

Language Use in Taiwan: Language Proficiency and Domain Analysis

Hsi-nan Yeh

Department of English
National Taiwan Normal University

Hui-chen Chan

Department of English
National Chengchi University

Yuh-show Cheng

Department of English
National Taiwan Normal University

Abstract

In Taiwan, the compulsory National Language Policy since 1950s has forcefully caused a shift from the indigenous native languages, including Minnanyu, Hakka, and Polynesian languages, to the national language, Mandarin. However, the drastic socio-economic and political changes in late 1980s seemed to have re-kindled the revival of these native languages. These native languages are coming back in all aspects of life, including the mass media and education.

To obtain a better idea of the process of language shift in Taiwan, this study examined the language proficiency and language use of the three non-Mainlander groups in Taiwan. It focused on analyzing the relationships between their language choice and such variables as age, gender, education levels, and social domains. The use of Mandarin by Mainlanders was also examined as a reference point in some analyses.

It was found that there were significant relationships between language proficiency and age, gender, as well as education levels. As a whole, the language use of each individual non-Mainlander group in this study confirmed Fishman's domain analysis. Language shift patterns between the native languages and the national language vary with languages, with Minnanyu demonstrating an increasing reversed shift, Hakka continuing its long-term shift toward Mandarin, and Polynesian languages experiencing an even greater shift toward Mandarin.

Key Words: language use, language shift, domain analysis, native language

Introduction

After the founding of the Republic of China in 1911, the Nationalist government instituted the National Language Movement (NLM), a mass effort to standardize and propagate the National Language (or Mandarin). First, Mandarin was selected as the supra-dialectal norm. Next, in 1916, the Ministry of Education authorized a system for transcribing alphabets which was renamed the National Phonetic Symbols (NSP) in

1930. The propagation of Mandarin on the Mainland of China dated from 1911, but this language policy was not introduced to Taiwan until thirty-five years later.

From 1894 to 1945, Taiwan was under the Japanese occupation. During that period, at first, only Japanese and the various dialects in Taiwan were allowed to be spoken, and Mandarin was strictly forbidden; but very soon even the dialects

were prohibited. In 1945, after the surrender of Japan, Taiwan was returned to the Republic of China, and the government immediately started the NLM in Taiwan. In the following year, the Committee for the Propagation and Promotion of the National Language (CPPNL) in Taiwan was established. The major tasks of CPPNL were to implement the language policy of the nation, to propagate the authorized standards of Mandarin, to promote literacy through NPS, to direct the teaching of Mandarin in the regions, and to train teachers of Mandarin. At that time, qualified teachers of Mandarin were few, standard textbooks were not available, and the teaching/learning situations were not at all effective. To remedy the problems, since 1952 the training of regular teachers of Mandarin has been taken over by the normal schools and Chinese departments of all colleges and universities. Moreover, throughout the textbooks of Chinese for the first and the second grades, all the characters were transcribed into NPS. Further, since 1954, all first grade students of primary school have been required to take the course of Chinese Phonetic Alphabets and Pronunciation in the first twelve weeks of the first semester of school. On the surface it seems to be a glorious victory that today most, if not all, of those under the age of fifty-five speak the national language fluently. Unfortunately, the goal of promoting Mandarin was achieved at the price of endangering the native languages in Taiwan.

Basically, before 1945, using dialects was not prohibited by the Nationalist Government. However, from mid 1940s to mid 1980s, all the

language policies seem to hold a negative attitude toward the native languages of the non-Mainlander groups. A summary of those policies below reveals such discrimination:¹

- (1) No dialects² can be used as the medium of instruction in the schools.
- (2) No dialect is taught as a subject.
- (3) Dialect writing is prohibited.
- (4) In the military, the governmental organizations, and educational institutions, public use of dialect is banned.
- (5) The use of dialects in the media is curtailed, and any attempt to use it ceases altogether.
- (6) The dialects are given no legal status.
- (7) The notion that using dialects is unpatriotic is encouraged via the Speak Mandarin Campaign, which equates speaking Mandarin with love and fidelity for one's country.

In 1970, six measures were announced by the Ministry of Education as part of the plan to promote wider use of Mandarin, which became a part of the Chinese Cultural Restoration Movement. Again, some of these measures aroused vigorous debates. Among them, Measure 3c demanded improvement of radio and television programs, i.e., the amount of dialect programs should be decreased and Mandarin programs increased; Measure 5 required organizations, schools, offices, and all public areas to use Mandarin, i.e., civil servants and teachers in the public schools should use Mandarin and set an example for others. By law, instruction in the native languages in school has been declared illegal since 1945, and the dialect programming was reduced.

¹ This summary is adapted from Ether Figueroa, "Language Policy in Taiwan: The Politics of Guoyu," Master Thesis, Hawaii: University of Hawaii, p.50.

² "Dialects" means primarily the native languages of the non-Mainlander groups.

There has been constant argument between those who support strengthening the promotion of Mandarin and those who are concerned with the loss of the dialects. To prevent the discord within the nation, in 1973 the Ministry of Education proclaimed officially before the National Assembly that linguistic unity is a national policy, but the government in no way plans to eliminate the dialects.

The lift of martial law in 1987 marked a new era for a multi-cultural and multi-lingual society in Taiwan. With this political change and worldwide multiculturalism, people started to view dialects from a new perspective. In mass communication, the Legislative Yuan removed the constraints on dialects, and added a new provision in Radio and Television Law to secure the chances of broadcasting in dialects (Chen, 1998). In education, in 1993 the Ministry of Education (MOE) finally approved to implement native language education at the levels of primary and secondary school education, provided that the promotion of Mandarin remains unimpeded. Three years later, in 1996, a 40-minute course of “native culture instruction activity” was offered once a week in the primary school. However, in this culture-oriented course, very little time was devoted to language teaching (Chen, 2003), and Mandarin was used as the primary medium of instruction in most cases (Chen, 1998).

A further move was the inclusion of a new course “Taiwanese Native Languages” in the Grades 1-9 Curriculum. Starting from 2001, students in elementary schools are required to

study their own native languages, one period a week, for six years. However, in view of poor planning and implementation of this new language education policy, it is never optimistic that the native languages will survive the competition with Mandarin and English (Hong, 2002).

The latest effort in protecting Taiwanese native languages is the drafting of the National Languages Development Law (NLDL). It could be traced back to the draft of language law by the MOE in 1983, which discontinued due to lack of consensus. The MOE re-drafted a new language policy entitled “Language Equality Law” in February, 2003. With a view that languages are important cultural assets, the Council for Cultural Affairs took over the draft in March, 2003, and proposed a draft of the NLDL (<http://www.cca.gov.tw/news/2003/09222.htm>) in September, 2003.³ The NLDL aims to assign equal status to all the national languages in Taiwan. “National languages” are defined as the natural languages/dialects, sign languages or written systems used by any ethnic group in this country. Central or local government may designate any national languages as the “common languages” in the “community.” With such designation, “this” government is obliged to provide multi-lingual services or resources on all official occasions (*The Libertytimes*, 9/23/2003). It entails lot of tasks to accomplish in all aspects of life, including administration, mass media, education, and the like. Nevertheless, if this law is passed in the Legislative Yuan, it will definitely become a very important landmark in the history of Taiwanese language policies.

³ At the moment of writing this paper, the NLDL proposal is in the process of public hearing.

To sum up, under the compulsory National Language Policy for half a century, the indigenous non-Mainlander⁴ residents in Taiwan are said to have experienced language shift from their native languages to Mandarin or “Guoyu”, the national language of the Republic of China. However, the drastic socio-economic and political change by the non-Mainlander ethnic groups (especially the Minnanrens) in the past twenty years and the advocacy of multilingualism and multiculturalism have enabled these groups to claim for their right to promote their status and the status of their native languages in the society of Taiwan, which later on, in late 1990s, invited the enactment and the

reinforcement of the nation-wide Native Language Education. Today, the language shifting phenomenon originally activated by the compulsory National Language Policy seems to have eased down.

To obtain a better idea of the process of language shift in Taiwan, the authors of this paper examined the language proficiency and language use of the three non-Mainlander groups in Taiwan, with a focus on analyzing the relationships between their language choice and such individual as well as social variables as age, gender, education levels, social domains, and so on. The use of Mandarin by Mainlanders was also examined as a reference point in some analyses.

Literature Review

1. Language Maintenance and Language Shift

In general, there are three possible results of language choice: (1) language maintenance—a community chooses to continue using the language(s) that it has previously used, (2) language shift—a community decides to adopt another language and abandon the language that it traditionally used, and (3) coexistence of language maintenance and language shift—a community

retains one of the languages that it has used in the past and, at the same time replaces another with a new language.

According to Fishman et al. (1985), the interaction between two separate monolingual collectives may result in three major linguistic resolutions. First, the intrusive language is lost. That is, the indigenous language is maintained, but the intrusive language fails to take hold. Second, the indigenous language is lost, and the intrusive

⁴ One limitation of this study is the definition of “mainlanders.” The first-generation Mainlanders, who moved to Taiwan with the Nationalist Government in 1949, came from different parts of mainland and spoke different Chinese dialects (Chen, 2003). Therefore, as noted by one of the reviewers of this paper, many of these mainlanders did not actually enjoy any advantage in the National Language Movement later on. They went through the same process of learning a new language as Minnanrens, Hakka, and aboriginals did.

