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1. Introduction

This thesis is a case study on the planning of the Kadazandusun language from Sabah, Malaysia. The Kadazandusun language was planned as a standard language for the specific purpose of mother tongue education in schools. The teaching of the Kadazandusun language officially began in 1997. It was hoped that through the Kadazandusun language, mother tongue maintenance would be promoted and hence, help to preserve the numerous indigenous languages in the Kadazandusun community. Today, the Kadazandusun language is taught to over 30,000 students (ages 10-12 or Year 4, 5, and 6) in about 400 primary schools throughout the state of Sabah.¹

However, not much is known about how the Kadazandusun language came to be. In particular, how the three-dialect concept of the language was formulated and how it works. Therefore, this thesis seeks to study the actual language planning story behind the Kadazandusun language. Nonetheless, in order to understand how the Kadazandusun language came to be, the issues surrounding labels and identity must first be studied. This is because neither the Kadazan nor Dusun group had wanted each other’s language as the standard language, or for that matter, each other’s label as the sole label in the community. The thesis will explore the reasons why labels and identity were problematic for the planning of the Kadazandusun language, and how they influenced the early stages of planning: the tasks of language selection (selection of a code) and codification.

¹ Statistics from the Jabatan Pendidikan Negeri Sabah or Sabah state education department (JPNS).
1.1 Background

To begin, this thesis will first provide the reader with a background to the Kadazandusun community and their setting of Sabah, Malaysia. The purpose of this section is to help the reader become familiar with the research site.

1.1.1 Geography and socio-political history of Sabah, Malaysia

Sabah is located in the northern regions of the island of Borneo (see the map of Sabah and Malaysia below). It joined the Malaysian constitution in 1963. Previously, it was under British rule from the late 1800's and was known as “North Borneo”. Sabah was also, historically, a territory of the Sultanate of Sulu from the Philippine islands.² There are about 3 million people in the state of Sabah, today. Sabah is also sometimes referred to as “East Malaysia” and/or “Malaysian Borneo”.

Map 1. Location of Sabah & Malaysia

Sabah: Longitude (4 – 8 deg. N; 115 – 120 deg. E)

² The Philippine government has attempted to make a claim on Sabah in the past (see Philippine and Malaysian government websites cited in the reference portion). A recent claim on Sabah was dismissed in the International Court or Justice or the World Court Tribunal, in The Hague, Netherlands.
1.1.2 The ethnic population in Sabah

There are more than 30 ethnic groups in Sabah. Most of these groups are defined as "indigenous" by the Malaysian government. In Sabah, there are two indigenous categories: Borneon and non-Borneon. The Borneon groups refer to the Kadazandusun, Murut, and Paitan groups, which originate from the island of Borneo itself. They are predominantly non-Moslem in their religious beliefs and have been categorized by the Malaysian government in the past, as "Bumiputera Bukan Islam" (in the Malay language) or 'non-Moslem indigenous'. In contrast, the non-Borneon groups are the Malay community and other Moslem ethnic groups from the Philippines and Indonesia. The term "Bumiputera Islam" or 'Moslem indigenous' has been used to refer to these groups.

1.1.3 The Kadazandusun community

The Kadazandusun community is the largest Borneon group in Sabah, followed by the Murut and Paitan communities. The Kadazandusun community makes up about 1/5 of the state population or about 0.5 million people. The label "Kadazandusun" is a new label and is derived from the labels "Kadazan" and "Dusun". It came into existence in 1995, when the standard Kadazandusun language became official. Today, the label "Kadazandusun" is used in both formal and informal situations, whether to identify the individual, community, and/or language. However, the authorities have not yet officially accepted the term, as the Malaysian government still retains the use of both "Kadazan" and "Dusun", today. Hence, for registration purposes in identification papers and the like,
a member of the Kadazandusun community must choose to state either Kadazan or Dusun as his/her official identity.

As a community, the Kadazandusun is comprised of more than 10 major ethnic groups that bear strong cultural and linguistic similarities to one another. (See Appendix A for a listing of these groups). Some groups in the community have called themselves Kadazan or Dusun, while other groups continue to use their autonyms or self-labels. Still others use a combination of Kadazan/Dusun, their autonyms, and/or their place of origin. The label “Kadazandusun”, therefore, is more of a cover or umbrella term for all these groups above. Note that the term “Kadazandusun” will be used in reference to the community in this thesis. However, the term “Kadazan/Dusun” will be used when referring to a particular group or individual.

1.1.3.1 Culture

Traditionally, all Kadazan/Dusun groups are agrarian by nature. That is, they were known to clear forested areas to grow rice, vegetables, and fruit trees. In contrast, non-Borneon groups tended to live by the sea and fish for their living. Hence, Kadazan/Dusun groups are typically found in in-land areas. Today, the Kadazandusun community is found predominantly on the west coast of Sabah.

In terms of food, clothing, and dwelling, each Kadazan/Dusun group can be seen to bear items according to climate, style and preference, respectively. For instance, Kadazan/Dusun groups living closer to the coast plant “wet rice”, i.e., rice plants that are grown in submerged rice fields. In contrast, Kadazan/Dusun groups in the inland areas
plant “hill rice” strains, as they grow better in drier climates. In clothing, we see that the traditional costumes of the women-folk may vary in terms of length (sleeves and skirts) and in features such as, motifs and embroidery (Lasimbang and Moo-Tan 1998). In terms of dwelling, some Kadazan/Dusun groups, like the Rungus group in the far northern coast of Sabah, maintain “long-houses”, i.e., long single structure homes for the occupancy of several families. In contrast, other Kadazan/Dusun groups live in single-family dwellings or in village environments, where homes are built next to each other in a single compound.

The Kadazan/Dusun groups are similar in their customs and spiritual beliefs. For instance, all groups consider rice as their cultural plant. It is also a sacred symbol and a rice festival called “Kaamatan” (Harvest Festival) is celebrated every year. All Kadazan/Dusun groups also view Mount Kinabalu as a spiritual place, i.e., as the final resting place of one’s soul (heaven). Mount Kinabalu is the highest mountain in Sabah and in Malaysia at 13,455 feet. Further, all Kadazan/Dusun groups believe in the traditional Kadazan/Dusun priest or priestess called the “Bobohizan/Bobolian”, who performs healing services through rituals and chants, among others.

The community organization in the Kadazan/Dusun groups is also similar. When it comes to decision-making, a group of leaders or ‘native chiefs’ in the respective Kadazan/Dusun groups will meet to discuss and reach a conclusion or agreement. This has been called “consensus-style leadership” in literature (Lasimbang and Miller 1990). Overall, the main principle in the Kadazan/Dusun culture is the principle of cooperation. That is, all members of the group or community must work together to advance a
common good and at the same time, ensure that no one is left behind in the process. This principle is encapsulated in the spirit of “mogitaatabang” (cooperation) (Tongkul 2002).

1.1.3.2 Language

In terms of language, the Kadazan/Dusun groups are believed to reflect a dialect-chain relationship (Banker and Banker 1984). That is, speakers of neighboring dialects are mutually intelligible with one another, but the speakers of dialects that are farthest away from each other in the chain may find it harder or extremely difficult to understand one another. For instance, in the groups indicated on the language map below, we see that the Coastal Kadazan and Central Dusun dialects, which are adjacent to each other towards the center of the chain, are mutually intelligible with 94.5% shared cognates. In contrast, the Rungus dialect to the north is less intelligible with the Coastal Kadazan and Central Dusun dialects. Intelligibility cross-tests resulted in only 19-50% intelligibility (King and King 1984; Stephen and Atin 2004). (See Appendix B for a comparison of 200 basic vocabularies between Coastal Kadazan and Central Dusun).

---

3 Based on my own experience as a native speaker of Kadazan, I found it difficult to carry a full-length conversation with a Rungus speaker, although both Kadazan and Rungus carry the voiced bilabial and alveolar implosives /b/ and /d/ that do not typically occur in the Dusun dialects. I found that I could not understand a great number of the vocabularies used by the Rungus speaker.
According to the Summer Institute of Linguistics (hereafter “SIL”), dialects are separate languages if no more than 80 to 85% of their cognates are shared (Smith 1984). Hence, Rungus is a language, while Coastal Kadazan and Central Dusun are dialects of the same language. However, the linguistic relation, especially language classification, among Kadazan/Dusun groups has not yet been fully determined by research.⁴ For instance, while the SIL Malaysia branch continues to find new speech varieties among

---

⁴ These researchers have studied the classifications of the languages in Sabah: Dyen 1965; Prentice 1970; Appell 1963, 1966, 1967. The work of SIL Malaysia branch represents the most recent language survey of languages in Sabah. For a cross-comparison of several Sabah language classification charts (Smith 1984; Moody 1984; Prentice 1970), see Julie K. King’s “A preliminary update to the language situation in Sabah” (1992).
Kadazan/Dusun groups, several varieties have also been reanalyzed and reclassified from “language” to “dialect” (King 1992).\(^5\) Hence, the results of SIL Malaysia branch surveys conducted in the 1970’s and 1980’s (Smith 1984; Moody 1984; King 1992) differ markedly from those reported in the SIL Ethnologue (website version 2004).\(^6\)

Some of the varieties that are still in question pertain to the three dialects that make-up the standard Kadazandusun language. The 1984 and 1992 SIL Malaysia branch reports show that the Coastal Kadazan and Central Dusun are dialects of the same language called “Kadazan/Dusun”. As mentioned earlier, a comparison of 200 words found that Kadazan is 94.5% cognate with Dusun. However, the SIL Ethnologue lists Coastal Kadazan as a separate language and not as a dialect of Central Dusun. Meanwhile, Central Dusun is a dialect under a new language label called “Central”. See the SIL Ethnologue’s Dusunic language family chart below. Note that the three dialects in the Kadazandusun language are highlighted in bold in the chart below.

---

\(^5\) The language discussions in this thesis focus primarily on the “Dusun” subgroup. The SIL has classified two other subgroups, which are determined to be part of the “Dusunic” language family. They are “Bisaya” and “Dumpas”. These subgroups have remained relatively unchanged in all of SIL Malaysia branch reports above. There is an interesting detail about the Bisaya subgroup/group. It is similar in name to the Central Philippine group of “Visayan” (Cebuano language). These groups may be related in terms of language. According to the SIL, the Bisaya language in Sabah is related to the Bisaya languages in the neighboring country of Brunei, and neighboring state of Sarawak (both on the island of Borneo).

\(^6\) Number of languages in the SIL Ethnologue: 23 Dusunic varieties (15 languages) with 17 varieties (12 languages) under the Dusun subgroup. Numbers of languages in SIL Malaysia branch reports: 10 Dusunic languages with 13 languages under the Dusun subgroup (Smith 1980 report in Smith 1984) and 14 Dusunic languages with 11 languages under the Dusun subgroup (Moody 1982 report in Smith 1984).
Hence, more surveys and analysis will be needed in the future to fully understand how the speech varieties in the Kadazandusun community are related. However, for the purpose of this thesis, the Coastal Kadazan, Dusun Tambunan, and Central Dusun have
been determined as dialects.\(^8\) Two items support this: the 200-word vocabulary comparison that was conducted for this thesis and the Kadazan Dusun—Malay—English dictionary (1995) (hereafter “KDME dictionary”). Note that the 200-word vocabulary data comes from this dictionary. Further, the Kadazan portion of this dictionary is the Coastal Kadazan dialect, while the Dusun portion is derived from both Central Dusun and Dusun Tambunan dialects.\(^9\) (From this point forth, the Coastal Kadazan will be referred to as the Kadazan dialect, while the Central Dusun and Dusun Tambunan will be referred collectively as the Dusun dialect).

1.1.3.2.1 Similarities and differences between the Kadazan and Dusun dialects

The Kadazan and Dusun dialects are perhaps most similar in terms of their grammatical structure; i.e., both Kadazan and Dusun have a Verb-initial word order. Both the Kadazan and Dusun dialects also feature a complex verbal morphology, which is characterized by a focus-marking system. That is, focus morphemes upon the verb correspond with focus morphemes that appear before the noun that is in focus. For instance, in “John bought fish” below, we see that the focus morpheme “mo-” on the verb ‘buy’ corresponds with the focus morpheme/marker “i” before “John”.\(^{10}\) Hence, the

\(^8\) The Dusun Tambunan is a dialect area that is adjacent to both Coastal Kadazan and Central Dusun dialects. The Dusun Tambunan area lies between both Coastal Kadazan and Central Dusun dialect areas. While the Dusun Tambunan dialect is phonologically more similar to Central Dusun, it shares lexical similarities with the Coastal Kadazan dialect.

\(^9\) Note that SIL researchers undertook the analysis for the KDME dictionary above in the 1980’s. Hence, the KDME dictionary is based on SIL Malaysia branch’s 1980’s language classification reports. As mentioned, these reports place both Kadazan and Dusun dialects under the single language “Kadazan/Dusun”. This means that the three dialects in question have been classified as belonging to a single language.

\(^{10}\) Ref. “Mengenali Bahasa Kadazandusun” [Getting to know the Kadazandusun Language]; a pre-publication manuscript (2004) by the Kadazandusun Language Foundation (KLF).
subject “John” is in grammatical relation to the verb. Kadazan/Dusun focus-marking also indicates whether the subject or object is “not in focus”. That is, the subject or object that is not the focus of the verb does not trigger agreement with it. The following examples seek to illustrate the points above.

Example 1: Sentences
(Note—AF: Actor (Agent) Focus, UF: Undergoer (Patient) Focus, F: In-Focus, NF: Not-in-Focus)

a. Momohi/momoli i John do sada’.
   AF.buy F John NF fish

b. Bohizon/bolion di John i sada’
   buy.UF NF John F fish

(Ref. “Getting to know the Kadazandusun language” (2004)).

The Kadazan and Dusun dialects are also characterized by vowel harmony and reduplication: two very common phenomena in the Dusunic languages (ref. KDME dictionary). In the examples below, we see that these phenomena do not alter the affixation order in Kadazan and Dusun.

Example 2: Vowel harmony
(Note—Caus: Causative; RUF: Reduced Undergoer Focus)

a. “make it better/good”
   Kadazan po-avasi-o’ > po- øvosi-o’ > povosio’
   Caus.good.RUF

   Dusun po-awasi-o’ > po- øwasi-o’ > powosio’
   Caus.good.RUF

Example 3: Reduplication
(Note—ST: stative; MEAS: expresses size/quantity; RD: reduplication; PST: past tense)

a. To describe state or condition of X—“in state or condition of ‘big’”
   Kadazan o-ngo-ga-gazo > a-n-ga-ga-gazo> angagagazo
   ST-MEAS-RD-big Vowel harmony

   Dusun o-ngo-ga-gayo> o-ngo-ga-gayo> angagagayo
   ST-MEAS-RD-big Vowel harmony
b. To indicate occupation/job of X—“singer”

Kadazan  hozou + um> h-um-ozou> hu-hu-mozou> huhumozou
song + PST> humozou> RD-humozou> huhumozou

Dusun  loyou + um> l-um-oyou> lu-lu-moyou> lulumoyou
song + PST> lumoyou> RD-lumoyou> lulumoyou

(Ref. KDME Dictionary 1995).

However, word recognition by sight shows that distinctions in vocabularies rest on two features: whether words are only “slightly different” due to phonology (due to sound correspondences between the two dialects) or words appear “very different” because they take on a very different shape. Otherwise, words that do not have any of these distinctions above are identical in spelling in both dialects.

Firstly, words that appear “very different” are non-cognate forms. They appear significantly different in Kadazan and Dusun, mainly because they differ in matters like shape and spelling. For instance, the word for “neck” in Kadazan is “tahanan”. However, in Dusun, the word for “neck” is “liou”. The following table shows several more examples to illustrate this point.

Table 1: Kadazan and Dusun Vocabularies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kadazan</th>
<th>Dusun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>zou</td>
<td>oku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirty</td>
<td>azamut</td>
<td>omurong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>onini</td>
<td>okoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feather</td>
<td>sisilong</td>
<td>hulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ref. Appendix B)

On the other hand, words that are only “slightly different” are different due to the sound correspondences between the two dialects. For instance, in word samples in the grammar sub-section above, we saw that the word for “big” is ‘agazo’ in Kadazan but ‘agayo’ in Dusun. Note that the phoneme /z/ in Kadazan corresponds to the phoneme /y/ in Dusun. (Sound correspondences between Kadazan and Dusun will be discussed in
detail in the following paragraph). In this sense, cognate forms are only “slightly different” due to sound correspondences. Despite differences between the Kadazan and Dusun dialects, i.e., whether one vocabulary is seen as “very different” or “slightly different”, speakers who are familiar with the phonology and vocabularies of both dialects often find that the Kadazan and Dusun dialects are more similar to each other than not.

In terms of phonemes, all the vowels /a, i, o, u/ occur in both Kadazan and Dusun. The vowel /o/ is less rounded in these dialects. In the Dusun dialect, however, the vowel /o/ is even less rounded than in the Kadazan dialect, and the vowel /e/ is sometimes used to represent this. The following vowel and consonant table shows the phonemic inventory in each dialect.

Table 2: Kadazan and Dusun Vowels and Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Dusun</th>
<th>Coastal Kadazan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vowels</td>
<td>a, i, o, u, (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonants</td>
<td>p, t, k, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b, d, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s, h,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m, n, n̄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l, r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w, y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ref. Miller 1993; KDME dictionary 1995)

As seen in the table above, most of the consonants in the Kadazan and Dusun dialects are the same. However, several phonemes are unique to Kadazan but not to Dusun, and vice-versa. For instance, the consonants /v/ and /z/ occur in Kadazan but not in the Dusun dialect. Similarly, the consonants /w/ and /y/ are found in Dusun but not in the Kadazan dialect. However, these consonants, and others, show up as sound correspondences in shared cognates between the two dialects. The following table and
cognate samples show that consonants /v, z, l, h/ in Kadazan corresponds to the consonants /w, y, r, l/ in Dusun, respectively. (Note: Kadazan (K); Dusun (D)).

Table 3: Sound correspondences in Kadazan and Dusun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K /v/</th>
<th>D /w/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K /z/</td>
<td>D /y/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K /l/</td>
<td>D /r/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K /h/</td>
<td>D /l/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 4: Sound correspondences 1

a. Kadazan /v/: Dusun /w/  
   ‘good’ avasi awasi/osonong

b. Kadazan /z/: Dusun /y/  
   ‘big’ agazo agayo

c. Kadazan /l/: Dusun /r/  
   ‘road’ lahan ralan

d. Kadazan /h/: Dusun /l/  
   ‘song’ hozou loyou

e. Kadazan versus Dusun sentences featuring all sound/phoneme correspondences above

   ‘That road is big’          ‘That song is good’
   Kadazan: Agazo lahan diti  Avasi hozou diti
   Dusun:  Agayo ralan diti    Awasio loyou diti

However, while the voiced bilabial and alveolar plosives, /b/ and /d/, and implosives, /b/ and /d/, and are found in the Kadazan dialect, only /b/ and /d/ are found in the Dusun dialect. The implosive phonemes in Kadazan appear in minimal pairs: the plosive phonemes have been marked with an underscore to distinguish them from their implosive counterparts. That is, in Kadazan, /b/ and /d/ are written as ‘b’ and ‘d’, respectively, as seen in the examples below. Note that the plosive marking distinction does not apply in the Dusun dialect.
Example 5: Sound correspondences 2 (Implosives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K: bangku /banjku/</th>
<th>D: bangku /banjku/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. ‘bench’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. ‘shin’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1. ‘sour plum’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. ‘puppy’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the descriptions above, we see that there are indeed more similarities between the Kadazan and Dusun dialects than not. That is, both dialects do not differ in their grammatical structure, and a very large percentage of their vocabularies are similar to one another. Further, almost all of the vowels and consonants in the Dusun dialect can be seen in the Kadazan dialect, and vice-versa.

However, the main differences between the Kadazan and Dusun dialects seem to be in the areas of phonology and vocabulary. For instance, in at least 5% of all their basic vocabularies, speakers from both dialects will use different words to mean the same thing. In this sense, the Kadazan and Dusun vocabularies sound “very different” from each other. On the other hand, Kadazan and Dusun vocabularies may sound only “slightly different”, if sound correspondences are present. Hence, the Kadazan and Dusun dialects can be said to be “more or less” similar to one another. Some native speakers have commented that the main difference between the Kadazan and Dusun dialect is a matter of accent or ‘lagu’ (it can mean “song”, “rhythm”, or “tone” in the Malay language). According to Evelyn Anmol, from the Jabatan Pendidikan Negeri Sabah (Sabah state education department), accent is the only difference among her language teachers. On top of their basic training in
researchers have noted that stress, pitch, and length are important features among the Kadazan and Dusun dialects (Miller 1993). Hence, intonation is a key area in studying similarities and differences in the Kadazan and Dusun dialects in the future.

1.4 Socio-political dynamics among Kadazan/Dusun groups

As mentioned earlier, the Kadazandusun community is made up of more than 10 groups that have come to identify with one another due to strong similarities in culture and language. However, the matter of identity in this community has been a confusing and thorny issue. Firstly, each group is loyal to its own autonym or self-label. However, the Malaysian government does not recognize these autonyms. In the eyes of the Malaysian government, only the labels “Kadazan” and “Dusun” are official terms. Hence, each group must also take-up either the Kadazan or Dusun label as their official identity. For community leaders, the existence of two official ethnic labels is the primary reason why identity is so complex in the community.

In the past, it was believed that the “Dusun” label was the only label that was used among the Kadazan/Dusun groups. Over time, the Kadazan label became more prominent than the Dusun label, due to a political promotion of the label in the 1960’s. In particular, two areas in the predominantly Kadazan/Dusun districts in Sabah became known as “the Kadazan area”. These areas or districts are the Penampang and Papar districts (on the west and south coastline of Sabah). The reason for this association is that almost all Penampang and Papar-born speakers had adopted the label “Kadazan”. In contrast, teaching, teachers must be fluent in their respective Kadazan/Dusun mother tongue, before they can qualify to teach the Kadazandusun language in school.
speakers away from these districts largely preferred the label “Dusun”. (The meanings behind these labels will be explored in Chapter 3).

However, a tension began to grow between these two groups. This was because the Penampang and Papar districts were closest to the capitol city of Kota Kinabalu and hence, Kadazan speakers were believed to be more affluent, modern, and educated than Dusun speakers. Eventually, the Kadazan group was seen to represent a kind of elitism in the larger Kadazandusun community. Hence, those who did not carry Kadazan markers of identity, such as being modern and educated above, became associated with the Dusun label and hence, the Dusun identity. Interestingly, language became a way to figure out the identity of the Kadazan and Dusun person. That is, those who spoke the dialects of the “city folk” must be a Kadazan. Similarly, those who spoke the Dusun dialect, or the dialects of the “country folk”, must be a Dusun.

Given the negative dynamics between Kadazan and Dusun groups, community leaders sought to remove the idea that the Kadazan group was better than the Dusun group, by calling for the label Kadazan to be adopted by everyone in the community. However, as will be discussed in upcoming chapters, the Kadazan movement was strongly opposed by pro-Dusun supporters. Nevertheless, community leaders became persistent in reconstructing the Kadazan and Dusun labels because they wanted to have a more organized community and hence, a more progressive community. However, on another level, community leaders wanted Kadazan and Dusun groups to align under a single label for political reasons. As a single-labeled community, the Kadazandusun community would first be seen as drawing upon a common identity. This would then
make the community appear more united in their endeavors and hence, retain and promote their political strength in the larger Sabahan community. This was especially important during the 1980's and 1990's because of the political upheavals occurring in the community and in the Sabah state government.

1.2 Literature review/ Conceptual framework

Since the Kadazandusun language came to be in 1995, most of the research on the Kadazandusun has addressed the impact of labels on identity. For instance, Reid (1997) has pointed out that the tussle between the “Kadazan” and “Dusun” labels has actually served to “endanger” identity in the process. While Stephen (2000) has looked into the arrival of the latest nomenclature to join “Kadazandusun”, the spin-off term “KadazandusunMurut” that is currently used by several politicians to indicate the close alliance between the Kadazandusun community and the Murut community.

