NO. 95

LANGUAGE MANAGEMENT IN A MULTILINGUAL STATE: THE CASE OF PLANNING IN SINGAPORE[+]

Eddie C.Y. Kuo[*] and Bjorn H. Jernudd[**]

[+]Paper prepared for the CAS-DELL Seminar on "Language Planning in a Multilingual Setting: The Role of English," 6 - 8 September, 1988, Singapore

[*]Associate Professor and Head, Department of Sociology
National University of Singapore

[**]Senior Fellow with Department of English Language and Literature
National University of Singapore

ISS 0129-8186

ISBN 9971-62-515-6

OUTLINE:

LANGUAGE MANAGEMENT IN A MULTILINGUAL STATE: THE CASE OF PLANNING IN SINGAPORE

Eddie C. Y. Kuo and Björn H. Jernudd
National University of Singapore

THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC SITUATION

Singapore's population of approximately 2.6 million is ethnically heterogeneous, with about 77% Chinese, 15% Malay, 6% of Indian origins, and 2% of other ethnic definitions. Its language situation is richly diversified. The 1980 census lists 20 specific "dialect groups" under the above four major ethnic category labels (see Table 1). It is however important to note that the reference to the dialect group background of a person in this context indicates basically the dialect group origin of a person, and does not necessarily reflect his linguistic competence. In other words, a person belonging (or assigned to belong) to a certain dialect group may or may not have acquired the said dialect as a mother tongue. As a result, statistics given in Table 1 do not reflect the size of a group of mother tongue speakers for various enumerated languages/dialects in Singapore. However, the statistics may be used as useful baseline data and point to a trend of language shift. Considering the complexity of the home language situation in Singapore (see Kuo 1985a), it appears that more children today, as compared to their parents, are acquiring one of the official languages as the mother tongue rather than the language of their dialect group origin. We expect that there will be further differentiation between the dialect group origin and mother tongue proficiency of a person in the future, a clear sign of language shift.

In a multilingual setting, each language/dialect is used for intra-group communications within the respective subethnic group; hence, Cantonese is often used among the Cantonese, and Hakka among the

Hakkas. For inter-group communications, several lingua francas have evolved after generations of inter-language inter-group contact.

Historically, Hokkien used to serve as a language of local (and regional) commerce and trade along side with the more important Bazaar Malay, which evolved to become the lingua franca for inter-ethnic communication. At present, partly as a result of the bilingual educational policy, and partly due to the influence of the Speak Mandarin Campaign (both to be discussed below), an increasing proportion of Chinese, especially the young ones, also know and use Mandarin Chinese to a degree. The use of Mandarin has replaced the use of other Chinese dialects, Hokkien in particular, for intra-ethnic communication in some domains. Hokkien is known and still used but mostly by older Chinese and the less educated. This regional lingua franca may however continue to reproduce itself in its Singaporean variety for intra-ethnic communication among the less educated Chinese. Mandarin is still by and large a High (H) language, while Hokkien is dominant in hawker centers, on buses, etc.

Competitive with Mandarin Chinese, English is also replacing Bazaar Malay and Hokkien among those younger Singaporeans who acquire sufficient ease with English as a result of schooling and accelerating acceptance of use of a vernacular English unique to Singapore (labelled "Singlish" for purposes of stereotyped characterization). The use of English is almost certain to expand and spread from formal to informal domains, competitive with Mandarin. Mandarin, on the other hand, will continue to attract a substantial proportion of the Chinese with its ethnic and "popular cultural" mass base for its maintenance and expansion. Chinese Singaporeans will acquire it in addition to or in place of Chinese dialects in individual repertoires.

The expansion of the role of English is supported by government endorsement and an explicit policy to establish English as the de facto

working language in Singapore's public, industrial and modern business sectors. Change has been so thorough and rapid that people in their thirties may complain that they are `handicapped' when applying for jobs because their English is poor. The very same sentiment propels these people in their roles as parents to support their children's English learning. These people may actually have acquired some English; what has made them feel inadequate is the rapid spread of and the increased competence in English especially among youth in the past decades.[1]

Among members of Indian ethnicities, about 64% are of Tamil origin (Table 1), but only 54% report that they use Tamil as the principal language of the family domain (Kuo 1985a:28). Apparently, Tamil, although given an official status as the language which "represents" the Indian community, is not acquired as a mother tongue by many (most non-Tamils and even some Tamils) who fall within the ethnic classification of Indian. About 21% of the Indians use English as the dominant home language, while 15% use "others", including Hindi, Gujarati, Malayalam, and Punjabi. Mandarin Chinese is now also selected in schools as a second language by a small but increasing number of Indians.

Of the three major ethnic groups, Malays are the most homogeneous in religion, culture and language. The 1980 census shows that almost 98% of the Malays use Malay as the dominant language in the family domain (Kuo 1985a:28). It is obvious that most of the Javanese and Boyanese who

1. These very people may not *in fact* be so handicapped; should they start all over, they would be, but not from the positions where they are now in their middle age or older. The president of the Singapore Chinese Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Mr. Linn In Hua, expressed concern before a workshop for small and medium-sized businesses to take place from May 4 to 6, 1988, that the 51% of people in such trades could not take part because they use Chinese, and the language of the workshop, run by the Economic Development Board, would be English: "Language is still a problem. Maybe 15 year from now when those 40 years old and above are gone, English will become the language at the workplace" (Straits Times 30 April 1988). (It was subsequently reported that any language could be used by participants in the workshop.)

are classified under the Malay ethnic group label have accepted Malay as their home language.

Singapore's own traditions are recent and diverse. Each of the three major ethnic communities is characterized by its distinctive Great and Little traditions. Although a supra-ethnic, national identity is now deliberately being forged by the Singaporean government, and is spontaneously emerging as well under the realities of the modernizing city-state political economy, it is unlikely that there would be rapid cultural and linguistic assimilation among the heterogeneous population. Indeed, the "national culture" that is being forged is made distinct in its own right precisely by the bringing together of a "multi-racial, multilingual" Singapore with its flag, national songs and its medium--which is English. The significance of English as an emerging common language is best expressed by the Prime Minister when he commented on the success of the 1986 National Day Parade. The Prime Minister pointed out that the success was because

> "the compere spoke in English, and the whole National Stadium understood and responded as one. And the spectators sang together, when once they could not even laugh at the same jokes, never mind singing the same songs." (Straits Times 18 August 1986)

POLICY OF MULTILINGUALISM

Given the multiethnic and multilingual setting in Singapore, two language-related issues are of fundamental significance and are closely related to the task of nation-building.

One is the phenomenon of communicative integration. Singaporean society has been able to sustain a high level of communicative integration through the evolution and adoption of several lingua francas and through the presence of bilingual social brokers. Moreover, the mass media system in Singapore (see below) provides and channels government, commercial, cultural etc. messages in all important languages to cater for the

population of diversified linguistic background. It is through these devices and mechanisms that a certain level of communicative integration has been maintained for exchange of information and interaction so that individuals from diverse backgrounds can reach a working consensus for effective functioning of the economy and polity.

The other and historically basic issue in this multilingual state is the government's desire to develop a new national identity which is additional to, and above and beyond the identity and loyalty at the ethnic and sub-ethnic levels, and which serves the government's vision of economic, social and cultural development. The crucial question for the government here is, how can this Singaporean identity be shaped and developed for a population who speak different mother tongues and who come from divergent traditions?