Liao (2000) maintains that “distinctions between Mainlanders and Taiwanese are based on when they first settled on this island,” and “language plays a minimizing distinguishing role in the two identities.” As for the language backgrounds of these Mainlanders, both Liao (2000) and Hong (2002) note that due to “language competition,” their individual Chinese dialects were very soon replaced by Mandarin. Those “hometown” dialects continue to function only among the older mainlanders. Hong therefore concludes that “the so-called mainlanders can be said to primarily use only one language, though some may also be able to speak Minnanyu or Hakka” (p. 1). For the ease of analysis, the researchers here adopt Hong’s definition and classify these mainlanders as a general group. This definition is even less problematic today, a time when most of the first generation mainlanders turn seventy years of age or even older, and the diversity among the younger mainlanders has decreased greatly.

language replaces the indigenous language. The third resolution is that both the indigenous language and the intrusive language are maintained. Under the third circumstance, the situation of language maintenance may be further divided into two patterns: (1) both the intrusive language and the indigenous language are utilized for the same functions, and (2) one of the two languages functions as high language, and the other language serves as the common vernacular. In the former case, there is no compartmentalization of the two languages in the same polity, i.e., the intrusive language and the indigenous language compete for realization in the same domains, situations, and role relations. In short, either language may serve almost full-fledged functions. The community may thus either be diglossic without bilingualism or bilingual without diglossia. An example of diglossia without bilingualism is Asian colonies of European countries, in which the ruling group speaks only their native language (or the intrusive language), while the dominated group uses exclusively their native languages (or the indigenous language). This kind of compartmentalization is quite stable since the two groups seldom, if ever, interact with each other. However, bilingualism without diglossia generally leads to language shift--either the indigenous language is swamped by the intrusive language or the intrusive language is lost to the indigenous language. In Mcrae's (1983, reported in Fishman et al. 1985, p68) study of Switzerland, the Italian speakers in German and French cantons, due to economic factors, finally yielded to the local linguistic patterns, despite the fact that they were the first comers to settle in that area. In other words, the intrusive language (Italian, in this case)

was taken over by the indigenous language (German and French).

Contrary to the pattern described in the previous paragraph, in some communities the intrusive language and the indigenous language may compete for the role of high language. That is, the indigenous language may play the role of high language, with the intrusive functioning as the low language; or it is the intrusive language that is the high language, and the indigenous language the low language. Fishman et al. (1985) reports that in Ireland, especially outside of the Gaeltacht region, Irish (the indigenous language) is the high language, while Hiberno-English (the intrusive language) is the vernacular of the Irishmen. Opposite to Fishman's finding, Rubin (1968) indicates that in Paraguay, it is the intrusive language (namely, Spanish) that serves as high language, while the indigenous language (Guarani) is the low language. In either case just mentioned, the linguistic situation of the community is language maintenance under the pattern of diglossia with bilingualism.

It is usually expected that a language shift, once triggered, would move toward its end, whatever the pace may be. However, sometimes this journey may not be completed, and the on-going language shift is reversed, i.e., the community shifts from an old language to a new language, and then swings back to the old language. In Fasold's study of the Tiwa Indians of New Mexico (reported in Fasold 1984, pp231-49), the linguistic data collected suggest that a shift from Tiwa to English may have begun, but there are some indications that there is currently a reversal from the shifting (from Tiwa to English) back to maintenance (of Tiwa). In Taiwan, the general

public tend to believe that Minnayu, the native language of the Minnanrens, may have a chance to escape from the tide of language shift, since it takes a considerably large proportion of speakers within the total population of Taiwan, and has been enjoying a relatively high socio-economic and political status in the society of Taiwan. Of course, scrupulous investigations are needed before any conclusion can be drawn.

2. Domain Analysis of Language Choice

Language choice has been analyzed from different perspectives. First, the sociological approach provides a way to subcategorize people's behavior of language choice. Second, the social-psychological approach tries to offer internal reasons (i.e., an individual's psychological state and needs) to explain why people make a certain language choice. Third, the anthropological approach looks for external factors (i.e., the value system of the society or the culture) to explain and, perhaps, to predict people's language choice. Since this paper lays its focus on presenting a preliminary description of the language use in Taiwan today, only the first approach is reviewed and applied for data analysis.

From social perspective, Fishman's (1964, 1968a) domain analysis proposes that one language may be more appropriate than another in certain domains (which are a constellation of factors such as participants, location, and topic), and usually it is the standard or prestigious language that is used in high domains, while the vernaculars are selected in low domains.

Following Fishman's model, Greenfield (1972) finds that in the bilingual Puerto Rican community in New York City, Spanish (the low language) is favored in intimate domains (such as family and

friendship), while English (the high language) is chosen when status difference is salient (such as in employment and education). Parasher's (1980) study of India shows that the family domain is the only domain in which the low languages (including the subjects' native language and languages other than English) dominate. On the other hand, English, the high language, dominates not only the high domains (including education, government, and employment) but also, unexpectedly, some of the low domains, such as friendship and neighborhood domains. Parasher's explanation for the use of English in low domains is that most of his educated subjects do not share a native language with their friends, and that topics of conversation among friends are usually from more formal domains; therefore, despite the setting and the relationship between the interlocutors, English is used more often than any other languages. It seems that to a large extent, in Taiwan, Mandarin is also chosen for the purpose of mutual intelligibility. In Huang's (1988) study of Taiwan, it is found that Mandarin has extended its domain. In addition to the domains of friendship and work, it also invades the family domain. According to Huang, both the Minnanrens and the Hakka show a significantly decreasing use of their native languages and shift toward Mandarin, especially when they talk with family members of succeeding generations. In Chan's (1994) study, Mandarin is also found to be used in all domains, including for home communication and even for religious purposes which depended solely on Minnanyu just two generations ago.

Domain analysis is not fully supported by all scholars. Gal (1979) suggests that setting, occasion, and topic are less important factors than

the identity of the speaker and his/her interlocutors. According to Gal, instead of putting stress on the congruency of the components of a domain, perhaps a person's identity alone would be sufficient to explain people's language choice. Gal's proposal is supported by Lu (1988). Lu claims that language choice in Taiwan may not be domain-determined because in the family domain, for instance, a bilingual speaker might use Minnanyu to talk with his/her parents but shift to Mandarin when he talks with his/her siblings on the occasion about the same topic. Moreover, Gal (1979) tries to explain people's language choice by examining the influences of the community structure and its value system. In Austria, German, the high language and the national language, is associated with the more "Austrian" and urban values, while Hungarian, the low language and the traditional ingroup language, represent the traditional peasant values. A Hungarian's choice between these two languages is determined by his/her self-identity--whether he/she wants to retain the identity as a member of a traditional social group (i.e., as a Hungarian) or he/she wants to pursue a new identity as a member of the nation of industrial commercial economy pater (i.e., as an Austrian). In the former situation, the Hungarian language is chosen; in the latter situation, the German language is adopted. In addition, if a Hungarian considers German and Hungarian as parallel social groups, he/she would use Hungarian even in the presence of a monolingual German. Although Gal's solution saves the trouble of dealing with the congruency of the components of each communicative event, Fasold (1984) points out that it has a problem--how to measure the strength of each person's

community involvement, which would determine whether he/she desires strongly enough to be a member of the community and would, therefore, obey the value system of that community when that person makes his/her language choice.

3. Determinants of Language Choice

3.1. Ethnicity

Ethnicity, according to Fishman et al. (1985, p4), consists of "the sensing and expressing of links to one's own kind (one's own people), to collectivities that not only purportedly have historical depth but, more crucially, share putative ancestral origins and, therefore, the gifts and responsibilities, rights and obligations deriving therefrom." It is comprised of three components--being, knowing, and doing. To reflect each of these three dimensions, language is always the selected tool. To be more specific, every language serves as an index of a culture and becomes symbolic of that culture in which it dwells. Since ethnicity is one of the major phases of culture, very often languages are taken as markers of ethnicity.

Ethnicity is politically motivated as well as culturally or biologically oriented. It is on the political ground that language, as a transmitter of ethnic identity, is utilized in all kinds of movements to arouse people's consciousness and actions to defend the ethnocultures that they are embedded or to reject those ethnocultures that threaten their status (or even their existence) in the same context. Whatever the function that ethnicity may serve, one basic question to ask is whether ethnic identity changes with language change, and vice versa. Fishman et al. (1985) proposes that ethnocultural identity may remain at a conscious or unconscious attitudinal level even

though the language which intimately associates with it disappears. Following the same line, Edward (1977 & 1984) claims that language carries not only the communicative functions but also the symbolic functions, and the latter may still exist after the former extinguishes. Eastman and Reese (1981) propose that the relationship between language and ethnicity is built on the basis of "association," but the language which is associated with a certain ethnic identity is not always the one that the members of that ethnic group choose for daily use, or it may be one that the members do not even know. In other words, it is not necessary that a person's ethnic identity coincides with the language he/she uses. Lu (1988) offers supportive evidence. According to her, many Minnanrens in Taiwan, although they neither speak nor understand Minnanyu, consider Minnanyu as a sign of their ethnic identity.

