

# Language Use and Identity of Foochow Chinese in Malaysia

Associate Professor Dr Su-Hie Ting<sup>1</sup>

Su-Lin Ting<sup>2</sup>

*1\*Faculty of Language and Communication, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, 94300 Kota Samarahan Sarawak, Malaysia. Tel: +60-82-581760. Fax: +60-83-581781*

*2Methodist Institute, Lily Road, P.O. Box 760, 96000 Sibul, Sarawak, Malaysia. Tel: +60-84-322268. Fax: +60-84-320623*

## Abstract

*The study examined the language use and identity of Foochow respondents in Sarawak, Malaysia. Analysis of questionnaire data from 376 respondents (188 parents, 188 children) showed that more parents could speak Foochow whereas more children could speak Mandarin. The younger Foochow has lower self-reported Foochow proficiency than their parents. They use Foochow in fewer domains (family, friendship, religious, transactions) compared to their parents who speak Foochow in all domains of language use. There are significant differences between the strength of Foochow identity for parents and children. The strength of Chinese ethnic identity for parents and children are also significantly different. The Foochow identity is positively associated with Foochow usage and negatively associated with Mandarin usage, but no inverse relationship was found between Foochow identity and Chinese identity. The younger Foochow is more detached from their Foochow identity, and this generational change is engendered by the rise of Mandarin.*

**Keywords:** Foochow; Chinese; ethnicity; identity; Malaysia

## Introduction

Malaysia has a multiethnic 32.58 million population, comprising 62.51% Bumiputera (comprising Malay and Indigenous), 20.55% Chinese, 6.18% Indian, 0.92% others, and 9.84% non-citizens (Malaysia Department of Statistics, 2020). In many studies conducted on language maintenance and shift in Malaysia, the Chinese are treated as a singular group (David, Yee, Ngeow, & Gan, 2009). Chinese dialects are only given attention in qualitative studies showing a shift towards Mandarin from Hakka (Ding, 2016; Ting, 2018; Ting & Chang, 2008; Wang, 2017), Hokkien (Low, Nicholas, & Wales, 2010), Cantonese (Kuang, 2002), Hainan (Kow, 2003), and Foochow (Ting & Hung, 2008). The Chinese dialect groups have their own culture and language, although they share the standard Chinese language (Mandarin), and Chinese values like filial piety. "The continuous use of Chinese dialects is linked to showing appreciation to their ancestors, because knowing family roots, such as surnames, language groups, and origin of ancestors, is essential in Chinese society and will prevent the family umbilical cord from breaking" (Ong, 2020, p. 2).

Awareness of Chinese dialect groups is growing. Later research on the Chinese in Thailand (Lee, 2014) sub-divided the Sino-Siamese population into Chinese dialect groups, unlike earlier research (Morita, 2005). At this point in time, it becomes even more crucial to study the ethnicity of Chinese dialect groups because studies have indicated a shift away from Chinese dialect usage. Research should be conducted before further weakening of Chinese dialect ethnicities happens.

The study examined the language use and identity of Foochow respondents living in Sibul, Sarawak, Malaysia. The specific aspects studied were: (1) proficiency in Foochow and other languages; (2) language use; (3) strength of Foochow identity; (4) strength of Chinese ethnic identity; and (5) relation-

ships between Foochow usage, Foochow identity, and Chinese identity of the Foochow respondents. Foochow, a large Chinese dialect group, was chosen to document the strongest possible levels of dialect use, attitudes, and identity in the face of threat from Mandarin.

### **Sociocultural background on Foochow of Sarawak, Malaysia**

The Foochow population in Sarawak, an East Malaysian state, is concentrated in the Rejang River basin bordered by the towns of Sibul, Sarikei and Bintangor. The Foochow is the largest group in Sarawak (34.8%), followed by Hakka (31.5%) (Department of Statistics Malaysia, Sarawak, 2014). Later population statistics reports do not provide the breakdown into Chinese dialect groups. The Chinese constitutes 45.39% of the Sibul population of 277,600, and 22.36% of the Sarawak state population of 2.79 million (Department of Statistics, Malaysia, 2017).