Through historical experiences and based in the need to sustain a working consensus effectively, a language policy has taken shape that serves the government's goals of nation-building. What has evolved is a policy that we will refer to as a policy of pragmatic multilingualism. It prescribes that there shall be four official languages, namely, Malay, English, Mandarin Chinese and Tamil, and that the four shall be treated as equal. Since it would be absurd to prescribe equality of use of four languages in all public domains (cf. Kloss 1967:42), a Singaporean political consensus allows continuing adjustment of policy based on a pragmatic evaluation of a changing communicative environment.[2]

Of the four official languages, Malay is designated as the national language. The decision reflects the political history and geographical location of the island-state as Singapore became an independent Republic in 1965 after having been a part of the Federation of Malaysia. The formal

---

2. For a discussion on the ideology of pragmatism in Singapore, see Chua (1985).

role of Malay is mainly ceremonial. The role of (Bazaar) Malay as a lingua franca has also declined. With increasing use of English for intergroup communications, few non-Malays now acquire proficiency in Malay. The situation has in recent years caused some concern among government leaders. There is thus a renewed emphasis on Malay, apparently in response to the now openly discussed issues of the Malays as a minority group, and the sometimes strained relations with neighbouring countries. Among other things, Malay is considered important as a regional language, and proficiency in Malay is believed to help build rapport with Indonesia and Malaysia.

Singapore's civil service is now requiring its key officers to learn Malay.[3] The pragmatic evolution of language policy is apparent here, as this renewed emphasis on the Malay language is consistent with its perceived instrumental value; notably absent is any reference to Malay, or to the learning of Malay, as a national language. The role of Malay as a mother tongue, however, and as a "cultural ballast" for Malays in Singapore is brought to public attention by the Malay Language and Cultural Month, launched in August, 1988, sponsored by the Ministry of Communications and Information. Activities are primarily directed at Malay youth, to maintain Malay and to "ensure that the Malay used in Singapore is abreast with the standard in the region" (Straits Times 9 August 1988).

Mandarin Chinese, while not the mother tongue for the great majority of the Chinese in Singapore, was chosen to represent the largest ethnic community, due to historical and political considerations. A Speak Mandarin campaign was launched in 1979 and has been continued as planned through

---

3. According to a Public Division circular, the following categories of civil servants who are in the pensionable services are required to attend and pass a Malay language and culture course within their first five years of service: personnel in the Singapore Armed Forces (Senior), Singapore Police Force (Senior), security service, administrative service (foreign service branch) and administrative service (Straits Times 24 April 1988).

annual campaign events with unabated force to promote the use of Mandarin in place of dialects among all Singaporean Chinese. In addition to the sentimental appeal as a language associated with Chinese culture and traditions, Mandarin is also promoted for its increasing importance as a trade language which facilitates individual Singaporeans' access to the expanding market in China. This has given additional motivation to the promotion of Mandarin at the level of govern-mental justification and among the population at large.

The policy selects Tamil to represent the Indian community, despite its relatively weak position when measured by the proportion of Indians who acquire it for use at home. At best half of all individuals classified as Indians appear to use Tamil to any significant extent. Attempts have been made to promote Tamil as a link language among Indians in Singapore but with little effect. To this extent, the position of Tamil as an official language has by and large been ignored but tolerated by the non-Tamil Indians, and Tamil is not challenged by advocates for other languages of South Asian origin. The status of Tamil as an official language gives the language (and therefore the Indian community) a position which parallels that of the other two ethnic languages and groups. Tamil's designation successfully serves to inform decisions on language selection in parallel contexts, such as in education and the media, and to organize community rights and events by the multilingual and multiethnic policy's principle of equality.

The role of English

Of the four official languages, English is the only one which is not Asian in origin and hence regarded as "neutral" in regard to relations between groups in Singapore, if not so regarded in terms of its external existence and use. In regard to the latter, English is often associated with

"western interests" and "western [lack of] values". As the language of the colonial government,[4] English has been retained as the administrative language in independent Singapore. Moreover, its perceived importance for and also actual use in higher education, international trade, and modern industry and technology have strengthened over the years. English is the dominant language in these sectors. Much of this spread of English can be explained by the pragmatic implementation of the language policy.

In the implementation of language policy and as a guiding principle, English functions as a working language. This is, however, supplemented by impromptu use of any other variety of language in spoken transactions involving public agents when the client does not know English.

The government deems an expansion of proficient use of English across the population necessary for the continued growth of the economy. For example, the government is of the opinion that a general competency in English in Singapore has already given and will continue to give the Singaporean worker an edge over other NICs' labour forces (Business Times 21/22 March 1987). The managers of Singapore and many expatriate business executives say that Singapore is particularly attractive to foreign investors (and tourists) because foreigners can communicate freely in English in Singapore. Individual social mobility thus also becomes dependent on English proficiency and competency in use, as mediated by an expanding educational system. It is therefore obvious that English is of instrumental value both from the societal perspective of economic growth and from the individual perspectives of social mobility and economic gain (Kuo 1985b).

---

4. English is also an important language for in-group communications as well among Singaporeans who led Singapore to achieve independence. Cf. Mazrui (1975) on the equivalent use of English among leaders who achieved independence in Africa.

The government's promotion of English is supported by the fact that English is regarded as a language which is native to none in Singapore. Whomever it may favor, the use of English does not favor one ethnic group over any other. Its use as a dominant working language in public and modern domains of production and commerce hence serves to neutralize potential group cleavages in the polity. As indicated by the Minister of State for Education, Dr. Tay Eng Soon,

> "English has served not only in giving Singapore access to international trade and technology but also enabled the avoidance of racial tension." (Business Times 4 April 1987)

The use of English also serves to express an emerging supra-ethnic national identity (which need not be exclusive of simultaneously held ethnic identity). The transition (or rather extension) from an identification of self exclusively or dominantly by ethnic origin and its associated language to an identification of self by national Singaporean identity may take time. But the government appears confident that as long as economic development and political stability are sustained, such a new national identity will emerge in due time. The discourse for the new identity is now being created, notably through English-language songs, poetry, a nascent prose literature and speeches, marked in content mainly, but marked linguistically also by the use of words lifted from the local vernaculars (including spoken English) and through vernacular English jokes and conversational routines. As the Acting Minister of Health, Mr. Yeo Cheow Tong puts it,

> "As time goes by, with increasing educational level of the people, we must work more and more on a nationwide basis through one language, a unifying language." (Straits Times 30 March 1987)

Singapore presents a case of a small polity choosing not to defend its traditions, values, and integrative community-forming communications by excluding an "international language" from domestic use. Instead, it

incorporates English, even to the extent of identifying future Singapore with it. Inter-translatability between English and the ethnic languages in Singapore therefore has not been raised as a potential problem area.[5] The other languages have their different functions as integrative of Singapore's ethnic constituents in a multiethnic, multilingual polity. What does arise, however, is a tension between the matter-of-fact de-ethnicization of Singaporeans through English, in the direction of reforming a Singaporean identity, and the continuing tradition-bound appreciation of what in Singapore are referred to as Asian[6] as opposed to western[7] values expressed through their respective languages. The policy intends for a Singaporean polity to be kept open through the use of English in education, entertainment, industry and commerce, at the same time as it is kept "culturally" on a course of communicating cherished Asian values. A recent statement by the Prime Minister, although dealing with programming at the SBC, is very relevant here,

> "And they [foreign talents] can impart their skills, not their values, to Singaporeans...." (Straits Times 30 April 1988)

Simpler models of language planning processes rely on division of labour between languages; in Singapore, we suggest that the language planning process has to take into account the possibility of the formation of a split discourse in the one language, English.[8] Singapore does not

---

5. Other than with reference to the authenticity of language in translation for dubbing locally produced TV drama series from Chinese into a not sufficiently colloquial English, in mid 1988.