On the other hand, a speaker's native language may not always be the indicator of his/her ethnic identity. Pool (1979) indicates that in Quebec, the language to which a speaker shifts is a better predictor of his/her ethnic background than is the language from which he/she shifts. In other words, in Quebec, it is more likely that when a person acquires and uses a language other than his native language, he also acquires the ethnic identity accompanying that language. However, in Wales (Pool, 1979), those speakers who have native competence in Welsh are more likely to claim themselves to be Welsh than those who do not have the native competence of Welsh. That is, in Wales, it is one's native language that is the better indicator of one's ethnic background.

Moreover, there is not always a one-to-one correspondence between ethnic identity and

language. Instead of keeping a single identity, some people may carry dual identity, and this dual identity is not necessarily signified by more than one language. In Tudgill's (1983) study of Arvanitika-speaking villages of Greece, it is found that most of Arvanitika-speaking subjects think that they can have both Arvanitis and Greek identities, and that it is not necessary to be able to speak Arvanitika to be an Arvanitis. Similar finding is reported by Chan (1994). In her study, it is found that young Minnanrens do not demand a one-to-one relationship between the ethnic identity of Minnanren and Minnanyu, their native language. Many of them tend to keep a dual Minnanren-Chinese identity. Some of them even replace their ethnic identity with a national identity. It is the detachment of the association between their ethnic identity and their native language that leads to the language shift from Minnanyu to Mandarin.

3.2. Social Factors

3.2.1. Social Characteristics of the Community

Lewis (1985) indicates that the openness of the community is related to people's language choice. Some communities are more open and welcome to both non-linguistic and linguistic contacts. Through those contacts, some people of the community may adopt a new language and change their ethnic affiliation, while some other communities reject contact on the grounds of authoritarian attitudes, dogmatism, pride, or indifference. It is communities of the former type that are more likely to foster language shift, while those of the latter type foster language maintenance. Similarly, St. Clair (1982) proposes that the more conservative a community is, the more likely it is that it will use language as a constraint to deny the

minorities' access to the social, cultural, and political resources of the community.

In addition, social mobility, urbanization, industrialization, and modernity are also impetus to language shift. In Gal's (1979) study of Oberwart, it is found that language shift (from Hungarian to German) coincides with the change of the social structure (from an agricultural pattern to an urban, industrial pattern). Similar phenomenon is reported to be existent in Taiwan (Berg, 1988). According to Berg, Mandarin (the language shifted to) is associated with social upward modernity, while Minnanyu (the language shifted from) is related to localness and traditional values. Berg also claims that the socially mobile Minnanrens have found in bilingualism and multiple identity a mechanism for functioning in the bicultural society of Taiwan without creating new boundaries, and he believes that the future direction of change in Taiwan's sociolinguistic setting will be determined by the size of the new middle class and by the way that they wish to define their identity to meet social needs.

However, Berg's idea is not shared by Lu (1988). Lu argues that Minnanrens do not necessarily acquire Mainlander ethnic group membership when they acquire and use Mandarin for the sake of social mobility. According to her, the reason why Minnanrens use Mandarin so often is because they have been educated in Mandarin and have become accustomed to speaking it.

3.2.2. Age, Gender, Education Level

Language choice is also influenced by people's social characteristics. Huang (1988) reports that there are several social factors, singly or in combination, that will determine the amount

of the use of Mandarin and native languages. In his study, Huang finds that, for all subjects as a whole, those who consistently use more Mandarin with family members are females, younger respondents, respondents of higher education level, respondents born and raised in Taipei City, respondents grown up in a predominantly Mainlander neighborhood. Among these factors, the most influential ones are age, education level, and who one's early neighbors are. Likewise, Lu (1988) finds that Minnanrens are the only group among the three non-mainlander groups that show strong differences in age, education, gender, and residence area in their attitudes toward maintenance and legitimate status for the native languages, toward the native languages as markers of ethnic identity, and toward Mandarin as a marker of positive social values and the native languages, of negative values.

With mild difference from Huang's and Lu's findings, Chan (1994) reports that age and education level, but not gender, have significant effects on Minnanrens' proficiency in Mandarin and their native language, with the higher scores of Mandarin proficiency corresponding with subjects of younger age and those of higher education level, and the higher scores of Minnanyu proficiency with subjects of older age and lower education level. Chan (1994) also finds that Minnanrens' age and education level are significantly related to their choice between Mandarin and Minnanyu to talk with different people, in different locations, and on different topics. Again, no significant gender difference in Minnanrens' use of the two languages is located.

Research Design

In the *International Expert Meeting on UNESCO Programme: Safeguarding of the Endangered Languages* (2003), nine criteria are concluded to determine the vitality/endorsement of a language: (1) intergenerational language transmission, (2) absolute number of speakers, (3) proportion of speakers within the total population, (4) trends in existing language domains (areas of use), (5) response to new domains and media, (6) materials for language education and literacy, (7) governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies (including official status and use), (8) community members' attitudes toward their own language, and (9) amount and quality of documentation. The project, which was designed and conducted by the authors of this paper and from which this paper is derived, shares more than half of these nine criteria (except criteria 6, 7, and 9) in its investigation of the language shifting phenomenon in Taiwan. However, due to limitation of time and length of paper, only the first two parts of the design--language proficiency and domains of language use--are analyzed and discussed in this paper.

1. The Questionnaire

The first section of the questionnaire is to elicit information on the subjects' proficiency in Mandarin and their native languages, and their social backgrounds, which include their age, gender, education, place of origin, the neighborhoods where they grew up, and related social backgrounds of their mothers and spouses. The second part of the questionnaire is intended to examine how the subjects use Mandarin and their native languages when they communicate with

different people, in different locations, and on different topics.

2. Data Collection Procedures

In this study, there were two stages of data collection. In the first phase, 2,600 copies of questionnaire were sent out to 15 different cities in 2001, with a consideration of balanced distribution in northern, central, and southern Taiwan. To assure better return rate, high school teachers helped ask each student in class to bring home one questionnaire for his/her family, friend, or neighbor. Among the 2,185 returned questionnaires, 2,161 copies were valid while the other 24 copies, each with at least one whole page blank, were considered invalid.

In the second phase, 4 research assistants distributed 1,200 questionnaires in 12 aboriginal villages in the high mountains in early 2002. The questionnaires were mailed back later by the volunteers in these villages. 754 copies were returned, with 15 invalid, and 739 valid. In total, there were 2,900 valid copies.

3. Subjects

The demographic features of the subjects are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Features of the Surveyed Subjects

Variables	Number Percentage	
	(valid)	(valid)
gender	male	1361 47.0
	female	1533 53.0
age	young (<30)	1084 37.8
	mid (31—50)	1291 45.0
	old (>51)	496 17.3
education	low (\leq junior high)	977 34.0

	high (\geq senior high)	1895	66.0
location	northern cities	806	27.8
	central cities	604	20.8
	southern cities	751	25.9
	aboriginal villages	739	25.5
Ethnicity ⁵	Mainlanders ⁶	193	6.7
	Minnanrens	1580	55.0
	Hakka	337	11.7
	Aboriginal	762	26.5
native language	Mandarin	263	10.4
	Minnanyu	1264	50.2
	Hakka	252	10.0
	Polynesian languages	741	29.4

In general, the sample seemed to represent the

whole population in gender, age, and education.⁷ However, aboriginals were “severely” over-represented here in this study. Huang (1993) estimated that aborigines accounted for only 1.7% of the whole population in Taiwan. This over-representation resulted from the demand for a satisfactory number of subjects due to ethnic complexity from each aboriginal tribe (i.e., eleven different tribes in total) in the process of in-depth analysis. There were a great number of missing values (12.9% of the collected questionnaires) in the category of “native language” because many subjects reported more than one native language and were thus considered invalid.

Results

1. Proficiency in Mandarin and Native Languages

In section I of the questionnaire, the subjects were asked to self-evaluate their proficiency level in Mandarin and their native languages. A five-point scale for language proficiency was used, with 5= “very fluent”, 4= “able to communicate with other people”, 3= “able to communicate but with difficulty”, 2= “able to understand, but not able to speak”, and 1= “not able to understand at all.” The

means of Mandarin and native language proficiency in each ethnic group (i.e., Minnanyu, Hakka, and Malayo-Polynesian languages respectively) are presented in Table 2. Comparisons of the means of both Mandarin and native language proficiency were conducted using paired samples t-tests. The results reveal that the mean difference in each ethnic group was significant, though in different directions. Minnanrens spoke Minnanyu more fluently than

⁵ In spite of doubts from some scholars, the most widely-accepted classification of the major population in Taiwan includes four major ethnic groups: Minnanrens, Hakka, mainlanders, and aboriginals (Chen, 1997; Huang, 1994; Tzeng, 2000). Although there are many sub-groups in each of the four, no further classification of this kind was made in this study. Further study in this regard could be an issue worthy of exploration.

