play a part together in most cases.

Endnote

1. Thanks for the cooperation of the following organizations: New Era College, Malaysia, United Chinese School Committees Association of Malaysia, Confucian Private Secondary School and SMJK Confucian. I also appreciate the precious suggestions from Professor Benjamin Tsou.
2. The six-scale language proficiency for spoken languages is as follows: (1) To be able to understand a few words; (2) To be able to understand simple sentences; (3) To be able to understand and speak simple sentences; (4) To be able to conduct casual speech; (5) To be able to appreciate TV programs, movies and so on; (6) To be able to talk any topics fluently.
3. Their own dialect refers to the Chinese dialect attached to their dialect group. For example, if he is from Hakka group, then his own dialect is Hakka.
4. There are 1288 Chinese national-type primary schools in Malaysia. 90% of the Chinese send their children to Chinese national-type primary schools according to the data provided by United Chinese School Committee's Association of Malaysia (<http://www.djz.edu.my>). The enrolment in year 2004 is 647,015 out of which 10.7% are non-Chinese students.

Reference

- Appel R. and Muysken P. (1987) *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Aronin L. (2005) Theoretical perspectives of trilingual education. *International Journal of the*

- Sociology of Language* 171,7-22.
- Edwards J. (1985) *language, Society and Identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fishman J.A. (1990) What is reversing language shift (RLS) and how can it succeed? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 11(1/2), 5-36.
- Giles H. (1977) *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Gopinathan S., Pakir A., Ho W. K. and Saravanan V. (1998) *language, Society and Education in Singapore*. Singapore: Times Academic Press.
- Hornberger N.H. (1989) Can Peru's rural schools be agents for Quechua language maintenance? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 10(2), 145-159.
- Hornberger N.H. and King K. A.(1996) Language revitalization in the Andes: can the schools reverse language shift? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 17(6), 427-441.
- Kennedy C. (ed.) (1983) *Language Planning and Language Education*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Lee K. H. (1997) Malaysian Chinese: seeking identity in Wawasan 2020. In Leo S. (ed.) *Ethnic Chinese as Southeast Asia (pp.72-107)*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Li W., Saravanan V and Ng L. H. J. (1997) Language shift in the Teochew community in Singapore: a family domain analysis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 18(5), 364-384.
- Liang C. M. (2003) Language shift in the Thai Chinese community. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 24(6), 485-495.
- Omar A. H. (1982) *language and society in Malaysia..* Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa Dan Pustaka Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- Omar A. H. (1992) *The linguistic scenery in Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa Dan Pustaka, Ministry of Education Malaysia.
- Roberts A. (1991) Parental attitudes to Gaelic-medium education in the western Isles of Scotland, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 12(4), 253-269.
- Spolsky B. (ed.) (1986) *Language and Education in multilingual Setting*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters 25.
- Ye Y. X. (2002) *Language Policy and Education: a comparison between Malaysia and Singapore*. Taipei: Advance Pushing House.