6. Some of these "Asian" values may in fact be universal or typical of traditional social formations. It may be important to establish the extent to which there are such communalities of value.

7. Some of these "western" values may in fact be universal or typical of modern social formations. It may be important to establish the extent to which there are such communalities of value.

8. We are dealing with conditions of discourse that may but need not give rise to the kind of situation that Kandiah (1981) describes for Sri Lanka.

represent a case of the transition of a multilingual polity by a one-language-one-polity ideological principle to a unilingual English one, although English is being promoted as the common language of future Singapore. Living in Singapore, individuals plan for a multilingual future. It also does not fit a model in which the planned support for English, "initially adopted for econotechnical functional purposes ... results in integrative nationalism" and in which English is eventually "accorded full ethno-national symbolic value." (Fishman 1987, 45) The exonormative fact[9] alone may render a uniquely English outcome unlikely because only the content, not the language system, is available for symbolic vestment. Moreover, English is exoglossic and distinctively identified with non-Asian peoples, i.e., it embodies what's "western," unlike the other official languages which in relation to English are all "Asian" because of demographic, historical, and geographic continuity and contiguity. The "mother tongue principle" which Fishman tentatively names as a theoretical engine in the transformation of the integrative language into nationalistic symbol explicitly applies to the other ethnic languages, not English. But English is used for the job of forming a Singaporean "culture" inclusive of desired Asian values.[10]

In Singapore's official terminology, English is a "working language," while the other ethnic languages are called "mother tongues." Each "mother tongue" is used to re-ethnicize and consolidate separate ethnic communities, i.e., Mandarin Chinese for the diverse Chinese population,

---

9. We are referring to the public, overt management of the English norm for broadcasting, schools, public speaking etc. in Singapore, as expressed by its management idiom, ideology and theory; neither evaluation nor implementation in correction in schools, for example, need necessarily accomplish correspondence with this norm. (See, for examples, Gupta 1986).

10. It then also becomes an issue in Singaporean language management to define the roles of the other official languages in regard to transmission and formation of values, relative to English. The issue is reflected in discussion of the "cultural ballast" of the "mother-tongues".

Tamil for the diverse Indian population, and Malay for the relatively homogeneous Malays. Interestingly, these languages are all also exonormative, especially for evaluation of their written varieties. Ethnic interests within Singapore, and geopolitical context without, necessitate a balance of effort as well, and the future national planning process will depend, in the starkest outline, on the success of Singaporean political solidarity in steering competing ethnic interests on a mutually rewarding course.

In Singapore, general goals and guidelines of language-related policies are expressed in policy speeches by political leaders. There does not exist in Singapore a separate and permanent language planning agency to deal with language problems at the state level. In implementation, the ministry that is most directly and explicitly involved in language planning is the Ministry of Education; also involved are the Institute of Education (IE) and the Curriculum Development Institute of Singapore (CDIS). The Speak Mandarin campaign is implemented through a secretariat in the Ministry of Communications and Information. Language planning involving mass media is primarily the responsibility of respective media institutions, with the Ministry of Communications and Information playing a coordinating role.[11] Coordination of language planning efforts is apparently made easier as the policy of pragmatic multilingualism provides room for flexibility and allows constant adjustments of implementation rules prompted by changing circumstances.

---

11. Private publishing of dictionaries, manuals etc. should not be neglected in a study that attempts complete coverage of language management in Singapore, nor should the internal editing processes for purposes of achieving "correct" language (in Chinese, English etc.) in publishing houses, the newspapers, and in the media.

LANGUAGE PLANNING IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

The present assumption in Singapore is that the individual's rewards after school are closely linked to the person's success in the educational system. The planning, implementation and use of languages in school therefore interact with the planning, implementation and use of languages before (with parents) and after schooling (in career development). It is in the educational system that the government's role in language planning is most clearly manifested.

Before Independence in 1965, four more or less independent school systems had evolved in Singapore, each with a different language as the major medium of instruction. The Ministry of Education in the new Republic has consolidated the schools of different language streams into a national educational curricular system. All schools follow standard curricula. Textbooks are now locally produced and most teachers are locally trained. The school system has also been streamlined in regard to medium of instruction. English is now the medium in all classes *except* when special considerations warrant use of one of the other official languages. The slow but consistent shift took place in the past few decades. Statistics show that in 1959, 47% of children entering primary schools registered in English schools. By 1979, the figure rose to 91%, and by 1983, more than 99%. All Primary One students were in the unified national system using English as the first language from 1987 (Soon 1988, 7, 21).

Selection of languages in education

Under a policy of bilingual education (as an ideal for the individual in a society governed by a multilingual policy), all students in Singapore are required to take lessons in English (the first language) and one of the other official languages (the second language). The bilingual curriculum begins from Primary One (or even pre-Primary classes in some selected

schools). The pupil is expected to select as the second language of study the language associated with the student's ethnic classification. The Chinese are expected to choose Chinese, the Malays are expected to choose Malay, and the Indians, Tamil, although there are cases of Malay and Indian pupils taking Chinese as the second language. An interesting twist to this matching of second language with ethnicity is the occasional preference by the Malay-speaking Baba (Straits) Chinese who are ethnically Chinese (and perhaps the closest to forming a historical indigenous ethnic group) to select Malay as their second school language. The Ministry of Education may grant the choice of Malay after appeal on a case by case basis. This second language is also the language that may be used as a medium of instruction in moral-religious education classes, in addition to language and literature classes.

There is a small set of Special Assistance Plan (SAP) schools in which students may elect to take two languages both at the first language level. Nine Chinese stream schools were selected in 1979 to allow this double choice of English and Chinese as first languages of study. Pupils in the top 8% of the Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE) can choose to enter these schools. Some of these pupils can now elect to study a third language also, namely German, French or Japanese. Also, in line with the renewed government emphasis on Malay, in 1986, a pilot project was conducted by the Ministry of Education to let non-Malay pupils learn basic Malay as a third language.

Minimum language requirements are upheld at different levels of standard examinations as a basis of admitting students to Secondary schools, Pre-University colleges, and tertiary institutions. For entry to the National University of Singapore, a pass in a second language is no longer required due to the fact that the government is placing more emphasis on content subjects in the last few years and therefore also on English.

Students who are admitted and who fall short in second language grades are required to attend an intensive second language "camp".[12] The relaxation of the second language requirement favors English and those competent in it since English is the exclusive language in university education, excepting of course in the study of languages (such as Chinese and Malay). On the other hand, educators and community leaders from time to time express some concern about maintaining Chinese written language competency; and government representatives repeatedly underline the importance they attach to bilingual, not just monolingual, language competencies among Singaporeans.