⁶ One problem in the classification of ethnicity could be the time or place from which one moved to Taiwan. In the questionnaire, item A4 requires the subjects to tick their own ethnicity from the four choices. Their self-reported responses were respected as their identified ethnicity. Such self-perceived, identity-based ethnicity may go beyond the geography-based or biological ethnicity. Thus, Minnanrens moving from mainland China to Taiwan in 1949 might choose their own identity to be Minnanrens or mainlanders, depending on how close they perceived their languages or cultures to be to Minnanyu or Minnan cultures. This present study is more concerned with an ethnicity based on one’s identity than his geographical origin. Another problem in defining one’s ethnicity is the intermarriage. People coming from an intermarriage family may tick more than one. To make the comparison among ethnic groups simple, responses with more than one choice were considered invalid in this study. However, it is possible that offsprings of intermarriage families may tick only one for various reasons, such as their identity with a particular ethnic group, the dominance of a particular language, or the important role played by one of the two parents in the family. Questionnaires of this kind were considered valid.

⁷ The specific distribution of the education levels in this study is “no schooling” (3.7%), “elementary”(9.9%), “junior high”(20.4%), “senior high”(35.0%), “college”(31%). For a more accurate comparison with Chan’s (1994) study, these levels were classified only as “high” vs. “low.”

Mandarin. However, interestingly, both Hakka and aboriginals spoke Mandarin better than their native languages.

Table 2: Comparison of Proficiency in Mandarin and Native Language⁸

Ethnicity	Mandarin	Native language	p
	Mean		
Mainlander	4.90 (N=191)	---	--
Minnanren	4.42 (N=1527)	4.61 (N=1553)	.000
Hakka	4.70 (N=329)	4.18 (N=330)	.000
Aboriginal	4.74 (N=714)	3.65 (N=694)	.000

1.1. Ethnicity

Proficiency in Mandarin among the ethnic groups was compared using one-way ANOVA. The results show a significant difference among the four groups compared ($F=41.30$, $p=.000$). A post hoc analysis of multiple comparisons using Bonferroni procedures produced the results in Table 3. Mainlanders spoke significantly better Mandarin than the other three groups. And the surveyed Minnanrens spoke significantly less fluent Mandarin than the other groups. Yet there was no significant difference between Hakka and aboriginals in their Mandarin proficiency.

Table 3: Post hoc test on Mandarin Proficiency by Ethnicity

Mean	Ethnicity	Ethnicity			
		Ma	Mi	H	A
4.90	Mainlander (Ma)				
4.42	Minnanren (Mi)	X			
4.70	Hakka (H)	X	X		
4.74	Aboriginal (A)		X		

Note. "X" indicates pairs of group means significantly different at the .05 level.

For the native language proficiency, the comparison was done only on three ethnic groups: Minnanrens, Hakka, and aboriginals.⁹ The ANOVA results show a significant difference in their native language proficiency ($F=283.52$, $p=.000$). The post hoc analysis of multiple comparisons, summarized in Table 4, shows that the surveyed Minnanrens spoke significantly more fluent native language than the other two ethnic groups with their native languages. And Hakka spoke better native language than aboriginals did.

Table 4: Post hoc test on Native Language Fluency by Ethnicity

Mean	Ethnicity	Ethnicity		
		M	H	A
4.61	Minnanren (M)			
4.18	Hakka (H)	X		
3.65	Aboriginal (A)	X	X	

Note. "X" indicates pairs of group means significantly different at the .05 level.

⁸ Native language here is defined as the language of the subjects' ethnic group. The researchers here are interested in how different ethnic groups use the national language "Mandarin" and the language of their ethnic groups. Traditionally, mother tongue is defined as the language one's mother or parents speak. This concept seems to be losing its defining power because the parent(s) may speak to their children in the national language or the language most prevalent in the community or neighborhood. For example, 98 Minnanrens reported Mandarin as their native language, and 9 Hakka language. 24 Hakka reported Mandarin as their native language, and 17 Minnanyu. To avoid such confusion, this study therefore adopts the concept of "native language" instead of "mother tongue."

⁹ Mainlander group was excluded because the first-generation mainlanders came from different parts of Mainland China and might consider the dialects of their hometowns, rather than Mandarin, as their native language.

1.2 Gender

Gender was expected to be another possible factor which might have some impact on one's Mandarin and native language proficiency.

One-way ANOVA was conducted to check whether in each ethnic group males' and females' proficiency in Mandarin differed significantly.

Table 5: Mandarin Fluency by Gender

Ethnicity		SS	df	MS	F	p
Minnanren	Between Groups	.46	1	.46	.52	.473
	Within Groups	1344.62	1525	.88		
	Total	1345.07	1526			
Hakka	Between Groups	.27	1	.27	.54	.462
	Within Groups	165.24	326	.51		
	Total	165.51	327			
Aboriginal	Between Groups	.21	1	.21	.642	.423
	Within Groups	230.62	710	.33		
	Total	230.83	711			

As shown in Table 5, no significant difference between male and female Minnanrens' Mandarin proficiency was found. Nor was there significant gender difference with the case of Hakka and

Aboriginal. Another ANOVA was conducted with males' and females' native language proficiency, and the results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Native Language Fluency by Gender

Ethnicity		SS	df	MS	F	p
Minnanren	Between Groups	3.91	1	3.91	13.37	.000
	Within Groups	381.77	1304	.29		
	Total	385.68	1305			
Hakka	Between Groups	.47	1	.47	.64	.426
	Within Groups	201.90	272	.74		
	Total	202.37	273			
Aboriginal	Between Groups	4.27	1	4.27	2.91	.089
	Within Groups	1001.22	682	1.47		
	Total	1005.49	683			

Table 6 shows no significant difference between males' and females' proficiency in native language in the groups of Hakka and aboriginals. However, male Minnanrens (mean=4.76) spoke significantly better Minnanyu than females (mean=4.65).

1.3. Age

The subjects were classified into three age categories: young (under the age of 31), middle-aged (31-50), and old (above 50). Their proficiency level in Mandarin was compared by age group using one-way ANOVA. Such comparison was conducted ethnic group by ethnic group. The results are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7: Mandarin Fluency by Age

Ethnicity		SS	df	MS	F	p
Minnanren	Between Groups	502.00	2	251.00	452.93	.000
	Within Groups	841.22	1518	.554		
	Total	1343.22	1520			
Hakka	Between Groups	40.05	2	20.03	51.63	.000
	Within Groups	125.27	323	.39		
	Total	165.33	325			
Aboriginal	Between Groups	35.26	2	17.63	63.35	.000
	Within Groups	193.71	696	.28		
	Total	228.97	698			

The results in Table 7 show a significant difference in Mandarin fluency among the three age groups (young, middle-aged and old) with all the three major ethnic groups. A post hoc

analysis of multiple comparisons using Bonferroni procedures was conducted to locate specific difference between age groups.

Table 8: Post hoc test on Mandarin Fluency by Age

Ethnicity	Group 1 (M=mean)	Group 2	Mean difference	p
Minnanren	Young (M=4.81)	Middle-aged	.21	.000
		Old	1.57	.000
	Middle-aged (M=4.61)	Young	-.21	.000
		Old	1.36	.000
	Old (M=3.24)	Young	-1.57	.000
		Middle-aged	-1.36	.000
Hakka	Young (M=4.90)	Middle-aged	.03	1.000
		Old	.86	.000
	Middle-aged (M=4.87)	Young	-.03	1.000
		Old	.83	.000
	Old (M=4.04)	Young	-.86	.000
		Middle-aged	-.83	.000
Aboriginal	Young (M=4.84)	Middle-aged	.06	.492
		Old	.73	.000
	Middle-aged (M=4.78)	Young	-.06	.492
		Old	.67	.000
	Old (M=4.11)	Young	-.73	.000
		Middle-aged	-.67	.000

The results, summarized in Table 8, show that middle-aged Minnanrens spoke less fluent Mandarin than young Minnanrens, but much more fluent Mandarin than the older generation (with a mean difference of 1.36). Different from

middle-aged Minnanerns, middle-age Hakka were no less proficient than young Hakka in Mandarin, but still spoke much more fluently than old Hakka. In other words, a significant drop in Mandarin fluency was found in the old Hakka. This Hakka

pattern also appeared in the case of Aboriginal. Little difference could be found between young and middle-aged aboriginals. But they both spoke Mandarin better than the old group.

One-way ANOVA was also conducted to

examine whether people of different ages exhibit significant difference in their native language proficiency. The results, summarized in Table 9, show that age had an impact on their native language proficiency in each ethnic group.

Table 9: Native Language Fluency by Age

Ethnicity		SS	df	MS	F	p
Minnanren	Between Groups	44.77	2	22.39	85.39	.000
	Within Groups	340.55	1299	.26		
	Total	385.32	1301			
Hakka	Between Groups	55.20	2	27.60	52.92	.000
	Within Groups	140.84	270	.52		
	Total	196.04	272			
Aboriginal	Between Groups	397.03	2	198.51	224.70	.000
	Within Groups	591.91	670	.88		
	Total	988.94	672			

A post hoc analysis was conducted for multiple comparisons between different age groups. The results in Table 10 show that young Minnanrens were less proficient in their native language than the middle-aged and the old. Yet, there was no significant difference between the middle-aged and the old groups. The same pattern was also found among Hakka, with a even sharper drop in Hakka proficiency among the

young people. The aboriginals exhibited a significantly steady decrease of native language proficiency from the young to the old groups. It is noteworthy that young aboriginals reported a very low proficiency level in their native language (M=2.89) on the 5-pint scale. To sum up, a sudden drop in native language proficiency was identified in the younger generation of all the three ethnic groups.