Given that the label “Kadazandusun” only appeared through the planning of the language itself, we expect to find ample research on the Kadazandusun language itself. However, there is little explanation in these areas, and descriptions on the Kadazandusun language are brief, vague, or even missing. According to Reid (1997:136), the Kadazandusun is “...a standard based on the interior dialect of the Ranau and Tambunan area, but with some concessions to coastal dialects”. According to Stephen and Atin (2004:166), “...the main dialects that form the Standard Kadazandusun are Central Dusun and Coastal Kadazan” but that the Kadazandusun language is more Dusun than
Kadazan. Lasimbang and Kinajil (2000), on the other hand, did not describe the linguistic structure of the Kadazandusun language, when they described the role of the Kadazandusun Language Foundation (KLF) (hereafter “KLF”) in the planning effort.

Recently, there have been specific discussions in research on the Kadazandusun language. These discussions show that there is a fundamental problem in the Kadazandusun language concept. In particular, there is a difficulty in deciding how to select elements and features from the three dialects that were chosen, in order to create the basic Kadazandusun form/language. According to the Kadazan Dusun Cultural Association (KDCA) (hereafter “KDCA”), the three dialects—Coastal Kadazan, Dusun Tambunan, and Central Dusun—are meant to be synthesized into a single form called “Bunduliwan”. After which, a second and final stage of the construction will see an enrichment to the Bunduliwan.

According to Henry Bating (2001), who is a spokesperson for the KDCA, language planners have to follow a “majority rules” criteria, whereby the selection of a particular element or feature must show that it is the majority element or feature among the three dialects in question. That is, the particular element or feature in question must appear in at least two of the three dialects. However, Bating (2001) admits that the majority criterion is not always applicable, as the decision is not always clear-cut. For instance, in the word “below” in table below, we see that it is easy to see that ‘siriba’ should be chosen as it appears in two dialects, Dusun Tambunan and Central Dusun. However, in the word for “soul/spirit”, the choice is less obvious.
In the first place, community leaders under the direction of the KDCA had been advised not to pursue a standard language like the Kadazandusun, as it would mean that language planners would have to take-up the process of “selecting, chopping, and patching” of elements and features. According to Asmah Haji Omar (1992), a renowned Malay linguist who advised KDCA on the matter, this process will bring a kind of “artificiality” into the codification process. Asmah Haji Omar suggested that community leaders should instead choose the most prominent dialect in their community as the standard language.

However, Carolyn Miller, from the SIL Malaysia branch, who had also advised KDCA in its language planning, said that “acceptability” should be the key in the decision-making. Miller (1989), citing Fasold (1992:256), argued, “A language that people have an aversion to will never be “easy to learn and use”, regardless of how straightforward its grammar and pronunciation seem to be in some absolute sense…” (Miller 1989). She suggested that the KDCA should instead focus on building and testing a standard language “model”, before deciding on the final appearance of the language.

Therefore, why did the community leaders decide to create the Kadazandusun language concept the way it is? On one hand, it may be that the strong desire to have a language in school was a long-held dream for the leaders and for everyone in the community and hence, the conceptual challenges, no matter how trying, may not have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Dusun Tambunan</th>
<th>Central Dusun</th>
<th>Coastal Kadazan</th>
<th>Kadazandusun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>below</td>
<td>siriba</td>
<td>siriba</td>
<td>siibo [siibo]</td>
<td>siriba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soul/spirit</td>
<td>sunduan</td>
<td>sunduwan</td>
<td>sunduvan</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ref. Bating 2001)
been the most important topic in the planning discussions. On the other hand, due to disagreements among Kadazan and Dusun groups in the community, leaders seem to have created the Kadazandusun language concept as a compromise. So that, each faction’s idea and hence, dialect, can be seen in the Kadazandusun language, today.

Hence, not all of the considerations that have gone into the planning of the Kadazandusun language were based purely on language alone. In particular, the unity of the community became the primary factor in influencing the community leaders’ decision on the standard language concept. For instance, we will see that the community leaders’ decision to include the Dusun Tambunan dialect (the Huguan Siou’s dialect) was done primarily, as a means to focus people’s attention on leadership and strength and hence, the notions of security and unity.12

However, due to the complexities involved in synthesizing three dialects into a single form, we see that by choosing one element over the other, the Kadazandusun language is made to enact the sharp Kadazan/Dusun dichotomy that is prevalent in labels and identity. That is, by choosing Kadazan features, the Kadazan identity is upheld over Dusun, and vice-versa. Ironically, language planners are experiencing issues that community leaders had tried their best avoid.13

In this thesis, we will see that Kadazandusun language planners want to continue building the Kadazandusun language up to its enrichment stage. However, planners will

---

12 The “Huguan Siou” (meaning ‘paramount leader’) is the highest cultural title for a leader in the Kadazandusun community. The KDCA president, Joseph Pairin Kitingan, is currently the Huguan Siou of the community.

13 Although community leaders made the early decisions on the concept of the Kadazandusun language, the main planner of the Kadazandusun language, today, is the Jabatan Pendidikan Negeri Sabah or the Sabah state education department.
have to revisit the basic premise of the Kadazandusun language concept, before serious corpus planning activities can be carried out. Planners will also have to revisit their original purpose of mother tongue maintenance, to see if the standard language has been able to meet the needs of the wider community.

1.3 The study: Method and data analysis

In order to explain the various details in the planning of the Kadazandusun, I took the ethnographic approach as the basic approach in this study. As mentioned earlier, the story behind the Kadazandusun language plan is still lacking in the clarity of language specific details. For instance, not much has been said about how community leaders had actually sought to obtain the linguistic advice from experts before pursuing their plans. As mentioned, the planning of the Kadazandusun language had been viewed largely from the discussions on labels and identity.

In order to understand the ideological nature of the study, I have also sought to use the constructivist approach. The constructivist paradigm rests upon the understanding that there will be more than one viewpoint (multiple realities) to the planning of the Kadazandusun language among language planners. Given that, there is no true/untrue or more accurate/less accurate account of the planning story.

Therefore, through the constructivist and ethnographic approaches, I was able to create a fuller description of the Kadazandusun language planning.
1.3.1 Method

The following sections describe the main data collecting methods that I used in this study: participant-observation, interview, and archival study. I conducted a data collection period/fieldwork for approximately three months, from May to August 2004.

1.3.1.1 Participant-observation

I have been working at the Kadazandusun Language Foundation (KLF) since 1998. Hence, the participants interviewed for this study and the work of language planning were not new to me. However, I required the use of the participant-observation method in my study, as I wanted an opportunity to become re-acquainted to the language planning scenery, after being away for my studies. Through the participant-observation method, I was especially able to pay a closer attention to how language planners conveyed their ideological perspectives through their language activities. In particular, the participant-observation method helped me become aware as to how language planners expressed their views regarding identity, labels, and language through their speeches, conversation, and through their language programs in general.

1.3.1.2 Interview

For this thesis, I was able to obtain interviews from the following individuals:

(1) Dr. Benedict Topin, from the Kadazan Dusun Cultural Association (KDCA)
(2) Ms. Evelyn Annol, from the Jabatan Pendidikan Negeri Sabah (JPNS)
(3) Ms. Rita Lasimbang, from the Kadazandusun Language Foundation (KLF)
These individuals are the main spokespersons from their respective organizations/entities. All these individuals are called “language planners” in this thesis. However, each has had a different role to play both at the beginning and at the present planning of the Kadazandusun language.

In general, the KDCA was the main language planner of the Kadazandusun at its initial stages of the planning. It was instrumental in organizing community leaders’ decision on the Kadazandusun language concept. However, the JPNS is the current language planner of the Kadazandusun language today. It is the main planner in control of implementing the teaching of the Kadazandusun language in the school domain. On the other hand, the KLF is a supporting language planner to the JPNS. It provides linguistic training and consultancy for JPNS teachers.

The overall purpose of the interview method was to enable me to engage in direct conversation with language planners about their roles, perspectives, and ideas about the planning of the Kadazandusun language. Some of the interview questions were as follows: (See Appendix C for the full set of interview questions used).

1. In your role as language planner, what are your concerns with the Kadazandusun language?
2. What would you say is an accurate depiction of language use in our community today?
3. What is the Kadazandusun language in your definition? How do you define it?
4. What are your hopes for the Kadazandusun language in the future, and what do you propose as suitable plans for its success?

The three representatives above also participated in a group interview. The purpose of the group interview was to give language planners a chance to meet each other
and engage in similar conversations with one another. The group interview helped me to see what issues and challenges were shared, or not, among language planners.

1.3.1.3 Archival study

This method was especially important to the thesis. In general, there is a dearth of research on the language specific details of the Kadazandusun. However, write-ups on language and culture do exist in the community, but they could only be found in specific places. For instance, language and cultural information are written-up as short articles in program booklets, which are traditionally prepared as souvenirs/mementoes to guests attending language/cultural celebrations. Hence, while the issues and challenges surrounding the language-identity connection were found mostly in newspaper articles, the meaning of labels in “Kadazan” and “Dusun” could only be found in souvenir program articles.

Similarly, the archival method was taken to look up scholarly work on the research topic. In particular, the papers of the two linguists who had given advice to the community were found. The study of Carolyn Miller and Asmah Haji Omar’s recommendations was a significant part of my research, because they outlined the linguistic considerations in the Kadazandusun language.

Other notable mentions regarding archival study pertain to language shift and mother tongue maintenance: Rita Lasimbang’s papers and Lasimbang, Miller, and Otigil’s reports on mother tongue use and competence in the community. Linguistic
reports from the SIL and the Kadazan Dusun—Malay—English dictionary also served to relate language and linguistic details about the Kadazan and Dusun dialects.

Finally, two important documents were obtained from souvenir program booklets. These are the “Kadazandusun” and “Bunduliwan” agreements that described and detailed the resolutions of the KDCA and USDA. These agreements outlined the basic concept of the Kadazandusun language.

1.3.1.4 Challenges in data collection

Some challenges were faced in the use of the interview method in gaining data. They pertain to the construction of interview questions. Based on test interview sessions prior to fieldwork, I had asked interviewees questions such as (1) “What does language mean to you?” and (2) “Why is the Kadazandusun not going well/accepted?” Interviewees appeared to hesitate in providing their answers. The difficulty seems to stem from the way the questions were framed, i.e., the scope of the questions were either too broad as in (1) or too specific as in (2) above.

In the actual fieldwork scene, I found that the interview session went on a theme-by-theme basis, with each theme building the context for the following theme. Hence, it was not a matter of being too broad or specific in one’s questioning, rather a matter of being able to knit the various themes that were relevant to the issues at hand. Therefore, my interviews were constructed first by asking interviewees to discuss issues such as, the language use in the community. After several more themes, language planners were able
to discuss specific issues regarding community feedback to the Kadazandusun language, given that the previous themes had laid a framework for the new discussion.

On the matter of finding people to conduct interviews itself, I felt quite challenged. For one, I was not able to contact the relevant participants. For instance, I was not able to contact Mr. Raymond Tombung of the United Sabah Dusun Association (USDA) (hereafter “USDA”) for an interview. It was also unfortunate that I was not able to conduct my study earlier, as the president of USDA, Datuk Mark Koding, had passed on the year prior to my studies. Hence, there were no opportunities to interview USDA representatives for this thesis. Therefore, I had to rely on newspaper reports and other literature to account for USDA’s point of views. In the future, I hope to continue my attempts to contact Mr. Raymond Tombung and other USDA members.

On the other hand, I also had a difficulty in getting full participation from some people. While some participants could not participate in the study, due to reasons such as an illness in the family, being away on study-leave, and being busy with new work, some participants who were contacted refused participation, because they felt uncertain about talking on the issues. These individuals stated that they were not the right persons to talk to and that it was not “within their capacity” to talk about policies and such things. This shows that the Kadazandusun language is still very much thought of as a political issue.

In the future, difficulty in negotiating entrée, that is, difficulty in getting access to data via interviews with prospective language planners and their entities, may be avoided by having a joint-study among planners (KDCA, JPNS, KLF, and others). A joint-study will help encourage a stronger participation from all language planners concerned.
1.3.2 Data Analysis

Due to the ideological nature of this study, my main goal in analyzing the data collected was to locate the sites of ideology. That is, to locate where ideology is manifested in the planning of the Kadazandusun language, and to study the shape that the ideology was produced and reproduced. For instance, labels were a focus in this thesis; therefore, labels themselves represented a single site of ideology. Thus, I analyzed the meanings in the labels “Kadazan” and “Dusun”, and how the labels were used, and for what purposes. I also look at how the label “the Kadazan and Dusun community” spoke of one community, but that language, and not labels, provided the speaker with his/her “real” sense of identity.

The next site of ideology was the KDCA’s 1989 language symposium. According to Fishman (1993), “first congresses”, like the KDCA language symposium, are important because representatives of the community come to discuss language planning matters for the very first time. Fishman said, “The decision and errors that characterize this stage may long remain to guide and to complicate the subsequent stages of the entire (planning) process…” (1993:2-3). Hence, based on Fishman above, I note what decisions would complicate, or would not complicate, the implementation of the Kadazandusun concept.

Data were also analyzed by studying the planning of the Kadazandusun language as a debate. In particular, because the KDCA and USDA were in debate mode, it was important to study their exchanges and significances. In so doing, both text and non-text debates were located. For instance, in chapter 4, we see that KDCA and USDA also held
periods of discussion that were non-verbal, i.e., when USDA decided to hold separate
cultural celebrations in retaliation to KDCA president’s call for the “Kadazan” label to be
chosen over “Dusun”. Analyzing data as a debate also allowed the planning of the
Kadazandusun language to be understood based on a time continuum. This helped to
provide the context for “the socio-culturally motivated ideas, perceptions, and
expectations of language”; whose origins are often times not clear (Blommaert 1999).

I also analyzed the data in the two language agreements produced by KDCA and
USDA—Kadazandusun and Bunduliwan. For instance, the Bunduliwan text explains the
concept of “majority speaker” when it states that the Dusun dialects should take
prominence over Kadazan in the Kadazandusun language. Nevertheless, it also constructs
the idea of the “Dusun homeland” for the first time in the Kadazandusun planning
discussion. The agreements describe a still-heavily-imagined idea of the Kadazandusun
community. Anderson’s theory (1991:6) of understanding the community in “the style in
which they are imagined” has helped to discuss the two agreements above.

Finally, Kadazandusun texts and words were analyzed for their orthography. The
contesting of some orthographical markings revealed that there was a rejection for a
“Kadazan-ized” Dusun approach in the synthesis in the Bunduliwan. For instance, some
planners preferred marking distinctions because the marking will help to highlight the
contrastive meanings in minimal pairs. However, other planners rejected this
orthographical marking, as the marking distinctions had been unique only to the Kadazan
dialect, and not in the Dusun dialects concerned. Hence, the Kadazan/Dusun dichotomy
that is present in labeling and identity is also present in the linguistic structure of the Kadazandusun.

1.4 Contributions of this study

Firstly, the thesis would like to contribute to the general reader's understanding of the language-planning story of the Kadazandusun community. It is hoped that this thesis has shown the reader as to what kinds of motivations and factors were involved in planning a language like the Kadazandusun.

The thesis also hopes to contribute to language planners from other indigenous minority communities in Malaysia, who may be facing a similar situation in their quest for mother tongue education. It is hoped that the strategies undertaken in planning the Kadazandusun language can help inform other communities, what ideas can best work for their own situations and those that may not be so useful for their specific case.

Finally, this thesis would like to contribute to the language planners of the Kadazandusun language themselves. It is hoped that the thesis and the recommendations made in this thesis can help planners in their work today, in all ways possible. It is also hoped that language planners will find a new appreciation for the nuances in planning the Kadazandusun language, i.e., the political, as well as the cultural interfaces in the Kadazandusun concept.
2. Introduction: Mother tongue use in the Kadazandusun community

The use of the mother tongue, of whichever variant in the community, is an integral part to the Kadazandusun culture. It is used in transmission of knowledge related to “healing (particularly herbal medicines), language, songs, dances, adat (customs), social and kinship relationships” (Tongkul 2002:26-7). However, the continuity of the Kadazandusun knowledge and cultural truths found in these practices above are in a serious state of decline. Some of the factors contributing to this decline are the lack of cultural practices among the younger generations, who have not been encouraged to practice culture-specific traditions because most Kadazandusun families are now either Christians or Moslems. In general, the Kadazandusun culture is animistic in orientation and, this is a taboo for Christianity and Islam. Hence, the break in the flow of indigenous knowledge and cultural practice in the community has affected mother tongue transmission in the community.

However, mother tongue decline is not only attributed to the weakening and loss of cultural areas and activities but also to the appearance of dominant languages in the overall language ecology. Since dominant languages are used in places of prestige, such as at school and at work, they are viewed as socially and economically more rewarding.

14 Kadazandusun elders have lamented the lost of customs and traditions in the community. In particular, elders have tried to revive the community’s interest in the rituals and chants of the Bobohizan/Bolbian (traditional priest/priestess). However, some of the main problems in this endeavor are the lack of Bobohizan/Bolbian around to teach their art. This is because most have since passed on, while others no longer practice their art, as they have adopted Christianity/Islam (Lasimbang et al 2002).
In the Kadazan and Dusun community today, the Malay and English languages, in particular, have become the common languages for communication, especially among the younger generations.\textsuperscript{15} Mother tongue loss is related, therefore, to the use of and preference for other languages.

In this chapter, some of the circumstances surrounding language shift in the community will be explained. We will see that the language shift situation provided the impetus for and the rise of mother tongue maintenance in the Kadazandusun community. We will also see that parents actively engage in children’s language choices by allowing the use of other languages in the home. This, in turn, became the impetus for community leaders’ plans for a standard language in school. Leaders hoped that the presence of the ethnic language in school would help to encourage the learning of the mother tongue among children and hence, promote mother tongue use and maintenance in the community.

2.1 The shift to the Malay (and English) language(s)

As a lingua franca to the region (Collins 1996), the Malay language has been in a state of continuous use among the various ethnic groups in Sabah. The Kadazandusun community is no exception. There is an extensive borrowing from the Malay language in everyday speech, for example, in the terminologies below.

\textsuperscript{15} The Malay language refers to the “Bazaar Malay” variety, which is the regional lingua franca in the state of Sabah. Malay-based languages in Malaysia typically refer to Creole varieties, such as the Malaccan Creole Malay—a language believed to have originated from the speech of 16th century Tamil merchants (ref. Ethnologue 2004).
Example 1: Borrowed terminology from the Malay language in Kadazan/Dusun
(Note that Kadazan/Dusun speakers adjust borrowed terms according to their respective phonology).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Malay</th>
<th>Kadazan/Dusun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'car'</td>
<td>kereta</td>
<td>kulita'/kurita'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'slipper'</td>
<td>selipar</td>
<td>solipal/salipar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'fry'</td>
<td>goreng</td>
<td>guling/guring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ref. Lasimbang 1997).

Over time, many Malay words have become naturalized in the Kadazan/Dusun vocabulary, so much so that they are more familiar and acceptable to the Kadazan/Dusun speaker than the Kadazan/Dusun equivalents themselves, as seen in the following samples below. The Kadazandusun language team of terminology builders, supervised by the JPNS, noted this. This team has come to realize that it is not possible to remove Malay borrowings completely from the Kadazan/Dusun vocabularies.16

Example 2: Naturalized Malay loanwords in Kadazan/Dusun
(Note: the '0-' marks for stative; words in parenthesis is/are the Kadazan/Dusun equivalent or both).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Malay</th>
<th>Kadazan/Dusun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'meat'</td>
<td>daging</td>
<td>daging (tonsji)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'event'</td>
<td>acara</td>
<td>acara (abaabazan/abaabayan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'diligent'</td>
<td>giat</td>
<td>ogiat/ogirat (abagos, apagaat/aparagat)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ref: Lasimbang and Kinajil (IN PRESS)).

Due to the already-present state of the Malay language in the Kadazandusun community, therefore, it is often believed that the community has shifted wholly to the Malay language. However, the strong use of other languages has also been noted among speakers. For instance, the English language is common among Kadazan and Dusun persons with an English-based education. Further, due to the high rates of intermarriage between Chinese and Kadazandusun individuals, many in the Kadazandusun community

16 See Lasimbang and Kinajil (IN PRESS) for a discussion on the current state of Kadazandusun terminology building.
are also well-versed in one or more Chinese dialects. Hence, multilingualism is a common feature in the Kadazan and Dusun community. However, due to the multicultural society in Sabah and Malaysia in general, multilingualism is a common feature for any Malaysian citizen. It is common, therefore, to find a Kadazan/Dusun individual who is familiar with at least three/four languages—his/her own mother tongue, the Malay language, the English language, and/or the language of his/her neighbor.

2.1.1 The impact of language shift and the role of parents

Nevertheless, in the late 1960’s, the shift to the Malay language became more pronounced, when the Malaysian government began to enforce the Malay language as the sole medium of instruction in public schools. In the Kadazan community, at least, this meant the phasing-out of the Catholic/Christian mission-run schools called the “Native Voluntary Schools (NVS)”. The NVS featured the use of both the English language and the mother tongue for instruction. 17

Henceforth, the Malaysian government’s focus on the Malay language brought significant changes in the educational setting. For instance, today, in order to prove that one has completed a Malaysian high-school education, one must pass the Malay language subject in the secondary school exit examination called the “Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia” (SPM) (or Malaysian certificate of education). However, if one fails to pass the Malay language exam, he/she will only be eligible for the “Sijil Am Pelajaran” or the General Certificate of Education. Malay language proficiency is further required for job

17 Lena J. Sipulou, from the Kadazandusun Language Foundation (KLF) recalls for this thesis that her teachers at the NVS school in Puun Tunoh (the last NVS school in the Penampang district) would use the Kadazan language in class to highlight the concepts that were being taught in English.
applications in the public sector. Similarly, one is also expected to become proficient in the English language, the nation’s official “Second Language”.

According to Lasimbang (1996), Kadazan and Dusun parents felt pressured by the Malay language requirement in education, as well as the government’s strong focus on the English language. They confessed that they have had to encourage the use of the Malay and English languages at home, so that their children can get a head-start with the learning of “school languages”. As a result, Kadazan/Dusun children were acquiring three languages at home: Malay, English, and the Kadazan/Dusun “mother tongue”. However, Lasimbang (1996) observed that the nature of these languages in the home were one of mixing. That is, parents were mixing and switching codes/languages freely with their children. Therefore, children seemed to be acquiring a “mixed language” or “bahasa rojak”, such as those seen in the examples below. 18

Example 3: Code-mixing and code-switching in the Kadazan/Dusun’s “mixed language”

a. ‘If you want to go, I want to go too’
   Nung mongoi ko, I pun mau pigi (pergi) juga
   K/D K/D K/D Eng BM BM BM* (BM) BM

---

18 The meaning of “mixed language” here refers to the connotation carried in the meaning of “bahasa rojak” in the Malay language, i.e., “bahasa rojak” means a language that has seen a lot of mixing from all kinds of sources, so that the predominant feature in the language is that of mixing. Lasimbang (1996) has further observed that Kadazan/Dusun children also conduct themselves in a “mixed language” when playing with children from different ethnic backgrounds. Therefore, there are multiple types of “mixed languages” and hence, differing ideas and experiences regarding multilingualism among the Kadazan/Dusun. See Stephens (1999) for a case study on passive bilingualism in the Kadazan/Dusun home. See Lasimbang, Miller, and Otigil (1992:335–336) for a sketch of language use circa 1980’s in the Kadazan (Penampang) community.
b. ‘late’
   K/D: nokotohuri
       TF.Caus.tohuri
       K/D  K/D
   K/D+BM: nakalambat
       TF.Caus.lambat
       K/D  BM

(Ref. Lasimbang 1996).

Carolyn Miller and her husband, John Miller, SIL linguists who worked with the Kadazandusun community in the 1980’s-1990’s, also noted that the Kadazan/Dusun child with a “mixed language” is less capable of commanding the grammatical structure of the Kadazan/Dusun language. In one writing seminar, Miller noted that young Dusun individuals attempted to use the Malay language to comprehend Dusun grammar. In her paper, “The Dusun language: Dialect distribution and the question of language maintenance” (1988), Miller said:\(^{19}\)

“... My husband and I were asked to serve as consultants to a group of Dusun young people from the Menggatal-Telipok area. One older Dusun man from the same area was also part of the group. In the first assignment, the young people ran into trouble. “How do you say ... in Dusun?”, they asked the older man. The question was often repeated. Their writing contained frequent examples of Bahasa Malaysia grammar, such as the doubling of nouns to form plurals, etc. They were unable to recognize nominalized forms of words used by the older man. They readily admitted to not knowing Dusun well, although all of them came from Dusun homes and considered themselves Dusun.”