To promote individual bilingualism, small scale campaigns are also carried out in schools in the forms of student debates, dramas, oratory contests, compositions contests, etc. (See Kwok 1982.) Seeing pupils as potential change agents in their respective families, they are also encouraged to adjust the language environment at home.

The implementation of the societal multilingual policy, with English as a common working language across individuals who each are competent in their ethnic language, is actively carried out by the educational system through the streaming structure of the entire school system, the maneuvering of language curriculum design, gate-keeping by examination requirements, and by extra-curricular activities as well as intra-curricular justification in support of the national policies.

Managing norms in language teaching

All four official languages in Singapore are exoglossic in that centers of native speakers for each exist outside of the city-state. The Singaporean language teacher and user have to exert a distinct effort to

12. It is not surprising that a majority of students attending these camps are males because boys in a modern state tend to neglect languages (social skills) in favor of content (engineering).

access and keep up with these production norms and standards that have their creative sources outside of Singapore. This is especially so for language specialists who require detailed and precise information on evolving norms and evaluative standards. Furthermore, according to the 1957 census, up to 80% of the population did not speak any of the official languages as their mother tongue (Kuo 1976). And the 1980 census reveals that official languages are used as the dominant home languages by only about 35% of the population (Kuo 1985a).[13] It is recognized that since the Republic is so small and pursues a radically open economic policy, it is not feasible for it to establish and maintain its own unique norms for any of the official languages. Adjustment of norms within each language has therefore been minimal and involves mainly decisions to adopt and implement certain adjustments that have external origins. As a general principle, the school system in Singapore adopts the norms that are recognized at the international centers of language development and management for the respective school languages.[14]

---

13. Estimation of mother tongue statistics is difficult because of the rapidly changing home language situation in Singapore.

14. For the Malay language, the Majlis Bahasa Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia is the joint planning body that meets several times every year to coordinate language development and management. Singapore has observer status and generally accepts the decisions of the council. Singapore is represented through its Jawatankuasa Bahasa Melayu Singapura (Malay Language Committee), set up in 1981 by the Ministry of Communications and Information to handle Malay language development in Singapore.

Norm changes for Tamil have been under the influence of the Tamil language centres in Madras and Sri Lanka. Adjustments have been more informal, less systematic, and taken longer to implement than for Malay or Chinese. Notably, the Ministry of Education introduced thirteen new Tamil letters in 1983, following up on reform in Indian Tamilnadu. Also, although not appointed managers of the Tamil norm, the university-based Tamil Language Society in Singapore debates language problems and proposes adjustments.

For English, Singapore follows a British norm, represented first and foremost in-country by the British Council[15] but upheld through a variety of personal and institutional links, in and out of the world of education. However, with the increasing success of the bilingual education policy, it is not surprising that vernacular English is emerging. For an increasing number of young and middle-aged Singaporeans, peers accept and even expect use of vernacular English in the in-group. Peer usage incorporates and thus legitimates deviations from the school (and "official") norm, especially as such usage is neither limited to the very young nor to informal or intimate communication. A vernacular norm may be in the process of being formed, although as yet somewhat vague and encompassing a great deal of individual variation.

The school system inevitably finds itself under pressure to cope in practical pedagogical terms with this kind of peer group English that pupils/students also possess and use "among themselves" as their group norm, however vague. The conscious noting of these and other emerging Singaporean ways of speaking English has already led to debates in Singapore as to whether a unique and indigenous norm of English different from the school norm is emerging and whether this norm should be legitimated by Singaporean institutions. For example, in the academic community, specialists have applied the label "standard Singaporean English" to refer to aspects of uniquely Singaporean ways of speaking English. Understandably, such views have had a mixed reception, especially by educational authorities. Still another source of "pollution" comes from the influence of American English, both in spelling and pronunciation, which comes as part of "media imperialism" including movies, TV programmes, pop songs, magazines and comics, originating from the

15. Other foreign language interests are looked after by, among others, Alliance Française, The German Embassy and the Goethe Society. There are many private language schools.

United States, and increasingly also from texts and speech produced by computer equipment in, e.g., telecommunications. The popularity of personal computers, which almost invariably apply terminologies and commands in American English, also makes imprints on pupils and students. There are signs that such influence is becoming more and more difficult to resist--as evidenced by the increasing numbers of "errors" (`color' instead of `colour', `center' instead of `centre') made by students due to apparent American influence.

So far, the educational system, the university included, stand clear and firm in support of continuing reliance on the British standard, with signs of increasing acceptance, however, of a Singaporean "accent" of pronunciation of the same English, and an acceptance of uniquely Singaporean lexical items (whether naming uniquely Singaporean objects or not). The educational authority has in fact countered the matter of fact pressure from pupils' peer Englishes by reinforcing the presence of an external norm in the schools through recruiting native speakers from the United Kingdom. Also, the Institute of Education invites foreign visiting experts to assist with teacher training. An example of the latter's critical role was the visit and newspaper interview with the visiting expert John Honey from the UK and the ensuing debate in the Straits Times (16, 19, 22 and 30 December 1987; 15 and 21 January 1988).

LANGUAGE PLANNING IN THE MEDIA

The policy of multilingualism is reflected and indeed enforced in the mass communications networks in Singapore. Contents in all four official languages are available in the press, radio, television, and movies. Two observations can be made from audience analysis (Kuo 1978). First, the media situation attests to the dominant position of English. Communication messages in English are the only ones that do not carry an internally

differentiating ethnic-traditional flavor and can thus be potentially constitutive of a supra-ethnic discourse. They are the ones with a potential of stimulating common feelings among all people in Singapore.

Second, media contents in ethnic languages draw almost exclusively audiences from the Chinese, Malay, and Indian communities, respectively, with an exception perhaps in the case of Chinese TV serial dramas which seem to attract quite a few non-Chinese viewers due to their inherent general human interest as the only locally produced serials.[16] People generally show sentimental attachment to media contents in their own ethnic languages. Some of the media at times also champion the causes of the language and cultural community that they represent.

In the domain of mass media, significantly, Chinese is the "number one" language in Singapore among the young and the old. Much to the surprise of many observers, the Chinese language press has continued to see an increase in readership in recent years. Out of a claimed 1.1 million people literate in Chinese, 980,000 read at least one Chinese newspaper, while, as a contrast, of 1.2 million literate in English, 845,000 (of them 610,000 are Chinese) read an English newspaper (Lianhe Zaobao 6 Oct 1987). Intriguingly, "one of the secrets of the [Chinese] papers' success was the use of plain Chinese," according to a newspaper person (Straits Times 6 October 1987).[17] It remains to be seen if the launching of The New Paper, an English-language tabloid with very much simpler language

---

16. Their popularity is such that SBC dubbed some locally produced Chinese serials into English and telecast them in 1988.

17. One aspect of "plain Chinese" is the use of simplified Chinese characters. These have been implemented in Singapore schools since the early 1970s following the new orthographic system in China. The Chinese-language newspapers joined in their use in 1979, although advertisements can still appear in either form. According to a source, 59% of advertisements in the Chinese newspapers used simplified characters in 1985, 85% in 86 and 87% in 87 (Straits Times 27 April 1988).

and popular content than The Straits Times, will affect the number of readers of the Chinese papers.