Table 10: Post hoc test on Native Language Fluency by Age

Ethnicity	Group 1 (M=mean)	Group 2	Mean difference	p
Minnanren	Young (M=4.43)	Middle-aged	-.38	.000
		Old	-.44	.000
	Middle-aged (M=4.80)	Young	.38	.000
		Old	-.06	.282
	Old (M=4.87)	Young	.44	.000
		Middle-aged	.06	.282
Hakka	Young (M=3.86)	Middle-aged	-.96	.000
		Old	-.98	.000
	Middle-aged (M=4.82)	Young	.96	.000
		Old	-.02	1.000
	Old (M=4.84)	Young	.98	.000
		Middle-aged	.02	1.000

Aboriginal	Young	Middle-aged	-1.37	.000
	(M=2.89)	Old	-1.92	.000
	Middle-aged	Young	1.37	.000
	(M=4.26)	Old	-.55	.000
	Old	Young	1.92	.000
	(M=4.81)	Middle-aged	.55	.000

1.4. Education Level

All subjects were classified into two education levels: high (senior high school or above) and low (junior high school or under). One-way ANOVA was conducted to detect significant difference between the two groups. The results in Table 11 show an impact of education on the Mandarin

fluency of people in all ethnic groups. Minnanrens with high education (M=4.75) spoke better Mandarin than those with low education (M=3.76), high-education Hakka (M=4.90) better than low-education Hakka (M=4.36), and high-education aboriginals (M=4.85) better than low-education aboriginals (M=4.54).

Table 11: Mandarin Fluency by Education Level

Ethnicity		SS	df	MS	F	p
Minnanren	Between Groups	324.39	1	324.39	491.08	.000
	Within Groups	1000.74	1515	.66		
	Total	1325.13	1516			
Hakka	Between Groups	22.21	1	22.21	50.30	.000
	Within Groups	142.15	322	.44		
	Total	164.36	323			
Aboriginal	Between Groups	16.31	1	16.31	54.00	.000
	Within Groups	2113.91	708	.30		
	Total	230.22	709			

Education level continued to exert an impact on the native language fluency level of the Aboriginal, only in the opposite direction. Those with high education (M=3.50) spoke less fluent native language than those with low education

(M=3.90). Yet, no significant difference in native language fluency between the two groups was found in Minnanren (M=4.68 vs. M=4.74) and Hakka (M=4.52 vs. M=4.51).

Table 12: Native Language Fluency by Education Level

Ethnicity		SS	df	MS	F	p
Minnanren	Between Groups	1.07	1	1.07	3.75	.053
	Within Groups	369.70	1294	2.86		
	Total	370.77	1295			
Hakka	Between Groups	.01	1	.01	.01	.935
	Within Groups	201.44	268	.75		
	Total	201.44	269			
Aboriginal	Between Groups	25.02	1	25.02	17.42	.000
	Within Groups	976.82	680	1.436		
	Total	1001.84	681			

2. Language Use and Interlocutors

One major purpose of this study is to explore the overall language use of the subjects in association with different people. In section II of the questionnaire, the subjects were asked to rate, on a 3-point Likert scale, the frequency of their use in Mandarin and their native languages with family members (items 1-5), close friends (item 6), neighbors (item 7), strangers (item 8), school associates (items 9-10), work associates (items 11-12), people of the same ethnic group (item 13), and people of different ethnic groups (item 14). On the scale, 3 means “frequently use the language”, 2 “sometimes use the language”, and 1 “rarely or never use the language.”

2.1. Comparison Within Groups

Except for Mainlanders, paired samples t-tests were computed for each non-mainlander group to check whether there were significant differences in each group’s use of Mandarin and native language with different interlocutors. Table 11 summarizes the observed group means and the results of the t-tests. Because 14 t-tests were computed for each ethnic group, probably leading to inflated type I error rate, Bonferroni adjustment was adopted in interpreting the significance level of the difference. Specifically, for a mean difference to be judged to be significant, the p value should be smaller than .0036 (or .05/14).

Table 13: Comparisons of Use of Mandarin and Native Language With Different Interlocutors Within Each Ethnic Group

Interlocutors	Ethnicity	Mean		p
		Mandarin	Native	
Grandparents	Minnanren	1.29	2.85	.000
	Hakka	1.44	2.64	.000
	Aboriginal	1.96	2.26	.000
Parents	Minnanren	1.72	2.83	.000
	Hakka	1.96	2.59	.000
	Aboriginal	2.32	2.15	.004
Siblings	Minnanren	2.06	2.70	.000
	Hakka	2.25	2.45	.022
	Aboriginal	2.56	1.92	.000
Spouses	Minnanren	1.95	2.75	.000
	Hakka	2.17	2.36	.096
	Aboriginal	2.47	2.06	.000
Children	Minnanren	2.22	2.54	.000
	Hakka	2.45	2.17	.010
	Aboriginal	2.66	1.80	.000
Close friends	Minnanren	2.24	2.59	.000
	Hakka	2.49	2.24	.005
	Aboriginal	2.64	1.94	.000
Neighbors	Minnanren	1.98	2.65	.000
	Hakka	2.32	2.23	.312
	Aboriginal	2.49	1.98	.000

Strangers	Minnanren	2.34	2.35	.809
	Hakka	2.66	1.80	.000
	Aboriginal	2.84	1.34	.000
Teachers	Minnanren	2.68	2.00	.000
	Hakka	2.80	1.66	.000
	Aboriginal	2.84	1.25	.000
Classmates	Minnanren	2.45	2.38	.083
	Hakka	2.71	2.01	.000
	Aboriginal	2.73	1.66	.000
Colleagues	Minnanren	2.27	2.53	.000
	Hakka	2.55	2.06	.000
	Aboriginal	2.74	1.61	.000
Bosses/superiors	Minnanren	2.30	2.42	.007
	Hakka	2.60	1.78	.000
	Aboriginal	2.82	1.36	.000
Same ethnic group	Minnanren	2.06	2.72	.000
	Hakka	2.11	2.59	.000
	Aboriginal	2.40	2.23	.001
Different ethnic group	Minnanren	2.46	2.19	.000
	Hakka	2.69	1.66	.000
	Aboriginal	2.84	1.23	.000

Note. For a difference to be judged as significant, the p value should be smaller than .0036 (or .05/14).

As shown in Table 13, Minnanyu was the dominant language of Minnanrens. They spoke Minnanyu more often with different kinds of interlocutors, including family members (including grandparents, parents, siblings, spouse, and children), close friends, neighbors, colleagues, and people of the same ethnicity. They used Mandarin more often only in talks with teachers (but not classmates) and people from different ethnic groups.

In sharp contrast, aboriginals seemed to rely heavily on Mandarin in their daily communication. They spoke Mandarin more often than their native languages in conversation with all different kinds of interlocutors except grandparents and parents. In particular, they spoke Mandarin even more often than their native language in talks with people of

the same ethnicity. They only used more native language than Mandarin in talks with grandparents.

The pattern of language use by Hakka people seemed to lie between that of Minnanrens and aboriginals. Specifically, Hakka used their native language significantly more often when talking to family members of the older generations (grandparents, parents) and the same generation (sibling), as well as to people of the same ethnicity. When talking to other kinds of interlocutors, including those in the domains for education, work, and friendship, Hakka people used Mandarin significantly more often than the Hakka language. Interestingly, in spite of the expected intimacy, Hakka people used significantly more Mandarin in talks with their own children than the Hakka language.

2.2. Comparison Between Groups

The subjects' use of Mandarin and native language was further compared among the ethnic groups by means of ANOVA.

2.2.1. Use of Mandarin

For the use of Mandarin, the comparison was done with four ethnic groups: Mainlanders,

Minnanrens, Hakka, and aboriginals. 14 ANOVAs were computed, so Bonferroni adjustment was adopted in interpreting the significance level of the difference. Therefore, for a mean difference to be judged as significant, the p value should be smaller than .0036 (or .05/14). Table 14 presents the ANOVA results.

Table 14: Comparisons of Use of Mandarin with Different Interlocutors Among Mainlanders, Minnanrens, Hakka, and Aborigines

Interlocutors		SS	df	MS	F	p
Grandparents	Between Groups	246.57	3	82.19	161.31	.000
	Within Groups	1011.38	1985	.51		
	Total	1257.95	1988			
Parents	Between Groups	216.42	3	72.14	110.02	.000
	Within Groups	1479.21	2256	.66		
	Total	1695.63	2259			
Siblings	Between Groups	119.07	3	39.69	72.63	.000
	Within Groups	1356.35	2482	.55		
	Total	1475.42	2485			
Spouses	Between Groups	98.85	3	32.95	58.81	.000
	Within Groups	953.60	1702	.56		
	Total	1052.45	1705			
Children	Between Groups	56.88	3	18.96	38.16	.000
	Within Groups	895.78	1803	.50		
	Total	952.65	1806			
Friends	Between Groups	74.30	3	24.77	49.55	.000
	Within Groups	1301.54	2604	.50		
	Total	1375.85	2607			
Neighbors	Between Groups	137.16	3	45.72	84.01	.000
	Within Groups	1331.73	2447	.54		
	Total	1468.90	2450			
Strangers	Between Groups	88.07	3	29.36	71.56	.000
	Within Groups	1086.68	2649	.41		
	Total	1174.74	2652			
Teachers	Between Groups	9.40	3	3.13	11.05	.000
	Within Groups	725.15	2559	.28		
	Total	734.55	2562			
Classmates	Between Groups	35.50	3	11.83	29.59	.000
	Within Groups	984.81	2463	.40		
	Total	1020.30	2466			
Colleagues	Between Groups	73.08	3	24.36	54.82	.000
	Within Groups	903.80	2034	.44		
	Total	976.89	2037			
Bosses/ superiors	Between Groups	75.67	3	25.23	57.72	.000

	Within Groups	874.91	2002	.44		
	Total	950.58	2005			
Same ethnic group	Between Groups	88.50	3	29.50	50.11	.000
	Within Groups	1404.54	2386	.59		
	Total	1493.04	2389			
Different ethnic group	Between Groups	48.27	3	16.09	43.71	.000
	Within Groups	952.57	2588	.37		
	Total	1000.83	2591			

Note. For a difference to be judged as significant, the p value should be smaller than .0036 (or .05/14).