At the beginning of the 20th century, the Foochow migrated from the Foochow prefecture of the Fukien Province in South China to Sarawak. They migrated from 10 counties: Minhsien, Haukwong, Changlok, Fuching, Liengchiang, Loyuan, Mintsing, Yungfu, Kutien and Pingnan (Ling & Thock, 2015, p. 21). The history of Foochow settlement in Sibul is linked to Wong Nai Siong (a Methodist missionary). When he returned to China after six years, a missionary James Hoover took over as the headman of the Foochow community, and this is why many Foochow are Methodist Christians (Ling & Thock, 2015).

Initially the Foochow failed at farming because of the different conditions in China and Sarawak but later they become prosperous from growing rubber and pepper. Due to the shortage of land, the Foochow people later moved out of the Rejang River basin. Foochow presence can be seen in Kuching and Miri (the two biggest cities in Sarawak) in the form of Foochow associations, Methodist churches, Foochow food sold in coffee shops and restaurants, as well as Foochow-owned businesses.

### **Theoretical framework of study**

Two theoretical frameworks underpin this study. In Fishman's (1977, pp. 16-47) framework on dimensions of ethnicity, ethnicity combines both inherited and acquired aspects. The paternity aspect of ethnicity is reflected by "physical traits, temperamental qualities including intelligence ("mind"), and, quite commonly, language" (Fishman, 1977, p. 18). In the patrimony dimension, ethnicity is acquired and behaviours that characterise an ethnic group are learned to express their membership. Among the collectivity-defining behaviours (e.g., food, dress), Fishman (1977) singled out language behaviours because language is a very powerful symbol for the ethnicity experience. The phenomenology of ethnicity is concerned with the meanings that an individual attaches to his descent-related being and behaving (Fishman, 1977, p. 23).

Next, Giles, Bourhis, and Taylor's (1977, pp. 308-318) taxonomy of ethnolinguistic vitality is employed to explain the interrelationships between language and ethnicity. The three structural variables that affect ethnolinguistic groups are demography, institutional support, and status. First, the demographic variable refers to the population size and distribution of the group. Second, formal institutional support refers to institutions of a community, region, or nation such as government, parliament, education, and mass media. Informal institutional support refers to support offered by industry, religion, and culture. Minority groups have been known to establish cultural groups by exerting pressure on the outgroup to safeguard their own interests in intergroup situations (Giles et al., 1977). Third, status refers to economic, social, sociohistorical, and language status. Ethnolinguistic groups that have control over the economic life of its community, region, or nation may develop better self-esteem of their group, giving rise to a higher social status. Sociohistorical status refers to how the historical past mobilises or demobilises the group to either bind them together or lead them to hide their linguistic identity respectively. Language status is derived from the use of the language both within and outside the ethnolinguistic group.

To evaluate the objective ethnolinguistic vitality of a group, the combined effects of the three structural variables need to be carefully assessed. A group that has high vitality on one factor but low on another two variables is said to have an overall medium vitality. Subjective vitality is obtained by studying group members' perceptions of its vitality.

## Method of study

The data were from 376 Foochow respondents, comprising 188 students studying in a private college in Sibü and their parents. The parents and their children were sampled to compare the changes, if any, in language use and identities across generations. Table 1 shows the respondents' demographic information.

Table 1: *Background information on respondents (N=376)*

Demographic characteristic		Parents (n=188) %	Children (n=188) %
Gender	Female	71.12	65.96
	Male	28.88	34.04
Average age		48.52	19.99
Family monthly income	Less than RM2000	48.55	
	RM2000-RM3999	38.73	
	RM4000-RM5999	7.51	
	RM6000-RM7999	4.05	
	More than RM8000	1.16	
Medium of instruction (primary school)	Malay	10.16	11.56
	Chinese	81.28	88.44
	English	8.56	0

Note: 1USD is approximately equivalent to RM4.44.

The selection criteria were that both the student and one of their parents had to participate in the study, and they had to self-identify themselves as Foochow. Out of 514 questionnaires returned, 376 were selected. If either the student or the parent was not Foochow (i.e. from other Chinese dialect groups), they were excluded to avoid confounding the results. To highlight the family relation, the students will be termed as "children" in this paper.