Chinese is also strong in video viewing and listening; "distributors [of video tapes] say that at present, 90% of tapes in many public video libraries are Chinese ones" (Sunday Times 7 February 1988). The two major distributors of English videotapes are adding Chinese subtitles to all their tapes.

Mandarin TV programs are popular. As an illustration of the contrast between the popularity of TV programs in English and those in Mandarin, the Prime Minister, in his speech to mark the 25th anniversary of TV in Singapore, quoted the following figures: On an average day, of the two million Singaporeans aged 15 and above, only 14% watch SBC's English news, while 33% watch the Mandarin news, and 9% the Malay language news (Straits Times 30 April 1988). For several years, the top ten most popular TV programs have been consistently those in Mandarin, and even the tenth most popular Mandarin program enjoys a viewership 50% higher than the most popular English program. Mandarin enjoys a mass base which in an important way helps to maintain the language as a language of middle-class Chinese in Singapore.

The total communication network in Singapore is designed to carry messages in as many languages as economically feasible in order to reach and to mobilize the linguistically diversified population. This policy is moderated by the Speak Mandarin Campaign objectives, in that, e.g., all Cantonese dramas are dubbed into Mandarin. SBC has also stopped broadcasting advertisements in the other dialects. As a contrast, for its Indian audience, SBC telecasts both Tamil and Hindi movies, and over the radio songs in Hindi, Telugu, Punjabi, Bengali and Malayalam. There is apparently no reason to provide programs to the Indian audience in Tamil only.

SBC Radio broadcasts four separate language channels, with the proportion of transmission time ranging from 28% for Chinese (Mandarin only) to 22% for Tamil (SBC 1987, 45). There is another FM channel which broadcasts only English and Mandarin programs. The relatively equal allocation of hours over SBC radio is obviously not based on the relative proportion of population nor on the audience size in each channel, since Tamil programs attract less than 5% of the total radio audience. The rationale lies more with the policy of multilingualism and the fact that sufficient transmission hours are necessary to serve the audience from a given language group, no matter how small.

The language distribution in television broadcasting is different. Although programs in all four official languages are available in the three SBC channels, English and Mandarin programs take up more than 80% of TV broadcast hours.[18] This uneven distribution is in part due to the fact that production costs for TV programs are high. For entertainment programs, production is highly dependent on the support of advertisers. Their support in turn is almost totally based on the consideration of viewership ratings. On this basis, SBC cannot produce the same proportion of programs in Tamil as in English or Mandarin, following the simple guideline of multilingualism, for the simple reason that Tamil viewers constitute less than 5% of the total viewership.

Still another important reason for the uneven distribution is that SBC Television depends heavily on programs imported from foreign countries, especially English-language programs from the United States and the United Kingdom. Presently, of the 152.5 transmission hours per week, 60.6% are used to transmit imported programs; among such acquired

---

18. No official statistics on the distribution of the four official languages in SBC's three channels are available at present. A 1979 source reveals that the distribution was: English 62,7%, Chinese 23.6%, Malay 7.5% and Tamil 6.2% (Kuo 1984b, 54).

programs, 51.4% are imported from the United States, 17.6% from the United Kingdom (SBC 1987, 46-47). These are all English language programs. Programs from Hong Kong and Taiwan are either originally in Mandarin or dubbed into Mandarin. They are highly popular among viewers although they form only 5.6% and 2.0%, respectively, of the imported transmission hours (SBC 1987, 47). Television is an important medium of entertainment, and the cultural as well as linguistic influence of such imported programs cannot be ignored.

The language offerings by SBC Television are actually more extensive because of the subtitling service. As a principle, non-English language programs are supplied with English subtitles (another indication of English as a supra-ethnic language), and English language programs are often provided with Chinese or Malay subtitles in part to compensate for the shortage of programs in Malay language. Multilingual offerings are also reflected in the distribution pattern with Channel 8 reserved for programs in Mandarin and Tamil, Channel 5 for those in English and Malay, and Channel 12, English and Mandarin. Such a pattern of language-by-channel division is in a way "officially" confirmed by Singapore Armed Forces mobilization announcements which are made in those channels in such languages accordingly.

Language planning is here interconnected with communication planning, and media messages are made available in various languages so that people are mobilized for national development of the modern state.

It should be noted that the government-controlled SBC Television does not enjoy a monopoly and hence its planning has to take into account competitive channels and sources. Not only are there three additional TV channels from neighbouring Malaysia available for Singapore audience, video tapes are also highly popular and readily available from video centers. Malaysian TV channels regularly run popular Cantonese drama

serials from Hong Kong which are seen to be a major competitor by SBC. SBC is known to have made careful programming planning to make itself competitive without giving in to the pressure of showing popular dialect programs. The same can be said of video tapes which may be available in dialects. The situation does allow the older folks and die-hard "dialect chauvinists" to seek entertainment in their preferred dialects (mostly Cantonese) from the magic box.

THE SPEAK MANDARIN CAMPAIGN

Since 1979, the government has been implementing a campaign to convert speakers of all other Chinese dialects to speakers of Mandarin Chinese, as the language of Chinese ethnicity and traditions. In recent years, to the motivations of forging "national identity" and of consolidating Chinese ethnicity have been added the motivation of foster-ing "better economic and political ties with China" (Straits Times 25 Feb 1988). The Speak Mandarin campaign is conducted also in coordination with moral education of the youth to counter what is felt to be an erosion due to "western" influences of the Chinese traditional value system, often expressed in terms of Confucian ethics.

A Speak Mandarin Campaign Secretariat, under the Ministry of Communications and Information, coordinates the campaign in close cooperation with other government agencies, the media, community associations and interest groups (especially those of Chinese origin), and in continuing close cooperation with the Ministry of Education.

The Singapore Broadcasting Corporation (SBC) is no doubt among the most important institutions in fostering the success of the campaign (see Kuo 1984a). SBC ceased broadcast of Chinese dialect programs and commercials in its television service since the beginning of the campaign. Popular TV drama serials from Hong Kong, Japan, France and even Brazil

have been dubbed into Mandarin. These serials have consistently enjoyed the largest viewership over and above English and other language programs.

The campaign is an apparent success. From a slogan that urges people to speak more Mandarin, the campaign slogan now urges people to start conversations with Mandarin and to use it more often.

According to a Ministry of Education survey, 68% of all new entrants into primary school in 1987 came from homes in which parents now use Mandarin with their children. If comparison is meaningful--and by some order of magnitude it should be--there has been a spectacular increase in use of Mandarin in homes. In 1980, 64.4% of the Primary 1 Chinese pupils were said to speak some other dialects at home and only 25.9% Mandarin; by comparison, in 1980, only 9.3% of the Primary 1 Chinese pupils spoke English at home whereas in 1987, 19.1% are said to do so (Straits Times 9 October 1987). A 1987 survey by the Ministry of Communications and Information revealed that 87% of the Chinese now speak Mandarin, as compared to 82% in 1985 (Straits Times 12 October 1987).

Special language courses have been designed in support of the campaign and made available through the media, the telephone, the Singapore Chinese Chamber of Commerce and Industry, etc. An annual month of intensively focussed campaigning brings continuous visibility to Mandarin, as do the posters and stickers displayed in public places and taxi cabs. The month's theme in 1987 which was launched on Oct 8 by the Education Minister was: "Start with Mandarin, speak it more often" and was primarily aimed at shopping centres to urge Singaporeans to make the first move in using Mandarin in their daily dealings with other Chinese.

