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Introduction

Although there have been some attempts to examine language planning and its successes and failures in South and East Asian languages, especially as such planning relates to English and to other European languages, no systematic cross-national study is available that looks systematically at these issues. While such a study is not possible within the limits imposed by this paper - a monograph would probably be needed, we attempt to sketch the broad outlines of what such a study might look like and provide some basic data about, and examples of the successful and more problematic language policy and planning that has occurred in this region.

If we look beyond the large regional languages (e.g., Bengali, Chinese, Japanese, Javanese, Korean, and more recently Malay/Indonesian and Filipino) and
the multitude of minority languages, we find European – and of course Arabic
and other Asian languages – have become established in the various polities in
the region. These languages have come to be used for a number of reasons, in-
cluding:
• Trade internally within the region, from the Arabian peninsula, and later
from Europe (Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Rus-

sian, Spanish);
• Religious proselytisation conducted through Arabic and various European
languages;
• Colonization, as conducted through various European (and Asian) lan-
guages;
• Languages learned to access overseas education and technology;
• Wars of aggression, some of which were linked to European, North
American, and Asian colonial development;
• The geopolitics of the “cold war”, especially for Russian and English; and
• The rise of English as an economic world language or lingua franca.

These uses indicate that the language ecology of the region is complex and
varies widely depending on the polity and the combination of historical events
which have shaped it. As Wright (2001) has noted in relation to Vietnam, but
which can be applied to all polities in the region, that language policies and usage
have been shaped by the various geopolitical situations in which polities have
found themselves in different eras. Appendix 1 provides some basic demographic
information about Asian polities, along with some general details of the lan-
guages in use in those polities.

English has increasingly become the dominant foreign language in the region.
While colonialism, missionary work and the geopolitics of the cold war in the
past have played significant role in making English the dominant foreign (sec-
cond) language, globalization and the world economic system have made English
the region’s lingua franca and increasingly the de facto second national language
in many polities (see Appendix 1). The debate now is not about “whether Eng-
lish”, but about which English (or Englishes) are to be learned by whom for what
purposes, and what other second foreign languages need to be mastered.

Most polities in the region have actively been involved with foreign language
planning, particularly through language-in-education planning. For instance, as
the individual polity language planning scenarios in this paper suggest, the rush
to develop English through changes in schooling has meant that English is in-
creasingly being required for all children at an early age (See, Appendix 2). Asian
language policy planners seem to have accepted this evidence (or succumbed to
citizen-based pressure), based principally on ESL rather than EFL populations,
that starting language studies “earlier is better” (cf. Múnoz 2006). In the competi-
successes and failures in language planning for European languages in Asian nations

tive world economic race, where English is seen as a key resource, countries are moving quickly to try to secure the apparent advantage that English brings — but based on what evidence, at what cost, and with what success? How does such planning emphasis effect national languages, minority languages and the study of other foreign languages?

While English has become a dominant lingua franca being taught in schools and being learned through private tuition, other languages continue to be studied. The study of Chinese is growing rapidly — Chinese may soon pass French as the language most studied in Australian Universities — and north Asians seem to be studying each other’s languages more frequently. Other languages, including European languages are also available for study in schools and in communities as the case studies indicate.

In this section, we have tried to provide a brief, and hopefully not too stereotypic, overview of the language (planning) situation in Southeast and East Asia. However, as indicated, the polities in this region have very different stories to tell about their language situations and the successes and failures of language planning to meet the needs of those in their polities. An individual can work in this region for most of their adult life, know something about the language situation therein (see, e.g. Baldauf & Kaplan 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf 2003, 2008; Zhao & Baldauf 2008), but can only ever bring an etic (i.e. extrinsic concepts and categories) perspective. While one can argue that this allows for a more critical and ‘scientific’ perspective — although some would not be comfortable using these terms in the same phrase, when judging success and failure, we would argue that one needs first to take an emic perspective (i.e. to consider the intrinsic cultural distinctions that are important to the group involved) (Lett 2007). Thus, authors from eight polities (i.e. Bangladesh (Hamid 2006), China (Li 2007), Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Singapore (Chua 2004), Taiwan and Vietnam (Nguyen & Nguyen 2007)) developed a brief summary of the language planning situation there. These sections and their related references, which can be found in the full version of this paper published on the Symposium website, have been written based on local experience in language teaching and language-in-education planning to provide insider views on the successes and failures of language planning, especially as it relates to European languages1. The discussion which follows develops out of