The questionnaire had sections on demographic background, linguistic repertoire and language proficiency, language use, strength of Foochow identity, and strength of Chinese identity. Respondents' language use in seven domains were examined using 23 items (parents) or 21 items (children, excluding employment). The Foochow identity comprised four items dealing with their attachment to the Foochow dialect, the need to speak Foochow to signify their identity as a Foochow, and their self-identification as a Foochow versus a Chinese. The Chinese identity was measured using Ting and Rose's (2014) adaptation of the Multiethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) formulated by Phinney (1992) to assess ethnic identity across diverse ethnic groups. Ting and Rose (2014) added four items on ethnic behaviour to the original 20 items because language is marker of ethnic identity for many ethnic groups in Malaysia (Ting, 2016; Ting & Campbell, 2013). The Cronbach Alpha value is 0.765, showing internal consistency of the questionnaire. Ingroup ethnic orientation comprised ethnic identity achievement (7 items), affirmation and belonging (5 items), and ethnic behaviour (2 items). Other-group orientation (6 items) deals with intergroup attitudes, and high scores show that individuals have positive attitudes towards other ethnic groups.

Questionnaires in Chinese, English, or Malay were given to respondents depending on their preference. The second researcher explained the purpose of the study, voluntary participation, and confidentiality of responses, and invited them to participate in the study. Those who were willing to participate in the study gave their written consent. The research procedures complied with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2000 (5). As the survey presented low risk to respondents, ethical approval was not required at the university. Nevertheless, to safeguard the respondents' safety, the second researcher was trained to provide information on the study, and the researchers' contact details were given in the questionnaire.

T-tests were conducted using the Excel statistical functions to compare the strength of the Foochow and Chinese identity for parents and children at the confidence level of 95%. Pearson correlation tests were conducted to find relationships between Foochow usage, Foochow identity, and Chinese identity of the Foochow respondents, and the p-value threshold was set at 0.05.

## Results

This section presents results on the Foochow dialect usage and identity of 376 respondents (188 parents, 188 children), encompassing their Foochow proficiency, extensiveness of Foochow usage in relation to other languages in seven domains, strength of Foochow identity, and relationships between Foochow usage, Foochow identity, and Chinese identity.

### Foochow proficiency

The respondents' Foochow proficiency was investigated because if the youngest generation, the children, can speak Foochow, it means that the dialect situation is sustainable. Among the children, more could speak Mandarin (183 or 97.34%) than Foochow (174 or 92.55%), but more parents could speak Foochow (181 or 96.28% parents) than Mandarin (177 or 94.15%). Even in Sibiu, some were losing the ability to speak Foochow (3.19% parents, 7.45% children). The intergenerational transmission of the Foochow dialect is vital because the children were more likely to learn Foochow from their family (59.42%), compared to their school (40.58%, percentages not shown in tables).

The children's best language was Mandarin (mean of 3.51 out of 4.00). Their Foochow proficiency trailed behind (2.90). Although their Foochow proficiency is still good, it is far below that than their parents' (mean score of 3.80). Both groups' proficiency in other languages were only adequate for daily communication.

Table 2: *Languages spoken by Foochow respondents and their language proficiency (N=376)*

Language	Parents (n=188)		Children (n=188)	
	Languages spoken by respondents	Language proficiency <sup>2</sup>	Languages spoken by respondents	Language proficiency <sup>2</sup>
Foochow	181	3.80	174	2.90
Mandarin	177	3.12	183	3.51
Malay	139	2.18	168	2.09
English	107	2.23	177	2.12
Hokkien	55	2.60	27	1.37
Iban	13	1.85	4	1.50
Cantonese	11	2.00	24	1.83
Hakka	7	1.86	7	1.29
Heng Hua	3	2.67	0	-
Malay dialects	2	2.00	0	-
Foreign languages	2	2.00	3	1.67
Total <sup>1</sup>	697		767	

Notes:

1. The total number exceeds the number of respondents because most could speak more than one language.
2. A scale of 1 to 4 was used: 1, a little bit; 2, enough for daily life; 3, well; 4, very well.

### Extensiveness of Foochow usage

Foochow usage in seven domains was examined to determine whether Foochow is still used as a language of wider communication, like in the 1970s and 1980s when all Chinese and even some non-Chinese in Sibiu could speak Foochow. Table 3 shows that for the parents, Foochow was used across all domains. Foochow was their most used language (53.21% of their total language choices), followed



by Mandarin (31.10%), but Mandarin had encroached into all domains. Malay was clearly the language for government business and interethnic communication in transactions and the mass media, but English was mostly used for work purposes.