In August and September 1987, a part-campaign was conducted seeking to replace the use of dialects with Mandarin for the auctioneering events during the Seventh Moon Festival (Hungry Ghosts Festival), a

domain which is a dialect stronghold. The implementation involved a media blitz, visits by state dignitaries to auctioneering sites, and most impressively, a telephone service to make available to auctioneers the correct Mandarin keywords and phrases in a special 18-lesson course. This service received 43,300 calls during its first two days of operation. According to a survey by the Mandarin Campaign Secretariat, of the 373 auction organizers, 325 used both Mandarin and dialect at the auctions, an increase of 37% over the previous year. And ten auctions were conducted entirely in Mandarin, while there was none the year before. This was considered a "big breakthrough" (Straits Times 24 November 1987).

Managing the Mandarin norm

The case of the auctioneering language typifies some problems with what appears to be an otherwise straight-forward substitution of languages within Chinese domains. In some auctions, the audience crowd apparently urged the auctioneers to switch back to dialect. A partial explanation could be that auspicious and time honored phrases and idioms cannot be directly translated.

The equivalent language problem was also noted in other measures to implement the campaign, including (1) the drive to promote use of Mandarin names for local food items instead of traditional names which may be in dialect or Malay; (2) in the pinyinization on the basis of Mandarin of district, building (shopping centre), and street names; and (3) pinyinization in Mandarin of personal names, hitherto when written in Roman script rendered on the basis of other dialects' pronunciation (i.e., on the basis of Hokkien, Hakka, etc.).[19]

19. Names proposed by a committee appointed by the Ministry of Culture (now Ministry of Communications and Information) in 1976 stand in a very different relationship to the Mandarin user. The committee was put in charge of the standardization of translated terminology in Chinese and announced several lists of proposed standard Chinese translations of

The food name problem was partly solved by a conscious effort to codify into Mandarin Chinese uniquely Singaporean names of food items, based on an adjustment of existing dialect or Malay names. The campaign secretariat compiled a list in Mandarin of names of items commonly used in hawker centres, markets, restaurants and also at Hungry Ghost Festival auctions. Many of these items are of purely local origin with no previous Mandarin lexical precedent. Such newly codified items in Mandarin represent an original contribution from Singapore to the corpus of the Mandarin lexicon. But old habits die hard and, for effective communication, many hawkers and their customers simply do not use the Mandarinized names. There is little in their immediate communicative environment that gives them reason to do so.

The pinyinization[20] of personal names has been systematically applied in schools but not in other domains. The fact that schools are obliged to register Chinese pupils in the Mandarin-equivalent form of their names propagates the use of names in this Mandarin version. However, this version is not generally used at home and among peers. This kind of resistance to general use of the Mandarin form of names poses a problem which has not been finally resolved.

In the case of place names, in recent years, in response to community demand to retain some traditional names which have dialect origins (for reasons of easy reference and undoubtedly also ingrained

---

geographical names, names of international and national organizations, titles of civil servants, etc. Here, prior dialect usage was not a hindrance to potential adoption in use.

20. Pinyin, the new system of Romanized phonetic transcription developed and used in China, was adopted already in the early 1970s to replace the older system based on the Chinese Phonetic Characters (Zhuyin Fuhao). The new system is taught in schools and used in official documents and mass media. It has been applied to facilitate the Speak Mandarin Campaign.

sentiment), dialect forms were selectively reintroduced,[21] in their traditional Roman script.

As a principle, the educational authorities and the mass media accept as the standard the Chinese norm which is practiced in China. The Mandarin norm originating from Taiwan differs in some respects from that of China and poses an alternative to it. Not the least, the simplified characters are not used in Taiwan. The availability to Singaporean users of Chinese of two norms, both external, is strikingly parallel to the availability to Singaporean users of English of two norms, a British and an American one. The differences between the Beijing putonghua and Taiwan Mandarin norms is not perceived as posing a problem for students, although there is some concern over the overall standard of written Chinese of younger people. In view of this general concern, it is surprising that little attention has been given to the fact that Mandarin Chinese as it develops in Singapore is differentiating into a spoken vernacular based in peer networks and informal domains, on the one hand, and a public norm, on the other hand, propagated by the Speak Mandarin Campaign's major implementing agencies, namely the mass media and the schools[22]. The parallel phenomenon for English is being given considerable attention. In terms of language distance between Chinese varieties in individual repertoires, however, the trend is one of convergence between varieties. Formerly there were more linguistically distant varieties spoken due to the influence of Chinese dialects. Mandarin in Singapore today, in all domains, is generally closer to the "official" standard than that in the past. The emergence of a local Mandarin-based vernacular is one of the processes in the convergence.[23]

---

21. Public signs, place names etc. are managed by administrative means.

22. This same point is made by Noss (1984, 164).

23. Confirmed by Chen Chung Yu in a recent discussion.

THEORETICAL COMMENTARY

Two perspectives

In a recent state-of-the-art paper, Fishman (1987, 409) refers to two definitions of language planning, one that points "in societal directions" which deals with the "authoritative allocation of resources to the attainment of language status and language corpus goals, whether in connection with new functions that are aspired to, or in connection with old functions that need to be discharged more adequately," and the other one "reiterated by [Neustupný and Jernudd] that is "more linguistically oriented". He feels it would be "instructive to determine whether the distinctions between the two models are really etic or emic." (1987, 410).

We suggest that the former (the "societal" one) is indicative of a macrosociological perspective on language management. The acts of language management that the societal perspective finds within its focus are, as a matter of empirical fact, also mainly macrolinguistic. They constitute highly organized systemic correction of an entire language (Neustupný 1978, 255) for both actual and potential users of the language in a national society. This macro-level language management is motivated by both linguistic and non-linguistic interests (Jernudd and Neustupný 1987, 77). The "societal" perspective also favors study of the kind of language management ideology (or at least idiom, cf. Neustupný 1978, 252) that is held by language managers involved in institutions charged with language planning, typically at a national level, formative of a nation-state. This is an ideology of planning through which the language managers reach for some ideal in the future (Jernudd 1982:2).

The latter (the "linguistic" one) is indicative of a microlinguistic perspective on language management. The acts of language management that it finds within its focus are microlinguistic in that they constitute

simple or increasingly rigorous correction of inadequacies that are noted by individuals in their own discourses (e.g., Jernudd and Neustupný 1987, 75-6). The microlinguistic perspective favors study of correction in discourse and of the sources in discourse between specific individuals for acts of language management which in consequence may involve more people.[24] Because it explores the link between individual conduct in discourse and group behavior in communication, including behavior towards language, this perspective is also microsociologically oriented.[25]

The two perspectives are thus not exclusive of each other, neither in theory nor in reference to any concrete case of actual language management. In cooperation with the macrosociological concern and methods (as surveyed, e.g., by Fishman 1987, or in the (still relevant) research appendix in Rubin and Jernudd 1971), the microsociological perspective asks for research that identifies demand for intervention in language in discourse. It also asks for research to understand the consequences of authoritatively imposed action, and reaction, not just in the generation of discourse but also in the evaluation of inadequacies in discourse. It provides an apparatus to explore the details of noting, evaluating, and correcting these consequential communication problems in iteration of policy and planning action.[26]

---

24. Skyum-Nielsen tackles the transition from evaluation of inadequacy in discourse to correction adjustment by design in his doctoral dissertation (1986).