Further, multilingual homes in the Kadazandusun community meant that there are many Kadazan/Dusun parents today, who are unlikely to become good language role models for their own children, because they themselves were not exposed to the full

\(^{19}\) In the doubling of nouns to form plurals, Kadazan/Dusun children seem to indicate that they have trouble commanding the use of the plural marker ‘ngaavi/ngaawi’. E.g., ‘cats’ ought to be “tingau ngaavi/ngaawi” and not “*tingau-tingau” as in kucing-kucing in the Malay. Older or competent speakers often prompt younger speakers’ awareness of differences or mistakes made in their language. For instance, incompetent speakers are told that their language mastery is “nabati”, which means “half-cooked rice” in Kadazan/Dusun.
linguistic structure of their Kadazan/Dusun mother tongue (Miller 1988). However, while some parents realize that they need some kind of means to support their children’s mother tongue learning, other Kadazan/Dusun parents do not find multilingualism as an inappropriate family tradition or behavior. Rather, they defend their position and actually want their children to become multilingual, out of a conscious desire to have their children become socially and economically mobile later on, as adults. This can be seen in the following narrative below.20

"Case 3: ... After returning from the States, I found a job with the private sector and am now married with three children. I speak English to them because that is the language that I communicate with my wife and with my office mates. She does the same thing at home or in her office. I prefer speaking English to them (my children) also because I think they would be able to read and write better in that language. I have plans of sending them overseas. Since they were small, my mother (their grandmother) has been speaking to them in Bazaar Malay. I don’t find anything wrong with that because they are used to it already. (JM)


Overall, the most obvious effect of shift is children’s struggle to demonstrate basic Kadazan/Dusun grammar, due to the lack of exposure to correct grammatical forms.

However, on a more psychological front, the lack of the Kadazan/Dusun mother tongue in the community also signals a lack of esteem for the Kadazan/Dusun language, as seen in the example above. That is, there seems to be no desire among parents and among adults, for that matter, to continue the use of the Kadazan/Dusun language, because there appears to be no tangible benefit. According to Lasimbang (1996), language loyalty or allegiance to Kadazan/Dusun has become distorted in the present

20 I have also heard Kadazan/Dusun parents say that children will learn to speak in the Kadazan/Dusun language/mother tongue naturally on their own, when they get older. Hence, there is no need to worry. At the same time, researchers have also wondered whether parents really care about mother tongue issues because their beliefs, such as the one above, do not match their practice (see Kadazan/Dusun leader’s comment in Lasimbang et al (1992:337).
time, due to the speaker's overall changing values, where social and economic gains are prime motivations. Hence, the loss of core oral traditions in the Kadazan and Dusun community, a strong focus on Malay and English language competency, and the loss of language allegiance have affected the language value system in the Kadazan/Dusun community today.

2.2 Reversing language shift: Mother tongue maintenance efforts

The declining state of the mother tongue in the Kadazandusun community is often associated with the loss of one's culture and identity. According to Benedict Topin, the Secretary-General of the KDCA, the role of the mother tongue has always been as a tool to inculcate culture. For instance, one is taught not only the names of native plants, but also the particular Kadazan/Dusun worldview that will help the individual to learn to protect and preserve the plants in the environment. Hence, the Kadazandusun identity is perpetuated in the relationship between language and culture. Therefore, when parents are asked to give the reason why their children should learn their mother tongue, it is not surprising that parents often express in absolute terms that their children should learn their mother tongue "because they are Kadazan" (Miller 1989:2, Lasimbang, Miller, and Otigil 1992). There is a strongly held belief in this community, therefore, that the ability to speak one's mother tongue reflects one's possession of culture, which at the same helps to preserve one's identity.

However, by the mid-1980's, Kadazandusun leaders began to realize that mother tongue use was rapidly declining in the community. In some cases, even community
leaders themselves were prone to speaking Malay and English with their children, but not in the mother tongue. There was much hope for the reversal of mother tongue loss coming from the KDCA. In particular, the KDCA had begun to show a strong interest in the language survey and documentation work of the SIL linguists. In 1985, KDCA collaborated with the SIL to conduct a materials’ production workshop. For the first time, parents were involved in preparing storybooks in the mother tongue for their own children (Lasimbang, Miller, and Otigil 1992).

Following the workshop, a mother tongue use and competency survey was conducted among these parents, who were Kadazan speakers from the district of Penampang. As a diagnostic tool, the survey was able to reveal the tendencies and attitudes towards the mother tongue in the community. Interestingly, the survey was also able to show that despite the general fear in the community that the mother tongue was no longer practiced, at least 50% of all the parents that were surveyed stated that they have maintained the full use of the Kadazan language in the home. Conversely, only 10% of parents said that they had shifted fully to the Malay language with their children; while the rest admitted using a language other than the mother tongue at home (Miller 1998:14; Lasimbang et al 1992:345). The survey was further able to find that parents (57%) had a new and strong orientation towards the value of learning Kadazan through books, although there was a scarcity of books/storybooks in the Kadazan language at the time.

---

21 To my knowledge, there have been no mother tongue surveys conducted on a large-scale in the Kadazandusun community. However, there are some observations in SIL language surveys (classification studies) that state the widespread use of the Malay language in Kadazan/Dusun groups, from other parts of Sabah (King 1992).
This new desire correlated with parents’ belief that children should know how to read Kadazan (93%), as well as in English (82%) (Lasimbang et al 1992:347-8).

However, surveyors were most surprised that parents had a desire for the Kadazan language to be taught in school. At least 26% of the parents surveyed stated that the Kadazan language “was useful to know at school and that it should be learned there” (26%) (Lasimbang et al 1992:347-8). Surveyors were surprised because shortly after the survey began, the KDCA announced their efforts to submit a request to the Malaysian government to make provisions for the teaching of the Kadazan language in school (1992:347). Hence, the effort of community leaders in the KDCA was much praised by parents, as parents felt supported in their endeavors to continue mother tongue maintenance with their children.

2.3 Mother tongue education and the possibility of the Kadazan language in school

Nevertheless, what was the actual possibility of mother tongue maintenance or education in Sabah/Malaysian schools? Lasimbang, Miller, and Otigil (1992:352) had noted in their report that despite being enthusiastic about the prospects of mother tongue education, community leaders’ will was mixed with fear, as they were unsure about the authorities’ position in the matter. In particular, community leaders were not sure whether the Malaysian government would permit the teaching of the Kadazan language, as it was still strongly promoting the use of the Malay language as the national language. In fact, the Kadazan language proposal would be the very first time under the Malaysian
constitution, that the Malaysian government will have to address the possibility of supporting the teaching of an indigenous language in the public school domain.

Previously, only a handful of communities have had the legal provision to establish their mother tongue education programs. The Chinese and Indian communities in Peninsular Malaysia, for instance, had imported and implemented school curriculum from China and India, respectively. These two communities were able to retain their mother tongue rights in the formation of the Malaysian constitution in 1957 and hence, they were able to continue with their respective vernacular schooling systems (Yang Pei Keng 1998; Kua Kia Soong 1998; Shahul Hamid Mydin Shah 1998). Similarly, the Iban community, from the neighboring state of Sarawak on the island of Borneo, was also able to retain the teaching of one of its language at the primary schools, secondary schools, and at teacher-training colleges. In 1963, upon entering the Malaysian constitution, the Sarawak state government entered into a special agreement with the Malaysian government, and was able to secure the rights to teach the Iban language in Sarawakian schools (Jim bun Anak Tawai 1998:104-5).

However, the Malaysian mother tongue education policy called the “Pupil’s Own Language” (POL) does not treat the teaching of the Mandarin, Tamil, and Iban languages all in the same manner. For instance, the Mandarin and Tamil languages carry the POL status and are allowed as mediums of instructions in their own vernacular school systems. However, the Iban language is only permitted as an “elective subject”, and has the status of an elective like the French and Japanese languages, which the Malaysian government had instituted in the public schools in the 1980’s. Therefore, the Malaysian government
does not recognized the Iban language as a POL language, and hence as mother tongue education (Jim bun Anak Tawai 1998).

However, each community above has had a different experience from the other in how advanced their respective mother tongue programs are in school. For instance, both elective and POL languages appear to be constrained by similar stipulations: elective/POL classes can only be conducted if 15 or more parents sign-up their children for such classes and classes must be taught outside regular school hours, among others. However, due to their historical precedents, the Chinese and Tamil schools have been able to use their respective languages as full mediums of instruction in school. Nevertheless, in the larger scheme of Malaysian education, all three languages above are outside the periphery of the Malaysian curriculum and hence, subject to the government’s priority for the all-Malay education.

In relation to the proposed Kadazan language therefore, community leaders were uncertain as to how the Malaysian government would choose to consider it: whether as a POL like the Chinese and Tamil languages or as an “elective” like the Iban language. What was clear to the Kadazan and Dusun community leaders at the time was the firm position of the government to prioritize the Malay language over all other languages in the country. Further, it was also clear that as with the Malay language, there could only be “one language per ethnic community” in mainstream education. For instance, this was seen in the reduction of languages in the Indian schools. For on one hand, while the Punjabi vernacular schools (Indian minority group in Malaysia) were abolished, the Tamil vernacular schools (Indian majority group in Malaysia) were allowed to continue...
their operations. Meanwhile, Punjabi children were reassigned to national-type schools, where Malay is the medium of instruction.

2.4 Kadazan or Dusun in school?

Back in the Kadazandusun community, leaders were becoming hopeful with recent news from the Malaysian Ministry of Education. In November 1988, the hopes of the Kadazan community and its leaders were raised, when the then Minister of Education, Anwar Ibrahim, remarked that the Kadazan language proposal that KDCA had submitted earlier was being studied as part of the proposed Education Bill in 1990. Anwar Ibrahim said in an interview, “the Ministry of Education may incorporate the study of other languages such as Iban and Kadazan into the school syllabus”.22

However, the KDCA, which mooted the proposal, faced a sudden protest from its rival organization, USDA. USDA argued strongly that the KDCA should consider the Dusun dialect instead of the Kadazan dialect because it was the majority dialect in the overall Kadazandusun community, which meant that more members in the community were actually speaking the Dusun dialect.

Due to USDA's protest, it was believed that this was the time that the Kadazan language proposal became jeopardized. According to one news report, Kadazan leaders said that the Kadazan language proposal was actually already being discussed in terms of its implementation at the local education department. However, when USDA’s protest

---

came about, the local education department had to stop their work on it seeing as there was some disagreement on the issue.\textsuperscript{23}

Both organizations began to call for community leaders from all over the community to attend language discussions to resolve the standard language issue. In 1988, USDA organized a seminar entitled “The Dusun society in the context of nation-building”, and sought to discuss the matter of dialect distribution with members of the community (Miller 1988). In the following year, the KDCA organized a language symposium, “Towards the standardization of Kadazan dialects”, with the aim of arriving at a consensus on the standardization matter (Lasimbang et al 2000). However, each organization was clearly seeking to justify its own dialect of choice, i.e., KDCA with the Kadazan dialect and USDA with the Dusun dialect.

Nevertheless, another matter began to influence the planning of the standard language. During the KDCA symposium in 1989, KDCA president Joseph Pairin Kitingan also called for community leaders to consider resolving the labeling dilemma in the community, i.e., by choosing the label “Kadazan” over “Dusun”. This caused an uproar among pro-Dusun leaders in the crowd, not to mention with USDA, whose main contention with the KDCA was over the use of the labels above. Following Pairin’s comment, USDA began to boycott major symbolic events in the community that year: in May 1989, USDA conducted its own Harvest Festival celebrations to protest the call made by Pairin. As the major cultural celebration in the community, the multiple celebrations at concurrent days and times threatened to fracture the sense of unity in the Kadazandusun community.

\textsuperscript{23} Malakun: PDS taking over job of KDCA. 1 November 1994. Daily Express.
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As the issue of labels began to weave deeper into the planning of the Kadazandusun language, the primary language issue still rested on the matter of “Whose dialect gets to serve as the standard?”. In this thesis, we will see that KDCA and USDA will attempt to work with each other in order to reach a satisfactory solution, but the process became increasingly complicated due to the labeling issue above. Therefore, the questions arise: Why have the labeling practices in this community become so divisive? How did they become that way and what are the meanings behind these labels that seem to promote division and hence, appear to hinder the standard language discussion? In the following chapter, we will discuss labels and identity in this community before continuing further with how Kadazandusun language came to finally. We will see that the meanings behind the labels—Kadazan and Dusun—became complicated due to the socio-political struggles of this community.
Chapter 3
A PROBLEM FOR THE STANDARD LANGUAGE PROPOSAL: ISSUES AND CHALLENGES IN LABEL AND IDENTITY—“KADAZAN” OR “DUSUN”?

3. Introduction

Since the label “Kadazandusun” came to be, it has become an overnight phenomenon. Today, “Kadazandusun” can be found in every format: on billboards, in the newspapers, radio, and television, among others. Government officials and community leaders have especially sought to address both Kadazan and Dusun groups as “the Kadazandusun community” and not “the Kadazan and Dusun community”. However, the Malaysian authorities have not agreed to the use of the new nomenclature in official documents, such as in the birth certificates and in the national registration identity cards. Nevertheless, the Sabah Statistics Department can be seen to experiment with the new term. For example, in the 1999 census, the “Kadazan” and “Dusun” groupings were stated in two separate columns, but in year 2003, the categories “Kadazan” and “Dusun” have been merged under one heading, “Kadazan Dusun”.^24

Although, it has been 10 years now since the Kadazandusun label came to be, the contesting of labels is still going on. Politically-correct variations that use a space, hyphen, dash and/or capital letters, such as, “Dusunkadazan”, “Dusun-Kadazan”, “DusunKadazan”, and “KaDus” have appeared in literature. Indeed, even the Sabah Statistics Department could be said to be contesting the Kadazandusun label. Note that a space and capitalization of “Dusun” is retained by the Sabah Statistics Department

Further, the construction of labels is no longer just a practice among community leaders, but also among the ordinary members of the community. Hence, after more than 30 years of labeling contests in this community, it seems that labels have come to matter more to people than ever.

However, why should labels matter, especially if in the eyes of the Malaysian government, the Kadazan and Dusun people were still considered the same group of people? In this chapter, we will study the issues in labels and their relation to the preservation and/or the protection of the individual’s identity and the identity of the community. We will see in this chapter that the KDCA and USDA are the main initiators and perpetuators of the labeling-identity quest in the community. However, as each label is used to create the nuances in ones’ identity, we will see that the “real” identity of the person seems to lie in the dialect that he or she speaks. Eventually, as the “Kadazan versus Dusun” ideology gave way in the speaking of a third or neutral language, we see that the identity of the “Kadazan and Dusun” community begins to surface. At the end of the day, we see that labels continue to matter for community leaders, as the presence of two labels often gives the impression that the Kadazan and Dusun people are two separate ethnic groups, and hence, disunited.

---

25 However, the National Registration Department (NRD) is not following the trend with the label “Kadazandusun”. It still only accepts the registration of persons as “Kadazan” or “Dusun”. During the fieldwork portion for my thesis, I took some time off to renew my identity card at the local NRD. I asked if the label “Kadazandusun” was now an official term with their department and was told that it was not, as it “belongs only to the associations” (the NRD officer’s response in Malay was “itu association punya”).
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3.1 The meanings behind the “Kadazan” and “Dusun” labels

According to Warren (1981), there has been a certain kind of “flexibility” regarding ethnicity in the Southeast Asian region, whereby the rapid creation and disappearance of cultural labels and the emergence and assimilation of whole groups of people have been seen. This has created an overlapping and sharing of cultural practices and beliefs in the past, so much so that, according to Lasimbang and Miller (1990:118) citing Appell (1967:179), commonalities among the cultures in Sabah today “…can only be understood once the question has been posed as to their differences”. Hence, the many means of cultural distinctions, such as self-labeling (autonym) and neighbor-labeling (exonym) according to one’s folklore, territory, and occupation, can play a significant role in judging the ethnic group of one or the ‘Other’. In the following sections, we will see that the Dusun person is often framed with the Kadazan person in mind, and vice-versa. In the manner of ‘Self-Other’, we see that what has been ideologized about “the Kadazan” or “the Dusun” forces the ideologizer to question: Whose account is the more “original” of the two and hence, whose label is more legitimate? Hence, the labeling conflict in this community centered on the legitimacy and originality of the label in question.

3.1.1 How the label “Kadazan” came to be

It all began in the late 1950’s, when the top leader of the overall Kadazan and Dusun community, the late Donald Fuad Stephens, proposed “the acceptance and official usage of the term “Kadazan” to apply to Dusuns, Muruts, Rungus, and other tribal
communities akin to the Kadazan" (Topin 1997:22). Stephens was in the opinion that the term “Dusun”, which had been used by past rulers was a label given by outsiders, while “Kadazan” was an autonym arising from among the Borneon groups themselves. Stephens made the call for the Kadazan label at the first congress of the United Kadazan National Organization (UNKO) in 1961. UNKO was also the first political party dedicated to the non-Moslem indigenous groups in Sabah. Hence, Stephens proposed the label “Kadazan” as a means to unite the Borneon or non-Moslem indigenous groups under one umbrella term, so that they could have a stronger voice in the Malaysian constitution. At the time, the Sabahan population was moving towards joining the Malaysian constitution, which it did in 1963 together with the neighboring state of Sarawak.

According to Topin (1997:24), there was a unanimous vote at the UNKO congress above for the adoption of the term “Kadazan”, but the Murut group in Keningau under the leadership of G. Sundang and the Tuaran Lotud (Dusun) group disfavored the motion. As a counter-measure to Stephens and his proposal, Dusun supporters went on to form a separate cultural association—the “United Sabah Dusun Association” (USDA). USDA was formed in the 1950's and was registered in 1967. Since then, the two cultural associations have fashioned their own ideas and ideals of a separate nation. This can be seen in their desire to have separate cultural celebrations, separate standard dialects in the media, newspapers, among others. Hence, we see that from the very beginning of the modern-time Kadazandusun society, labels have been problematic as emblems of identity.
3.1.2 The Dusun label

In times past, the Malay and Philippine rulers had generally referred to all agrarian folk that occupied the inland areas in Sabah as “Orang Dusun” (orchard/plantation people). It was believed, therefore, that “Dusun” was a label that was given by outsiders—an exonym. The term “Dusun” does not appear in the origin stories of the Kadazan/Dusun people. This accounts for the existence of numerous self-labels or autonyms in the community. For instance, the Tindal group, from the district of Kota Belud, believes that their self-label or autonym means “coming out from the earth”.26

By far, the most acclaimed origin story in the community is the origin story of “Nunuk Ragang” (‘red banyan’) (Guriting 1991; Sorudim 2000; Topin 2000). It is believed that all Kadazan/Dusun groups had once originated from a single location in the Ranau-Sugut area (in the northern regions of Sabah), where a red banyan stood.27 However, in waves of migration, these groups dispersed and populated other regions. Upon reaching their newfound home, it was believed that groups then gave themselves a new name after special characteristics to the place. For instance, the Tuhawon group, from the district of Tambunan, call themselves after the wild ginger plant “tuhau” found in their area (Guriting 1991).

Interestingly, while each group in the wider Kadazandusun community has an autonym of their own, there has been no rejection of the exonym “Dusun” prior to

---

26 Wendell Gingging, who is a native speaker, explained the meaning of the label “Tindal”. British records of the Tindal group states that “Tindal” or “Tulun Tindal” means “landsmen” (Rutter 1929).
27 Topin (2000) also states other popular legends, which had sought to account for the origin of the Dusun people, such as, the concept of the Madai (cave) man and Huminodun (daughter of Kinoingan (God)). Topin (2000:26) also said that some accounts said that the Dusun people come from “some country to the south-east edge of the earth referred to as Pitas or Tisan do Tana (edge of the earth)”. However, there is consensus among Kadazan/Dusun folklorists on the Nunuk Ragang story.
Donald Fuad Stephens’s call for the Kadazan label above. Over time, the term “Dusun” simply became part of one’s identity. In fact, it acted as a useful cover term for all groups involved. Therefore, “Dusun” was used specifically to indicate one’s identity to an outsider, but it was also used to indicate one’s in-group identity, especially among Kadazan speakers.

3.1.3 The Kadazan label

On the other hand, the Kadazan label also acted as a cover term for those who took to Stephens call to Kadazan-ism above. However, when Stephens called on the Borneon groups to embrace the label “Kadazan” as their own, he did so by criticizing the label “Dusun”. Stephens said that the derogatory connotation of “orchard” in the word “Dusun” was a hindrance to the aims of the community to become progressive in the modern times. Stephens worried that the label ‘Dusun’ will unnecessarily bind the Kadazan and Dusun groups to a lasting image of the agrarian past and hence, render the community as rural and “uncivilized” (Topin 1997).

In order to support his claim, Stephens argued that the label “Kadazan” was actually the real autonym of all the Kadazan/Dusun groups. According to census counts by British officers, Dusun folk living on the West Coast have reported themselves as “Kadazan” and not “Dusun” (Rutter 1929). Stephens believed that the incident marked the first time that the Dusun folk were politically aware about their own self-identity, and made the effort to correct the misrepresentation. Hence, Stephens call for the Kadazan
label was actually to call for the community to uphold the “true identity” found in the Kadazan label; but by abandoning “Dusun” for “Kadazan”.

In recent years, folklorists in the community studying the Bobohizan/Bobolian, the Kadazan/Dusun priest/priestess, said that the label “Kadazan” meaning “people” has been heard in the Bobohizan/Bobolian chants (Guriting 1991; Topin 2000; Tunggolou 1999). The chants of the Bobohizan, as are her ritual ceremonies, are believed to be impervious to change and hence, they provide credible support for the meaning of “people” in “Kadazan”. However, similar to the case in Dusun, the Kadazan label had not just become the identity of the community, but also as one’s in-group identity.

3.1.4 Questioning originality and legitimacy

Nevertheless, pro-Dusun supporters continue to regard the term “Kadazan” as an invented term because it was widely believed that prior to the term “Dusun”, the term “Kadazan” did not exist. Some accounts have also gone to state that the term “Kadazan” was in fact, a coining of the word ‘kedai’ in the Malay language meaning “shop”. Therefore, some believed that the label “Kadazan” was merely a reference for Dusun folk who have become competent in the cash-based economy. Tunggulou (1999) argued against this claim stating that “shops” did not exist in the Kadazan speech areas until the 1960’s. Tunggulou said that the term “Kadazan” can be proven to exist prior to the 1960’s and cited the 1920’s journal entries of the British officer, Owen Rutter. However, it has also been argued that since the modern idea of shops did not come into existence until the 1960’s, and if “Kadazan” came into existence before then and the label “Dusun”
materializing even earlier than that time-frame, then “Dusun” should be the more original of the two.

Hence, the labeling dilemma in the community began to center on the question of whose label was the more original and hence, the more legitimate of the two. As seen above, labels have become a way not just for self-labeling and neighbor-labeling, but in order to differentiate and distinguish one’s sense of identity from the other. In particular, the Kadazan-Dusun labeling dichotomy shows us that the Dusun perceives himself/herself to be the “original” term and hence, the “authentic” group, while the Kadazan is seen to be an “invented” term and therefore, the “evolved” Dusun group.

However, due to the Kadazan label campaign, the Kadazan perceives his/her label to be the original autonym for both groups and argues that the Dusun term is merely an exonym given by outsiders. Therefore, the Dusun label is as an imposition on both groups, with the imposition also meant to denigrate. As the Dusun views himself/herself against the Kadazan, he/she is increasingly disadvantaged because the Kadazan constantly attempts to represent both the Kadazan and Dusun identities in view of this imposition from the Other*. Nevertheless, in promoting his/her own term as a label for both parties, the Kadazan had inadvertently provoked the Dusun identity to rise.