Table 3: *Foochow parents' language use in seven domains (N=188)*

Language	Family	Friendship	Transactions	Religion	Government	Mass media	Employment*	Total	%
Malay	6	7	53	2	101	17	37	223	4.43
Malay dialect	0	4	15	0	36	1	13	69	1.37
Mandarin	345	209	117	175	38	535	147	1566	31.10
Cantonese	6	2	0	1	0	8	1	18	0.36
Foochow	1676	315	377	173	9	4	125	2679	53.21
Hainan	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0.04
Hakka	15	0	1	2	0	0	1	19	0.38
Heng Hua	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.02
Hokkien	41	10	6	4	0	1	7	69	1.37
Teochew	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	0.08
English	6	55	72	17	52	73	98	373	7.41
Iban	2	4	0	0	1	2	3	12	0.24
Foreign languages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2099</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>642</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>641</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>5035</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes: Family (children, spouse, father, mother, paternal grandparents, maternal grandparents, paternal aunts and uncles, maternal aunts and uncles, paternal cousins, maternal cousins), friendship (neighbour, close friends, online friends), transactions (shops, banks), religion (interactions, reading religious texts), government, mass media (radio, movies and television, newspaper), employment\* (colleagues, written communication)

\*Only for parents



Table 4: Foochow children's language use in seven domains (N=188)

Language	Family	Friendship	Transactions	Religion	Government	Mass media	Education*	Total	%
Malay	4	16	2	5	107	16	28	178	3.51
Malay dialect	1	7	0	1	37	0	4	50	0.99
Mandarin	856	487	196	298	43	532	162	2574	50.79
Cantonese	21	11	3	0	0	19	0	54	1.07
Foochow	1087	433	200	27	2	4	7	1760	34.73
Hainan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Hakka	13	4	5	1	0	0	0	23	0.45
Heng Hua	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Hokkien	6	4	2	1	0	1	0	14	0.28
Teochew	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
English	22	26	12	40	69	115	125	409	8.07
Iban	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0.04
Foreign languages	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	0.08
<b>Total</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>989</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>692</b>	<b>5068</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: \*Education (teacher, office staff) is only for children

Table 4 shows that for the children, the most frequently used language was Mandarin (50.79%), followed by Foochow (34.73%). Foochow usage was mainly in informal domains (family, friendship, transactions, and religion) and clearly absent from formal domains (government, mass media, education). The transactions domain is undergoing a transition, where Foochow is being supplanted by Mandarin. As far as the children are concerned, Mandarin is the language for wider communication. They could use Mandarin in the private college where they were studying because of the Chinese-dominant staff, but they had to speak some English to non-Chinese staff. In other public universities where there are fewer Chinese staff, the students have to speak English or Malay. The results showed that Foochow is used in education (for the children), work (for the parents), but not in the mass media, which indicates that Foochow is not a language of wider communication that can transcend language differences in Sibü.

### Strength of Foochow identity

The strength of Foochow identity was computed from four components, that is, whether Foochow was the respondents' most cherished language, the most emotionally expressive language, speaking Foochow symbolised the Foochow identity, and they identified more with the Foochow identity or the Chinese identity. The t-test showed that there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Foochow identity for parents ( $M=6.08$ ,  $SD=2.73$ ) and their children ( $M=3.58$ ,  $SD=2.20$ ) at  $p=0.000$ . The mean scores indicated that the Chinese dialect identity had weakened among the children.

Table 5 shows that the Foochow respondents wrote down the same language as their most cherished language, and their most emotionally expressive language in the questionnaire. For the parents, it was Foochow, but it was Mandarin for their children. Although the children had good proficiency in Foochow (Table 2), Foochow was merely a means of communication and they had no emotional attachment to the language (mean of 2.30 out of 10 for both most cherished, and most emotionally expressive language). About one-third of parents were also more attached to Mandarin than Foochow, but the overall mean for the parents was still high for the selection of Foochow as their most cherished language (6.46) and the most emotionally expressive language (6.70).

Table 5: *Foochow respondents' most cherished language and most emotionally expressive language*

Language	Parents (n=188)		Children (n=188)	
	Most cherished language	Most expressive language	Most cherished language	Most expressive language
Malay	1	0	1	0
Mandarin	67	56	129	134
Foochow	126	129	47	52
Hokkien	1	2	0	1
English	8	4	22	14
Foreign languages	0	0	1	1
Total <sup>1</sup>	203	191	200	202
Mean for selection of Foochow out of language(s) stated <sup>2</sup>	6.46	6.70	2.30	2.30
Standard deviation	4.64	4.57	4.11	4.05

Notes:

1. The total number exceeds the number of respondents because a few wrote two or three languages
2. The mean for the most cherished and the most expressive languages was calculated on a scale of 0 (if Foochow was not stated) to 10 (if Foochow is the only language stated). When three languages are stated and Foochow is one of them, a score of 3.33 was given.