Table 14 shows that when talking to all of the 14 categories of interlocutors, the four ethnic groups exhibited significant difference in their use of Mandarin. To check where the significant

difference resided, post hoc multiple comparisons using Bonferroni procedure were conducted. The results are summarized in Table 15.

Table 15: Multiple Comparisons of Use of Mandarin with Different Interlocutors among Mainlanders, Minnanrens, Hakka, and Aborigines

Interlocutors	Mean	Ethnicity	Ethnicity				
			Ma	Mi	H	A	
Grandparents	2.40	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	1.31	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	1.54	Hakka	(H)	X	X		
	1.97	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	X	
Parents	2.78	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	1.80	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.06	Hakka	(H)	X	X		
	2.33	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	X	
Siblings	2.81	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.16	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.38	Hakka	(H)	X	X		
	2.57	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	X	
Spouses	2.82	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.07	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.34	Hakka	(H)	X	X		
	2.48	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X		
Children	2.83	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.33	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.57	Hakka	(H)	X	X		

	2.66	Aboriginal	(A)		X		
Friends	2.83	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.34	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.60	Hakka	(H)	X	X		
	2.65	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X		
Neighbors	2.72	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.07	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.41	Hakka	(H)	X	X		
	2.52	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X		
Strangers	2.85	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.44	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.73	Hakka	(H)			X	
	2.82	Aboriginal	(A)			X	
Teachers	2.91	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.73	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.85	Hakka	(H)			X	
	2.83	Aboriginal	(A)			X	
Classmates	2.85	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.53	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.78	Hakka	(H)			X	
	2.73	Aboriginal	(A)			X	
Colleagues	2.81	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.37	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.65	Hakka	(H)			X	
	2.76	Aboriginal	(A)			X	
Bosses/Superiors	2.83	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.41	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.70	Hakka	(H)			X	
	2.82	Aboriginal	(A)			X	
Same ethnic group	2.84	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.16	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.24	Hakka	(H)	X			
	2.43	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	X	
Different ethnic group	2.78	Mainlander	(Ma)				
	2.53	Minnanren	(Mi)	X			
	2.75	Hakka	(H)			X	
	2.83	Aboriginal	(A)			X	

Note. "X" indicates pairs of group means significantly different at the .05 level.

Despite some disparity, three general patterns can be identified in the multiple comparisons above. First of all, when talking to family members of the older and the same generations (i.e., grandparents, parents, and siblings), Mainlanders used Mandarin significantly more often than Minnanrens, Hakka, and aboriginals. Aboriginals, in turn, used Mandarin significantly more often than Minnanrens and Hakka. Compared with Minnanrens, Hakka used Mandarin significantly more often. In addition, when the interlocutors were spouses, friends, or neighbors a similar tendency was found in the use of Mandarin except that no significant difference existed between aboriginals and Hakka. That is, Mainlanders used Mandarin with spouses, friends, or neighbors significantly more often than Minnanrens, Hakka, and aboriginals. Aboriginals and Hakka, in turn, used Mandarin significantly more often than Minnanrens. Finally, a different pattern emerged when the interlocutors were strangers, teachers, classmates, colleagues, or bosses/superiors. To be specific, Minnanrens used Mandarin with these categories of interlocutors significantly less often than Mainlanders, Hakka, and aboriginals, while there was no significant difference among the latter 3 groups in their use of Mandarin in these education, work, and distant social domains.

When talking to children, Mainlanders used Mandarin significantly more often than Minnanrens and Hakka, though they did not use Mandarin significantly more often than aboriginals. In fact, aboriginals as well as Hakka talked to their children using Mandarin significantly more often than Minnanrens. In the case of talking to people from the same ethnic group, Mainlanders used Mandarin significantly more often than Minnanrens, Hakka, and aboriginals. The last group, in turn, used Mandarin significantly more often than Minnanrens and Hakka. Given that the interlocutors were from a different ethnic group, Mainlanders, Hakka, and aboriginals used Mandarin significantly more often than Minnanrens.

2.2.2. Use of Native Language

For the use of native language, the comparison was done only on three ethnic groups: Minnanrens, Hakka, and aboriginals. Again, because 14 ANOVAs were computed when examining use of native language, Bonferroni adjustment was adopted in interpreting the significance level of the difference. Specifically, for a mean difference to be judged as significant, the p value should be smaller than .0036 (or .05/14). Table 14 presents the ANOVA results.

Table 16: Comparisons of Use of Native Language with Different Interlocutors Among Minnanrens, Hakka, and Aborigines

Interlocutors		SS	df	MS	F	p
Grandparents	Between Groups	116.50	2	58.25	176.23	.000
	Within Groups	679.90	2057	.33		
	Total	796.41	2059			
Parents	Between Groups	160.46	2	80.23	250.39	.000
	Within Groups	700.45	2186	.32		
	Total	860.91	2188			
Siblings	Between Groups	243.17	2	121.58	283.43	.000
	Within Groups	912.42	2127	.43		
	Total	1155.59	2129			
Spouses	Between Groups	132.33	2	66.17	166.62	.000
	Within Groups	587.72	1480	.40		
	Total	720.05	1482			
Children	Between Groups	153.57	2	76.79	170.51	.000
	Within Groups	637.66	1416	.45		
	Total	791.23	1418			
Friends	Between Groups	175.76	2	87.88	184.47	.000
	Within Groups	1013.25	2127	.48		
	Total	1189.01	2129			
Neighbors	Between Groups	189.48	2	94.74	206.02	.000
	Within Groups	994.23	2162	.46		
	Total	1183.71	2164			
Strangers	Between Groups	403.97	2	201.98	393.26	.000
	Within Groups	1003.60	1954	.51		
	Total	1407.57	1956			
Teachers	Between Groups	198.47	2	99.24	178.40	.000
	Within Groups	958.97	1724	.56		
	Total	1157.44	1726			
Classmates	Between Groups	189.80	2	94.90	176.38	.000
	Within Groups	974.36	1811	.54		
	Total	1164.16	1813			
Colleagues	Between Groups	245.26	2	122.63	250.90	.000
	Within Groups	753.18	1541	.49		
	Total	998.44	1543			
Bosses/superiors	Between Groups	334.45	2	167.23	331.27	.000
	Within Groups	744.58	1475	.51		
	Total	1079.03	1477			
Same ethnic group	Between Groups	97.64	2	48.82	136.26	.000
	Within Groups	775.72	2165	.36		
	Total	873.37	2167			
Different ethnic group	Between Groups	339.67	2	169.84	331.85	.000
	Within Groups	950.38	1857	.51		
	Total	1290.05	1859			

Note. For a difference to be judged to be significant, the p value should be smaller than .0036 (or .05/14).

The above ANOVA results indicate that there were significant differences among the three ethnic groups in their use of native language with all of the 14 categories of interlocutors. Post hoc

multiple comparisons using Bonferroni procedure were subsequently conducted and the results are summarized in Table 17.

Table 17: Multiple Comparisons of Use of Native Language with Different Interlocutors among Minnanrens, Hakka, and Aborigines

Interlocutors	Mean	Ethnicity		Ethnicity		
				M	H	A
Grandparents	2.88	Minnanren	(M)			
	2.71	Hakka	(H)	X		
	2.35	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Parents	2.86	Minnanren	(M)			
	2.65	Hakka	(H)	X		
	2.25	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Siblings	2.74	Minnanren	(M)			
	2.48	Hakka	(H)	X		
	1.98	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Spouses	2.78	Minnanren	(M)			
	2.42	Hakka	(H)	X		
	2.11	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Children	2.58	Minnanren	(M)			
	2.19	Hakka	(H)	X		
	1.83	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Friends	2.62	Minnanren	(M)			
	2.26	Hakka	(H)	X		
	1.98	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Neighbors	2.69	Minnanren	(M)			
	2.30	Hakka	(H)	X		
	2.04	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Strangers	2.38	Minnanren	(M)			
	1.84	Hakka	(H)	X		
	1.36	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Teachers	2.02	Minnanren	(M)			
	1.67	Hakka	(H)	X		
	1.27	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Classmates	2.41	Minnanren	(M)			
	2.03	Hakka	(H)	X		
	1.69	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Colleagues	2.55	Minnanren	(M)			
	2.07	Hakka	(H)	X		
	1.66	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Bosses/Superiors	2.45	Minnanren	(M)			
	1.81	Hakka	(H)	X		
	1.39	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Same ethnic group	2.75	Minnanren	(M)			
	2.64	Hakka	(H)	X		
	2.28	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	
Different ethnic group	2.22	Minnanren	(M)			
	1.69	Hakka	(H)	X		
	1.27	Aboriginal	(A)	X	X	

Note. "X" indicates pairs of group means significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 17 shows that Minnanren consistently used their native language significantly more often than Hakka and aboriginals to talk to all of the 14 categories of interlocutors. Hakka, in turn,

consistently used their native language significantly more often than aboriginals when talking to the 14 categories of interlocutors.