As mentioned in earlier paragraphs, there is a history of change in labels and ethnicities in the region in the past. Hence, neither the Kadazan nor Dusun may actually have a definite claim to their labels as autonyms.28 Consider the changes undergone by

---

28 Paradoxically, the contesting of labels at the early points of the Kadazan-Dusun labeling conflict above is in fact enacting the process of change on labels themselves. One can argue that the reduction of labels may help to curb the impermanence issue surrounding labels in the community, i.e., if people had chosen Kadazan over all else in the 1960’s, the labeling dilemma today could have been avoided. However, as will
the Tangaa' label (Kadazan) believed to be formerly known as “Sondot” and the Liwan label (Dusun) from “Tiang” in the following description:

“It would seem that most of the terms now used as dialect names in the Kadazan/Dusun chain were terms applied by neighbors and then accepted by people to apply to themselves. For example, the terms Tangara' (meaning “in the middle”) or Sondot (meaning “the plains”) were used by people at higher altitudes to refer to the coastal group which lived between themselves and the people of the coast. The term Tengara’ was then accepted by the coastal people who adjusted it to their phonology and now refer to themselves as Tangaa’.

Conversely, the coastal people referred to the people of the highlands as Hivan (meaning “inland”) or Sokid (meaning “highland”) and the dialect, which they spoke as Tiang. The term Tiang is no longer used, but the term Hivan in its central dialect form of Liwan is used by some speakers of the central dialect to refer to their dialect and the term Sokid (meaning ‘inland’) was given as an autonym in Balabakan, Tuaran (Smith 1984:33)”

(Ref. Lasimbang and Miller 1990:123).

As we continue to see in the following sections, the ideologizing of “Kadazan” and “Dusun”, in the matters of originality and legitimacy, is but the first production of the ideology or notion of identity through labels by KDCA and USDA. However, the important point to note in the early beginnings of the Kadazan-Dusun labeling conflict is that labels were now consciously used to indicate one’s socio-political identity. This meant that the ethnic or cultural identity in the labels themselves was becoming subsumed by the in-coming socio-political ideology. In reality, therefore, this proved to be a major complication because labels had begun to foster multiple notions of identity in each Kadazan and Dusun individual, whether cultural, socio-political, both, and/or others.

be mentioned in the next few sections, recognition and acceptance, different from originality and legitimacy, is the main motivation behind labels in this community.
3.2 Kadazan vs. Dusun: Labels and identity

As each label began to grow into its own ideologies, it became clear that community members were learning about themselves and the "Other" through the lives and experiences of Kadazan and Dusun leaders, who were more mobile due to the nature of their work.\(^{29}\) Therefore, they became portals of information—the eyes and ears—for their constituents, as they typically saw how the ‘Other’ behaved and spoke.

Over time, due to the steady migration of Dusun families into the city for work and educational opportunities, contact also grew between Kadazan and Dusun individuals and they were able to see and experience for themselves what the other group was like. However, judging from the “Kadazan versus Dusun” stories that have come out over the years, it can be seen that the contact experiences post 1960’s were more derisive than those in the 1980’s. The reasons for this change will be explained in section 3.3.

In the following sections, we first examine what the symbols of Kadazan identity were in contrast to the Dusun context. We will see that language played a part in promoting the Kadazan identity among Dusun speakers.\(^{30}\) Note that the discussion on Kadazan below refers primarily to Kadazan speakers from the district of Penampang and those that attend schools in the city.

---

\(^{29}\) In the 1960’s and up to the recent decade or so, large amounts of interaction between the Kadazan and the Dusun community, i.e., in equal directions, were unheard of. The Kadazan group tended to stay on the coast and in the city; the Dusun group were more prone to urban migration.

\(^{30}\) The conflicts between Kadazan and Dusun groups have gone on to create stereotypical images of one another. Hence, those who are coming into contact for the first time with each other may find themselves viewing the other based on the stereotypes from contact stories in the 1960’s-1980’s time-frame.
3.2.1 Kadazan markers of identity: The city (modern lifestyle), the school (education), and the founding leaders (the rise of the Kadazan intelligentsia)

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the Kadazan/Dusun groups closest to the capital city of Kota Kinabalu, in areas like Penampang and Papar, are often believed to be "Kadazan people". Their identity is immediately apparent by their speech, that is, in the perceived "accent" of the Kadazan. As mentioned, the sounds unique to the Kadazan dialect may carry the so-called accent of the Kadazan and hence, they signal the Kadazan identity.

However, not everyone in the Penampang and Papar districts speak the so-called Kadazan dialect. In fact, many so-called Kadazan speakers in Penampang today have parents and grandparents that speak the Dusun dialect (closer in speech type to that of the adjacent Dusun Tambunan dialect). Hence, the term "Kadazan leaders", and "Kadazan" for that matter, really entails those whose identity follows the paradigm of modernity and progress set-out by Donald Fuad Stephens.

Nevertheless, at the mention of the term "Kadazan", the first image that comes to mind is often the image of the people that are live in or near the capital city of Kota Kinabalu. This has given the Kadazan group an automatic association with the notions of "convenience" and "sophistication", and the idea that the Kadazan are "modern people". Another marker of the Kadazan identity is their long history with education. In particular, Kadazan speakers have great pride in the presence of highly prestigious mission schools in their district. These schools were some of the first schools built in the state of Sabah.
(the NVS schools (c.f. Chapter 2)). For that reason, the Kadazan could boast of being “more educated” than others.

In contrast, the Dusun speaking areas only began receiving a full infrastructure at the onset of Malaysia. Due to the mountainous and heavily forested terrain, and the sprawling countryside of the Dusun speech areas, roadside access and basic amenities, such as, electricity and running water have been seriously lacking. In some areas, these basic facilities are still not available today. In order to bring education to these areas, the Malaysian government had had to build schools in the nearest Dusun towns. However, this meant that children from Dusun families living at the town peripheries would have to walk for hours, before they could reach their respective schools.

The disparity in educational history and geographical setting between the Kadazan and Dusun groups often gave the impression that “being Kadazan” meant that one was socio-economically more mobile than the Dusun group. Indeed, over time, the ease of education and the modern benefits of the city became part of the Kadazan lifestyle. Unfortunately, the rivalry between Kadazan and Dusun leaders encouraged their constituents to entertain negative images of one another. In particular, Kadazan leaders were said to openly criticize the Dusun group due to the differences in lifestyle and exposure. This can be seen in the experience of Masidi Manjun, a prominent Dusun-speaking leader. Lasimbang, Miller, and Otigil (1992) said that:

“He [Masidi] speaks of leaders from Penampang who “openly relished... their roles as ‘big brothers’ to the ‘backward’ Tagahas. Some of them did not even attempt to hide their pleasure in cracking jokes on our people and our backwardness...” (from Masidi Manjun 1988:10)”.

The ridicule towards Dusun speakers became fodder for community gossip among the Kadazan. Local newspapers captured some of the sentiments among Kadazan speakers, as seen in the following excerpt in Reid (1997):

"... In the late 1986, the press began to publicize allegations of resentment by “Dusuns” that they were still the butt of jokes by urban “Kadazans”. “In pubs in Penampang, drinkers laugh themselves silly with jokes of a barefoot Dusun not knowing there is a bell to get the bus to stop…” [reported in the Sabah Times; 21 December 1986]. …”

(Ref. Reid 1997: 134).

Nevertheless, Dusun leaders could not deny that through education and the modernity of the Kadazan-speaking areas, the wider Kadazandusun community saw to the rise of the first few political leaders in the community (Lasimbang et al 1992). Leaders from the Kadazan area had made extraordinary contributions at the state and national levels, as called for in the 1960’s. For instance, the father of Kadazan ideology, the late Donald Fuad Stephens, was chiefly responsible for advocating and mediating the inclusion of the Sabah government into the Malaysian constitution. Stephens was also instrumental in bringing the Kadazan language into the newspapers and radio. Therefore, Dusun leaders did not dispute the rise of the Kadazan intelligentsia and their laying the foundation of the modern-day Kadazandusun society; as primarily the efforts of the Kadazan leaders had assured the community’s strong footing in government.

3.2.2 The role of the Kadazan language in promoting identity

While the rise of the Kadazan intelligentsia has strengthened both the Kadazan and Dusun identities, the Kadazan versus Dusun ideology continued to persist in the community. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Kadazan language is strongly
associated with the physical tool-like ability to inculcate Kadazan identity. In the early stages of the Kadazan ideology, Dusun speakers who moved into Kadazan neighborhoods often found themselves pressured to speak the Kadazan dialect. We see in the excerpt from Lasimbang, Miller, and Otigil (1992) below that ridicule was used until the Dusun speaker conformed to the Kadazan language.

“... Because highly prestigious church schools were located in the Coastal Kadazan dialect area ... Those coming from other dialect areas [Dusun speakers] to study at these [Kadazan] schools recall being teased about their speech until they made a conscious effort to adapt their speech to that dialect [Coastal Kadazan/Tangaa’].”


Linguistically speaking, however, the Kadazan and Dusun dialects are more similar than not. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, there are several sound correspondences between the Kadazan and Dusun dialects, and depending on how different a vocabulary sounds, it is relatively easy to understand each other’s dialect. However, it is the presence or absence of these key phonemes in one’s speech, that a hearer will be able to tell whether the speaker is a Kadazan or Dusun individual.

However, by the 1970’s, there was a significant number of Dusun families in urban areas and these were able to acquire a modern lifestyle and education on their own merit. Therefore, without the sole claim to modernity and education, the Kadazan speaker had become protective of his territorial space. Hence, the Kadazan speaker could be seen to consciously attempt to pressure the Dusun speaker to speak the Kadazan dialect, as a way to retain the Kadazan identity. It can be seen, therefore, that as modernity and education became Dusun markers of prestige, the only key distinguishing feature of the Kadazan group is its dialect. However, as will be seen below, Kadazan and Dusun
speakers have also attempted to consolidate their identities, or perhaps avoid taking on each other's identity, by using a neutral code to speak with each other.

3.3 The breaking down of the “Kadazan versus Dusun” ideology

3.3.1 The use of the third or neutral language

As mentioned earlier, the contact experiences after the call to Kadazan-ism by Stephens in the 1960’s were decidedly different from those in the 1980’s. In particular, the “Kadazan versus Dusun” stories in the 1980’s featured less pressure from the Kadazan group towards Dusun speakers, at least in terms of language use. In fact, as mentioned in Chapter 2, more and more Kadazan and Dusun speakers themselves were speaking in languages other than their own dialects for communication.

However, between the Kadazan and Dusun speaker, the move to adopt a third or neutral language between the two first begins with an effort by the Dusun speaker to learn the Kadazan dialect. In the example below, we see that the Dusun speaker tries to accommodate to the Kadazan dialect. However, when the Dusun speaker was not successful at it, he found that Kadazan speakers were willing to speak in another language, Malay.

“Case 2: ... When I was 13 years old, my parents were transferred to Kota Kinabalu city and I was sent to La Salle school. There were quite a number of coastal Kadazan-Dusun students, but I was not able to converse in Tangara. I tried to speak in my mother tongue Tuhawon but it was not properly received. Since then, my friends always talk to me in Malay. (VL)”

One reason for this difference in Dusun speakers’ experience is the fact that the exchange above is set in a “neutral” environment, i.e., the school, La Salle, is in the city and not in the immediate Kadazan-speaking area. Hence, Kadazan speakers can be said to be less territorial and hence, less demanding of Dusun speakers in neutral environments. However, in some ways, we can also posit the case that Kadazan speakers actually use the Malay language, whether consciously or not, to keep Dusun speakers out of their Kadazan cliques and hence, to keep the Kadazan identity to themselves. In this case, a Dusun speaker can be said to be unsuccessful at “joining the Kadazan group” whenever he/she finds himself/herself “relegated” to the use of the Malay language among Kadazan speakers.

From another angle, however, the Kadazan speaker’s lack of persistence is a sign of the breaking down of the Kadazan ideology, and the developing of an inclusive identity. That is, by refraining from the Kadazan dialect in group conversation, the Kadazan speaker can be said to avoid pushing his/her own identity and hence, avoid offending the Dusun speaker in the process. Nevertheless, while the lack of Kadazan use means the decline of the Kadazan ideology, the use of a third or neutral language among Kadazan and Dusun speakers goes towards the consolidating of their identities in the larger identity of the “Kadazan and Dusun” community.

---

31 There are other reasons why the Kadazan ideology is believed to have declined. According to Topin (1997), Stephens’ conversion to the Muslim faith in the 1970’s diminished his standing in the community and this caused a decline of Kadazanism.
3.3.2 The breaking down of labels

Perhaps the main reason why the Kadazan ideology had begun to break down is due to the arbitrariness in label use and the multiplicity in label meaning. By the 1980's, there were many who were formerly “Dusun” in their identification papers but had since changed their ethnic grouping to “Kadazan”. However, there are also those who have retained the official label of Dusun but openly claim the Kadazan label as his/her political identity. Still, due to the promotion of “Kadazan” to other Borneon groups, we see that some Murut and Paitan speakers have also adopted the label “Kadazan” as their official ethnic group. Hence, the label “Kadazan” is used to indicate ethnic ethnicity but also to indicate one’s political identity and a common heritage in being Borneon.32

On the other hand, the label “Dusun” had also become an alternative to the label “Kadazan” for Paitan speakers. For instance, according to King (1992; 45-46), in the 1989 SIL survey in the upper Sugut River (inland regions of north Sabah), surveyors found that Sugut Kadazan speakers actually “use the autonym Dusun...and are referred to by others with the same name.”. In fact, SIL surveyors found that no one in the so-called Sugut Kadazan dialect area uses the autonym Kadazan, despite findings in an earlier SIL survey (1979-1981) (Smith 1984). A closer look at the sociolinguistic write-up in the King study above showed that Sugut Kadazan/Dusun speakers were not cognizant of the Kadazan dialect, but were fluent speakers in the adjacent Central Dusun dialect, which

---

32 One’s official identity is not known publicly, as there are stated in the personal effects of the individual, such as in identification papers: identity card and birth certificate. For adults, attempts to change one’s ethnic group involve legal procedures. Therefore, the decision to adopt the Kadazan label is usually made by parents at the registration of their children’s birth. The situation above is a case in my own family, i.e., my parents and grandparents are officially “Dusun” but my siblings and I are officially “Kadazan”.
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they viewed as a prestige dialect. From this, we see that there are increasing overlaps in
use between the Kadazan and Dusun labels.

However, this also raises the question as to what is the “real” identity of the
Kadazan/Dusun person. That is, which of the two facets of identity above—ethnic or
political—does one feel mirrors his/her true self? Based on our previous discussions on
the ties between language and cultural identity, it is more than likely that one’s real
identity is represented by one’s own mother tongue. That is, one can report one’s identity
based on one’s speech type. However, judging from the practices among the Kadazan and
Dusun groups, today, identity is indicated through a combination of ethnic, political,
speech labels, and/or the name of one’s place or birth or origin. Still for some, in-group
identity still largely follows one’s autonym.

Indeed, if one’s actual or “real” identity is one’s particular group culture, then
one’s basic ethnic identity is experiencing the real conflict. Hence, while the labels
Kadazan and Dusun are arbitrary in their use, they are not arbitrary in their meanings and
intentions. Perhaps the question for future studies is to find out which label, Kadazan or
Dusun, do people find their identities to be most intact? The following table seeks to
illustrate what the identity of a person is based on the Kadazan label. (Note: EL (Ethnic
label); PL (Political label); OL (Origin label); SL (Speech label); AU (autonym)).
3.4 Conclusion: The Kadazandusun community

The active (re)labeling practices in the Kadazandusun community has rendered a new complexity to identity in the Kadazandusun community. For although, one’s personal identity is based on one’s official label or based on one’s autonym (encapsulating the label of one’s particular cultural group and mother tongue), this part of one’s identity is mainly hidden until it is “exposed” through the use of one’s mother tongue. In its basic form, one’s personal identity could be said to be Dusun, if one does not speak the Kadazan dialect, and/or he/she does not have native Kadazan parents, and/or he/she is not from the Penampang and Papar districts, and vice-versa.

On the other hand, group identity is triggered by political sentiments. That is, a Dusun person can still claim the Kadazan identity, if they take part in the Kadazan movement. As mentioned in the earlier chapter, KDCA’s president attempted to revive the Kadazan ideology and labeling movement, when he called for the community to support the choice of the KDCA in the Kadazan dialect as the standard language. However, as we can see from the descriptions and explanations given in this chapter, the
dialect and label Kadazan represents a kind of elitism for pro-Dusun supporters. Conversely, the dialect and label Dusun represents a kind of provinciality for pro-Kadazan supporters. We see, therefore, given the inter-woven themes of labels, identity, and language that the planning of the Kadazandusun was problematic from the start, as neither the Kadazan nor the Dusun wanted each other’s label, identity, or language.

In the following chapter, we will explore the language planning proper events that took place, namely the KDCA language symposium. We will see that community leaders from all the major ethnic groups in the Kadazandusun community would be called to deliberate on the standard language matter. However, the resolution of community leaders will reflect their non-linguistic goals of unity. Overall, the community leaders’ decision was an attempt to acknowledge both the Kadazan and Dusun dialects as a single standard choice for the wider community.
CHAPTER 4
THE PLANNING OF THE KADAZANDUSUN LANGUAGE

4. Introduction: Selection of a code

Linguists working with the Kadazan and Dusun community have often remarked that consensus-style leadership characterizes much of Sabah society (Lasimbang and Miller 1990:132-3). However, it was not just cultural mechanism at play, when it came to the planning of the Kadazandusun language. For one, community leaders were concerned for the matter of unity. On the other hand, educational conventions in the country suggested that the Malaysian government could financially support only one (standard) language. In this chapter, we will focus on the decision-making process in the planning of the Kadazandusun language. We will see that community leaders attempted to seek for linguistic advice to inform their decision, despite the end-result. However, instead of the Kadazan or Dusun dialect as the standard language, community leaders would chose both dialects and include their own choice of the Huguan Siou’s (paramount leader) dialect. Interestingly, for the Kadazan ideology, the planning of the Kadazandusun language will be its demise, as the community leaders’ decision will introduce another Dusun dialect and hence, with two Dusun dialects in the mix, the Dusun identity had come into stronger focus.

4.1 Carolyn Miller and Asmah Haji Omar’s suggestions for the Kadazan/Dusun standard

As mentioned in Chapter 2, USDA organized a seminar in 1988 in which language planning was discussed. Carolyn Miller, from SIL Malaysia branch, was invited
to give a talk to USDA members. In Miller’s talk, “The distribution of Dusun dialects”, Miller advised USDA to make several pre-prepatory measures, if it wanted to pursue the standard language matter. Among others, Miller suggested the conducting of a comprehensive study of dialects, after which, a testing on orthography and lexical choice should be conducted. As an advanced step, Miller suggested a sociolinguistic survey on the acceptance of the proposed standard form (Miller 1988:15).

In the following year, KDCA organized a language symposium, “Towards the standardization of Kadazan dialects”, and invited Carolyn Miller to speak to its members. In this symposium, KDCA gathered the major leaders from all the Kadazan/Dusun groups in the community. Miller offered the same advice to the KDCA at the symposium, but in addition, she also suggested that a non-partisan body be formed to look into the developing of a “model” for the standard language. As she did at the USDA seminar, Miller strongly advised the KDCA to take a careful planning approach to language standardization. She stated that the same non-partisan body above could be put in-charge of developing a sample body of literature based on the standard model, which should then be used to test for acceptability at the grassroots. With feedback from the community, Miller believed that community leaders would then be able to arrive at a proper consensus in the matter of code selection (Miller 1989:8-11).

Asmah Haji Omar, a well-known Malay linguist, was also invited by the KDCA to give her advice at the symposium. Omar found Miller’s suggestions to relate to two options: (1) To involve the entire community in the language planning decision via a voting process, and/ or (2) To create a variety or a model language that would be
acceptable to all by merging features of all dialects concerned, such that the resultant variety belongs to everyone but identifiable with none (Asmah Haji Omar 1992).

However, Asmah Haji Omar found both options impractical for the Kadazandusun community. In particular, she said that making attempts to arrive at a democratic solution by collecting a consensus was impractical because it would mean that each person would tend to vote for his or her own dialect, i.e., the Kadazan would vote for the Kadazan dialect and similarly the Dusun would elect his/her own dialect. In her book, "Linguistic Scenery of Malaysia", Asmah Haji Omar reflected on the Kadazandusun situation and said:

"(The first proposition was impractical for the simple reason that) the majority of the people would have no idea what a standard language was all about. Voting would be done for the conservation and elevation of one's own dialect, rather than for the purpose of choosing a variety that was efficient in functioning as the tool for inter-dialectical communication."


As for the second proposition, i.e., to create a variety by merging or "mixing" features of all dialects concerned in order to arrive at one form, Asmah Haji Omar (1992) stated that it would involve a labor-intensive process of weighing each dialect for elements that would then be subject to "artificiality". She stated that such a decision would require:

"...a process of "selecting, chopping, and patching" elements of disparate dialects. Besides becoming a game of artificiality, it could turn out to be a horrendous task. First and foremost, a list of criteria would have to be set up for the selection of a particular feature from a particular variety. ... Even if the selection was to materialize, and a particular part of a system of a particular dialect was chosen to be patched to those of others, the result may prove to be artificial in nature. This may not engender the acceptability that was the objective of the whole exercise."

According to Asmah Haji Omar, the selection of a code in a standard language must be planned based on a "features criteria". To illustrate her point, she lists the features of the Johor-Riau dialect, the code for the standard Malay language. In so doing, the status of the Johor-Riau dialect is comparable to the Kadazan dialect. For instance, both the Johor-Riau and the Kadazan dialects are in the respective focal areas where cultural, political, and socioeconomic activities have taken place. Like Johor-Riau, whose spread covers neighboring Singapore, the Kadazan dialect area also includes the capitol city of Kota Kinabalu.

Further, Asmah Haji Omar also stated that the dictionary must also be seen as an agent of standardization. Hence, the dialect that already has one ought to be considered as the more suitable choice as a standard language. By that time, the KDCA had begun revising and expanding upon Antonissen's 1958 "Kadazan grammar and dictionary". Meanwhile, there were no dictionaries yet for the Dusun dialects. However, note that the KDCA dictionary includes Dusun entries as well, i.e., the main entry was the Kadazan dialect, followed by the Dusun dialect and, equivalents in the Malay and English languages.

It can be seen in the above linguistic advice to the USDA and KDCA leaders that Asmah Haji Omar differed with Carolyn Miller in approach to the Kadazandusun language planning situation. That is, Asmah Haji Omar appeared to suggest a more practical point to follow, while Carolyn Miller suggested a more democratic approach.

33 The state of Johor is located at the southern tip of the Malaysian Peninsular. It is adjacent to the country of Singapore.
Nevertheless, Omar agreed with Miller on several key points. That is, when and however the standard language should result, Miller had said that language planners should not discourage or disparage the use of other dialects, or to expect instant conformity from the community, or to over-regulate the standard language in its implementation (Omar 1992:230; Miller 1989:7-8).

However, it must be stated here that Miller had also recognized that at the very heart of the language planning dilemma is the fact that the desire for a standard language did not match the overall language planning objectives of community leaders. That is, the desire for a language in school had simply been that community members everywhere would be able to find it as a way to maintain their respective mother tongue or dialect varieties. However, Miller stated that planners ought to also discuss and understand how the standard language should be connected to the maintenance of dialect varieties in the community, i.e., the preparation of bridge materials featuring the standard language and/or the mother tongue variant ought to be developed and administered (Miller 1989:8). In addition, Miller also asked community leaders to understand and decide what the role of the standard language would play in bringing them closer to their mother tongue goal above.

4.2 The planning of the Kadazandusun language

Nevertheless, community leaders gathered at the 1989 KDCA symposium could not decide on the Kadazan or the Dusun dialect as the code for the standard language. In fact, according to Asmah Haji Omar (1992), “everyone wanted his/her own dialect to be
the standard language". Therefore, the 1989 KDCA symposium held in January of that year did not reach a conclusion on the matter of language selection. In September 1989, KDCA held another language meeting and called for community leaders to re-convene on the matter of standardization. It was at this meeting that the Kadazandusun language concept was first formulated. The following section describes the decisions regarding the "Bunduliwan". In section 4.2.2, we will discuss the parallel movement on the matter of the standard language label "Kadazandusun". Following that, we will discuss what transpired at the higher levels of government, as the Malaysian authorities began to review and finally, approve the entry of the Kadazandusun language into mainstream education.

