

**A
Sociolinguistic
Profile of
Singapore**

EDDIE C. Y. KUO

SOCIOLOGY WORKING PAPER NO. 52



DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE



Department of Sociology
University of Singapore

The Department of Sociology, University of Singapore, is publishing a series of "Working Papers" under the editorship of Peter S. J. Chen, Chang Chen-Tung and Michael A. H. B. Walter. These papers provide reports of ongoing research by staff members, postgraduate students and visitors to the Department, and are primarily focussed upon Singapore and the Southeast Asian region.

Copyright remains with the author, but a Working Paper may be cited in a published work unless otherwise indicated.

A list of the papers which have appeared so far can be found at the back of this issue.

© All Rights Reserved.

Strictly not to be cited or quoted in any form without written permission from the author.

Published in 1976 for the
Department of Sociology, University of Singapore by
CHOPMEN ENTERPRISES
428 and 429 Katong Shopping Centre, Singapore 15, Republic of Singapore. Tel: 401495

Printed by Eurasia Press, Singapore.

I

Linguistically, Singapore society represents a prototype of what Rustow describes as a language pattern involving "a variety of unrelated languages each with its own literacy tradition",¹ and what Fishman designates as one of the "multi-modal nations".² The government of Singapore decided at the time of independence in 1965 that there would be four official languages in the new Republic — Malay, Chinese and Tamil to represent the three great traditions in Singapore, and English because of the colonial background of Singapore and the international status of the language. Among the four official languages, Malay was designated the national language, reflecting both the historical and geographical position of the island-state. Characterised by the co-existence of four official languages, plus more than a dozen vernaculars, Singapore is thus among the countries with the most complicated linguistic make-up. It is quite understandable that the language problem has always been a major concern for the leaders of Singapore.

The present paper attempts to outline a sociolinguistic profile of this multi-lingual state by identifying the major and minor languages in Singapore and the functions they perform. Language data available from different sources will also be compared to assess the trend in language competence among various ethnic groups. In addition, a "communicability index" is formulated to compare the statuses of various major languages in Singapore.

The data for the current study were drawn from three sources. One is the 1957 population census of Singapore,³ the only census thus far that has included information on the sizes of both mother tongue and non-mother tongue speakers of the four official spoken languages. For the current language situation in Singapore, we rely for our analysis on a recent national sample study by Survey Research Singapore, a market research group, in 1972.⁴ (Hereafter referred to as the SRS survey.) The survey was carried out among a representative cross-sectional sample of the adult population aged 15 and over in Singapore, using the multi-stage random sampling procedures. A total of 4,839 were interviewed. A third source of data is the 1972 ECAFE study directed by Chen.⁵ This also was a national survey and covered a sample of 2,500 married individuals in Singapore. A two-stage stratified random sample was applied.

It should be noted that in all the three surveys, the data were based on the subjective evaluation of language ability claimed by the respondents. Just as with most language data drawn from studies using survey research method, no actual test of language ability was carried out. It can only be assumed that data from such surveys are sufficiently reliable and valid for our analysis.⁶

II

In describing the language situation in Singapore, we will follow the format and typologies suggested by Stewart⁷ and Ferguson⁸ in identifying the "major" and "minor" languages, as well as their "types" and "functions". Following Ferguson, in our present analysis, a major language is defined as a language which (1) is spoken as a native language by more than 25 per cent of the population or by more than 1,000,000 people in the society; (2) is an official language of the nation; or (3) is the language of education of over 50 per cent

Table 1: A Sociolinguistic Profile of Singapore

Profile: 8L = 5Lmaj (Sow, Sowi, Soi, So, Vg) + 3Lmin (3Vg)

Language	Genetic Relationship	Mother Tongue Speakers (1957) Population = 1,445,929 N (thousands)	Mealtine Speakers (1972) Sample = 2,500 %	Status	Type	Function
Malay	Malayo-Polynesian (Western)	167	13.2	21.2	Major	Standard Official, wider communication
English	Indo-European (Germanic)	27	1.8	4.3	Major	Standard Official, wider communication, international communication
Mandarin	Sinitic (Chinese)	1	0.1	0.8	Major	Standard Official, international communication
Tamil	Dravidian	76	5.2	4.5	Major	Standard Official
Hokkien	Sinitic (Chinese)	434	30.0	27.9	Major	Vernacular Group communication
Teochew	Sinitic (Chinese)	246	17.0	16.5	Minor	Vernacular Group communication
Cantonese	Sinitic (Chinese)	218	15.1	14.5	Minor	Vernacular Group communication
Hainanese	Sinitic (Chinese)	74	5.2	*	Minor	Vernacular Group communication

* Data not available.