Discussion and Conclusion

The results presented above show some interesting sketches of Minnanrens', Hakka's, and aboriginals' use of Mandarin and their respective native language at the beginning of 21st century.

Overall proficiency

As a whole, in each ethnic group the subjects' overall Mandarin proficiency differed significantly from their native language proficiency, though in different directions, as summarized in Table 2. In average, Minnanrens spoke Minnanyu more fluently than Mandarin. However, both Hakka and aboriginals spoke Mandarin better than their native languages.

A comparison of the results of Tsao's (1997) study and this study regarding the overall general proficiency was made in Table 18.

Table 18: Comparison of Tsao's (1997) and the Present Study in Mandarin and Native Language (NL) Proficiency

Ethnicity	Language	Tsao	This
		(1997) (mean of proficiency)	Study (mean of proficiency)
Minnanren	Mandarin	4.63	4.42
	NL	4.66	4.61
	t-test		*
Hakka	Mandarin	4.86	4.70
	NL	4.52	4.18
	t-test	*	*
Aboriginals	Mandarin	4.42	4.74
	NL	4.55	3.65
	t-test	*	*

The comparison shows that in the Minnanren group the difference between self-reported Mandarin proficiency and Minnanyu proficiency was about the same in Tsao's study, but the difference became significant in the present study. Subjects in this study reported a higher proficiency in Minnanyu than in Mandarin. This may show today Minnanrens feel more comfortable admitting that their own Mandarin is not as proficient as their native language. This finding echoes the fact that many political figures, even many Mainlanders, speak Minnanyu on public appearances. Liao (2000) also observed that in some parts of Taiwan, Minnanyu is becoming a more dominant language both "in public and private discourses."

In contrast, Hakka in both studies demonstrated higher proficiency in Mandarin than in native language. The greater difference between Mandarin and Hakka fluency suggests that Mandarin's dominance seems to increase in the present study. This finding indicates that in spite of more favorable attitudes towards all indigenous Taiwanese languages in recent years, the Hakka language has not yet made a comeback as Minnanyu. It seems that the Hakka language continues to lose its territory.

In the aboriginal group, the difference in proficiency between native languages and Mandarin remained significant, but in the opposite direction. The aboriginals reported higher proficiency in their native languages, i.e., Malayo-Polynesian languages, in Tsao's study; but they reported much higher proficiency in Mandarin

in the present study. This change again signals an ever-increasing and striking loss of the aboriginals' native languages.

Language proficiency and ethnicity

Minnanren's native language proficiency was significantly better than the other two ethnic groups. The accomplishments of national language movement in Taiwan over the past several decades have been noted by many scholars (Tsao, 1999; Tse, 1986). The younger generation of the non-Mainlander groups in Taiwan spoke Mandarin so well to the extent that many of them and their children were more fluent in Mandarin than in their native languages. As minorities, the Hakka people and aboriginals have conformed to the national language Mandarin (Hong, 2002). In contrast, constituting the majority of the population in Taiwan, most Minnanrens could still survive well by using only Minnanyu in daily life¹⁰ (Hong, 2002; Liao, 2000). This might partly account for more resistance in their language shift from Minnanyu to Mandarin.

Language proficiency and gender

The association between gender and language proficiency was found only in Minnanyu proficiency of the Minnanren group. Males spoke better Minnanyu than females. However, no similar difference was found in their Mandarin proficiency. This finding echoed the same observation in Chan's (1994) study with Minnanrens. As for the other two ethnic groups, no similar difference was identified. This is probably because their shift toward Mandarin for both males and females is so strong as to outshine

any possible relationship between gender and language use.

Language proficiency and Age

Overall, the Mandarin fluency of the three age groups exhibited a continuum of decrease from the young to the old group. The sharpest drop lied in the older generation. This tendency appeared in all three major ethnic groups: Minnanrens, Hakka, and aboriginals. However, in sharp contrast, their native language proficiency levels moved in the opposite direction. A striking decrease in native language proficiency was found in the younger generation of all the three ethnic groups. An examination of the age factor across Mandarin and native language indicates that the middle-aged stayed in the middle of the other two generations, and were proficient in both Mandarin and native language. This pattern confirms most studies on language use in Taiwan (Chan, 1994; Hong, 2002; Tsao, 1997).

Language proficiency and education level

As noted in Tsao's (1997) study, education level had a great impact on Mandarin proficiency. In the present study, people with high education spoke significantly better Mandarin than those with low education across all three ethnic groups, with the most striking difference found in the Minnanren group. As for native language fluency, education level had its impact only in the aboriginal group. Aboriginals with high education seem to lose more of their proficiency in native language than those with low education.

A look at the means of both high- and low-education groups across all three ethnic groups

¹⁰ Huang (1994) estimates that Minnanrens accounted for 73.3% of the whole population in Taiwan, Mainlanders 13%, Hakka 12%, and Aboriginal 1.7%.

shows that aboriginals regardless of their education level spoke much less fluent native language than the other two ethnic groups. This basically repeated the same contrast in native language proficiency between aboriginals and the other two groups.

Language use and interlocutors

The language use of each individual non-Mainlander group in this study confirmed Fishman's (1964, 1968a) domain analysis. In general, they tend to use the national language Mandarin more in high domain than in low domain, and their native languages more in low domain than in high domain. However, due to different vitality of these native languages, on the low-domain-to-high-domain continuum different groups shift more toward Mandarin at different points, some earlier and others later. Minnanrens used Mandarin more often only when talking to teachers and people from different ethnic groups. They spoke Minnanyu more frequently in talks with all the other interlocutors. In sharp contrast, aboriginals relied heavily on Mandarin in their daily communication with almost all people except grandparents and parents. They even spoke Mandarin more frequently with people of the same ethnicity. They used native language more frequently only in talks with grandparents. Mandarin also dominated in the language use of Hakka people and aboriginals.

A comparison of Mandarin use among the three non-Mainlander groups together with the Mainlander group exhibited three major general patterns and two other minor ones.

Pattern (1)

In the family domain, Mainlanders used Mandarin the most frequently, aboriginals the

second, Hakka the third, and Minnanrens the least. This pattern specifically applied to talks with grandparents, parents, and siblings.

Pattern (2)

In the friendship and neighborhood domains, as well as a part of the family domain (i.e., spouse), Mainlanders again used more Mandarin than the other three groups. Aboriginals and Hakka were both the second; whereas Minnanrens used Mandarin the least.

Pattern (3)

Mainlanders, aboriginals, and Hakka were similar in their use of Mandarin in the more distant social domain (i.e., strangers, or people from other ethnic groups), or less-intimate domains like in education and work/employment (i.e., teachers, classmates, colleagues, and bosses/superiors). All these three groups of speakers used more Mandarin than Minnanrens.

Pattern (4)

In the talk with people from the same ethnic group, Mainlanders spoke Mandarin the most often, aboriginals the second, and both Hakka and Minnanrens the third.

Pattern (5)

When talking to their own children, Mainlanders spoke more Mandarin than Hakka and Minnanrens, but not aboriginals. Besides, both aboriginals and Hakka spoke more Mandarin than Minnanrens. This supports Huang's note that Hakka and Minnanrens decrease their use of native languages in talks with family members of succeeding generations (1988).

The above five patterns show that Mandarin exhibits different degrees of dominance among the four groups, with Mainlanders the strongest, of course, aboriginals the second, Hakka the third, and Minnanrens the weakest.

In contrast to the complexity of Mandarin use as outlined above, there was great uniformity in the use of native language. Among the three non-Mainlander groups in comparison, Minnanrens used their native language more frequently than Hakka and aboriginals, regardless of the types of interlocutors. Hakka people in turn used their native language more frequently than aboriginals. In other words, regarding the resistance to the shift from the native language toward Mandarin, only one pattern appeared across different domains, with Minnanrens the most resistant, Hakka the second, and aboriginals the least.

In conclusion, the above findings identify very complex language shift patterns between the native languages and the national language in Taiwan.

These shifts vary with ethnicity. In Minnanren group, there was a language shift from Minnanyu to Mandarin before, but such a shift now starts to reverse. This may mean more likelihood for the maintenance of Minnanyu. In the Hakka group, however, the long-term shift from Hakka to Mandarin has continued, and there is even an increasing proficiency in Mandarin over Hakka. In the aboriginal group, such a shift from the native language to the national language is even more drastic, with higher proficiency in the native language than Mandarin before, yet much higher proficiency in Mandarin than the native language now. This signals an increasing loss of the Malayo-Polynesian languages in Taiwan.