25. It is relevant that the study of repair is indeed a topic of interest in the field of ethnomethodology with its close relationship to (micro)sociological study.

26. We agree with Fishman (1987, 420) that macrosociological theory in language management is weak. Also, microsociological theory need to be incorporated in language management study.

A particular perspective on language management may well fit the data in a concrete situation better than some other perspective.[27] We claim that this is so in Singapore's case.

Application to Singapore

The historical circumstances in which Singapore finds itself place it at the point of socioethnic consolidation and incorporation of varieties of languages into a uniform system of communication which can be centrally managed and coordinated with the pursuit of defined national goals. The polity relies on a forward-looking and anticipatory model of noting of, and acting on, problems and opportunities, be they economic, cultural or linguistic. The Singaporean reality thus favors application by analysts of a macrosociological perspective on language management, specifically informed by planning theory (Jernudd 1982). This is so because the discourse of proactive planning and its associated macro-sociolinguistic language management perspective fit its realities better than does a discourse based on assumptions of communicatively corrective reaction, i.e., on a micro-sociolinguistic perspective.[28] The planning perspective may well incorporate linguistically professional description of usages. What its proponents do not do is abdicate responsibility at the national level for a collective linguistic future based in "language planning policies, the public administration of these policies and getting the community as a whole to accept the policies" (Foley 1988, xx).

It would be possible to apply a discourse-based microsociological perspective by metaphorical extension, e.g., to state that the government has monitored as a deviation in recurring discourses (either) the presence

---

27. We shall not elaborate on typology here. For beginnings, see Neustupný (1965, 1970 and 1978); Jernudd (1977, 1987).

28. Cf. Edwin Thumboo's Foreword and J. A. Foley's Introduction to Foley (1988).

of use of Chinese dialects (or the absence of significant use of Mandarin) among Singaporean Chinese, noted it as a deviation from norms, and evaluated it as inadequate, in consequence of which the government has decided to institute a national multilingual, multiethnic policy. As a matter of fact, analysts of the Singaporean case generally assume that belief in planning as a guiding ideology makes the government intervene in domains of language communication in a proactive fashion at this particular stage of national and economic development. Language is one of the domains of intervention in which the government has chosen to act. Analysis from the point of view of planning does not require that language problems have already occurred in discourse to create a demand for language management by planning. Still, evaluation of a current communicative state of affairs may well play an important role in the government's planning action.

The microlinguistic discourse-based perspective does not deal well with language problems that may only occur in the future, including problems that may occur precisely because of proactive language management.

Singaporean managers give priority to the political tasks of forming a nation and developing its economy. They create language planning reality, a planning discourse, as they (inter)act. However, there is a reality of communicative life in Singapore which the micro-level demand-based perspective can reveal in discourse and which a macro-level planning perspective cannot. This other reality may be found, e.g., in the day to day management of newspaper language, in the teachers' management of language pedagogy in the classroom, in editing of texts, in dictionary compilation, in production of "good language" manuals, in within-office term management, etc. These aspects of the microsociolinguistic communicative life of Singapore are *not* salient in 1988 and are *not seen* to belong together in the social political discourse of the country. The one

possible exception is the set of reactions to the presence of home-grown spoken varieties of English.

Some of the reactions to spoken English in Singapore can be understood from the point of view of macro-level planning, namely, reinforcement of the presence of the exoglossic norm in the channels through which English is provided, accompanied by reinforcement of evaluative devices at gates to individuals' social mobility. Even labelling of the set of spoken varieties as "Standard Singaporean" can be understood in the context of planning. Some people thus seek to replace the exoglossic norm because a foreign source for the norm threatens authentification of an English norm for Singapore once speech is beginning to become authentically home-grown. In consequence, evaluation of variation in English usage would come into focus.

Variationist ideology and its application to linguistic study are compatible with the use of a micro-level discourse management perspective. A micro-sociolinguistic perspective based in the study of reaction to, debate of, and management of discourse in relation to individual acquisition and use of language in Singapore may well be gaining ground (cf. Gupta 1986, Harrison and Lim 1988, Loh and Harrison 1988). There is a lack of concern with Singaporean indigenization of spoken Mandarin Chinese,[29] a linguistic process now under way. And there is a concern instead with standards in written Chinese, the simplification of characters, and the regularization and uniformation of personal names and names in and of public places. These are typical of societies characterized by the planning paradigm (and developmental phase) of language management (cf. Neustupný 1978, 181 on Japan), or presently referred to as the macro-sociolinguistic perspective of language management.

---

29. With some notable exceptions, represented by Chen's several articles (1983, 1984, 1986a, 1986b).

The application of exoglossic norms for the official languages minimizes attention to language development matters in language planning in Singapore. Although it is an issue whether individuals live up to the norms in usage, there is no simultaneous process of creation of norms (as systemic macrolinguistic correction) and therefore no need for monitoring of alternative sources of norms, neither for creation of evaluative principles and so on. This shortcut may in fact prevent public attention to support for individuals who would opt for training and careers in language management, skills which may be found wanting if there is a transition from a planning to a demand-in-discourse management system in Singapore as a result of successful modernisation and consolidation of the city-state.

It is among the young people in Singapore that the language policies are having a decisive effect, and it is among these younger generations also that the vernaculars emerge. The older generation knows what it wants but does not necessarily modify own language behavior, at least not to the same extent as among the younger generations. This is a process whereby a "politicized" point of view in the early period of formation of the polity is succeeded by a matter-of-fact acceptance of the realities of usage norms and institutional solutions. According to Fishman, the former is "best represented by an older generation of users", while the latter is "best approximated by a younger generation of users" (1977, 212). Also, the success of consolidation of the polity and modernization of the economy allow attention to variation as (merely) individual or as deviations which, if found inadequate, can be corrected without upsetting existing institutions and communicative order (see Pendley 1983:53).[30] At the very same time,

30. The Speak Mandarin campaign and the pinyinization efforts met with unexpected consequences in communication that temporarily upset the overall direction of these efforts. The planning mode of operation left managers unprepared to deal with situations that would have benefitted from foresight informed by a corrective "reactive" (i.e., anticipated consequence, monitoring, reaction) approach to problems of communication in matter-of-fact real-time communicative situations.

however, Singaporean language management practice has allowed a gap to develop between macro-level systematic implementation of language norms and micro-level noting and evaluation of language use. In pursuing the former, they have overlooked problems of communication at the interactional micro-sociolinguistic level and, perhaps justifiedly so in view of the larger issues at stake, been less attentive to individual difficulties in accommodating to the linguistic policies. The macro-sociolinguistic perspective fits an earlier period of development in which Singapore has found itself for some time, the micro-sociolinguistic perspective will become increasingly relevant in the future as Singapore matures, without prejudice as to the pragmatic capacity of response to changes in the surrounding economic and political circumstances.