4.2.1 The formulation of the Kadazandusun language concept

After much protest from the USDA and pro-Dusun supporters against the selection of the Kadazan dialect, the KDCA appeared to have resolved to become more inclusive towards the Dusun dialect. In particular, this was due to an admission by the KDCA president himself that the Dusun dialect was indeed, more widely spoken than Kadazan. As a result, when KDCA called for community leaders to reconvene in September 1989, leaders became more inclusive towards the Dusun dialect. Based on a report of the meeting, community leaders chose to formulate a two-stage development to the standard language. With the decision, both the Kadazan and Dusun dialects were chosen as a compromise. However, community leaders also made the surprising decision to select another dialect, the Dusun Tambunan dialect. As will be mentioned in the

following section, the selection of this latter dialect is due to the non-linguistic goal of keeping the leadership and unity intact in the community.

Nevertheless, the Kadazandusun language concept was decided as follows:

(1) At the first stage, the three main dialects in the overall Kadazandusun community were identified. The three dialects were chosen out of 12 other dialect choices, all of which represented the 12 major groups in the Kadazandusun community. (See Appendix A for a list of the dialects and groups concerned). These dialects—Coastal Kadazan, Dusun Tambunan, and Central Dusun—would become references for the creation of a single form. Collectively, the three dialects would form the "base dialect", which was nicknamed "Bunduliwan" for ease of reference. (Bunduliwan is a conjoined label of the local names of the Dusun Tambunan and Central Dusun dialects, "Bundu" and "Liwan", respectively). (See Appendix D (Bunduliwan agreement)).

(2) As for the second stage of the Kadazandusun language, community leaders decided that the remaining nine (9) dialects will have the role of enriching the base dialect. Hence, lexical contributions from other dialects in the community will be incorporated into the base dialect.

The Kadazandusun language at its basic form, therefore, will be the Bunduliwan form, whereas the advance state of the Kadazandusun language will see vocabularies from all over the Kadazandusun community. At this meeting, the KDCA also agreed to coordinate on-going language planning discussions. In particular, the KDCA agreed to
set up a language council, whereby members from the 12 representative dialects above will continue to research and determine the extent of the contribution of each dialect in coming meetings.

4.2.2 Negotiating “Kadazandusun”: KDCA vs. USDA

In the meantime, USDA made no outward indication that it was in favor of KDCA’s proposal above. In fact, earlier that year 1989, following KDCA’s January 1989 language symposium, USDA representatives had made a public protest on KDCA’s plan to institute the Kadazan dialect. As mentioned earlier, USDA’s protest was believed to have blocked the full approval of the Kadazan as standard language.

However, the real reason why USDA made the protest was that Joseph Pairin Kitingan, KDCA’s president, had begun the language symposium by asserting that the label “Kadazan” should be used as the label of the official standard language (Yee 1991: 464-469; Reid 1997). He particularly reminded community leaders in attendance that the decision on the label “Kadazan” had already been resolved as the name of the community by the founding leaders in 1961. Pairin also stated that the real reason why the Kadazan dialect had not found a widespread acceptance was not so much due its label but because “some communities” viewed the Kadazan dialect “with skepticism and at times blind resentment” (Yee 1991: 467).

This incited the Kadazan versus Dusun labeling sentiment all over again. USDA officials were so provoked by Pairin’s words that they issued a public statement saying that the Dusun groups would not accept any form of pressure to change their ethnic name.
from "Dusun" to "Kadazan". According to Reid (1997:134), Kalakau Untol, a top USDA representative, said that the Dusun groups have "recognized and accepted all ethnic names, including Kadazan" and hence, KDCA should give the full measure of respect and recognition due unto these groups.

The following year in 1990, the KDCA announced a decision to rename itself from "Kadazan Cultural Association" to the "Kadazan Dusun Cultural Association" in order to get rid of the labeling "stumbling block". It was also a hope that USDA will become more cooperative in the language standardization talks and hence, generate consensus among pro-Dusun supporters in the community (Reid 1997). However, USDA launched its own dictionary project instead signaling their desire to pursue standard language discussions on their own. Ironically, the title of the USDA dictionary would mirror the title of KDCA's dictionary, i.e., the "Dusun Kadazan—Malay—English dictionary" (USDA) versus the "Kadazan Dusun—Malay—English dictionary" (KDCA). Hence, a firm indication from USDA as to how it viewed the labeling situation to be in the community, i.e., "Dusun" before "Kadazan". The USDA would publish their dictionary in 1994, a year earlier than the KDCA dictionary.35

Perhaps out of all the discussions, direct/indirect and verbal/non-verbal, between USDA and KDCA in the year 1989, the most detrimental effect towards the unity in the community came from the decision of the USDA to boycott the state-level Harvest Festival celebrations that year. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the Harvest Festival celebration is a commemoration of the Kadazandusun rice culture. As the largest and most important cultural event in the community, however, the state-level Harvest Festival

Festival is celebrated once a year in the month of May at a single location on a specified time and day. However, USDA decided to hold a counter-celebration at a different location. Therefore, instead of congregating in one area, the community was going to two different celebrations. USDA’s decision sent a significant message to the KDCA leaders. That is, it would not compromise to KDCA’s Kadazan-only ideas of culture and language. Perhaps it was especially embarrassing for the KDCA, as it had built an impressive cultural building and planned to dedicate the building during the Harvest Festival season. Ironically, the building was called “Koisaan”, which means ‘unity’ or “one-ness”.

However, USDA’s protest of the Harvest Festival celebration was also USDA’s leaders’ refusal to commit to the wider political influence of the KDCA president, Pairin. At the time, Pairin was the top-ranking government officer in the state of Sabah being the Chief Minister. His leap into political power in the state government was a major turning point for the Kadazandusun community overall, as it had increased the status of the Kadazandusun community as the fore-runner of indigenous (non-Moslem) movement in the state of Sabah. In his address at the state-level Harvest Festival celebration that year, Pairin attempted to resolve the Kadazan versus Dusun label issue by saying that:36

"...Nobody will force anyone to get rid of any ethnic or tribal label. It is up to each community to call themselves by whatever name they wish. ...whether Dusun or Kadazan we are one and the same people, and that is more important than anything else...".


36 The Harvest Festival is officially celebrated en masse on a state level, and nowadays, on the national level as well.
However, by the end of his speech, he once again asserted that "...collectively as a united people of this distinct linguistic group; we (should) identify ourselves as "Kadazan. ...". Despite the Harvest Festival incident and the dissipating political harmony among leaders, KDCA continued to promote the Bunduliwan model to USDA.\(^{37}\) However, it was clear that the label issue would have to be resolved, before USDA could consider the language plan.

By the early 1990's, there was another significant event in the Kadazandusun community that would seek to complicate the negotiation process between KDCA and USDA. Pairin's government had by then left the ruling coalition in Malaysia, effectively becoming an opposition state government to the federal government. The leadership in the state government began to collapse as leader after leader began to change his/her political ideology to return to the ruling coalition. The impact of this situation was grave for the leadership of the Kadazandusun community, as community leaders that had served with Pairin in the state government were no longer in a working relationship with Pairin and those leaders that stayed on in Pairin's camp. The planning of the Kadazandusun language soon became a minor event to the breaking down of leadership in the Kadazandusun community.

In 1994, the media attempted to broker the language planning and label decisions by publishing a lengthy series investigating the social changes and impacts upon the Kadazan-Dusun community. KDCA and USDA representatives were interviewed to state their opinions on the labeling issue. KDCA Deputy Secretary-General at the time,  

\(^{37}\) Bunduliwan to be the foundation. 4 November 1993; Bunduliwan plan must go ahead. 11 November 1993.
Wilfred Tangau, said, “Perhaps things could have gone smoother if Kadazan had been the chosen label and Dusun the medium of communication”. Tangau proceeded to suggest a labeling solution in the label “Kadazandusun”. He said that it would be a way out of the labeling predicament, as it meant a joining of the two labels “without the dash, hyphen, or slash”. By then, in order to indicate that there is only one community and not two, community leaders have often resorted to fuse the two labels, for instance, “Kadazan-Dusun”, “Kadazan/Dusun”, “Dusun-Kadazan”, “Dusun/Kadazan”, among others. But Raymond Tombung, the Deputy President to the USDA, argued against Tangau’s suggestion and iterated the position of the USDA in demanding equal respect for its choice in labels. Tombung said:

> “From the community’s standpoint, we have accepted a compromise due to history and events in the generation that followed the 1961 decision [referring to the adoption of “Kadazan” over “Dusun”]. [But] While others in the community have succeeded in promoting the word Kadazan, we have succeeded in retaining the word Dusun.”

(Ref. Wrangle over a label. 17 September 1994).

4.2.3 The approval for the Kadazandusun language and KDCA-USDA resolutions

Meantime, at the Malaysian Parliamentary sessions, the 1994 Education Bill was being tabled again, after a second revision was called for in the 1991 parliamentary sessions (the 1991 and 1994 Education Bill revised the Education Act of 1961). The Kadazan/Dusun language proposal had been listed in the 1991 bill, at this point. The

---

38 To my knowledge, there are no mentions in literature as to why the term “KadazanDusun” with the ‘d’ in “Dusun” in the capital letter form was not chosen instead. I suspect that the decision to have “Kadazandusun”, as it is, was community leaders’ desire to drive home the point that there exists only “one people, one label” in the community.

39 Each successive education ministers responding to queries from Kadazandusun leaders would make a press announcement to assure that the Kadazan/Dusun language proposal was still being considered: 1988
JPNS had also received a commission from the Ministry of Education to make a preliminary research as to the materials needed for the writing of a curriculum, a syllabus, and a teacher’s manual/guide. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the JPNS had begun to conduct preparations for the Kadazan language in the late 1980’s but stopped due to USDA’s protest.

In April 1995, the Malaysian Education Minister finally made the long-awaited announcement that the Federal Government had “agreed in principle” to the proposed inclusion of the Kadazandusun language. In a second reading of the Education Bill that December, the Education bill was officially passed into the Malaysian Education Act of 1995. With it, the Kadazandusun language entered for the first time into the sphere of Malaysian education.

However, seeing that the KDCA and USDA still had no agreement or final decision on the language or the labeling matter, the JPNS decided to consult with both organizations directly. According to Joe Kinajil, who was the JPNS personnel involved in the planning of the Kadazandusun language at the time, the JPNS contacted the KDCA and USDA for a formal “in-writing” decision. KDCA and USDA responded by transmitting two written agreements between themselves: the first document recorded their decision on the label “Kadazandusun” as the name of the standard language, while the second document recorded the decision on the Bunduliwan model that had previously been agreed upon by community-wide leaders. (See Appendix D and E (Bunduliwan and

through Anwar Ibrahim, April 1995 through Sulaiman Daud, December 1995 through Najib Tun Razak and 1996 through Fong Chan On.

40 Personal communication with Joe T. Kinajil, who was the Kadazandusun Desk Officer for the Sabah State Education Department at the time.

Kadazandusun agreements)). The JPNS has since referred to these documents as guidelines for implementation of the concept of the Kadazandusun language.

4.3 Implications of the Kadazandusun language and label: Language acceptance

4.3.1 Parental feedback

It has been 10 years since the Kadazandusun language was approved by the Malaysian parliament. Since then, it has been taught in over 400 primary schools throughout the state of Sabah to about 30,000 students (ages 10-12 or Year 4, 5, and 6) each year. This impressive figure speaks of parents' support and belief that the Kadazandusun language is helpful for their endeavors at mother tongue education and maintenance. It also indicates that parents have not been dissuaded by the conflicts arising from the language planning, which has been taken by some as having delayed the delivery of mother tongue education. Instead, most parents have been enthusiastic with the idea of having their “own language” in schools.

However, not all Kadazan/Dusun groups in the community have been able to see the value or the connection of the Kadazandusun language to the goal of mother tongue maintenance. For instance, the Kadazandusun language classes in the Kudat district, i.e., the Rungus speech area, have recently stopped. According to Stephen and Atin (2004), the Rungus group, whose dialect is most distinct from any of the main dialects in the Kadazandusun language, there are several reasons as to why Rungus parents are not supportive of the Kadazandusun language classes in school. For one, Rungus parents are
not satisfied with the current structure of the Kadazandusun language, seeing that it does not carry any Rungus words.

At the same time, however, Rungus parents have also wondered as to why their own variant of Rungus could not be taught in the schools in their own neighborhood, if almost everyone in the neighborhood spoke Rungus, and not the major dialects of Kadazan or Dusun. Similarly, while some Kadazan parents in the Penampang district are genuinely happy about the teaching of the Kadazandusun language in school, they have also felt “uncomfortable” when their children begin to respond to them in “Dusun” and not in the Kadazan mother tongue. Still some Kadazan parents have resorted to viewing the Kadazandusun language as the learning of “a dialect” and not “the standard language”.

From the comments of Rungus and Kadazan parents above, we see that there is a great need to understand parents’ perspective towards the Kadazandusun language. Several reports regarding parents’ lack of support towards the Kadazandusun language have since surfaced over the past few years. For instance, Atin (2004), citing JPNS officials, said that the number of schools offering the Kadazandusun language is actually declining because there is not enough demand from parents to keep classes open. A recent newspaper report also stated that the state of mother tongue use in the community has not greatly improved, as parents were still not speaking to their children in their respective Kadazan/Dusun mother tongue; despite the presence of the Kadazandusun language in schools.
However, it also seems that part of the lack of support for the Kadazandusun language stems from the political implications in the label “Kadazandusun”. According to Stephen and Atin (2004), another reason why Rungus parents have not viewed the Kadazandusun language positively is due to their belief that they will lose their in-group identity, if they take part in the Kadazandusun identity. That is, by taking part in the Kadazandusun language program, Rungus parents feel that they are being “Kadazandusun-ized”. Similarly, Kadazan parents appear to be comfortable with the label “Kadazandusun” but, as mentioned above, do not deny that the Kadazandusun language is really the Dusun dialect, as it sounds and looks almost 100% Dusun.

4.3.2 Language planners’ efforts to study acceptance: Planner relationships

Overall, the implications of the Kadazandusun language on acceptance, so far, show that it may take awhile before the standard Kadazandusun language can find a firm grip in the language ecology of the Kadazandusun community. Apart from the acceptance of the community that is needed for the Kadazandusun language to continue its trajectory in school, the efforts of language planners are crucial to the continued planning of the Kadazandusun language. For instance, given the above sentiments from parents above, it comes as a surprise that there has not been any language acceptance survey coming from language planners themselves. However, a closer look at the main bodies believed to be responsible in the planning the Kadazandusun language, today, explains why there is a lack to this aspect of language planning.
Kadazandusun language planners, today, are themselves still attempting to find their positions and roles to play in the language planning community. One of the characteristics to planners is that each planner has a specific expertise that does not require or allow a collective effort. On the other hand, planners have also entered the planning task at different points in the planning framework, so that, they have not greatly overlapped in their planning efforts. For instance, the KDCA can be said to have been the conceptual planner of the Kadazandusun language, while the actual implementation of the concept through the teaching of the Kadazandusun language goes to the JPNS, as it is the education body of the Malaysian government. The KLF, on the other hand, is a relatively new language planner to the Kadazandusun language, as it only entered the planning scene in 1995. Therefore, it appears as if each planning body is conducting separate language planning activities.

Further, due to the Kadazandusun language being taught and used specifically in school, JPNS can be said to be the main language planner, while KDCA is more of a stakeholder to the Kadazandusun language. Meanwhile, the JPNS has consulted the KLF in linguistic matters and have asked the KLF to provide linguistic training to its language teachers.\(^4\) Hence, KLF is a supporting planner to the JPNS. However, in all of planners’ forms of relationships above, there is yet to be a formal working relationship among all three planners.

\(^{4}\) Previously, the KLF was known as the “Kadazan Language Center”, a language tutorial center offering after-school classes. JPNS began working with the KLF when it utilized KLF’s language center materials in the past for the writing-up of the Kadazandusun language syllabus (KLF News Bulletin 1999).
Perhaps the lack of working relation is further driven by the compartmentalization of their work. That is, it can also be said that the JPNS's main concern should go towards planning the Kadazandusun language, since it is chiefly responsible for the success of the language in school. On the other hand, the KDCA and KLF, which are community-based organizations, should focus on planning for the success of the wider mother tongue situation in the community. However, it cannot be said that the JPNS is the only language planner responsible in studying how the Kadazandusun language has affected mother tongue use in the community. That is, all of the planners mentioned above have a direct interest in each other's work, in knowing how each other's plans and endeavors promote all indigenous languages, including the Kadazandusun language, in the community. Hence, at some point, planners may need to collaborate on future language planning projects, especially as they are serving the same community.

4.4 Conclusion: Problems in the Kadazandusun concept

Language planners have indicated that planners are hopeful in fostering a future relationship with each other. Despite some rejection from the community, planners have all stated their desire for the school to continue being used, as a way to promote mother tongue maintenance, that is, through the Kadazandusun language. However, planners are aware that the enrichment stage of the Kadazandusun language must come soon, in order to see to the fruition of the Kadazandusun concept. For that, planners have shared some of their ideas for the enrichment of the Kadazandusun language (these will be highlighted in the final chapter). As mentioned, the enrichment stage consists of drawing
vocabularies from the rest of the Kadazan/Dusun groups and incorporating them into the present database.

Nevertheless, a closer look at the Kadazandusun language, today, shows that there is a fundamental problem in executing its concept. In particular, language planners are inconsistent among themselves in the matter of application. This appears to be due to differing interpretations of the concept. In the following chapter, we will look into the discussions among planners on the first stage of the Kadazandusun concept, Bunduliwan. We will seek to find out what are the problems in Bunduliwan. The basic problems in the concept will be outlined and a remedy will be proposed. We will also see that in order to advance the planning of the Kadazandusun language, the Bunduliwan concept must first be stabilized. In so saying, the language selection of the Kadazandusun language has been finalized but it is the codification process following the selection that requires immediate attention, before an enrichment process can begin.
CHAPTER 5
THE KADAZANDUSUN LANGUAGE CONCEPT:
CODIFICATION PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS IN BUNDULIWN

5. Introduction:

The Kadazandusun language is currently in its form of Bunduliwan. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Bunduliwan is the raw or basic form of the Kadazandusun language and is based on the three major dialects in the community—Coastal Kadazan, Dusun Tambunan, and Central Dusun. In advanced stages of development, the Kadazandusun language should look significantly different due to the proposed enrichment from other sources.

However, in recent years, some members of the community have indicated their confusion over the idea of the Bunduliwan versus the Kadazandusun language. In particular, whether the Bunduliwan is in fact, the Dusun dialect, and whether the Kadazandusun language will truly be a mixture of the Kadazan and Dusun dialects, and other dialects. While KDCA spokespersons have attempted to explain how the idea of the Bunduliwan was derived, on the other hand, language planners differ among themselves as to how the synthesis between the three dialects ought to be done. In particular, the KDCA differs with the JPNS and KLF in the use of so-called Kadazan elements in the Bunduliwan.

In this chapter, we will first discuss further justifications to the Bunduliwan beyond community leaders’ decision on the matter in 1989. We will then discuss the differing approaches among planners and the implications therein. Finally, some
possibilities will be suggested to resolve some of the issues in the application of orthography.

5.1 The Bunduliwan agreement, basic application, and some issues

According to the Bunduliwan agreement, it has been found that the vast majority in the Kadazandusun community speaks the Dusun dialect, nowadays. That is, the Dusun dialect can be seen in almost all the towns and districts with heavy Kadazandusun population. Hence, the Dusun dialect is believed to represent the majority population in the Kadazandusun community. This means that among the three dialects chosen to create the Bunduliwan form, the Dusun dialects, i.e., Dusun Tambunan and Central Dusun, take precedence over the Coastal Kadazan dialect. See a listing of towns and districts believed to be Dusun-speaking areas in the Bunduliwan agreement in Appendix D.

KDCA and USDA also base their claim on SIL research. SIL survey reports have stated that there is high degree of mutual-intelligibility among Dusun speakers. For instance, in the SIL 1992 report (King 1992), Paitan language speakers were noted to demonstrate proficiency in the Dusun dialect, rather than the Kadazan dialect. This is stated in the excerpt from the Bunduliwan agreement below.

"B. (The) Bunduliwan dialect has been identified by linguistic research experts, specifically Summer Institute of Linguistic (SIL), as the dialect that has the highest intelligibility among the dialects that are found in the Kadazandusunic and Paitanic group."

(Ref. Appendix D: Bunduliwan agreement)

Given the explanations above, it can be seen that the Bunduliwan concept has been further elaborated in the present time. Specifically, a firm decision has been made for the
Dusun dialect to act as the main feature in the Kadazandusun language. However, while the Bunduliwan agreement explains the basis for the Dusun dialect as the main reference, the technical guidelines in the Bunduliwan are lacking. That is, the Bunduliwan agreement does not explain how the synthesis between the three dialects ought to be carried out.

5.1.1. A basic application of the Kadazandusun language

Following the Bunduliwan agreement, however, all language planners, KDCA, JPNS, and KLF, have adhered to the Dusun dialect as the main reference (Bating 2001). What this means is that Dusun phonemes are used to represent the basic form of the Kadazandusun language. Therefore, Kadazan phonemes that are in correspondence to Dusun phonemes cannot be applied (c.f. Chapter 1 for a list of sound correspondences between Kadazan and Dusun). In general, at the Bunduliwan stage, the Kadazandusun language must first take the shape of the Dusun dialect. We see that in the Kadazandusun text sample below, the Kadazandusun follows the Dusun form except for some orthographical markings that appear in Kadazan. The Kadazandusun text below follows the application of the Bunduliwan by the JPNS and KLF. (The significance of orthographical markings will be discussed shortly).

(Ref. Excerpt from ‘I Kondiu om i manuk’ [The Eagle and The Chicken] (2001). This reader was transferred from the Kadazan variant into the Kadazandusun language by Evelyn Anmol).

**English:**
“Once upon a time, the chicken and the eagle got along really well together. Whatever that needed to be done, they would work with each other to accomplish it. If the chicken had a problem, the eagle would help. The chicken was like that too. If the eagle had a problem, the chicken would help it.”

87
In recent years, the KDCA has sought to provide a technical guide for the applications in the Bunduliwan. The KDCA has specified that the process of synthesis in the Bunduliwan must follow two rules or requirements. According to Bating (2001), the process of comparing words among the three dialects in the Bunduliwan must ensure that the “majority” and “minimal” rules are followed. In the majority rule, a word or contribution that appears in two dialects will be selected as the Bunduliwan form. However, words must appear identical in spelling. In the following example, for instance, we see that since Dusun Tambunan and Central Dusun are identical in the word for “below”, the word “siriba” is selected as the Bunduliwan form.

---

43 The KDCA linguistic guidelines to the Kadazandusun language is published in a book called “Ejaan bahasa Kadazandusun dan aspek-aspek persoalan [Kadazandusun language spelling and aspects of inquiry]” by Henry Bating (2001). Henry Bating is a spokesperson of the KDCA.
Table 5: Majority rule in Bunduliwan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Dusun Tambunan</th>
<th>Central Dusun</th>
<th>Coastal Kadazan</th>
<th>Bunduliwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>below</td>
<td>siriba</td>
<td>siriba</td>
<td>siibo ([siibo])</td>
<td>siriba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soul/spirit</td>
<td>sunduan</td>
<td>sunduwan</td>
<td>sunduvan</td>
<td>sunduan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ref. Bating 2001)

However, when no dialects show identical terms with one or the other, the minimal rule is applied. The minimal rule is specified as the selection of the word with the least number of phonemes. For instance, in the word for “soul/spirit” above, we see that the word “sunduan” from the Dusun Tambunan dialect is chosen.

The KDCA has also tried to show that the majority and minimal rules can also be partial to the Coastal Kadazan dialect, even though the main reference is the Dusun dialect. For instance, in the word for “yesterday” below, the forms in Dusun Tambunan and in the Coastal Kadazan dialects are identical. Hence, ‘koniab’ is selected and not ‘konihab’ from the Central Dusun.

Table 6: Minimal rule in Bunduliwan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Dusun Tambunan</th>
<th>Central Dusun</th>
<th>Coastal Kadazan</th>
<th>Bunduliwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yesterday</td>
<td>koniab</td>
<td>konihab</td>
<td>koniab</td>
<td>koniab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like (as)</td>
<td>miagal</td>
<td>miagal</td>
<td>miaga</td>
<td>miaga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ref. Bating 2001)

Similarly, in the word for “like” above, the minimal rule can be seen to be applicable also to the Coastal Kadazan form. Since the Coastal Kadazan form “miaga” represents the word with the fewest number of phonemes, it is chosen as the Bunduliwan form.