Table 6: Mean scores showing respondents' Foochow and Chinese identity (N=376)

Items on Foochow-Chinese identity	Parents (n=188)		Children (n=188)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. Foochow people should speak Foochow. If they don't speak Foochow, they are not Foochow.	5.29	3.61	4.49	3.18
2. Chinese people should speak Mandarin. If they don't speak Mandarin, they are not Chinese.	5.24	3.55	4.71	3.26
3. I am more Foochow than Chinese.	5.88	3.19	5.23	2.96

Notes:

1. 11-point scale from 0 to 10, mid-point of 5
2. Item 2 was excluded from the calculation of Foochow identity

### Strength of Chinese ethnic identity

Table 6 shows that the Foochow respondents were somewhat neutral on the need for Foochow people to speak Foochow to earn their membership in the Foochow community (parents, M=5.28; children, M=4.49). The same pattern of results was seen for Mandarin, showing a rejection of the patrimony view of ethnicity. Both parents and children felt that they were more Foochow than Chinese, but the parents had a stronger Foochow identity (M=5.88) than their children (M=5.23). The t-test results reported earlier showed that the difference is significant.

Table 7 shows that the Foochow respondents' Chinese identity was moderate (mean scores of 2-3). The t-test showed that there was a significant difference in the overall scores for Chinese ethnic identity for parents (M=2.91, SD=0.87) and their children (M=2.80, SD=0.87) at p=0.000. The mean scores indicated that the parents had a stronger Chinese ethnic identity than their children, not only for the overall score but also all the components. The following descriptions are based on the MEIM questionnaire items.

Table 7: Strength of Chinese ethnic identity for the parents and children (N=376)

Ethnic identity components	Parents (n=188)		Children (n=188)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Ethnic identity achievement	2.73	0.80	2.58	0.77
Affirmation and belonging	3.21	0.77	3.14	0.79
Ethnic behaviour	2.86	0.94	2.76	0.90
Other-group orientation	2.87	0.86	2.75	0.91
Average	2.91	0.87	2.80	0.87

Note: The scale for the items is 1 to 4, mid-point of 2.5.

The Foochow respondents had favourable in- and other-group orientation. The parents had a slightly higher level of ethnic identity achievement than their children, and were more committed to their Chinese identity. The parents had done more exploration of what their ethnicity meant by talking to other people about their ethnic background, and participating in cultural activities. As for affirmation and belonging, the parents expressed more pride in their ethnic group and its achievements, and had a stronger sense of belonging to the Chinese community. The marginally positive scores for ethnic behaviours was due to a balancing of the positive ethnic language behaviour and lukewarm participation in cultural activities. As for other-group orientation, the Foochow respondents were involved in activities with people from other ethnic groups due to work or studies. Malaysia is a multiethnic society, and children grow up with exposure to other ethnic groups not only in daily life, but also through the mass media and school textbooks. In educational institutions and the workplace, the outgroup exposure depends on the ethnic composition of the colleagues.

## Relationships between Foochow usage, Foochow identity, and Chinese identity

Table 8 showed a significant strong relationship between Foochow usage and Mandarin usage ( $r=-0.75$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). As Foochow usage increases, Mandarin usage decreases. There is a moderately strong relationship between Foochow usage and Foochow identity ( $r=0.58$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). The relationship between Foochow identity and Mandarin usage is moderate and negative ( $r=-0.41$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). It appears that a stronger Foochow identity is associated with greater use of Foochow and less use of Mandarin.