Sources: 1957 data based on State of Singapore: Report on the Census of Population, 1957, by S. C. Chua, Department of Statistics, Singapore, Government Printing Office, 1964, Table 39-43, pp. 135-161.
1972 data based on National Reports on a Comparative Study of Husband-Wife Communication and Practice of Family Planning (Report I: Singapore), by Peter S. J. Chen, Bangkok, United Nations, 1973 (Memo.), Table 49, p. 42.

of the secondary school graduates of the nation? Using these criteria, there are five major languages in Singapore — the four official languages and Hokkien, which is a native language for over 25 per cent of the population (see Table 1).¹⁰

The criteria for a minor language are: (1) it is spoken as a native language by no more than 25 per cent of the population but by more than 5 per cent or 100,000 people; or (2) it is used as a medium of instruction beyond the first years of primary school, having textbooks other than primers published in it.¹¹ Accordingly, two vernaculars would no doubt qualify as minor languages in Singapore — Teochew and Cantonese, both spoken by around 15 per cent of population as native languages. In addition to these two, Hainanese may also be included, although there are no strong empirical data to support its inclusion in contemporary Singapore. The 1957 census data show that Hainanese was the native (mother) tongue for a total of 74,498 people or 5.2 per cent of the population, and thus was clearly one of the minor languages in Singapore according to the criteria mentioned above. However, over the years, it is expected that the percentage of native Hainanese speakers may have declined since it is a vernacular not supported by the educational and occupational structures of the society. But, it is still likely that through population growth the total number of people with Hainanese mother tongue may be very close to, if not more than, 100,000.

Hakka constitutes another marginal, but still weaker, case. The 1957 census data indicated only 66,597 (4.6 per cent) native Hakka speakers. For the same reason given above in the Hainanese case, it is believed that this percentage is probably still lower today and no possibility that the total number approaches anywhere near 100,000. Consequently, although there are again no strong empirical data to prove one way or the other, Hakka is not considered one of the minor languages in Singapore.

For the above major and minor languages, their types and functions are identified by making use of the following symbols:¹²

Language type (designated by capital letters) —

- S, standard,
- V, vernacular.

Language function (designated by lower case letters) —

- o, official,
- g, group ("used primarily for communication within a particular speech community, marking it as an identifiable group in the nation"),
- w, wider communication ("used as a lingua franca or language of wider communication within the nation"),
- i, international communication ("used 'internationally' as a language of wider communication with other nation").

Based on the data available, the sociolinguistic profile in Singapore may be represented as:

$$8L = 5Lmaj(Sow, Sowi, Soi, So, Vg) + 3Lmin(3Vg).$$

The above formula requires some explanation and clarification. Firstly, it should be obvious by now that we make no effort to distinguish between a language and a dialect. The concept of language is defined as "a system of arbitrary and conventional vocal symbols by means of which human beings communicate and cooperate with one another."¹³ As such, the concept includes the more standardized literary languages and the non-standardised vernaculars

Table 2: Percentage of Population Aged 15 and Over Competent in Various Languages in Singapore by Ethnicity, 1957 and 1972

Ethnicity	Major Languages				
	Malay	English	Mandarin	Tamil	Hokkien
Malays					
1957, % who can speak	99.4	23.5	b	b	b
1972, % who can understand	100.0	60.1	1.7	1.7	6.2
Chinese					
1957, % who can speak	32.5	18.0	26.7	b	b
1972, % who can understand	45.8	41.2	69.5	0.1	91.1
Indians					
1957, % who can speak ^c	88.3	35.5	b	76.7	b
1972, % who can understand	95.9	66.3	d	86.7	5.1
Total ^a					
1957, % who can speak	48.0	22.2	19.9	8.2	b
1972, % who can understand	57.1	46.6	54.4	6.7	72.7

a. Including "other ethnicities."

b. Data not available

c. Not including Ceylonese, most of whom were Tamil speakers

d. Less than 0.1%

Sources: 1957 data based on State of Singapore: Report on the Census of Population, 1957, by S. C. Chua, Department of Statistics, Singapore, Government Printing Office, 1964, Table 44-47, pp. 162-165.

1972 data based on SRM Media Index, 1972 General Report for Singapore, Vols. 1 and 2, by Survey Research Singapore, 1972, Table 6A.

and dialects. It should be noted that for those who insist that all different Chinese dialects belong to one single language, and thus must be classified as such, the formula would have been: $4L = 4L_{maj}(Sow, Sowl, Soi, So)$. Such formulation, however, seems to under-represent the complexity of the language situation in Singapore and to ignore the social significance of various dialect group identities in Singapore.