However, as mentioned earlier, phonemes that appear only in the Coastal Kadazan inventory cannot apply over Dusun phonemes. For instance, Kadazan phonemes /vl/ and /zl/ cannot be chosen over corresponding Dusun phonemes /w/ and /y/,
respectively. Hence, in the word for “door”, for instance, the word “wawayaan” from Central Dusun and Dusun Tambunan dialects must be chosen over the word “vavazaan” in Coastal Kadazan. In words such as these, the majority and minimal rules do not apply.

In general, therefore, JPNS and KLF follow all aspects pertaining to KDCA’s majority and minimal rules above. Further, they appropriate Dusun phonemes over Kadazan phonemes, as seen in the Kadazandusun text in the preceding pages. However, JPNS and KLF have also adopted a key orthographic decision from the Kadazan dialect into the Bunduliwan or the Kadazandusun language. The decision refers to contrastive marking in minimal pairs. The KDCA has contested this decision by the JPNS and KLF.

5.1.2. Application of contrastive marking in minimal pairs: JPNS and KLF vs. KDCA

Firstly, it must be noted here that all the contrastive marking decisions featured in this section and the following sections have been formulated by the KDCA itself. These orthography decisions came through the KDME dictionary project. The SIL was the main consultant for the project and the orthography decisions were made together with them. Hence, KDCA’s contesting of JPNS and KLF’s application of KDCA’s own orthography decisions has been puzzling. However, towards the end of this chapter, it is hope that the some of the reasons for KDCA’s position in this matter will become clearer.

The first type of contrastive marking that the JPNS and KLF have sought to employ in the Bunduliwan is the marking of /b/ and /d/ in minimal pairs. For instance, in the words for “bench” and “shin” below, /b/ is marked with an underscore in “bench” but
not in “shin”. Similarly, /d/ is marked with an underscore in “sour plum” and “puppy” below.

Example 1: Contrastive marking ‘b’ vs. ‘b’ and ‘d’ vs. ‘d’ according to JPNS and KLF

1. ‘bench’ bangku /bangku/
2. ‘shin’ bangku /baŋku/
3. ‘sour plum’ duku /duku/
4. ‘puppy’ duku /duku/

This marking convention comes from the Kadazan dialect. In the Kadazan dialect, the underscore marking is used to distinguish between plosive and implosive sounds in the dialect. That is, in the Kadazan dialect, the bilabial and alveolar plosive /b/ and /d/ are marked with the underscore to differentiate them from their implosive counterparts, /ɓ/ and /ɗ/, respectively. Due to the implosive sounds above occurring in greater numbers than plosives sounds, the least occurring plosive phonemes were marked but the implosive phonemes are not. For instance, “bench” is marked ‘bangku’ /baŋku/ but not “shin”, /baŋku/.

The KDCA has argued against JPNS and KLF’s decision to use contrastive marking in the Bunduliwan/Kadazandusun. In particular, the KDCA said that the contrastive marking conventions that are obligatory in Kadazan cannot be made obligatory in the Kadazandusun language, as the occurrence of implosive sounds, /ɓ/ and /ɗ/ are not typically found in the Dusun dialects. The KDCA further stated that contrastive marking is not a necessary convention in the Kadazandusun language, as a lack of its use was not found to impair learning comprehension (Bating 1998; 2001). Instead, the KDCA said that the context of the sentence often provides sufficient cues to

44 The Rungus and Kimaragang dialects appear to be some of the few Dusun dialects that carry the bilabial and alveolar implosive phonemes (Kroeger 1993; Boutin 2001).
highlight to the reader what the meaning of the minimal pair word is. For example, in Bating's version of the words for “bench” and “shin” below, we see that no underscore is marked on the word for “chair”.

Example 2: Bating's suggestion (2001)—unmarked bilabial plosive in ‘chair’

a. Minindikau isio id bangku.
   sat       s/he chair
   ‘She/he sat on a bench’

b. Tinandang dau ponong bangku.
   kicked    s/he part shin
   ‘She/he kicked at the shin part’

(Ref Bating 2001).

From a pedagogical standpoint, Veronica P. Atin (2004), a Kadazandusun language program coordinator at the Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS), has also asked about the contrastive marking in minimal pairs above. Atin asked whether JPNS and KLF’s use of the contrastive marking distinctions in the plosive-implosive minimal pair set, means that JPNS is requiring teachers to, therefore, teach implosive sounds to children in the classroom. Atin said in her paper, entitled “Linguistic challenges arising from the Kadazandusun language standardization process” (2004) that the implosive sounds were often overlooked in implementation, especially among Dusun teachers who are unfamiliar with the Kadazan dialect:

“... In the process of standardizing the Kadazandusun, the phonological constitutes a challenge to teachers whose native tongues do not comprise the sounds (of Kadazan). This is especially true for the implosive sounds, considering that none of the two main languages used in Sabah (and Malaysia), Malay and English have these sounds. Thus, teachers tend to overlook these sounds in their teaching of the language. Furthermore, words in the standard language that are supposed to be pronounced with the implosive ‘b’ or ‘d’ sounds are most of the times similar to words in most Dusun dialects that are pronounced with non-implosive ‘b’ and non-implosive ‘d’.”
Hence, the issue of contrastive marking in minimal pairs with plosive-implosive sounds is one problem area in establishing the Bunduliwan, today.

5.1.3. Contesting the use of the glottal stop /ʔ/ in relation to /h/ at word-final position

The JPNS and KLF also differ from the KDCA in the contrastive marking of another set of minimal pairs. In this set, the JPNS and KLF advocates the use of the glottal stop phoneme /ʔ/, which is written with the apostrophe ('). In general, the appearance of the glottal stop phoneme in the written form is not a familiar concept among Kadazan and Dusun speakers, although the glottal stop phoneme appears in many minimal pairs. In the written form, however, the presence or absence of the phoneme can alter the meaning of the word in question. For instance, in the expression for “I see” is /ool (oo) but the word for “yes” is /ooʔ (oo’).

In the 1990’s, some Kadazan and Dusun speakers, especially journalists, had begun to ensure that they use the glottal stop (’) in their writing (KLF News Bulletin 1999). However, some speakers continue to avoid using the glottal-stop in writing. According to Rita Lasimbang, the Chief Executive Officer of the KLF, who was the coordinator of KDCA’s KDME dictionary in the 1980’s and 1990’s, the reason for speakers’ reluctance, is due to aesthetics. Speakers had said that they avoided using the glottal stop (’) in their writing because they did not like how it made the text look, i.e., with (’) in the text, it looked as if “it was raining all over the page”. Speakers preferred to use the symbol /h/ or nothing at all to indicate the presence of the glottal stop phoneme in their writing.
In the 1980’s and 1990’s, the KDCA sought to standardize the use of \(?\)/ and \(h\)/ at the word-final position. The intention was to help speakers view the glottal stop \(?\)/ as part of their language and become familiar with its use. First, KDCA stated that the glottal stop should be applied whenever it occurs at the word-final position (see speaker B below). Then, in order to justify why \(h\)/ should not be used, KDCA applied a “phoneme economy” rule. That is, \(h\)/ was judged to be the more frequently occurring phoneme than \(?\)/ in both Kadazan and Dusun phoneme inventories. Hence, it was determined that \(h\)/ need not be marked in words that appear as a minimal pair to words that have the glottal stop \(?\)/, as shown in the examples below (see speaker C). Note that this is the same principle used in the plosive-implosive contrast, i.e., mark one phoneme but not the other.

Table 7. Glottal-stop \(?\)/and \(h\)/ contrast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>‘skunk’</th>
<th>‘to point’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker A: (h)/ and (\omega)/</td>
<td>tuduh</td>
<td>tudu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker B: (h)/ and (?)/</td>
<td>tuduh</td>
<td>‘tudu’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker C: the standard use of (\omega)/ and (?)/</td>
<td>tudu</td>
<td>‘tudu’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


However, the KDCA no longer appears to favor the presence of the glottal stop in writing. In the recent years, it has determined that the absence or presence of the glottal does not complicate the writing or reading process (Bating 1998). Bating used the following example to illustrate his point. Note that the (‘) is indicated in the word for “no/not” in sentence A but not in sentence B.
Example 3: Bating's suggestion (1998)—deletion of glottal stop (’)

‘I will not force (you/the issue)’

a. Au’ oku mononsog.
   Neg I force

b. Au oku mononsog.
   Neg I force

Hence, KDCA is suggesting that the use of (’) for the glottal stop be removed completely from the spelling system. In that sense, a null marker represents the glottal stop, when it occurs. However, the JPNS and KLF have thought differently and have implemented the glottal stop phoneme, represented by (’), as part of the Kadazandusun phonemic inventory. This means that Kadazandusun language teachers, today, are using the glottal stop (’) in their teaching. The use of the glottal stop, therefore, is another problem area in establishing the Bunduliwan.

5.2 Differences among planners in approach

We have noted earlier that planners do not differ in the basic premise of the Bunduliwan, that is, all planners seem to agree to KDCA and USDA’s decision to have the Dusun dialect be the main framework of the Kadazandusun language. We have also seen that the KDCA has invented majority and minimal rules in order to ensure that the synthesis process in the Bunduliwan runs smoothly. Although we see that, these rules primarily act as a measure of protection for the Dusun dialects. That is, words from the Kadazan dialect can only be considered, if all Dusun elements and features are fulfilled.

However, from the above descriptions of just two problem areas that have been highlighted for this thesis, we see that planners differ in their further considerations for
how to execute the Bunduliwan. First, it seems that the KDCA opposes the orthography conventions that have been made specifically for the Kadazan dialect. That is, KDCA opposes the plosive-implosive marking distinction that the JPNS and KLF seem to be making. However, we see that the KDCA has also protested the use of the glottal stop in the written form, although it is not specific to the Kadazan dialect, as the glottal stop phoneme also occurs in the Dusun dialect. On the other hand, both orthography aspects above are promoted by the JPNS and KLF.

Therefore, what is the main argument among planners? A closer look at KDCA’s reasoning shows that basically, KDCA has a different idea of how the Kadazandusun language ought to be learnt, which affects their views on how the Bunduliwan or the Kadazandusun should look. For instance, KDCA believes that students’ learning of the Kadazandusun language will not be jeopardized, due to a lack of marking elements and the glottal stop phoneme. Further, KDCA (Bating 2001; 1998) said that the Kadazandusun language should move away from transcription-like approaches to writing that are seen in the use of the underscore. He continued to comment that unfamiliar symbols and sounds, such as the glottal stop will also only complicate children’s learning process.

In that sense, the KDCA’s approach is “less is more”. That is, with fewer rules of marking to learn and by doing away with the learning of unfamiliar phonemes like the glottal stop, students of the Kadazandusun language will be encouraged to rely on their present knowledge from other languages, such as the Malay and English languages. Based on KDCA’s point of view, therefore, the Kadazandusun language should look
more like these mainstream languages, in order to take advantage of students' meta-
linguistic awareness of language learning, in general.

On the other hand, according to Rita Lasimbang, KLF and JPNS have enforced
marking conventions in minimal pairs with new learners of the Kadazandusun language
in mind. That is, Rita Lasimbang said that not all learners are Kadazan/Dusun children
and even so, they may have had no prior knowledge of the Kadazan or Dusun dialects in
the written form. Further, the JPNS had reported that many non-Kadazan/Dusun students
of Chinese and Malay ethnicity are also enrolled in Kadazandusun language classes at
school.\footnote{All races welcome Kadazandusun classes'. 27 February 1997. The Borneo Post.}
Hence, every effort should be made to expose students to the nuances of the
Kadazandusun language.

In that sense, KLF and JPNS’s approach is “more is less”. That is, with rules of
marking to learn and the exposure to the unique phonemes in the Kadazandusun
language, students of the Kadazandusun language will have to rely less on their abilities
from anywhere else and learn to appreciate the Kadazandusun for what it is. In regards to
how the Kadazandusun language should look, however, KLF and JPNS, have
commented, in general, that they have always tried to view the Kadazandusun language
by seeing how other mainstream languages have been planned.

However, in response to the perspectives brought up by the KDCA above, Rita
Lasimbang said that she did not deny that the Kadazandusun spelling system will need to
undergo revision, at some point. She gave the assurance that KLF had no objections to
the standardization of the Kadazandusun orthography and spelling, but stated that it
would probably take five years or more before changes or amendments necessary to the

However, Veronica P. Atin (2004) again has raised an interesting point about the acquisition aspects of the Kadazandusun language. She had raised the question as to how, if it is the case, the teaching of implosive phonemes could be carried out. That is, following Atin, we can ask whether one has to teach the implosive sounds in order to highlight to students that there is a difference in meaning between minimal pairs. Alternatively, if the implosive sounds are not meant to be taught, but only its plosive-implosive marking principle is learnt, should teachers teach students to memorize words that bear underscore marking versus those that do not?

This brings us to the glottal stop phoneme: similarly, the KDCA had proposed that the glottal stop phoneme not be represented in the written form. However, does this mean that in terms of acquisition, teachers do not have to teach this sound in class? How will teachers teach children to distinguish between the word for “skunk” and “to point”, without referring to the presence of the glottal stop phoneme? In any case, like the contrastive markings above, will teachers also have to teach these words with the glottal stop by rote learning?

Hence, one of the main issues in the Bunduliwan so far, is the level that the concept bears upon, i.e., whether the Bunduliwan should be discussed at the level of spelling only or whether establishing the Bunduliwan means that we need to address the

---

46 Koponuatan boos Kadazandusun maganu timpu do popotunud. [The writing of Kadazandusun takes time to be corrected]. 3 November 1998. Daily Express.
phonemic level of the Kadazandusun language. In the former, KDCA's approach would suffice, while the latter speaks of JPNS and KLF's approach. Therefore, given this account, planners will have to revisit the premise in the Bunduliwan and determine how the issues raised above should be discussed in the first place. After which, the development of an orthography chart and spelling guide would bring the most immediate help for those involved in planning and/or teaching the Kadazandusun language. The following section suggests some solutions to further aid language planners to this end. The section below will discuss a re-alignment of approach towards the Bunduliwan, technical solutions, and a philosophical outlook towards the Kadazandusun language.

5.3 Some solutions in the issues and challenges of Bunduliwan

Firstly, the situation in the issues in Kadazandusun orthography above, reflect a general tendency among planners to think of language planning as an "either/or" activity. That is, either contrastive markings ought to be removed or they should stay, and there is either a majority rule situation or a minimal one. Further, if we consider what level the Bunduliwan ought to be discussed, planners will have to consider whether the Kadazan and Dusun phonemes must be combined into an inventory (phonemic level) or only the Dusun phonemes must be fully adhered to (lexical representation; at spelling level only).

Ironically, this approach of having one or foregoing the other is reminiscent of the Kadazan/Dusun dichotomy in the labeling dilemma. For instance, KDCA's "majority" concept will seek to ensure that the Dusun dialects will take precedent over the Kadazan dialect, and by setting the main reference to Dusun, the Kadazan dialect may not apply
any of its key phonemic features. From an ideological level, therefore, KDCA’s rejection of JPNS and KLF’s approach can be seen as a rejection of a Kadazan-ized Dusun in the Bundulawan.

However, the sharp contrast to labels, identity, and language is what community leaders and language planners want to avoid, given the way speakers have protested over such matters. Hence, the first order in revisiting the issues in the Bundulawan is to find a new way to approach it. I propose that planners first view the three dialects in the Bundulawan as having the potential to make equal contributions to the Bundulawan. Based on planners’ own examples of how they have performed the synthesis among the three dialects, we see that each of the dialects has the following role to play in the Bundulawan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Dusun</td>
<td>Phonological referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusun Tambunan</td>
<td>Lexical referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Kadazan</td>
<td>Orthographical referent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the dialect above, there are reasons why each has a significant role to play. Firstly, based on their linguistic relation to each other, all dialects have been found to have share more or less features with one another. Further, the areas of these dialects are adjacent to one another, with Dusun Tambunan sharing overlaps with both dialects. This supports their linguistic inter-relation. From the examples that we have seen in this thesis and those in the table below, Central Dusun is similar to Dusun Tambunan in terms of phonemes. However, Dusun Tambunan is also similar to Coastal Kadazan but in terms of vocabularies.
Table 9. Application based on dialect role in Bunduliwan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Dusun Tambunan (DT)</th>
<th>Central Dusun (CD)</th>
<th>Coastal Kadazan (CK)</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Bunduliwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soul/spirit</td>
<td>sunduan</td>
<td>sunduwan</td>
<td>sunduwan</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>sunduwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>lamin</td>
<td>walai</td>
<td>hamin</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>lamin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, Central Dusun can be the main phonological reference, while Dusun Tambunan can acts as the main lexical reference. In this sense, we avoid contrasting Central Dusun to Coastal Kadazan, as among the three dialects, they are the most distinct from each other. Hence, in some way, avoid the Dusun versus Kadazan approach.

However, note that the role of the Coastal Kadazan cannot be fully discussed in this proposal. This is because the role of the Coastal Kadazan as an orthographical referent depends on planners’ present approaches. JPNS and KLF clearly refer to the Coastal Kadazan in matters of orthography. However, KDCA does not. Nevertheless, a thought to the future planning of the Kadazandusun language may help planners find a way to increase the role of the Coastal Kadazan, in another way. That is, planners may also think of the Coastal Kadazan dialect as an “enriching” dialect to the Bunduliwan, in general. That is, since the future stage of enrichment requires the importing of vocabularies from other source dialects and languages, perhaps planners can begin by drawing words from the Coastal Kadazan that do not appear in the two Dusun dialects. Hence, the Coastal Kadazan dialect’s contribution may act as a pre-enrichment stage and not a “Kadazan-izing” process to the Dusun dialects. The Coastal Kadazan as an enriching dialect may also give planners a foretaste of the complexities involved in pooling together words into the Kadazandusun database.
However, given this explanation, the synthesis efforts in Bunduliwan should take into account what tools of standardization are already available to planners. Recall that Asmah Haji Omar’s advice during the KDCA language symposium in 1989 was to select the dialect that already has a dictionary. Hence, KDCA’s dictionary should be referred to, as it contains the research and analysis of the dialect or language in question. Planners, as well as teachers, should use the KDME dictionary as a reference for orthography, correct grammatical forms in the language, and as a vocabulary database in general. By this planners and teachers can become more assured that he or she is implementing the Kadazandusun language accordingly, and in agreement with everyone else.

The solutions mentioned above are based on ways and approaches, that best take into consideration how each dialect in the Bunduliwan can make a full contribution towards the whole. These solutions have also been thought of, according to what is impartial yet open to the ideas of enrichment. In particular, the possibilities mentioned above have sought to avoid artificiality in the synthesis process among dialects by allowing each dialect, and not just certain elements or features, to have a wider scope in building-up the Bunduliwan form.

5.4 Conclusion: The image and identity of the Kadazandusun language

The final thought in this chapter touches on an underlying issue that has come up among the discussions above—the matter of image or identity of the Kadazandusun language. Planners have stated, especially the KDCA that the Kadazandusun language ought to look more like the mainstream languages. So that, students of the language will
find that there is less of a conceptual barrier to overcome when learning the
Kadazandusun language. This perspective addresses the basic question of what image of
the Kadazandusun language should be projected. This question can only be answered by
language planners themselves, as virtually, every planning decision they make will
highlight, or not, certain areas of the Kadazandusun language but not in others. It is
hoped that the suggestions made in this chapter can contribute to promoting the
pluralistic identity that community leaders have wished to upheld when they created the
concept in 1989.

However, it may well be that the image and identity of the Kadazandusun
language will become more pronounced, as the language planning goes on. However,
this entails that planners aim towards creating points in the planning schedule that will
stand as a development timeline to the Kadazandusun language. In this sense, in order for
planners to obtain a sense of how the Kadazandusun language is doing and looking,
planners will have to work towards “completing” the Kadazandusun language in stages.

However, this should be done with the Bunduliwan and enrichment phases to run
concurrently. For instance, the current Bunduliwan phase should grow next into
Bunduliwan phase 2 plus Enrichment phase 1, then Bunduliwan phase 3 plus Enrichment
phase 2, and others. The reason why this is being suggested is that planners should avoid
being stuck at the Bunduliwan stage for too long. It may be helpful to view the current
Bunduliwan form as still “unfinished” or “incomplete” without its enrichment aspect, and
that it takes both the Bunduliwan and the enrichment sources to create the Kadazandusun
language. Hence, the suggestion that the Coastal Kadazan is studied for lexical contributions as a pre-enrichment stage may be helpful towards this end.

In total, with each new phase of the language planning and as newer words are being incorporated into the Kadazandusun language, the identity of the Kadazandusun language will be revealed. However, given that identity itself is an integral part of language, it can be expected that the Kadazandusun language, and its planners, will continue to face the challenges from the on-going changes in identity in this community.

In the next and final chapter of this thesis, we will discuss more on the future of the Kadazandusun language. We will see that planners have had a host of ideas since the Kadazandusun language planning began. However, they have lacked the opportunity to reveal their thoughts to each other. As they venture into the future of Kadazandusun language planning, stabilizing the Bunduliwan will have to be the primary task, in order to accomplish their larger goals.
Chapter 6
SUMMARY & CONCLUSION
PLANNING KADAZANDUSUN IN THE FUTURE

6. Introduction: Labels, identity, and language

It all began as a need for parents to find a way and a hope for the future mother tongue transmission in the community. However, little did parents know that their simple request would in turn become the impetus for a major reconstruction to the identity of the community. Indeed, it was not to anyone’s expectations that the planning of a standard language would somehow resolve the long-running issue of labels and identity. Further, that the planning of the Kadazandusun language to have involved such high focus on politics. In this final chapter, we will summarize all the discussions that have been made throughout the thesis. In particular, we will study one last discussion on the future thoughts of the Kadazandusun language planners. This thesis will conclude with the implications of this study, future studies, and concluding remarks.

6.1 Summary

At the beginning of this thesis in Chapter 2, we saw that there is a strong Malay language influence among Kadazan and Dusun speakers, today. However, just as parents say that their children should learn the Malay language “because they are Malaysian citizens”, they also raise the point that because their children are Kadazan/Dusun, they need to learn the Kadazan/Dusun language.

Community leaders saw this need as “the right” of the community to have “their own mother tongue language in school”. In the foreword of the Kadazan Dusun—
Malay—English dictionary in 1995, KDCA president, Joseph Pairin Kitingan, wrote about the ideology that had gone into the making of Kadazandusun:

"...We offer this new trilingual Kadazan and Dusun dictionary to all users and particularly to our own fellow Kadazan Dusun who heed the calls of our sunduan (soul):

Lose your language and you’ll lose your culture,
Lose your culture and you’ll lose your identity,
Lose your language and you’ll lose mutual understanding,
Lose your mutual understanding and you’ll lose harmony, mutual support, and peace;
Lose your peace and you’ll lose your brotherhood,
Lose your brotherhood and you’ll lose your mutual destiny.”

(Ref. KDME 1995: Foreword)

As we see in the excerpt above, losing one’s language is tantamount to losing one’s common purpose in the community. This is because language, or the mother tongue, is a natural bond between one’s identity and culture in this community. Hence, the idea of losing one’s language is a very strong ideology and year after year, language promotion activities will incite this ideology, in order to rally the community behind language planning efforts.

However, community leaders also grappled with the relatively new concept of language planning. For one, they were uncertain about the possibilities for mother tongue education, as the Malaysian government was still actively planning the Malay language as the national language. On the other hand, the KDCA could not find the consensus for the Kadazan dialect as the standard language. Instead, USDA began to protest and demand that the Dusun dialect be promoted as the standard language. The labeling issue in the community had begun to threaten the plan for mother tongue education.

In Chapter 3, we saw why labels had become problematic in the Kadazandusun community. We saw that there is a high symbolism to labels and identity in this
community. At the heart of the exchange, we saw that the over-30 year old discussion of a common label comes from the Kadazan and Dusun cultural associations, KDCA and USDA, respectively. We saw that the individual, community leader, and the Malaysian government through its officials and agencies, have all taken part in constructing and deconstructing the idea of being "Kadazan" or "Dusun". Hence, the uses of labels have become arbitrary but they now carried a host of meanings. In particular, "being Dusun" and "being Kadazan" depended on deficit and plus features associated to each identity.