1 Studies such as this (e.g. Nunan 2003) often involve outsiders collecting data from or with the assistance of ‘informants’ to generalize about insider issues and problems. While this is a perfectly good data collection technique, it can lead to critical comments about such work (e.g., Beckett & Macpherson 2005) as being unrepresentative. In our Language Planning and Policy monograph series, Bob Kaplan and I (Baldauf) have adopted the policy of getting qualified insiders to describe their language situation, thereby providing local insights for further analysis. As Pennycook (1998: 126) has noted in relation to Hong Kong, “…in order to make sense of
these summary analyses.

Discussion

Having taken the emic point of view on the problems and challenges of language planning in the Asian polities as the basis for this discussion, we now try to take an etic perspective on what we have found and see if there seem to be generalizations that can be made about language planning success and failure with regard to European languages in Southeast and East Asian languages, and in particular whether there are implications for the themes of the symposium.

The role of languages of European origin in modern Asia

When one looks beyond English teaching, languages of European origin are not widely taught or available through the public system in Asia. In addition, they are not necessarily learned for their use in Europe, but for their use as world languages in Africa and Latin America. Much of the learning that occurs is through foreign government supported programs, or through other private and/or ethnically sponsored groups. [Dutch, French, German, Russian, Portuguese, Esperanto]

The increase in teaching of Asian languages

In North Asia in particular there seems to be an increase in the teaching of other Asian languages. Thus while English may be a general lingua franca, there is growing evidence that to suggest that Asians are also increasingly learning each other's languages as foreign languages. As languages compete for space in the curriculum, there is a danger in looking narrowly at just at European languages in Asian polities rather than considering the whole language teaching ecology.

The early introduction of English

Nunan's (2003: 594) data indicated that English was being introduced at an early age, and that trend has intensified under the pressure of economic competi-

language policies we need to understand both their location historically and their location contextually. "Too often we view these things through the lens of liberalism, pluralism or anti-imperialism, without understanding the actual location of such policies." This paper extends this perspective to cross-polity analysis. Polity authors have been asked to speak for themselves and their polities, and invited to contribute to the introductory and concluding discussions. Baldauf's role has been to try to organize the topic and some resources so the discussion can take place, both within the paper and in the symposium. Authors are listed alphabetically.
tion. This is despite the fact that such teaching requires massive commitments of funds, special early childhood teacher training, teachers with excellent language skills, and books and materials. As with much language ‘planning’, the decision appears to be predominantly political and against the little FL research evidence available. Support for such teaching also appears to be inadequate. Unless such programs are properly resourced, one might predict massive failures and the unfortunate waste of resources.

English and changes to the language ecology

As English has become increasingly important in Asian education and societies, it has had an impact on other languages. For example, in Singapore it has increased as a mother tongue in Singaporean households, and this required a change in the way Mandarin (and Tamil) are taught in schools with Mandarin as a second language programs being contemplated (Zhao, Liu and Hong 2007). Its increasing presence in the curriculum more generally may be reducing the space for other languages to be taught, including minority languages.

English in Asia: Indigenization and objections

A widespread phenomenon in Asia is the development of a cline of varieties of English ranging from ‘standard’ English at one end to substrate varieties at the other. These varieties represent both indigenization and identity markers on the one hand, e.g. Singlish incorporates Hokkien and Malay words and usage (See, www.talkingcock.com) and is widely used by young people in Singapore. Other recognized varieties in the literature include Manglish, Chinglish (Qiang & Wolff 2003) and Japlish.