It should also be noted that the above formula does not take into account the presence of different speech variants in each language spoken in Singapore. It is well known that Bazaar Malay is quite different from Bahasa Melayu. Both English and Mandarin are spoken with various degrees of pidginisation among different circles and segments of population. Similarly, Hokkien and Cantonese can be divided into a variety of "accents", stemming from different origins in the southern provinces of China. While all these variations are themselves significant and interesting linguistic topics to be researched, the present study assumes that the variants of each of these languages are more similar than different both linguistically and culturally, and are so classified for our analysis.

The identification of various functions of these major and minor languages in Singapore also demands some explanation. The *w* (wider communication) function is especially ambiguous and thus may create some confusion. Here, *w* refers to the use of the given language as a *lingua franca* in inter-group communication. In our present context, we define the term, group, rather arbitrarily as ethnic group. Thus, only Malay and English perform substantial roles in inter-ethnic communication in Singapore as a whole. (This point will be elaborated later.) If, however, group is defined as dialect group or language group, then both Mandarin and Hokkien also perform the *w* function in inter-dialect group communication among the Chinese.

Similar confusion may occur with the *i* (international communication) function since in the original formulation no specification was made regarding the extent and level of international communication needed for a language to be identified with the *i* function. In our present formula, both English and Chinese are designated with this function, as these two are among the five official languages of the United Nations.¹⁴ With a different criterion, arguments can be made to attribute this same function to Malay when communications with Malaysia and Indonesia are involved.

III

In a society with a large proportion of bilingual population, the mother tongue reflects only the language identity of an individual and tells little about the function and status of the language in the community. In this section, we will focus on the five major languages and compare the proportion of the population competent in each language (rather than its native speakers only) in the community.

Table 2 compares such percentages among the total population aged 15 and above in 1957 and 1972. It should be noted that the 1957 census statistics in Table 2 refer to the percentage of population who could speak a given language, while the 1972 SRS statistics refer to the percentage who could understand a given language. They therefore refer to different aspects of language competence. Yet, assuming that the relationship between comprehension and speaking ability in a given language in the community remained unchanged for the period of time under discussion, we can compare the differences between 1957 and 1972 percentages among various languages and assess the trend and change of relative language status for different languages in Singapore.

Table 2 shows that, of all the five major languages, Mandarin seemed to have gained most in relative status over the years. The growth however was confined within the Chinese population. This should be a comforting fact for those who have been concerned that the Chinese language might be declining in importance in Singapore. On the contrary, we find that Mandarin is becoming a *lingua franca* among the Chinese in Singapore.

The relative gain of status of English was also impressive, but less than that of Mandarin. As a contrast to the growth in the Mandarin case, the improvement of English language status was evenly distributed among all three major ethnic groups. The Indians had gained most and remained the group most competent in English. They were followed by the Malay and then the Chinese.

In the case of Malay, we are not able to assess whether there was a real gain in status. Yet, of the four official languages, Malay remained the one comprehensible for most people in Singapore (57.1 per cent in 1972). Almost all the Malay and the Indian communities and a substantial percentage (45.8 per cent) of the Chinese community could understand a certain variant of Malay. The pattern was similar to that of English. Both Malay and English are therefore important for inter-group communication and qualify as the *linguae francae* in Singapore. Malay is also obviously the dominant language for intra-group communication within the Malay and the Indian communities.

The apparent decline of Tamil in Singapore is significant but not unexpected. The finding is consistent with the decline of the literacy rate in Tamil among the Indians in Singapore, from 48.6 per cent in 1957 to 38.8 per cent in 1970.¹⁵ As a language, albeit official, associated with a small Indian population which is itself diversified religiously, culturally and linguistically, the communication function of Tamil in Singapore seems rather limited. Its future status deserves close observation.

No data were available on the number of Hokkien speakers in Singapore in 1957. The SRS 1972 survey shows that Hokkien was the language understood by most (72.7 per cent) in the population. Due to the lack of baseline information, we are not able to tell whether this popular vernacular was gaining or losing status in the Singapore society. Judging from the fact that Hokkien was the mother tongue for around 30 per cent of the population while understood by over 70 per cent (more than any other language), it is safe to say that Hokkien serves important functions at least among the Chinese in Singapore. Hokkien being a vernacular not used in schools nor actively in mass media communication, the proportion of Hokkien speakers may have begun to decrease, although it will probably remain as the language known by most among the Chinese group for a long time to come.