Table 8: *Pearson correlation test results on Foochow usage, Foochow identity, and Chinese identity*

	Foochow usage	Mandarin usage	Foochow identity	Chinese identity
Foochow usage	1			
Mandarin usage	-0.75*	1		
Foochow identity	0.58*	-0.41*	1	
Chinese identity	0.11	-0.13	0.14	1

Note: \* $p<0.05$

## Discussion

The study on Foochow parents and their college-aged children showed an intergenerational weakening of the Foochow dialect use and identity. The Foochow dialect is sustainable as it is used for face-to-face communication by all generations, and its vitality can be described as vigorous. Presently, 92.55% of the children is still proficient in Foochow, but the proficiency level has decreased from their parents' generation. Mandarin has encroached into all domains of language use in the children's generation, leaving Foochow to the family, friendship, and religious domains. The transactions domain is in a transition phase, where Foochow is being pushed out by Mandarin. However, Foochow is irrelevant in the mass media, education, and government domains.

In the 1970s and 1980s, Foochow was somewhat a language of wider communication in Sibiu, and even some non-Foochow people used it in transactions, employment and, to some extent, in religious and mass media domains. Today, Foochow CEOs still communicate with Foochow partners and employees in Foochow, but they switch to Mandarin to speak with Chinese from other dialect groups (Ting, 2017). The institution that can offer institutional support to literacy in Foochow is the Methodist church, because Christians learn to read aloud the Chinese Bible in Foochow. However, church services in Foochow have dwindled to a handful in small rural churches. The Cantonese and Hokkien enjoy institutional support from the entertainment industry in Hong Kong and Taiwan respectively, but the Foochow entertainment industry is not developed. The Foochow segment on Radio Television Malaysia at 5.40 p.m. has been cancelled. Interestingly, Foochow associations are still making a strong presence in every town, but they use Mandarin for their activities (e.g., festival celebrations, singing competitions). It seems that Foochow is not immune to the threat from Mandarin despite having numerical strength in areas like Sibiu. According to Ting and Puah (2015), the agricultural beginnings of Foochow ancestors may have given the Foochow a low class identity leading them to prefer Mandarin, unlike the Hokkien who take more pride in speaking their dialect. However, the Foochow are known to be rich (Puah & Ting, 2015), and are prominent in politics (Chin, 2012), business (de Run, Subramaniam, & Wong, 2006), banking, education and other professions (Ling & Thock, 2015). In the context of Giles et al.'s (1977) framework on ethnolinguistic vitality, when there is no institutional support for the written use of the dialect, the high social status of speakers and numerical dominance are inadequate to raise the vitality of the Foochow dialect to a high level, and to enable it to serve as a language of wider communication in Foochow-dominant areas.

The study showed a generational change in identity as in the younger Foochow respondents are getting detached from their Foochow identity. This is due to the growth of Mandarin because greater use of Mandarin is related to a weaker Foochow identity and reduced Foochow usage. "The adoption of the Chinese standard language in schools provides the Chinese population with a new linguistic unity on the basis of their [shared] Chinese cultural identity" (Vollmann & Soon, 2018). With a majority of the Foochow having a Chinese-educational background (88.44% of children and 81.24% of parents), the trend is towards a pan-Chinese identity anchored to Mandarin. However, the emergence of the pan-Chinese identity will be gradual, unlike some younger Hakka in Kuching who have refused to identify

themselves as Hakka, and this is happening despite the Hakka population is the largest among the Chinese dialect groups in Kuching (Ting, 2018; Ting & Chang, 2008).

We had expected an inverse relationship between Foochow identity and Chinese identity, but no association was found. The Foochow dialect identity and Chinese identity may not be in a linear relationship, different from Foochow usage and Mandarin usage. This is because Chinese dialectal identity is subsumed under the broader Chinese identity. A limitation of the present study is that only the ethnic identity formation was measured but not the specifics of what it means to be Chinese in terms of behaviour and attitudes. Further research should be conducted to investigate the related, yet distinct, dialect and ethnic group identities to understand the changing nature of Chinese ethnicity in various diasporic settings.

### Funding

This work was funded by University Malaysia Sarawak via *Dana Penyelidikan Khas UNIMAS* [Special Research Grant UNIMAS] awarded to a project on “Predictive model of intergenerational transmission of ethnic language”. Grant No.: DPK/05/2010.