Examples of resistance to the spread of English or other foreign languages (e.g. Canagarajah 1999) are perhaps more difficult to cite, although this is clearly occurring in some sectors and may be causing increased social stratification as in Bangladesh. However, we may note that despite the fact that English is a required subject in many polities (for graduation, for professional qualifications), many students seem demotivated to learn it. The question may be posed of whether this is resistance, and/or problems related to instruction (Tran & Baldauf 2007).

Identity, linguistic rights and transnationalism in Asia

The increased presence of English in the curriculum normally means that something else must go – curricula and schools only have a fixed amount of time. Most new introductions – except for programs like teaching mathematics and

1 TALKING COCK (v) a local Singaporean term meaning either to talk nonsense or engage in idle banter. The Oxford Singlish Dictionary (www.talkingcock.com)
science in English in Malaysia from Form 1 – do not make use of bilingual principles. Typically such additions put pressures on 3rd languages, whether they are minority languages or 2nd foreign languages.

Resource implications

Funding for language programs is inherently expensive, and for some countries in Asia, that creates major problems. In Bangladesh and Indonesia, for example, funding for normal programs, the training of teachers, money for textbooks is inadequate. There is little or no funding that can be found for languages which consume a lot of resources. For this reason, much European language teaching relies on funding from interested foreign donors. Under such circumstances, foreign language teaching is unlikely to increase significantly, unless there are other social or economic reasons for this to occur.

Conclusions

Much of Asia has always been multilingual, but the underlying language learning strategy now seems to be shifting to an English knowing bilingualism as the underpinning for these multilingual societies. English is clearly becoming an Asian language and is being indigenized and used for local intercultural communication. In some polities where this process is more advanced, like Singapore, Malaysia and Korea, there are signs of concern about how English is affecting the national or mother tongue languages, as well as the growing development of local varieties. These globalization pressures are also putting pressure on minority languages and the resources available to teach them.
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## Appendix 1: Characteristics of Southeast and East Asian polities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polity</th>
<th>Area in Sq. Km</th>
<th>Population (Est July 07)</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Role of English</th>
<th>Estimated Usage¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>133,910</td>
<td>150,448,339</td>
<td>Bangla, English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2-5,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>374,577</td>
<td>Malay, English, Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>L1- 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, PRC</td>
<td>9,326,410</td>
<td>1,321,851,888</td>
<td>Mandarin, Yue (Cantonese), Wu, Minbei, Xiang, Gan, Hakka, over 120 minority languages officially recognized</td>
<td>120+</td>
<td>first foreign</td>
<td>226,710,000 (primary, secondary and tertiary undergraduates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong, SAR</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>6,980,412</td>
<td>Cantonese, English, Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td>first foreign</td>
<td>L1- 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1,836,440</td>
<td>234,693,997</td>
<td>Bahasa Indonesia, Javanese + 418-569 indigenous</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
<td>L2-2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>374,744</td>
<td>127,433,494</td>
<td>Japanese (13 varieties); Ainu, Ryūkyūan dialects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Korean (2 diversifying varieties North/South)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>foreign first foreign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(English)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>328,550</td>
<td>24,821,286</td>
<td>Bahasa Malaysia, (English), Tamil, Chinese varieties, Iban, Kadazan + 80-138 indigenous</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>L1- 380,000 L2-7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>298,170</td>
<td>91,077,287</td>
<td>Filipino, (English), 120 indigenous</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>official</td>
<td>L1- 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>682.7</td>
<td>4,553,009</td>
<td>(English), Mandarin, Hokkien, Cantonese, Teochew, 4 Malay varieties, Tamil, 8 Indian varieties</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>official</td>
<td>L1- 350,000 L2-2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>32,260</td>
<td>22,858,872</td>
<td>Mandarin, Tai yu, Hakka, 18 aboriginal languages</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>325,360</td>
<td>85,262,356</td>
<td>Vietnamese, Chinese, French, English, Khmer, Hmong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kaplan & Baldauf (2003: 5); China – Zhou, M.L (2003: 23); CIA World Factbook