Table 2 also shows the change of language status for various languages among each major ethnic group. Among the Malays, the status of the Malay language remained unchanged and practically every Malay could speak the tongue. As a group, the Malays were making much progress in English with over 60 per cent of them now capable of understanding English. No data are available to assess the trend of other languages among the Malays. It is expected that, even if there might be some slight increase due to more inter-group contacts, the percentages will remain inconsequential in the foreseeable future.

Chinese as the largest ethnic group showed a more diversified pattern in language competence. Hokkien had long been the major language shared by the Chinese population, understood by 91.1 per cent of Chinese in 1972. Mandarin had gained much over the past 15 years, with about 70.0 per cent of Chinese capable of understanding *Hua Yü* in Singapore today. With the im-

plementation of the bilingual education programme, it is expected that the percentage of population competent in Mandarin will continue to grow in the future among the Chinese population. For the Chinese as a group, both Malay and English are important in terms of interethnic group communication.

The Indians in Singapore were highly competent in Malay and in Tamil. What may seem astonishing is that there were, in 1972, more Indians who could understand Malay than could understand Tamil. This reflects the dominant status of the Malay language even among the Indians, especially among the non-Tamil Indians who constitute approximately a third of the total Indian population in Singapore. More than two-thirds of the Indians were competent in English in 1972. The percentage is higher than that of the other two major ethnic groups in Singapore.

IV

In order to assess the communication role performed by a certain language in a designated communication situation, a "communicability index" (CI) is proposed to measure the probability that two randomly selected individuals from a certain group or groups can communicate with each other in the given language. For the CI of a language (*a*) in a given group (*m*), the formula is therefore,

$$CI_m = (P_m)^2$$

where *P_m* is the proportion of population (*m*) who can understand the given language (*a*). For instance, the CI of English in Singapore was $(.466)^2 = .22$ in 1972. In other words, the probability was .22 that two randomly selected individuals aged 15 and above in Singapore could use English in communication. The possible values of CI range from 0 to 1. The CI for a language in a community is 0 when there is not more than one single person in the community who can understand the language in question. For instance, the CI of Mandarin among the Indians in Singapore is probably very close to 0. The value of CI will reach unity when every individual in the community is competent in the language. Such is the situation for the Malay language among the Malay community in Singapore.

To apply the index to the inter-group communication situation, the formula is modified as,

$$CI_{mn} = (P_m)(P_n)$$

where *P_m* and *P_n* are the proportions of population who can understand language *a* in group *m* and group *n* respectively. Consequently, the CI of English in Chinese-Indian communication in Singapore was $(.412)(.663) = .27$. In other words, the probability was .27 that a randomly selected Chinese and a randomly selected Indian in Singapore could carry on conversation in English. It should be clear that the CI of a language is not an absolute characteristic of the language itself, but is relevant only when a communication situation is specified.

In the present study, we will focus on the status of the five major languages for intra-group and inter-group communication in Singapore, using the 1972 survey data. Table 3 summarises the CI values of various languages in different communication situations. The rank-order of the CI scores for each language in a certain communication situation is also presented for easy comparison.

The bottom row of Table 3 shows the CI scores for various major languages in Singapore as a whole. Generally, the values are quite low except for Hokkien which has a CI of .53. It is clear from Table 3 that none of the official languages are highly "communicable" in Singapore, reflecting the extent of language barriers in this multilingual society.

Table 3: Communicability Index (CI) of Major Languages in Singapore, by Ethnic Origin of Interlocutors, 1972.

Communication Situation	Major Languages				
	Malay	English	Mandarin	Tamil	Hokkien
Intra-ethnic Communication					
Chinese-Chinese	.21 (3) ^a	.17 (4)	.48 (2)	—	.83 (1)
Malay-Malay	1.00 (1)	.36 (2)	—	—	b
Indian-Indian	.92 (1)	.44 (3)	—	.75 (2)	b
Inter-ethnic Communication					
Chinese-Malay	.46 (1)	.25 (2)	.01 (4)	—	.06 (3)
Malay-Indian	.96 (1)	.50 (2)	—	.02 (3)	—
Indian-Chinese	.44 (1)	.27 (2)	—	—	.05 (3)
Any Two from Population	.33 (2)	.22 (4)	.30 (3)	b	.53 (1)

a Number in brackets indicates rank order of the given language in the given communication situation.

b Less than .005

Source: Based on SRM Media Index, 1972 General Report for Singapore, Vols. 1 and 2, by Survey Research Singapore, 1972, Table 6A.

For intra-ethnic group communications, the situation is more encouraging. While Hokkien was quite communicable (CI = .83) among the Chinese, the Malay language was highly communicable among the Malay and the Indian communities, 1.00 and .92 respectively.