## References

- Chin, J. (2012). Forced to the periphery: Recent Chinese politics in East Malaysia. In L. H. Guan, & L. Suryadinata (Eds.). *Malaysian Chinese: Recent developments and prospects* (pp. 109-124). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- David, M. K., Yee, M. T. W., Ngeow, Y. M., & Gan, K. H. (2009). Language choice and code switching of the elderly and the youth. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 200, 49-74.
- de Run, E. C., Subramaniam, M., & Lung, M. W. S. (2006). The Foochow entrepreneurial characteristics: Comparison between generations. *Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability*, 2(3), 126-151.
- Department of Statistics, Malaysia. (2014). *Total population by sex and detail ethnic group*. Kuala Lumpur: Department of Statistics.
- Department of Statistics, Malaysia. (2017). Population Projections (Revised) based on the Population and Housing Census of Malaysia 2010. <https://data.sarawak.gov.my/home/data/resource/d8336af5-4667-463f-aa61-441edad63d08>
- Department of Statistics, Malaysia. (2020). Population quick info. <http://pqi.stats.gov.my/result.php?token=621547dba490abda3a4036508047a0fa>
- Ding, S. L. (2016). The role of parents in heritage language maintenance in Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Chinese Studies*, 5(1), 15-27.
- Fishman, J. A. (1977). Language and ethnicity. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15-58). London: Academic Press.
- Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 307-348). London: Academic Press.
- Kow, K. Y. C. (2003). Language shift and language maintenance in mixed marriages: A case study of a Malaysian-Chinese family. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 161, 81-90.
- Kuang, C. H. (2002). Code switches: A measurement for language shift? A case study of a Malaysian Chinese family. In M. K. David (Ed.), *Methodological and analytical issues in language maintenance and language shift studies* (pp. 91-111). Frankfurt: PeterLang.
- Ling, H. Y., & Thock, K. P. (2015). The economic activities of Foochow in Sibiu: Development and transformation. *Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture*, 3(2), 20-31.
- Low, H. M., Nicholas, H., & Wales, R. (2010). A sociolinguistic profile of 100 mothers from middle to upper-middle socio-economic backgrounds in Penang-Chinese community. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31(6), 569-584.

- Morita, L. C. (2005). Three core values (religion, family and language) of the Chinese in Thailand. *Studies in Language and Culture*, 27(1), 109-131.
- Ong, T. W. S. (2020). Why bother maintaining languages? A discussion based on diminishing Chinese dialects in Malaysia. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 14(1), 1-5.
- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7(2), 156-176.
- Puah, Y. Y., & Ting, S. H. (2015). Malaysian Chinese speakers' attitudes towards Foochow, Hokkien and Mandarin. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36(5), 451-467.
- Ting, S. H. (2016). Being Malaysian: Identifying characteristics. In K. Ali, & S. S. Wan Ahmad (Eds.), *Researching society and culture in Sarawak* (pp. 217-240). Kota Samarahan, Malaysia: Penerbit Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.
- Ting, S. H. (2017). Language choices of CEOs of Chinese family business in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38 (4), 360-371.
- Ting, S. H. (2018). Intergenerational transmission of the ethnic language: Hakka stops at gen X. *Grazer Linguistische Studien*, 89, 63-88.
- Ting, S. H., & Campbell, Y. M. (2013, November 16-17). *Salience of ethnic identity as an ethnic marker: A snapshot of the Bidayuh in Sarawak, Malaysia*. Proceedings of International Conference on Languages 2013 (ICL 2013), Phuket, Thailand.
- Ting, S. H., & Chang, Y. S. (2008, July 29-31). *Communication in a close-knit extended Hakka family in Kuching, Sarawak: Mandarin or Hakka?* Proceedings of 9th Biennial Borneo Research Council (BRC) Conference, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia.
- Ting, S. H., & Hung, Y. L. (2008, August 5-7). *Mothers and mother tongue: Their role in promoting Foochow to their children*. Proceedings of 6th International Malaysian Studies Conference (MSC6) "Engaging Malaysian Modernity: 50 years and Beyond", Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia.
- Ting, S. H., & Puah, Y. Y. (2015). Sociocultural traits and language attitudes of Chinese Foochow and Hokkien in Malaysia. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 25(1), 117-140.
- Ting, S. H., & Rose, L. (2014). Ethnic language use and ethnic identity for Sarawak Indigenous groups in Malaysia. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 53(1), 92-109.
- Vollmann, R., & Soon, T. W. (2018). Chinese identities in multilingual Malaysia. *Grazer Linguistische Studien*, 89, 35-61.
- Wang, X. M. (2017). Can a language spread from bottom upwards? A study on the spread of standard Chinese in Johor, Malaysia. *Global Chinese*, 3(2). DOI: 10.1515/glochi-2017-0008