Interestingly, language has held the awkward but strangely "neutral" position between labels and identity. While a Dusun in Kadazan territory must attempt to speak in the Kadazan dialect or else face stigma; elsewhere, the Kadazan and Dusun would resort to other codes without compromising their identities. Over time, the Kadazan identity and ideology began to break down, and Malay and English language use became a reflection of the compromise between the Kadazan and Dusun groups. On the other hand, language continued to be a strong marker of identity in each group. Therefore, the pressure from the KDCA and USDA to choose the Kadazan or the Dusun dialect and label became seen as a matter of removing one identity for the other.

In Chapter 4, the thesis began to turn to the proper language planning events of the Kadazandusun language. Carolyn Miller, from the SIL, continued to remind community leaders of the real concern behind the talks to standardize dialects, that is, for mother tongue maintenance. Both she and Asmah Haji Omar agreed on vital points in the language planning: that planners do not discourage the continued use of the mother
tongue variants, that they not expect instant conformity from the community, and they do not over-regulate in implementation when the standard language materializes.

Despite going more with Carolyn’s ideas than Asmah’s, KDCA can be said to have made-up its own mind to the issue, by selecting three dialects instead of one dialect to represent the standard language. KDCA’s decision was strongly driven by a desire to reach a consensus among leaders but also to rescue the sense of unity that was slipping away in the community, due to the political tensions among leaders. Each dialect that was chosen, therefore, represented a certain motivation: Coastal Kadazan (the Kadazan people’s choice), Central Dusun (the Dusun people’s choice) and Dusun Tambunan (the community leaders’ choice as a symbol of culture and unity). When the Malaysian parliament passed the Education Act of 1995, the provisions for the Kadazandusun language was finally approved. With that, USDA agreed to KDCA’s suggestion for the “Kadazandusun” label and the language concept in the “Bunduliwan”. However, with two Dusun dialects in the mix, it was clear that Dusun, and not Kadazan, would be the main characteristic of the Kadazandusun language.

Following that event, the planning of the Kadazandusun language became the sole task of the JPNS and other new planners like the KLF. Today, language planners are still trying to find their place in the overall planning community. On the other hand, some parents, especially Rungus and Kadazan parents, are unsure about the Kadazandusun language, as it is least like their own mother tongue variants. The political ideology embedded in the new label of “Kadazandusun” is part of the problem in people’s acceptance of the Kadazandusun language. It seems likely that language planners will
need to gather more feedback from the community, especially if they want to ensure that the Kadazandusun language continues to be accepted by everyone in the community.

In Chapter 5, we saw that in practice, executing the Bunduliwan model is difficult. Asmah Haji Omar had warned against the combining and mixing of more than one dialect in the standard language. One of the problems of the Bunduliwan is in the appropriating “majority” and “minimal” concept. Interestingly, the Kadazan dialect is now with the least role to play in the standardization process, although the KDCA had started the idea of a standard language with the Kadazan language in mind.

However, none of the planners disputed KDCA’s and the community leaders’ choice of the Dusun dialect as the main reference in the Kadazandusun language. Hence, in general, there are no major differences among planners. However, planners differed in matters of orthography. That is, contrastive marking and the presence of the glottal stop in writing were two areas that planners do not agree. Another issue was how much or how little one should plan in the Bunduliwan. The KDCA, for instance, was in favor of eliminating the use of orthographical markings, in order for the Kadazandusun language to look similar to mainstream languages.

The first step suggested in solving the issues in the Bunduliwan is the re-aligning of the “either/or” approach among planners. That is, by reviewing the roles of dialects, we saw that it was possible for each dialect chosen to contribute fully to the Bunduliwan form. For future guidelines, planners were referred to the Kadazan Dusun—Malay—English dictionary, as it stood for a period of time whereby all three dialects were researched and analyzed. On a philosophical level, planners were also called to view the
Bunduliwan in closer connection to the enrichment phase of the Kadazandusun language concept. It was proposed, that perhaps, vocabularies from the Coastal Kadazan dialect could be taken as a pre-enrichment phase, in order to find a way for Coastal Kadazan to fully contribute to the creation of the Bunduliwan.

As the Bunduliwan bridges into the enrichment of the Kadazandusun language, we begin to see for the first time that a regional language would actually be in the making. That is, what started out as a standard language idea for the Kadazandusun communities had grown into the idea of a Pan-Dusun language and then, into a Pan-Sabahan language. Hence, the image and identity of the language would be an on-going concern for language planners. Rita Lasimbang’s definition of the Kadazandusun language is, therefore, an accurate depiction of what the idea of the Kadazandusun language really is:

"[The definition of the Kadazandusun language is] a cluster of closely related languages strongly identifying themselves as one linguistic community and sharing a standard written language, while maintaining their own spoken variety."


Today, planners are hopeful that they can begin the enrichment phase to the Kadazandusun language, but it seems certain that they will have to revisit the Bunduliwan model to stabilize the matter of codification, before attempting to get into large-scale corpus planning activities.
6.2 Planning Kadazandusun in the future—exploring the aspect of enrichment

Since the Kadazandusun language came to be, planners have been encouraged by increasing evidence of mother tongue use. Evelyn Annol, the Kadazandusun language desk-officer at the JPNS, believes that the presence of the Kadazandusun language has been able to stimulate mother tongue use. She said in her interview below:

"... We should be proud [of the Kadazandusun] because parents are using their mother tongue at home. This is the first impact. You see, children who are born in the 1980's and 1990's are all speaking Kadazan or whatever dialect they are using at home...you can see that now...I mean especially when they open up a program in Kadazan/Dusun in the RTM (radio), you can see that they (deejays) actually have interviews with children. They (children) are talking in the mother tongue! So one of the impacts of the Kadazandusun has been to indirectly urge parents to teach their children at home and you can see that they (children) are very proud of their mother tongue."

However, Evelyn Annol (JPNS), Rita Lasimbang (KLF), and Ben Topin (KDCA), all agree that much more must be done, in order to ensure that the planning of the Kadazandusun will go well in the future, especially as KDCA and USDA had proposed big goals for the Kadazandusun language. For instance, in the Kadazandusun agreement, KDCA and USDA had stated plans for the future status of the Kadazandusun language as an academic language. See the excerpt from the Kadazandusun agreement below (see Appendix D).

Excerpt from the "Kadazandusun agreement"

2.I:(That) The Kadazandusun language is conserved and developed collectively for the benefit of all races in Malaysia that are interested in learning the Kadazandusun language.

2.II: (That the KDCA and USDA has a) shared responsibility to develop the Kadazandusun language at the local, national and international levels, specifically for those that would like to learn and study/research the Kadazandusun language.
It may well be that the plan above may materialize sooner than later because the Malaysian government is now more open to language education. According to Evelyn, the Ministry of Education is currently formalizing a new language policy called “Bahasa Etnik Malaysia” (BEM) or “Ethnic language of Malaysia”, which will seek to convert all mother tongue languages in schools from the “Pupil’s Own Language” (POL) to the BEM. The BEM policy fits into the larger educational reform of the Malaysian government. That is, as a language proficiency requirement, a BEM language will be taught in school as a “required ethnic language”, whereby students will need to acquire a BEM language in order to enter into the Malaysian university system.

Under the BEM policy, therefore, the Kadazandusun language is a step closer to the center of the Malaysian curriculum. It may soon be taught on a full-time basis as part of the school curriculum, instead of an elective subject as it is now. Another piece of good news for the Kadazandusun language planners is that, once the Kadazandusun language is a BEM, its classes will be opened-up fully for registration to all Malaysian citizens of other ethnic backgrounds. The future is very bright, therefore, for the Kadazandusun language and every effort must be made to prepare it for the future demand in school.

Already, JPNS is working at creating a textbook for the primary school level. It had also received instructions from the parent Education Ministry to begin drafting a curriculum for the secondary school levels. A pilot program for the secondary school is scheduled for the year 2007. In the community, the KLF has also been actively publishing storybooks and readers that would meet the needs in the schools. However, in
the very near future, school textbooks and other learning materials for the secondary school level will have to be provided as well. Nevertheless, what will the content of these materials look like, if the enrichment aspect of the Kadazandusun language is not developed starting from now? That is, would it be possible to offer the basic form of the Bunduliwan for the production of these materials?

It is clear from interviews with the JPNS, KDCA, and KLF that they have been thinking about the enrichment phase of the Kadazandusun language for quite some time. For the JPNS, Evelyn remarks that the enrichment could begin with the incorporation of vocabularies from other Kadazan/Dusun groups. This speaks of collecting “synonyms” from all over the community. Rita (KLF) shares in Evelyn’s idea. According to Rita, the terminology and vocabulary panel that was started by the JPNS in year 2000 could serve as a launching pad for this synonym project. The panel had been looking into equivalents from existing vocabulary, such as what Evelyn had mentioned above. The panel had also been studying the coinage of new terms that do not exist in the Bunduliwan or in the Kadazandusun culture. However, the panel has not been active since. Nevertheless, JPNS and KLF have hopes that they will be able to call members back and revive the panel (Lasimbang and Kinajil (IN PRESS)).

Ben (KDCA) brings another view to the enrichment process above. Ben’s main idea is for the enrichment process is incorporate the gathering of cultural information/data from each Kadazan/Dusun group. The information from each group will then be compiled as a single collection of the Kadazandusun culture. Ben said that in every Kadazan/Dusun group, there will be names, terms, and words of certain plants or
customary practices, that can be further taught to students. These cultural-specific information and vocabularies can be further offered as material for the creation of primary and secondary school textbooks in the future. The data can also be fed into the database of synonyms and terminologies in JPNS-KLF’s idea above. Hence, language planners do have great ideas for the enrichment of the Bunduliwan form and even, ideas for other forms of enrichment.

However, Ben has highlighted an important aspect to the Kadazandusun language that has not been sufficiently addressed since the inception of Kadazandusun, i.e., the cultural ideology of the language. Perhaps, if the language plan had less of a socio-political interface at the beginning, much of planners’ time could have gone into brainstorming the cultural import to the Kadazandusun language. That is, planners could have brought up much of their enrichment plans above as the major planning discussions at the beginning of the language planning. However, it is interesting to note that the Kadazandusun community would not have had the Kadazandusun language, today, if they did not continue to work out the political tensions surrounding it.

On the other hand, the socio-political ideology at the beginning of the Kadazandusun language planning still exists. That is, both Evelyn and Rita pointed out that some politicians still consider the Kadazandusun language from the label and identity angle. However, both Evelyn and Rita also remarked that there is perhaps no suitable venue or opportunity to engage politicians in the language planning process. Evelyn and Rita proposed the formation of a special group or committee among language planners,
whereby politicians can also be invited to participate and hence, learn about the kinds of issues and challenges language planners are facing in their planning and implementation.

However, coming back to the lack of a cultural ideology in the Kadazandusun language at present, it is encouraging to note that all planners were in agreement with the importance of this component to the Kadazandusun language. All connected language as the channel or tool of cultural ideology. In particular, planners have hopes for the Kadazandusun language to play a role in communicating values, adat (customary practices/beliefs), and ethnic dignity/pride: “language is the one bringing in the culture and it is playing the most important role of instilling values” (Evelyn), “language is a means to educate our children to our connection to adat, as a way of looking after our dignity as a Kadazandusun ethnic group” (Ben), and “language is the carrier of everything in our culture; our life” (Rita). Judging from planners’ positive notes above, it is possible that the image and identity of the Kadazandusun language will be one of culture and values.

In summary, the enrichment and cultural ideas from language planners are as follows:

(1) The compilation of similar words and meanings (synonyms or “existing vocabularies”) from other dialects/languages.

(2) The creation of new terminologies (coinage of new word for meanings not found in the Kadazandusun culture).

(3) The compilation of a cultural-historical handbook or textbook.
(4) The compilation of a cultural dictionary featuring terms and words that pertain to cultural meanings and uses.

6.3 Implication of this study and future studies

6.3.1 Implication of this study

“The planning of the Kadazandusun language (Sabah, Malaysia)” was intended as a study of the ideological approaches that went into the creation of the Kadazandusun in this community. It has attempted to study the “behind the scenes” story of how the Kadazandusun language came to be. This study has found that community leaders as politicians were the first language planners in this community. Due to strong political motivations among leaders, however, the issues of labels and identity have affected the planning of the language.

In particular, after much of the socio-political discussion was seen to have died down, this study has uncovered that the Kadazan/Dusun ideology still exists in the language internal structure, but in a reproduced form and in a reverse role of the “Dusun versus Kadazan” ideology. This study has also found out that the Kadazandusun language is not yet completed in its concept. The Kadazandusun language is still in the basic form of Bunduliwan. This study has, therefore, proposed that each dialect in the Bunduliwan be seen as having a role to play in bringing the Kadazandusun concept to fruition.

Several generalizations in the Kadazandusun case can now be offered to other indigenous minority groups in Sabah and Malaysia, who are interested in studying their own language planning situations. They are as follows:
(1) Contrary to the planning of the Malay language, the Kadazandusun community through its leaders had to voice-out its need for mother tongue education. Therefore, the “conscious planning” approach was taken, rather than by evolution (Malay language). This entailed having to state the cause (a proposal advanced to the government), in order to access mother tongue education privileges (POL) and hence, alert the authorities of their desire and readiness to enter the education domain (Ministry of Education and JPNS).

(2) In so doing, the Kadazandusun planners began to work on a language plan (Kadazan as standard/Dusun as standard/Kadazandusun as standard). However, this, in and by itself, is dependent on the nature of decision-making in the indigenous minority group (democratic/by consensus) and the state of the language(s) and dialect(s) being planned (homogenous/heterogeneous).

(3) In (2) above, language planning became the most political and labor-intensive of the undertaking, due to the problem of label and dialect choice(s). Most of the work is in ideologizing a new concept that would appeal to many, in the face of competing ideologies. The positive aspect of all those involved is their on-going discussion of the matter, although they were apparent communication breakdown among community leaders. Therefore, the media has played a role in reporting the events and decision-making in the language planning, which was otherwise seen as failing or slowing-down due to the political debates.

(4) The impact of individual planners was also important. In particular, organizations such as the Kadazandusun Language Foundation were able to provide resources
(linguistic training and materials production) for main language planners like the JPNS.

(5) However, time and tolerance are key factors for language planners themselves. That is, it is important for planners to have enough time to understand the Kadazandusun concept, as planners have differing approaches and interpretations.

(6) Tolerance for mother tongue varieties is important, so that planners can prevent over-regulation of the standard form or instant conformity that may cause sudden rejection from the intended recipients of the standard language.

(7) The developing of the standard Kadazandusun concept is not fully completed yet. Developing the Bunduliwan together with its enrichment phase can go in stages.

(8) Planners’ ideas for enrichment talk heavily about cultural ideology, i.e., importation of values, *adat* (customs and beliefs), and ethnic pride/dignity. It is possible to see cultural ideology being infused more into Kadazandusun language. This may help balance out the socio-political identity already inherent/permanent in its label.

(9) A standard language is not the same as one’s mother tongue. While one’s mother tongue is “full”, “complete”, and/or “fulfilling”, the standard language in its raw form is only a “base” and needs to be “enriched”, in order to meet the criteria of standardization that planners must fix from time to time.
6.3.2 Future studies

Much more can be added to the study that was carried out in this thesis exercise. For instance, a more extensive interviewing of personnel from each entity may help provide a deeper sense of the reasons and motivations that were seen in the Kadazandusun language. Given that, the perspectives of the community members themselves are important. In the future, a study on how community members view the planning of the Kadazandusun language, in relation to their mother tongue and identity will be conducted.

Another study regarding language planners is also needed. For instance, planners may have other issues and challenges in their planning. In particular, we have seen that planners continue to look at the Malay language as a model. A study should be undertaken to see what is being emulated from the Malay language plan. Language policy effects and the creation of policies in Kadazandusun are also another area of future concern.

The nature of dialects and languages in this community needs to be further studied also. For instance, there is much more that needs to be understood about the way people perceive differences among dialects. The matter of accent will be an important study to help provide a better understanding as to how Kadazan/Dusun groups have perceived each other. Further, how their perceptions affect their attitude and identity within the wider Kadazandusun community. The area of dialectology and folk dialectology can also be given a future study. For instance, almost all of the ways community leaders have attempted to understand the linguistic relation among the Kadazan/Dusun groups have
been through the cultural information arising from folklore and migration stories. The ways in which people understand where they are on the dialect chain will be helpful in future studies.

6.4 Conclusion

In conclusion, the planning of Kadazandusun today is perhaps the most telling of all the challenges that have been faced by the Kadazandusun community as an indigenous minority in Malaysia. One of the reasons why the Kadazandusun language has been so emblematic of the community’s struggle is the fact that it has been planned based on so many, if not all, of the social changes of the community: from a historic past with the dilemma between labels and identity, Kadazan-ism with Donald Fuad Stephens, indigenous self-government with Pairin Kitingan, the desire to (re)birth the Kadazan and Dusun identity through the standard Kadazandusun language.

As the planning of the Kadazandusun language continues to evolve, the Malaysian government is also beginning to change its ways of imagining the nation. Through the “Bahasa Etnik Malaysia” policy, it is finally acknowledging the care for the languages of its indigenous minorities. Perhaps the highly public nature of planning the Kadazandusun language had been able to influence this change somehow. Many indigenous minority groups in Sabah, in particular, have since asked the federal government to provide for their needs in terms of POL classes. It is hoped that for the betterment of mother tongue causes in Malaysia, the federal government will continue to
work with the language planners of the communities concerned in as many ways possible.

However, the reality is that there are many ethnic groups, in Sabah and Malaysia, who will not have a chance to promote themselves and their languages. In some cases, there is simply too few speakers left or too few in the community who feel motivated to play a major role in thinking about planning their mother tongue in specific ways. Indeed, there are those in the Kadazandusun community today, who do not share in the Kadazandusun language endeavor. However, for those who have no means to learn their Kadazan/Dusun mother tongue, for reasons such as a discontinuation of transmission in their own families, planners still feel that the Kadazandusun language is a good alternative.

This leads to a crucial point to make as this thesis ends. That is, parents still have the primary role and responsibility in transmitting their native tongues to their children in the Kadazandusun community. Language planners should therefore invest in other means that will help parents harness their roles as micro-language planners at home. Some of the suggestions coming from language planners have been to encourage mother tongue speaking sessions between young children and their grandparents, such as in story-telling sessions, among others (Miller 1989). There are also other suggestions for inter-married couples, i.e., to have the Kadazan/Dusun-speaking spouse to converse solely in the Kadazan/Dusun language with the children in the concept of “One Parent, One Language” (OPOL) (see OPOL website for more details). In some cases, parents have also taken to sending their children to Kadazan/Dusun-friendly preschools, in order to
surround their children with a mother tongue-friendly environment. Language planners must encourage all of these efforts.

In conclusion, the planning of the Kadazandusun language has shown that the main ideas about language are basic in nature, i.e., they aim to reflect our identity(s) whether they are socio-political or cultural ones. However, identity in the Kadazandusun community is based on the sense of feeling united with one another. Therefore, we have seen that it is when identity is problematic; that unity is scarce. In this community, the planning of a standard language had been used to manufacture a sense of unity and community belonging that was not possible through cultural labels. In so doing, the language planning aspect of the Kadazandusun language had been complicated. However, as language planners face the future planning of the Kadazandusun language, their hopes, ideas, and willingness to work with each other is promising, and these can surely help them overcome their present planning problems.
APPENDIX A
Kadazan and Dusun speakers according to the KDCA
Notation based on SIL/Ethnologue (2004) language/dialect classification: * (Paitanic language), ** (Palawano language), *** (Dusunic language), @ (Isolate language), *@ (Murutic language)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>12 major dialects that were considered for Kadazandusun standardization purposes</th>
<th>The three (3) dialects that were chosen to form the base, or the “base dialect”, of the Kadazandusun language, i.e., “Bundulawan”</th>
<th>The Bundulawan to be enriched by these sources, i.e., “enrichment dialects”</th>
<th>The “Kadazandusun” label as a generic ethnic label for the following speakers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bundu</td>
<td>Bundu</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Bundu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Liwan</td>
<td>Liwan</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Bisaya**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tangara</td>
<td>Tangara</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Paitanic dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kujiau</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Bundu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rungus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Dumpas***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kimaragang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Gana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tatana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Garo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lotud</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Idaan@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tombonuo*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Kadayan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sukang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Kimaragang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Papar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Kolobuan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Kuijau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Lingkabau*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Liwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Lobu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Lotud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Lundayeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Makiang*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Malapi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Mangkaak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Minokok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Murut*@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Ngabai*@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Paitan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Pingas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Rumanau*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Rungus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Sinobu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Sinorupu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Sonsogon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Sukang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Sungai*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Tatana***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Tangara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Tidong*@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Tindal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Tobilung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Tolinting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Tombonuo*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Tuhawon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Tutung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

A comparison of basic vocabulary between Kadazan and Dusun
(based on a 200-word Swadesh list (modified by Blust 2002))

Result of comparison: Kadazan shares 94.5% cognates with Dusun.