For inter-group communication, which is an important variable in ethnic relations in Singapore, the barriers again show. One exception was the use of Malay in Malay-Indian communication, with a CI of .96, reflecting the ease of interaction between these two groups. As for Chinese-Malay communication, Malay has a CI of .46, followed by English (CI = .25). For Indian-Chinese communication, the pattern is extremely similar, the CI being .44 for the Malay language and .27 for English.

Comparing the rank order of the CI scores for various languages in different communication situations, it becomes clear that Malay is the most important language in inter-group communication. It is also the dominant language in communication among the Malays and among the Indians. The status of Malay as the *lingua franca* in Singapore is clearly shown. This indicates that there is more than just a token gesture to make Malay the national language of the Republic. English ranks second in all the inter-ethnic communication situations and thus may be considered a second *lingua franca* in Singapore.

Less clear from Table 3 are the statuses of Hokkien and Mandarin as *linguae francae* among different Chinese dialect groups in Singapore, a fact not to be ignored given the large size of Chinese population in Singapore. Tamil, again, shows a relatively weak status ranking second even among the Indians in Singapore.

It should be noted that the data we have refer to language *competence* rather than language *performance* in the population. Consequently, the Communicability Index reflects the possibility that a language can be used, rather than the probability that it will actually be used. Since speech performance is known to be subject to various kinds of social constraints (e.g., topic, types of interlocutors, and social setting), the CI may be a poor predictor of the actual use of a certain language in various situations. Obviously, more sociolinguistic studies are needed to identify the relevant factors in the use of a language in a certain situation.

Granted the above limitation, it may still be argued that, generally speaking, a language is more likely to be used in actual conversation when there are more people competent in that language. Therefore, competence in a language is seen not only as an inner capability to perform but also an indicator of language behavior, and thus of social interaction and social relation. Based on this assumption, it is claimed that, in Singapore, social interaction is more frequent between the Malays and the Indians (of whom quite a substantial percentage are Muslims) than between the Chinese and the Indians. The Malay-Chinese relationship comes in between. In this connection, we find support from the statistics in inter-ethnic marriages in Singapore, which indicate that there are a higher percentage of Malay-Indian intermarriages, followed by Malay-Chinese and Indian-Chinese intermarriages in that order.¹⁶

V

In the present study, we have identified five major and three minor languages in Singapore, showing a sociolinguistic profile that is highly diversified. An analysis of the available data reveals that the population as a whole continues to be highly multi-lingual since most languages are understood by high percentages of population. There is no sign of a trend toward monolingualisation in Singapore.

The population competent in Malay and English is relatively evenly distributed among all the three major ethnic groups, reflecting their function in inter-group communications. An analysis of the Communicability Index of these two languages further confirms that Malay and English should be considered the *linguae francae* in Singapore.

Hokkien is understood by the highest proportion of the population, mainly the Chinese. Similarly, Mandarin is used only among the Chinese community, and Tamil, the Indian community. Since most of the Hokkien and Mandarin speakers are non-native tongue speakers, it is suggested that Hokkien is a *lingua franca* among the various Chinese dialect groups in Singapore, and Mandarin comes second with an ever-growing status.

The above analysis suggests some significant issues in the language situation in Singapore that deserve further discussion and future studies.

One is the issue of the *lingua franca*. Our present analysis shows that there is a dual linguistic system in Singapore. Malay, especially its pidginised variant, Bazaar Malay, is used among people from different ethnic backgrounds in the market place and other similar traditional sectors in the society. As a contrast, English is the common language among the more modern, for the more official or more formal functions. Interestingly, this pattern is paralleled by another dual system in the Chinese community, whereby Hokkien is used in the traditional sector in inter-dialect group communication, and Mandarin for the more formal or official functions.

Consequently, we see that Malay and Hokkien are more often used in the situations that are more traditional — at the market place rather than the departmental store, at the site of the *wayang* show and during the festivals such as the Seventh Moon, rather than at the cinema or in the concert hall. As a contrast, English and Mandarin are used at the universities, for public speeches or forums, at the court, in government offices, among the executives, the government officials, the lecturers, the teachers and the students. Applying Fishman's typology,¹⁷ we have here a case of "both diglossia and bilingualism", with the majority of the population multilingual in a variety of languages that are functionally differentiated: English and Mandarin are High languages (H), and Bazaar Malay, Hokkien and other vernaculars are Low languages (L).