¹ See Crystal (2003: 62ff). He does not provide information on Indonesia, Japan, Korea (North & South), Taiwan or Vietnam. China (Wen & Hu, 2007: 4).
## Appendix 2: Policy and reasons for the introduction of English in Southeast and East Asian polities

(Updated Table based on Nunan 2003: 594)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polity</th>
<th>Grade level and age at which English is introduced as a compulsory subject</th>
<th>Frequency of Instruction</th>
<th>Impact of English as a global language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Grade 1, Age 6</td>
<td>Primary school 3-4 hours/week; Secondary school 4-5 hours/week</td>
<td>English was introduced at grade 1 in 1991; CLT replaced structural curriculum in the 1990s; English introduced as a compulsory subject at the undergraduate level in the 1990s; English medium private universities started operating since 1992; English is dominating the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, PRC</td>
<td>Grade 3, Age 9</td>
<td>Primary school 2-3 40-minute lessons/week; 5-6 40-minute lessons/week</td>
<td>Age for compulsory English lowered from 11 to 9 in September 2001; English teaching emerging as a private business; English becoming increasingly significant as university entry requirement; English enhancing prospects in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Year 1, Age 6</td>
<td>Primary school: 4-6 hours / week; Secondary school: 7-9 hours week</td>
<td>Overwhelming concern in government and business sectors that Hong Kong will lose economic advantage if English language skills are not enhanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Year VII, Age 12</td>
<td>Grade 7-9: 4 x 45 minutes/week; Grade 10-12: 3-5 x 45 minutes/week</td>
<td>From 1996, English has introduced to elementary schools at grade 4, especially vocabulary and pronunciation; From 2003, elementary schools from grade 1 are increasingly exposed to English in response to local demands; English is increasingly becoming a significant university graduation requirement; English enhancing prospects in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>First year, Age 12</td>
<td>Junior high school: 3 50-minute lessons/week</td>
<td>from 2002, primary students increasingly exposed to English, especially listening and speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>Grade level and age at which English is introduced as a compulsory subject</td>
<td>Frequency of Instruction</td>
<td>Impact of English as a global language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Korea  | Grade 3, Age 9                                                            | Grades 3-4: 1 hour/week; Grades 5-6: 2 hours/week; Grades 7-8: 3 hours/week; Grade 9: 4 hours/week; Grades 10-12: 4 hours/week | • compulsory English lowered from age 13 to 9  
• huge financial investment in teaching English  
• concern with negative effects on national identity due to early introduction of English |
| Malaysia | Age 7                                                                    | Primary school: 90 minutes/week; Secondary school 4 hours/week | • concern with the decline in educational standards and economic competitive advantage  
• fear of impact on national language |
| Singapore | Grade 1                                                                  | As an L1 for Grades 1 through tertiary (except for mother-tongue classes) | • English is the first language of all Singaporeans  
• It is compulsory for all Singaporeans to learn to speak and write in English proficiently  
• It is the medium of instruction used in all subjects in government schools except for Mother Tongue and third language classes |
| Taiwan | Grade 1, Ages 6-7                                                         | 1-2 hours a week          | • compulsory English lowered from Grade 5 to Grade 1 |
| Vietnam | Grade 6, Ages 11-12                                                       | Grades 6-9: 4 45-minute lessons/week; Grades 10-12: 3 45-minute lessons/week (mainstream) 4 45-minute lessons/week (English specializing classes) | • English as an elective subject starting from the second semester of grade 3, with two 40-minute periods a week  
• English compulsory from junior high school (ages 11-12)  
• English plays a central role in education and employment  
• English proficiency now required for most professional employment |

Note: Text in bold has been added or updated from Nunan’s original data.
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