Note: All bilabial and alveolar stops /b/ and /d/ in Kadazan below are imploded except following a nasal and in Malay loanwords. (References: Kadazan Dusun-Malay-English dictionary (1995); Wendell Gingging and Pamela Petrus Purser (native speakers of Dusun), author and Joe Kinajil (native speakers of Kadazan)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kadazan (Tangaa' dialect)</th>
<th>Dusun (Central dialect)</th>
<th>Cognate (✓ = yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>hongon</td>
<td>longon</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>gibang</td>
<td>gibang</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>vanan</td>
<td>wanan</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>leg/foot</td>
<td>gakod</td>
<td>gakod</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>to walk</td>
<td>mamanau</td>
<td>mamanau</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>road/path</td>
<td>lahan</td>
<td>ralan</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>to come</td>
<td>mikot</td>
<td>runikot</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>to turn (=veer to the side, as in turning left or right on a path)</td>
<td>baahing</td>
<td>boriud</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>to swim</td>
<td>humozog</td>
<td>lumoyog</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>dirty</td>
<td>azamut</td>
<td>omurong</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>dust</td>
<td>togod/siovuk</td>
<td>togod/siowuk</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>skin</td>
<td>kuhit</td>
<td>kulit</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>back (body part)</td>
<td>hikud</td>
<td>likud</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>belly</td>
<td>tizan</td>
<td>tian</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>bone</td>
<td>tuhang</td>
<td>tulang</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>intestines</td>
<td>tinai'</td>
<td>tinai'/ tino'</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>liver</td>
<td>tongkovizau</td>
<td>tangkayau</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>breast</td>
<td>kangkab</td>
<td>kangkab</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>shoulder</td>
<td>bahazan</td>
<td>lihawa</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>to know (things), be knowledgeable</td>
<td>koipo</td>
<td>koilo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>to think</td>
<td>momuondom</td>
<td>momuhondom</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>to fear</td>
<td>oosizan</td>
<td>orosian</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>blood</td>
<td>zaa'</td>
<td>raha'</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>tuhu</td>
<td>tulu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>neck</td>
<td>tatahanan</td>
<td>liou</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>hair (of the head)</td>
<td>tobuk</td>
<td>tobuk</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>nose</td>
<td>todung</td>
<td>todung</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>to breathe</td>
<td>momuobo</td>
<td>momuhobo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>to sniff, smell</td>
<td>moningud</td>
<td>moningud</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>kabang</td>
<td>kabang</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>tooth</td>
<td>nipon</td>
<td>nipon</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>tongue</td>
<td>diha'</td>
<td>dila'</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>to laugh</td>
<td>mongiak</td>
<td>mongirak</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>to cry</td>
<td>miad</td>
<td>mihad</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>to vomit</td>
<td>mogihob</td>
<td>mogilob</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Kadazan (Tangaa' dialect)</td>
<td>Dusun (Central dialect)</td>
<td>Cognate (✓ = yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>to spit</td>
<td>momoduha’</td>
<td>momodula’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>to eat</td>
<td>mangakan</td>
<td>mangakan</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>to chew (a. general term; if no general term then b. chew betel)</td>
<td>monguza’</td>
<td>monguya’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>to cook (a. general term; if no general term then b. boil food)</td>
<td>magansak</td>
<td>mogonsok</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>to drink</td>
<td>monginum</td>
<td>monginum</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>to bite</td>
<td>mongokot</td>
<td>mongokot</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>to suck</td>
<td>monosop</td>
<td>monosop</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>ear</td>
<td>tohingo</td>
<td>tolingo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>to hear</td>
<td>mokinongou</td>
<td>mokirongou</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>eye</td>
<td>mato</td>
<td>mato</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>to see</td>
<td>mintong</td>
<td>mintong</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>to yawn</td>
<td>moguvab</td>
<td>moguab</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>to sleep</td>
<td>modop</td>
<td>modop</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>to lie down (to sleep)</td>
<td>humuvi</td>
<td>lumiwi</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>to dream</td>
<td>mogeni</td>
<td>mogeni</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>to sit</td>
<td>miniikau</td>
<td>miniikau</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>to stand</td>
<td>mingkakat</td>
<td>mingkakat</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>person/human being</td>
<td>tuhun</td>
<td>tulun</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>man/male</td>
<td>kusai</td>
<td>kusai</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>woman/female</td>
<td>tondu</td>
<td>tondu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>tanak</td>
<td>tanak</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>husband</td>
<td>sawo</td>
<td>sawo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>wife</td>
<td>sawo</td>
<td>sawo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>tina’</td>
<td>tina’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>tama</td>
<td>tama’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>lamin</td>
<td>lamin</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>thatch/roof</td>
<td>taap</td>
<td>taap</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>ngaan</td>
<td>ngaran</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>to say</td>
<td>moboos</td>
<td>moboros</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>rope</td>
<td>dukug</td>
<td>lukug</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>to tie up, fasten</td>
<td>mangagos</td>
<td>mongogos</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>to sew (clothing)</td>
<td>monombi</td>
<td>monombir</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>needle</td>
<td>totombi</td>
<td>totombir</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>to hunt (for game)</td>
<td>magasu</td>
<td>magasu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>to shoot (an arrow)</td>
<td>mamana’</td>
<td>mamana’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Kadazan (Tangaa' dialect)</td>
<td>Dusun (Central dialect)</td>
<td>Cognate (✓= yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>to stab, pierce (someone)</td>
<td>monobok</td>
<td>monobok</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>to hit (with stick, club)</td>
<td>momobog</td>
<td>momobog</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>to steal</td>
<td>manakau</td>
<td>manakau</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>to kill</td>
<td>mamatai</td>
<td>mamatai</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>to die, be dead</td>
<td>matai, mimang patai</td>
<td>matai, mimang patai</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>to live, be alive</td>
<td>masi/pasi, poimpasi</td>
<td>masi/pasi, poimpasi</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>to scratch (an itch)</td>
<td>mongukut</td>
<td>mongukut</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>to cut, hack (wood)</td>
<td>mamahaas</td>
<td>mamala’as,</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>stick (wood)</td>
<td>kazu/suduvon</td>
<td>kayu/suduon</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>to split (transitive)</td>
<td>momoviis, mamahapak</td>
<td>momohiris, mamalapak</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>sharp</td>
<td>atalom</td>
<td>atarom</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>dull, blunt</td>
<td>nohumpagan</td>
<td>otumpul, obuntol</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>to work (in a garden, field)</td>
<td>mobuvat</td>
<td>morobuat</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>to plant</td>
<td>mananom</td>
<td>mananom</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>to choose</td>
<td>momili’</td>
<td>momili’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>to grow (intransitive)</td>
<td>sumuni</td>
<td>sumuni</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>to swell (as an abscess)</td>
<td>humonit</td>
<td>lumonit</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>to squeeze (as juice from a fruit)</td>
<td>mamaga’</td>
<td>mamaga’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>to hold (in the fist)</td>
<td>mongonggom</td>
<td>mongonggom</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>to dig</td>
<td>mongukad</td>
<td>mongukad</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>to buy</td>
<td>momohi</td>
<td>momoli</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>to open, uncover</td>
<td>mogukab</td>
<td>mongukab</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>to pound, beat (as rice prepared on a stone)</td>
<td>monutu</td>
<td>monutu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>to throw (as a stone)</td>
<td>papagavad</td>
<td>papagawad</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>to fall (as a fruit)</td>
<td>hoo</td>
<td>loho</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>dog</td>
<td>tasu</td>
<td>tasu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>bird</td>
<td>tombohog</td>
<td>tombolog</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>egg</td>
<td>tontohu</td>
<td>tontolu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>feather</td>
<td>sisilong</td>
<td>hulu</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>wing</td>
<td>tahad</td>
<td>talad</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Kadazan (Tangaa’ dialect)</td>
<td>Dusun (Central dialect)</td>
<td>Cognate (√ = yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>to fly</td>
<td>tumuhud</td>
<td>tumulud</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>rat</td>
<td>tikus</td>
<td>tikus</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>meat/flesh</td>
<td>tonsi</td>
<td>tonsi</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>fat/grease</td>
<td>hunok/tumau</td>
<td>lunok/tumau</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>tail</td>
<td>tikiu</td>
<td>tiki/tikiu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>snake</td>
<td>vuhanut</td>
<td>tulanut</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>worm (earthworm)</td>
<td>tongkohivang</td>
<td>tonggiiuangan</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>louse (a. general term, or b. head louse)</td>
<td>kutu/hios</td>
<td>kutu/lius</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>mosquito</td>
<td>tundui/togonok</td>
<td>tundui</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>spider</td>
<td>tongkulalawa’</td>
<td>tongkulalawa’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>fish</td>
<td>sada’</td>
<td>sada’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>rotten (of food, corpse)</td>
<td>novunos/nobuntung</td>
<td>nounos/nobuntung, napasa’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>branch (the branch itself, not the fork of the branch)</td>
<td>haan</td>
<td>raan, ra’an</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>leaf</td>
<td>loun</td>
<td>roun</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>root</td>
<td>gamut</td>
<td>gamut</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>flower</td>
<td>vusak/bunga</td>
<td>wusak/bunga</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>tuva’</td>
<td>tua’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>grass</td>
<td>sakot</td>
<td>sakot</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>earth/soil</td>
<td>tana’</td>
<td>tana’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>watu</td>
<td>watu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>togis</td>
<td>togis</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>water (fresh water)</td>
<td>vaig</td>
<td>waig, woig</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>to flow</td>
<td>humuzung</td>
<td>lumuuyung, umiuung</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>sea</td>
<td>daat</td>
<td>rahat, dahat</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>salt</td>
<td>tusi</td>
<td>tusi</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>lake</td>
<td>botung</td>
<td>lotung</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>woods/forest</td>
<td>tahun</td>
<td>talun</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>sky</td>
<td>tavan</td>
<td>tawan, taan</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>moon</td>
<td>vuhan</td>
<td>wulan, tulan</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>star</td>
<td>tombituon</td>
<td>rombituon</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>cloud (=white cloud: not a raincloud)</td>
<td>gavun</td>
<td>gawun</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>fog</td>
<td>gavun</td>
<td>gawun</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>rain</td>
<td>asam</td>
<td>rasam</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>thunder</td>
<td>tinggoud</td>
<td>tinggoron</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>lightning</td>
<td>gonit</td>
<td>gonit</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Kadazan (Tangga' dialect)</td>
<td>Dusun (Central dialect)</td>
<td>Cognate (✓ = yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>wind</td>
<td>tongus</td>
<td>tongus</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>to blow (a. of the wind, b. with the mouth)</td>
<td>monuhib, monuugi</td>
<td>monilib, monougi</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>warm (of weather)</td>
<td>ahasu</td>
<td>alasu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>cold (of weather)</td>
<td>osogit</td>
<td>osogit</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>dry (a. general term, b. to dry up)</td>
<td>otuu, umasak</td>
<td>otuu, rumasak</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>wet</td>
<td>ozopos</td>
<td>oyopos</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>avagat</td>
<td>awagat</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>tapui</td>
<td>tapui</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>to burn (transitive)</td>
<td>monutud</td>
<td>monutud</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>smoke (of a fire)</td>
<td>hisun</td>
<td>lisun</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>ash</td>
<td>tavu</td>
<td>toun</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>oitom</td>
<td>oitom</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>opuak</td>
<td>opurak</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>aagang</td>
<td>aragang</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>ohisou</td>
<td>osilou</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>otomou</td>
<td>otomou</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>onini'</td>
<td>okoro'</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>agazo</td>
<td>agayo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>short (a. in height, b. in length)</td>
<td>odongkok, onibo'</td>
<td>osiriba', opokong</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>long (of objects)</td>
<td>anau</td>
<td>anaru</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>thin (of objects)</td>
<td>omumuk</td>
<td>omumuk</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>thick (of objects)</td>
<td>ahasau</td>
<td>asalau</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>okikip</td>
<td>okikip, okugui</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>ahaab, okivang</td>
<td>alaab, okiwang</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>painful, sick</td>
<td>olu, sumakit</td>
<td>oruol, sumakit</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>shy, ashamed</td>
<td>oikuman, amalu'</td>
<td>oikuman, amalu'</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>old (of people)</td>
<td>mohoiing</td>
<td>moheling</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>vau</td>
<td>vau</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>avasi</td>
<td>awasi, osonong</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>bad, evil</td>
<td>alaat</td>
<td>araat</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>correct, true</td>
<td>kotunud, otopot</td>
<td>kotunud, otopot</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>night</td>
<td>sodop</td>
<td>sodop</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>tadau</td>
<td>tadau</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>toun</td>
<td>toun</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>when (question)</td>
<td>songian</td>
<td>songira'</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Kadazan (Tangaa' dialect)</td>
<td>Dusun (Central dialect)</td>
<td>Cognate (✓ = yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>to hide</td>
<td>popohosok</td>
<td>popolisok</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>to climb (a. ladder, b. mountain)</td>
<td>sumaakoi, tumakad</td>
<td>sumako, tumakad</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>id</td>
<td>hilo/ id</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>in, inside</td>
<td>id suang</td>
<td>id suang/soliwan</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>above</td>
<td>id savat</td>
<td>id sawat</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>below</td>
<td>id siibo’</td>
<td>id siriba’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>iti</td>
<td>iti</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>ilo’</td>
<td>ilo’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>near</td>
<td>doos</td>
<td>doos</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>far</td>
<td>osodu</td>
<td>osodu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>where (question)</td>
<td>nomboo</td>
<td>nomboo, noonggo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>izou</td>
<td>yoku, yoho’</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>thou</td>
<td>iziau</td>
<td>ika, ia’, ikau</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>he/she</td>
<td>isido</td>
<td>isio</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>we (inclusive), we (exclusive)</td>
<td>izotokou/tokou, kito</td>
<td>tokou, dito</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>iziau</td>
<td>dia’ ia’, ikau,</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>iziho</td>
<td>yolo’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>what (question)</td>
<td>onu, nunu</td>
<td>onu, nunu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>who (question)</td>
<td>isai</td>
<td>isai</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>vokon</td>
<td>wokon</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>soviavi, saviavi</td>
<td>sawiawi</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>om</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>nung</td>
<td>nung</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>how (question)</td>
<td>ingkuo</td>
<td>ingkuro</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>no, not</td>
<td>au, okon</td>
<td>amu/au, okon</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>to count</td>
<td>moguntob</td>
<td>moguntob, mongintob</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>iso’</td>
<td>iso’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>duvo</td>
<td>duo, duwo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>tohu</td>
<td>tolu</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>four</td>
<td>apat</td>
<td>apat</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
Interview Questions used in this Thesis (Sample/JPNS)

Language Planning & Language Planner role
1. What are the plans of the Sabah Education Department (JPNS) regarding language development and planning in general?
2. What are the JPNS’s plans for the Kadazandusun language?
3. What are the activities or language events specific to Kadazandusun language planning/development?
4. What are the purposes or expected outcomes of these activities?
5. In JPNS, how are members (staff & supporters) involved in language activities?
6. Do you consider yourself a ‘language planner’? If yes, how do you define your role? If not, how do you define the role you take in the work of language development?
7. In your role as language planner, what are your concerns with the Kadazandusun language? Are your concerns for other indigenous languages also? (Whether other Dusun/Dusunic dialects/languages or other language families, i.e. Murut)

Multilingualism/General Language Use
8. In our community and for that matter in Malaysia, multilingualism is present. How do you consider multilingualism in our Kadazandusun community?
9. What would you say is an accurate depiction of language use in our community today?
10. Do you think the relatively vast variety of languages seek to hinder the promotion of indigenous language (Kadazan/Dusun) use in our community?
11. How about for the Kadazandusun language? Does multilingualism hinder its promotion?
12. In turn, does the Kadazandusun language hinder the development of other indigenous languages under the Dusunic language family, such as Kadazan and Dusun?
13. What are your opinions about the promotion/development of the Kadazandusun language so far?

Kadazandusun – impact on language and community
14. What is the Kadazandusun language in your definition? How do you define it?
15. How is Kadazandusun the same or different from Kadazan or Dusun in your opinion? What areas are Kadazan and Dusun different from each other?
16. Are these differences overcome-able? Do you think/find that these differences are detrimental in any way/to the success of the language’s development/promotion?
17. Do you think that our culture and community benefits from the planning of Kadazandusun? How?
18. Can you explain to me what the label ‘Kadazandusun’ means for the culture and community?
19. What are the hopes and dreams of this community in your opinion? And how does being Kadazandusun today help to achieve these hopes and dreams?
20. Lastly, what are your hopes for the Kadazandusun language in the future and what do you propose as suitable plans for its success?
APPENDIX D

English translation of the “Bunduliwan agreement”

Declaration of Agreement

Bunduliwan dialect as base dialect
Standardization and Pembakuan Kadazandusun language
between
Kadazan Dusun Cultural Association
And United Sabah Dusun Association

That the Kadazandusun language Consultative Council Committee – Jawatankuasa Majlis Perunding Bahasa Kadazandusun (MPBK), that has been formed between the Kadazan Dusun Cultural Association (KOISAAN) and Sabah Dusun Association (USDA), on 11th April, 1995 with this agree:-

A. to use the Bunduliwan dialect as the base dialect for the standardization of the Kadazandusun language in the writing and speaking in the teaching and learning of the Student’s mother tongue [Pupil’s Own Language (POL)].

B. The Bunduliwan dialect will continue to be enriched by other dialects that are found in the Kadazandusunic and Paitanic tree/group.

C. In order to revise the development of the Kadazandusun language, a consultative body called the Kadazandusun language Consultative Council Committee – Jawatankuasa Majlis Perunding Bahasa Kadazandusun (MPBK) is formed, to function as a reference body in spelling aspects, use of standard words, the incorporation of words from other dialects in the Kadazandusunic, Paitanic group/tree and foreign languages into the Kadazandusun language.

This declaration of agreement is made based on the following factors:-

A. In general, the Bunduliwan dialect, as the base dialect in the forming of the Kadazandusun language, received fewer objections, if compared with other dialects, from the representatives of main ethnic groups with the dialect Kadazandusunic and Paitanic, that were present at the symposium “Towards standardization of Kadazan Language” that was held at the Perkasa Hotel, Kundasang on the 13th of January, 1989.

B. Bunduliwan dialect has been identified by linguistic research experts, specifically Summer Institute of Linguistic (SIL) as dialect that has the highest ‘intelligibility” among the dialects that are found in the Kadazandusunic and Paitanic group.

C. From a geographical angle, the Bunduliwan dialect is used and spoken with more wide spread by those multi-ethnic Kadazandusunic and Paitanic, if compared with other dialects, specifically in the Apin-Aprin, Bundu Tuhan, Inanam, Kota Belud, Kota Marudu, Keningau, Kinarut, Kiulu, Kundasang, Lingkabau, Menggatal, Paitan, Ranau, Sook, Tambunan, Tamparuli, Telipok, Telupid, Tongos, Tuaran, Ulu Kinabatangan, Ulu Penampang dan Ulu Papar.

The success of teaching and learning of the Kadazandusun language at schools as the Student’s Mother tongue is dependent on the number of request (not less than 15 parents of students) so that the language may be taught in the school. Therefore, the use and speech in the Bunduliwan dialect that is more wide spread if compared with other dialects in the Kadazandusunic and Paitanic tree, at least will be able to help assure the success of the teaching and learning of the Kadazandusun language.

This declaration of agreement is made by KOISAAN and USDA and is witnessed by those signed below:

SIGNATURE PORTION
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PERISYTIHARAN PERSETUJUJAN

DIALEK BUNDULIWAN SEBAGAI DIALEK ASAS PEMIAWAIAN DAN PEMBAKUAN BAHASA KADAZANDUSUN

DI ANTARA

KADAZAN DUSUN CULTURAL ASSOCIATION DAN UNITED SABAH DUSUN ASSOCIATION

BAHAWASANYA Jawatankuasa Majlis Perunding Bahasa Kadazandusun (MPBK), yang telah dibentuk di antara Persatuan Kebudayaan Kadazan Dusun Sabah (KOISAAN) dan Persatuan Dusun Sabah (USDA), pada hari ini...bulan April, 1995 dengan ini bersetuju:-

(A) Menggunakan Dialek BUNDULIWAN sebagai dialek asas pemiawaian dan pembakuan Bahasa Kadazandusun dalam penulisan dan pertuturan di dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran Bahasa Ibuanda Pelajar [Pupil's Own Language (POL)].

(B) Dialek BUNDULIWAN akan terus diperkayakan oleh dialek-dialek lain yang terdapat di dalam rumpun Bahasa KADAZANDUSUNIK dan PALTANIK.

(C) Untuk mengemaskinikan perkembangan Bahasa KADAZANDUSUN, satu badan perunding yang dipanggil MAJLIS PERUNDING BAHASA KADAZANDUSUN SABAH (MPBK) dibentuk, berfungsi sebagai sebuah Badan Rujukan di dalam aspek-aspek ejaan,
penggunaan perkataan yang piawai, penerapan perkataan-perkataan dari dialek-dialek lain di dalam rumpun Bahasa KADAZANDUSUNIK, PAITANIK dan bahasa-bahasa asing ke dalam Bahasa KADAZANDUSUN.

PERISYTIHARIAN PERSIATUJUAN ini dibuat berasaskan faktor-faktor borikut:-


(B) Dialek Bunduliwan telah dikenalpasti oleh pakar-pakar penyelidik Bahasa, khususnya Summer Institute of Linguistic(SIL) sebagai dialek yang mempunyai "Intelligibility" yang tertinggi di antara dialek-dialek yang terdapat di dalam rumpun Bahasa Kadazandusunik dan Paitanik.

(C) Dari segi geografikal, dialek BUNDULIWAN diguna dan ditutur dengan lebih meluas oleh kalangan Multi-Etnik Kadazandusunik dan Paitanik, jika dibandingkan dengan dialek-dialek yang lain, khususnya di daerah Apin-Apin, Bundu Tuhan, Inam, Kota Belud, Kota Marudu, Keningau, Kinarut, Kiulu, Kundasang, Lingkabau, Menggatal, Paitan, Ranau, Sook, Tambunan, Tamparuli, Telupid, Tongod, Tuaran, Ulu Kinabatangan, Ulu Penampang dan Ulu Papar.

Kejayaan pengajaran dan pembelajaran Bahasa Kadazandusun di sekolah-sekolah sebagai Bahasa Ibunda Pelajar, adalah bergantung kepada banyaknya permohonan (tidak kurang lima belas ibubapa pelajar) supaya bahasa itu diajar di sesebuah sekolah. Oleh yang demikian, penggunaan dan pertuturan dialek BUNDULIWAN yang lebih menyeluruh jika dibandingkan dengan dialek-dialek lain dalam rumpun bahasa Kadazandusunik dan Paitanik, se kurang-kurangnya...
akan dapat membantu menjamin kejayaan pengajaran dan pembelajaran Bahasa Kadazandusun.

PERISYTIHARAN PERSETUJUAN ini dibuat oleh KOISAAN dan USDA dan disaksikan oleh mereka yang bertandatangan seperti di bawah ini:-

Ditandatangani oleh:

Presiden KOISAAN

HS. DK. JOSEPH PAIRIN DK. KITINGAN

Tarikh: 11 April 1995

Disaksikan oleh:

BENEDICT TOPIN
Setiausaha Agung KOISAAN

Ditandatangani oleh:

Presiden USDA

DK. MARK KODING

Tarikh: 11 April 95

Disaksikan oleh:

RAYMOND BOIN TOMBUNG
Setiausaha Agung USDA
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APPENDIX E
Kadazandusun agreement (English translation)

Declaration of Agreement
Kadazandusun language as Official Language
Between
Kadazan Dusun Cultural Association
And United Sabah Dusun Association

This Declaration of Agreement was made on the 24th of January, 1995 between the Highest Council Members of the Kadazan Dusun Cultural Association and the Highest Council Members of the United Sabah Dusun Association, two associations that is respectively/each registered under the Association Act of 1966 that is Bil. Number SAB 356 addressed at Kilometre 6, Penampang Road, W.D.T. (Window Desk Transfer) No. 39, 89509 Penampang for the Kadazan Dusun Cultural Association (hereafter KDCA) as the first party and Bil. Number SAB 119 addressed at 1st Floor, Block A, Sinsuran Complex for United Sabah Dusun Association (hereafter USDA) as the second party.

That, KDCA and USDA, with full awareness and remorse/regret have agreed regarding the matters that are stated inside the Declaration of Agreement below:

1. KDCA and USDA are with this agrees that:
   I. The Kadazandusun language is the official language for the two associations KDCA and USDA;
   II. The Kadazandusun language is the language that is used in the writing and speaking in the teaching and learning of the mother tongue (POL) [Pupil’s Own Language], and
   III. The Kadazandusun language is the language that is used by all Kadazan Dusun ethnic without restriction to the use of other local dialects.

2. KDCA and USDA with this agree:
   I. The Kadazandusun language is conserved and developed collectively for the benefit of all races in Malaysia that are interested in learning the Kadazandusun language.
   II. Shared responsibility to develop the Kadazandusun language at the local, national and international levels, specifically for those that would like to learn and study/research the Kadazandusun language.

This declaration of agreement is made by KDCA and USDA and is witnessed by those that represent both parties, as those signed below:

SIGNATURE PORTION
PERJANJIAN PERISYTIHARAN

BAHASA KADAZANDUSUN SEBAGAI BAHASA RASMI

DI ANTARA

KADAZAN DUSUN CULTURAL ASSOCIATION
DAN UNITED SABAH DUSUN ASSOCIATION


Bahawasanya, KDCA dan USDA, dengan penuh sedar dan keinsafan telah bersetuju mengenai perkara-perkara yang tertera di dalam Perjanjian Perisytiharan di bawah ini:

1. KDCA dan USDA adalah dengan ini bersetuju bahawa:

   (1) Bahasa KADAZANDUSUN adalah bahasa rasmi bagi kedua-dua pertubuhan KDCA dan USDA;

   (11) Bahasa KADAZANDUSUN adalah bahasa yang dipakai dalam pelajaran dan pertuturan di dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran bahasa ibunda (POL) tersebut, dan

   (111) Bahasa KADAZANDUSUN adalah bahasa yang dipakai oleh semua etnik Kadazan Dusun tanpa menyekat penggunaan dialek-dialek tempatan yang lain.

[Signature]
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KDCA dan USDA dengan ini bersetuju:

(1) Bahasa KADAZANDUSUN dipelihara dan dikembangkan bersama untuk manfaat semua kaum di Malaysia, yang bermir mempelajari Bahasa KADAZANDUSUN.

(11) Tanggungjawab bersama untuk mengembangkan Bahasa KADAZANDUSUN di peringkat tempatan, kebangsaan dan antarabangsa, khususnya kepada mereka yang ingin mempelajari dan mengkaji Bahasa KADAZANDUSUN.

PERJANJIAN PERISYTIHARAN ini dibuat oleh KDCA dan USDA dengan disaksikan oleh mereka yang mewakili kedua-dua pihak, seperti yang bertandatangan di bawah ini:

Ditandatangani oleh:

Presiden KDCA

dengan disaksikan oleh:

DK. WILFRED M. BUMBURING
SETIAUSAHA AGUNG

Tarikh: 24-1-1995

Ditandatangani oleh:

Presiden USDA
dengan disaksikan oleh:

DK. MARK KODING

Tarikh: 24 Januari 95

RAYMOND BOIN TOMBUNG
SETIAUSAHA AGUNG
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