Such a dual system is strikingly similar to the conception of the economic dual system suggested by Boeke¹⁸ in that English may be seen as representing the system that has been imported but has failed to "oust" or to assimilate the indigenous (Malay) language system. To a certain extent, Mandarin was also an imported system that clashed with the more "indigenous" Hokkien and other Chinese dialects. Both the high system and the low system seem to be functioning well and each has its distinctive spheres of operation known and accepted by members of the society.

Such a conception of a dual *lingua franca* system is helpful in identifying the sociolinguistic rules of language uses in the Singapore society. Besides, some hypotheses may be suggested regarding the trend of change in language structure with the process of modernisation being speeded up in Singapore. Under such a situation, we can expect to see the proliferation of the high system at the expense of the low system. Both the pattern and rate of transformation should be carefully studied.

Another issue involves the relationships between the language situation in Singapore and other non-linguistic variables in this society. According to Banks and Textor, a society is defined as linguistically heterogeneous when there is no single language spoken by 85 per cent or more of the population.¹⁹ Singapore

is therefore linguistically highly heterogeneous according to this criterion. As a linguistically heterogeneous society, Singapore however shows characteristics in some non-linguistic variables that are contrary to the general pattern summarised by Fishman.²⁰ Singapore is a political entity that is highly diversified in language structure *but* is small in area, has a high population density and is highly urbanised. Economically, Singapore enjoys a reasonably high *per capita* gross national product and is among the most developed countries in the region. Educationally, again contrary to the expectations based on the correlational analysis, this linguistically diversified society has a relatively high school enrolment rate, as well as high literacy and newspaper circulation rates. It is mainly in some religious and especially political variables that Singapore is in accord with the general pattern to be found in a linguistically diversified society according to Fishman.²¹ The discrepancies between language structure and the above-mentioned demographic, economic and educational variables are significant as they seem to imply some pressures towards language homogenisation that are not materialising. Perhaps some unique characteristics of Singapore society can be identified to account for such discrepancies.

The above issue is also closely related to the choice and implementation of the language policy and its consequences.

The language policy of Singapore may be seen as a response to competing cultural and linguistic traditions. Here, an indigenous native language is selected as the national language with a function that is more symbolic than pragmatic. In fact, the function and uses of the Malay language can not be more than symbolic at the national and official level simply because it is the native language of one of the three major ethnic groups. Otherwise it would give this ethnic community an advantage over the other two. The fact that English has been utilised as the *de facto* working language can partly be explained by the above consideration. The use of English is particularly related to the government and official functions. This situation fits strikingly well with what Fishman describes as "Type C" decisions, typical in a multi-modal nation, in which

a foreign Language of Wider Communication is frequently selected *de jure* or utilized *de facto* as (co-) official or as working language (W) at the national level (sometimes in conjunction with an indigenous national language which may actually be little employed by those who are ostensibly its guardians.)²²

In this connection, it would be especially fruitful to compare the language policy being implemented in Singapore with that in Malaysia. It is obvious that, despite the fact that these two countries share much in common historically and geographically, their language policies are in sharp contrast. The effect of the differences in language policies on the future language trend and other linguistic characteristics should be a significant topic deserving close investigation. Equally significant, though more so from the point of view of the sociologist, is the effect of such differences upon sociological and socio-psychological factors such as social stratification and mobility, social integration, ethnic relation, social alienation, and the development of national identity.

* The author wishes to acknowledge the helpful comments and criticisms made by Geoffrey Benjamin on an earlier draft of the article. He is also thankful to Survey Research Singapore, Ltd. for permission to use certain statistics from *SRM Media Index*. This paper will appear in Riaz Hassan, ed. *Singapore: A Society in Transition* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press).