References

- Alatis, James E. and Staczek, John J. (Eds.) (1985). *Perspectives on bilingualism and bilingual education*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Chan, Hui-chen. (1994). *Language shift in Taiwan: social and Political determinants*. Unpublished dissertation. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University.
- Chen, Mei-ru. (1998). *The Retrospect and Prospect of Language Education Policies in Taiwan* [台灣語言教育政策之回顧與展望], Kaohsiung: Fuwen Publishing Co.
- Chen, Su-chiao. (2003). *The spread of English in Taiwan: Changing use and shifting attitudes*. Taipei, Taiwan: the Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Chen, Zhi-lie. (1997). *Aboriginal Education in Taiwan*. [台灣原住民教育] Taipei: Shita Bookstore.
- Cheng, Robert L. and Huang, Shuanfan. (Eds.) (1988). *The structure of Taiwanese: a modern synthesis*. Taipei, Taiwan: the Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Eastman, Carol M. and Reese, T.C. (1981). Association language: How language and ethnic identity are related. *General Linguistics*, 21, 109-16.
- Edwards, John. (1977). Ethnic identity and bilingual education. In Howard Giles (Ed.) *Language, ethnicity, and intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.
- (1984). *Linguistic minorities, policies, and pluralism*. London: Academic Press.
- Fasold, Ralph. (1984). *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Figuroa, Esther. (1984). *Language policy in Taiwan: the politics of Guoyu*. Master Thesis. Hawaii: University of Hawaii.
- Fishman, Joshua. (1964). Language maintenance and language shift as fields of inquiry. *Linguistics*, 9, 32-70.
- (1968a). Sociolinguistic perspective on the study of bilingualism. *Linguistics*, 39, 21-49.
- (Eds.) (1968b). *Readings in the sociology of language*, Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton.
- (1972). *Advances in the sociology of language*. Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, Joshua, et al. (1985). *The rise and fall of the ethnic revival: perspectives on language and ethnicity*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Gal, Susan. (1979). *Language shift: social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Giles, Howard. (Ed.) (1977). *Language, ethnicity, and intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Greefield, Lawrence. (1972). Situational measures of normative language view in relation to person, place, and topic among Puerto Rican bilinguals. In Fishman (Ed.) *Advances in the sociology of language* (Vol. 2, pp.17-35). The Hague: Mouton.
- Huang, Shuanfan. (1988). A sociolinguistic profile of Taipei (1). In Chen and Huang *The structure of Taiwanese: a modern synthesis* (pp.301-35). Taipei, Taiwan: the Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.
- (1994). *Language, society and ethnicity* [語言、社會與族群意識]. Taipei, Taiwan: The Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Hong, Wei-ren. (2002). *Language policy in Taiwan: where to go?* [台灣的語言政策何去何從], The proceedings of International Conference on Language Policy: Multiculture and Ethnic Equality, (pp. 18-1~18-19). Taipei: Council for Hakka Affairs, The Executive Yuan.
- Lewis, E. Glyn. (1985). Types of bilingual society. In Alatis and Staczek, (Eds.) *Perspectives on bilingualism and bilingual education* (pp. 49-64). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Liao, Chao-chih. (2000). Changing dominant language use and ethnic equality in Taiwan since 1987. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 143, 165-182.
- Lu, Li-jung. (1988). *A survey of language attitudes, language use and ethnic identity in Taiwan*. Master Thesis. Taipei, Taiwan: Fu Jen Catholic University.

- Mcrea, K. D. (1983). *Conflict and comprise in multilingual societies: Switzerland*. Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier: University Press.
- Parasher, S. N. (1980). Mother-tongue-English diglossia: a case study of educated Indian bilinguals' language use. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 22(4), 151-68.
- Pool, Jonathan. (1979). Language planning and identity planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 20, 5-21.
- Rubin, Joan. (1968). Bilingual usage in Paraguay. In Fishman (Ed.) *Readings in the sociology of language* (Vol. 2, pp. 512-30). The Hague: Mouton.
- Tsao, Feng-fu. (1997). *Ethnic language policies: A comparison across the Taiwan Strait*. Taipei, Taiwan: the Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Tsao, Feng-fu. (1999). The language planning situation in Taiwan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20(4&5), 329-375.
- Tse, Kwock-ping. (1986). Standardization in Chinese in Taiwan. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 59, 25-32.
- Tse, Chin-yu. (2000). *Studies on the Hakka movement in Taiwan*. M. A. Thesis at NTNU, Taipei.
- Trudgill, Peter. (1983). *On dialect: social and geographical perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.
- Van den Berg, Marinus. (1988). Taiwan's sociolinguistic setting. In Cheng and Huang (Eds.) *The structure of Taiwanese: a modern synthesis* (pp.243-61). Taipei, Taiwan: the Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.

作者簡介

葉錫南，國立台灣師範大學英語系副教授

Hsi-nan Yeh is an Associate Professor in the Department of English at National Taiwan Normal University.
e-mail:brianyeh@cc.ntnu.edu.tw

詹惠珍，國立政治大學英語系副教授

Hui-chen Chan is an Associate Professor in the Department of English at National Chengchi University.
e-mail:hcchan@nccu.edu.tw

程玉秀，國立台灣師範大學英語系副教授

Yuh-show Cheng is an Associate Professor in the Department of English at National Taiwan Normal University.
e-mail:t22035@cc.ntnu.edu.tw

收件日期：92年10月20日

修正日期：93年03月02日

接受日期：92年03月02日

Appendix: Questionnaire

I. BACKGROUND

(Please answer the following questions or check the proper answers.)

Social Background

Gender: ___ Male, ___ Female

Age: ___ years old

Education Level:

___ (1) literate, but did not receive formal education

___ (2) received elementary school education

___ (3) received junior high school education

___ (4) received senior high school education

___ (5) received college education or more

Ethnic group:

___(1) mainlanders ___(2) Minnanren ___(3) Hakka ___(4) aboriginals

Birth place: _____

Place of growth: _____

Your mother's ethnic identity:

___(1) mainlanders ___(2) Minnanren ___(3) Hakka ___(4) aboriginals

Your spouse's ethnic identity: (if you are not married, please disregard this question)

___(1) mainlanders ___(2) Minnanren ___(3) Hakka ___(4) aboriginals

Linguistic Background

Mother Tongue:

___(1) Mandarin ___(2) Minnanryu ___(3) Hakka ___(4) Malayo-Polynesian

Local Dominating Language:

___(1) Mandarin ___(2) Minnanryu ___(3) Hakka ___(4) Malayo-Polynesian

Language Proficiency:

Proficiency	Fluently	Able to communicate with others	Able to communicate with others, but with difficulty	Able to understand, but not able to speak	Don't Understand at all
Languages					
Mandarin					
Minnanyu					
Hakka					

(Note: In the questionnaire for aboriginals, only two languages were included, Mandarin and Malayo-Polynesian)

II. LANGUAGE USE

How often do you use national language, local dominant language, and your mother tongue in the following situations? Please circle a proper number to indicate the frequency. (For each of the following questions, if it is not applicable to you, please ignore it.)

Frequency of Use: 3=frequently, 2=sometimes, 1=rarely or never.

Situations	Languages		
	Mandarin	Minnanyu	Hakka
1. When you talk with grandparents	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
2. When you talk with your parents	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
3. When you talk with your siblings	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
4. When you talk with your spouse	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
5. When you talk with your children	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
6. When you talk with close friends	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
7. When you talk with your neighbors	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
8. When you talk with strangers	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
9. When you talk with your teachers	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
10. When you talk with your classmates	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
11. When you talk with your colleagues	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
12. When you talk with your boss	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
13. When you talk with people from your own ethnic group	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
14. When you talk with people from other ethnic groups (including other aboriginal groups)	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1

(Note: In the questionnaire for aboriginals, only two languages were included, Mandarin and Malayo-Polynesian)

台灣地區的語言使用：語言能力與場域分析

葉錫南

國立台灣師範大學英語系

詹惠珍

國立政治大學英語系

程玉秀

國立台灣師範大學英語系

台灣 1950 年代以來長期的國語運動，導致本地人的語言使用有由母語移轉到國語的現象。然而，1980 年代後期的政經變化重新燃起這些母語的活力。在日常生活中，包括媒體傳播、甚至教育體系中，閩南語、客家語、原住民語又活躍了起來。

爲了瞭解母語與國語間的移轉現象，本研究檢視閩南、客家、原住民三個族群的國語與母語的語言溝通能力與使用情形，同時探討了此二者與個人因素如年齡、性別、教育程度、以及使用場域之間的關係。過程中，外省族群的國語使用亦納入分析，以作爲比較的參考。

研究發現，國語及母語的語言能力與個人年齡、性別及教育程度有顯著相關。各族群整體的語言使用，基本上驗證了 Fishman 的場域分析理論。而台灣地區母語與國語間的語言移轉程度，在三個族群間有相當大的不同。與以往相較，閩南語對國語展現了較強的抗拒，甚至有了逆轉的現象；客家語則延續長期以來朝國語移轉的趨勢；而原住民語言朝國語的移轉則似乎日益加劇。

關鍵詞：語言使用、語言移轉、場域分析、母語