NOTES

1. Dankwart A. Rustow, "Language, Modernization and Nationhood — An Attempt at Typology," in J.A. Fishman, C.A. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta (eds.), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*, New York: Wiley, 1968, p. 102.
2. Joshua A. Fishman, "National Languages and Languages of Wider Communication in the Developing Nations," in J.A. Fishman, *Language in Sociocultural Change*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1972, pp. 191-223.
3. S.C. Chua, *State of Singapore: Report on the Census of Population, 1957*, Singapore: Government Printing Office, 1964.
4. Survey Research Singapore, *SRM Media Index, 1972 General Report for Singapore*, Vols. 1 and 2, 1972.
5. Peter S.J. Chen, *National Reports on a Comparative Study of Husband-Wife Communication and Practice of Family Planning (Report I: Singapore)*, Bangkok: ECAFE, United Nations, 1973. (Mimeo).
6. Cf. Joshua A. Fishman and C. Terry, "The Validity of Census Data on Bilingualism in a Puerto Rican Neighbourhood", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 34, 1969, pp. 636-49.
7. William A. Stewart, "An Outline of Linguistic Typology for Describing Multilingualism", in F.A. Rice (ed.), *Study of the Role of Second Language*, Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1962, pp. 15-25.
8. Charles A. Ferguson, "National Sociolinguistic Profile Formulas," in C.A. Ferguson, *Language Structure and Language Use*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1971, pp. 157-70.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 159.
10. It should be noted that the 1972 ECAFE data are not exactly comparable with the 1957 census data as its sample was drawn among the married population only. Besides, the 1972 ECAFE study involved the language used during the mealtime, rather than the mother tongue data found in the 1957 census report. To what extent the "mealtime language" is different from the "mother tongue" in the present context is not known. The 1972 data are therefore presented here for want of better estimates.
11. Charles A. Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-60.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 162-63. The quotations below are from the same reference.
13. Simeon Potter, *Language in the Modern World*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1966, p. 208.
14. The same criterion was applied by Janet Roberts, "Sociocultural Change and Communication Problems," in F.A. Rice, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-23.
15. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, "Language Status and Literacy Trend in a Multilingual Society — Singapore," *RELC Journal*, Vol. 5, 1974, pp. 1-5.
16. Riaz Hassan, *Interethnic Marriage in Singapore: A Study in Interethnic Relations*, (Occasional Paper, No. 21), Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1974.
17. Joshua A. Fishman, "Societal Bilingualism: Stable and Transitional", in J.A. Fishman, *Language in Sociocultural Change*, *op. cit.*, pp. 135-152. See also, John T. Platt and Heidi K. Platt, *The Social Significance of Speech*, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1975, pp. 91-93, for a discussion of the Singapore case.
18. J.H. Boeke, *Economics and Economic Policy of Dual Societies*, New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1953.
19. Arthur S. Banks and Robert B. Textor, *A Cross Polity Survey*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965.
20. Joshua A. Fishman, "Some Contrasts Between Linguistically Homogeneous and Linguistically Heterogeneous Polities," in J.A. Fishman, C.A. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta (eds.), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-67.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Joshua A. Fishman, "National Languages and Languages of Wider Communication in the Developing Nations," *op. cit.*, p. 204.

SOCIOLOGY WORKING PAPERS

Department of Sociology
University of Singapore

The Department of Sociology, University of Singapore, is publishing a series of "Working Papers" under the editorship of Peter S. J. Chen, Chang Chen-Tung and Michael A. H. B. Walter. These papers provide reports of ongoing research by staff members, postgraduate students and visitors to the Department, and are primarily focussed upon Singapore and the Southeast Asian region. Correspondence regarding the papers should be addressed to the respective authors, c/o Department of Sociology, University of Singapore, Bukit Timah Road, Singapore 10, Republic of Singapore. A list of the papers which have been issued so far is given below.

1. Riaz Hassan and Geoffrey Benjamin, "Ethnic Outmarriage Rates in Singapore: The Influence of Traditional Socio-cultural Organization," 1972, 26p.
2. Hans-Dieter Evers, "Urban Involution: The Social Structure of Southeast Asian Towns," 1972, 19p.
3. Erik Cohen, "Social Ecology — A Multidimensional Approach," 1973, 97p.
4. Noeleen Heyzer and Wee Gek Sim, "Trade Union Leaders in Singapore," 1972, 92p.
5. Peter S. J. Chen, "The Political Course of Singapore," (in English and Chinese), 1972, 23p.
6. Chan Heng Chee and Hans-Dieter Evers, "National Identity and Nation Building in S.E. Asia," 1972, 29p.
7. Peter Weldon, "Indonesian and Chinese Status Differences in Urban Java," 1972, 41p.
8. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Austroasiatic Subgroupings and Prehistory in the Malay Peninsula," 1972, 63p.
9. Aline Wong, "Job Satisfaction Among Higher Non-expatriate Civil Servants in Hong Kong," 1972, 64p.
10. Peter S. J. Chen, "Modernization in Singapore: Changing Values and the Individual," 1972, 16p.
11. Geoffrey Benjamin, "An Outline of Temiar Grammar," 1972, 41p.
12. Peter S. J. Chen, "Social Stratification in Singapore," 1973, 99p.
13. John S. Western, Peter D. Weldon and Tan Tsu Haung, "Housing and Satisfaction with Environment in Singapore," 1973, 30p.
14. Mochtar Naim, "Pengkulu di Minangkabau (Pengkulu as Traditional Elite in Minangkabau)," 1973, 31p.

15. Michael A. H. B. Walter, "A Comparative Examination of Systems of Kinship and Marriage in Fiji," 1973, 41p.
16. Hans-Dieter Evers and Daniel Regan, "Specialization and Involvement: The Modernizing Role of Doctors in Malaysia and Indonesia," 1973, 33p.
17. Myrna L. Blake, "Kampong Eurasians in Singapore," 1973, 45p.
18. Mak Lau-Fong, "The Forgotten and the Rejected Community — A Sociological Study of Chinese Secret Societies in Singapore and West Malaysia," 1973, 150p.
19. Erik Cohen, "Southeast Asian Urban Sociology — A Review and a Selected Bibliography," 1973, 53p.
20. Thelma Kay, "Group Cohesion and Productivity among Dockworkers — a Study of Stevedores in Singapore," 1973, 28p.
21. Eddie Kuo, "Industrialization and the Family Type: An Overview," 1974, 45p.
22. Hans-Dieter Evers, "Changing Patterns of Minangkabau Urban Landownership," 1974, 45p.
23. Peter S. J. Chen, "Social and Psychological Aspects of Fertility: Findings from Family Planning Research in Singapore," 1974, 27p.
24. Hans-Dieter Evers, "The Role of Professionals in Social and Political Change," 1974, 28p.
25. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Prehistory and Ethnology in Southeast Asia: Some New Ideas," 1974, 32p.
26. Mochtar Naim, "Voluntary Migration in Indonesia," 1974, 41p.
27. Lawrence Babb, "Walking on Flowers in Singapore — A Hindu Festival Cycle," 1974, 46p.
28. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Indigenous Religious Systems of The Malay Peninsula," 1974, 27p.
29. Aline K. Wong, "Women as a Minority Group in Singapore," 1974, 46p.
30. Michael A. H. B. Walter, "Co-operation in East Fiji: A New Traditionalism?" 1974, 30p.
31. Aline K. Wong, "The Continuous Family Revolution in China — Ideology and Changing Family Patterns," 1974, 39p.
32. Eddie C. Y. Kuo and Riaz Hassan, "Some Social Concomitants of Interethnic Marriage in Singapore," 1974, 28p.
33. Riaz Hassan, "Symptoms and Syndromes of the Developmental Process in Singapore," 1974, 11p.
34. Hans-Dieter Evers and Riaz Hassan, "Studies on Social Stratification in Southeast Asia," 1974, 141p.
35. Pang Eng Fong and Thelma Kay, "Change and Continuity in Singapore's Industrial Relations System," 1974, 27p.
36. Eddie C. Y. Kuo, "Field Theory as a Conceptual Framework for Divorce Study," 1974, 25p.

37. Riaz Hassan, "International Tourism and Intercultural Communication: The Case of Japanese Tourists in Singapore," 1974, 23p.
38. Riaz Hassan, "Towards a Dialectic Anthropology — A Comment On Professor M. Freedman's Paper, Social and Cultural Anthropology," 1974, 7p.
39. Hans-Dieter Evers, "Urbanization and Urban Conflict in Southeast Asia," 1974, 16p.
40. Michael A. H. B. Walter, "The Gardening Game," 1975, 15p.
41. Frederic C. Deyo, "Organization and Its Socio-Cultural Setting: A Case Study of Structural Compensation in an Atomistic Society," 1975, 31p.
42. Mak Lau-Fong, "Chinese Secret Societies in Ipoh Town, 1945-1969," 1975, 17p.
43. Vivienne Wee, "A Preliminary Account of 'Buddhism' In Singapore," 1975, 56p.
44. Geoffrey Benjamin, "The Cultural Logic of Singapore's 'Multiracialism'," 1975, 34p.
45. Ekehard Kulke, "Social Class and Primordial Loyalty in Rural India — An Approach to the Study of Indian Untouchables," 1975, 31p.
46. Peter S. J. Chen, "Elites and National Development in Singapore," 1975, 15p.
47. Riaz Hassan, "Social and Psychological Implications of High Population Density," 1975, 30p.
48. Rory Fonseca, "Planning And Land-Use in Singapore," 1975, 26p.
49. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Temiar Kinship Terminologies," 1976.
50. Rory Fonseca, "Growth, Transition and the Urban Environment; a reference frame for Singapore," 1976, 19p.
51. Peter S. J. Chen, "Asian Values in A Modernizing Society: A Sociological Perspective," 1976, 17p.

All orders for the Sociology Working Papers should be sent to the sole distributors at the following address:

CHOPMEN ENTERPRISES,
428 & 429, Katong Shopping Centre,
Singapore 15, Republic of Singapore.