CONCLUSION

In multilingual Singapore, language diversity has been seen as an obstacle to nation-building, and hence "problematic" for several reasons. Firstly, linguistic identity is associated with ethnic and cultural identity. Language loyalty could thus lead to inter-ethnic conflict when the functional status or sentimental values of one's own ethnic language are at stake. Language has therefore long been a sensitive political issue in the short history of Singapore. Secondly, language diversity weakens communicative integration and generally implies inefficiency in the management of economy and polity. This is thought to hinder social, economic and political development of the nation.

In response to such perceived problems, a pragmatic approach to multilingualism has developed over the years. Pragmatism in language policy and language management has allowed for flexible responses to changing social, economic and political conditions. The underlying

consideration has consistently been that language policy (and hence language management at the national level) must serve the needs of nation-building. As a result of clever, and politically rational and rationalized, language management, accompanied by political stability and economic prosperity since Independence, the language issue in Singapore has undergone a process of depoliticization. Indeed, the fact that the language issue can now be presented as a topic of rational public discussion is itself testimony to the maturity of Singapore's nationhood.

In accordance with a pragmatic approach to multilingualism, decisions on language policy, adjustment measures and their implementation are made in cabinet, parliament and relevant ministries. The rationale of major policy decisions is articulated by political leaders, quite often by the Prime Minister himself, while the consequences for the implementation of such decisions are usually articulated at the ministerial or lower levels. Consultation with specialists is done on a confidential, ad hoc and piecemeal basis. The extent of their input to policy deliberations, assessments of communicative realities, and evaluation of language-related problems cannot be determined. Language planning in Singapore represents a case of centralized planning without a central language planning agency, unlike many other multilingual countries.

This pattern is functional and fully understandable given the strong emphasis on planning as a component in Singapore's development strategies. Indeed, there is probably no other alternative since in Singapore language planning at the national level is subsumed as an integral part of national development planning, serving the need for nation-building, and closely interconnected with other dimensions of social planning including educational planning and communication planning, as we have discussed in this paper. The connections between these different and interrelated dimensions of development planning (i.e., in language,

education, and mass media) are best demonstrated by the case of the Speak Mandarin Campaign.

Centralized planning generally implies a top-down approach in decision making and implementation. Under the circumstances, the focus of language management tends to be on the implementation of (super-imposed) norms at the macro-sociolinguistic--institutional--level, while relatively insensitive to communicative problems in language use or the emergence of indigenous language norms at the micro-sociolinguistic--interactional--level. In Singapore, the contemporary longer-term success of promotion of English as a working language and of Mandarin as a Chinese ethnic language both require management of their internal linguistic diversification into High and Low varieties and into usages that rely on developing indigenous norms. It is clear from this brief review that while the policy objectives are being met, efficiency improvements can still be significantly gained at the adjustment and implementation stages in the creation and management of Singapore's language resources. This calls for attention to and investigation of language management at the micro-sociolinguistic level.

We are of the view that the two approaches to language management, the macro-sociolinguistic and the micro-sociolinguistic, are complementary to each other. Since relatively more has been done on language and language management issues at the macro-level, with an institutional emphasis, the time has come for linguists and sociolinguists to explore more micro-level issues, with a discoursal and interactional emphasis, and to support both approaches by enriching use of both macro- and micro-level theories about social organization and change. Languages after all are major resources in the society, and a wise management of such resources will invariably serve both individual growth and the objectives of nation-building, however defined.

TABLE 1: Ethnic and Sub-ethnic Groups in Singapore, 1980

Total Population 2,413,945		100.0%	
Chinese	1,856,237	100.0%	76.9%
Hokkiens	799,202	43.1	33.1
Teochews	409,269	22.0	17.0
Cantonese	305,956	16.5	12.7
Hakkas	137,438	7.4	5.7
Hainanese	131,975	7.1	5.5
Foochows	31,391	1.7	1.3
Shanghainese**	14,732	0.8	0.6
Henghua	12,902	0.7	0.5
Others	13,373	0.7	0.6
Malays	351,508	100.0%	14.6%
Malays	312,889	89.0	13.0
Javanese	21,230	6.0	0.9
Boyanese	14,292	4.0	0.6
Bugis	491	0.1*	
Others	2,606	0.7	0.1
Indians	154,632	100.0%	6.4%
Tamils	98,772	63.9	4.1
Malayalis	12,451	8.1	0.5
Punjabis	12,025	7.8	0.5
Gujaratis	1,619	1.0*	
Others	29,765	19.2	1.2
Others	51,568	100.0%	2.1%
Europeans	23,169	44.9	1.0
Eurasians	10,172	19.7	0.4
Japanese	7,590	14.7	0.3
Arabs	2,491	4.8	0.1
Others	8,146	15.8	0.3

*Less than 0.1%

**A residual category used to refer to "others" who by origin are not from the provinces of Fujian, Guangdung, and Guangxi; not used to refer to Wu speakers from Shanghai.

Source: Khoo 1981, Tables 34-37, pages 59-63.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chen Chung-yu 1983

A fifth tone in the Mandarin spoken in Singapore. JOURNAL OF CHINESE LINGUISTICS 11:1,92-119.

_____ 1984

Certain lexical features of Singapore Mandarin. Hong, Beverly, ed., NEW PAPERS ON CHINESE LANGUAGE USE. Canberra: Contemporary China Centre, The Australian National University. Pages 93-104.

_____ 1986a

Salient segmental features in Singapore Mandarin. JOURNAL OF CHINESE LINGUISTICS 14:1,114-151.

_____ 1986b

Xinjiapo huayu yufa tezheng [Syntactic features of Singapore Mandarin]. YUYAN YANJIU 10, 138-152.

Chua Beng Huat 1985

Pragmatism of the People's Action Party government in Singapore: a critical assessment. SOUTHEAST ASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE 13, 29-46.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1977

Selected dimensions of language planning. Rubin, Joan, Björn H. Jernudd et al., LANGUAGE PLANNING PROCESSES. Mouton. 195-213.

_____ 1987

Reflections on the current state of language planning. Sing, Udaya Narayana and R. N. Srivastava, eds., PERSPECTIVES IN LANGUAGE PLANNING. Calcutta: Mithila Darshan. Pages 28-59. Also in Laforge, Lorne, ed., PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON LANGUAGE PLANNING, Ottawa, May 25-29, 1986. International Center for Research on Bilingualism A-21. Quebec: Les presses de l'université Laval. Pages 405-428.

Gupta, Anthea Fraser 1986

A standard for written Singapore English? ENGLISH WORLD-WIDE 7:1, 75-99. Reprinted in Foley, Joseph, ed., NEW ENGLISHES. THE CASE OF SINGAPORE. Singapore: Singapore University Press. 1988. Pages 27-50.

Harrison, Godfrey and Lim Soo Lin 1988

The acquisition of English questions by young Singaporean children. Foley, Joseph, ed., NEW ENGLISHES. THE CASE OF SINGAPORE. Singapore: Singapore University Press. Pages 148-168.

Jernudd, Björn H. 1977

Prerequisites for a model of language treatment. Rubin, Joan, Björn H. Jernudd et al., LANGUAGE PLANNING PROCESSES. The Hague: Mouton. Pages 41-54.

_____ 1982

Language planning as a focus for language correction. LANGUAGE PLANNING NEWSLETTER 8:4, 1-4.

_____ 1987

Globalism and language. Sing, Udaya Narayana and R. N. Srivastava, eds., PERSPECTIVES IN LANGUAGE PLANNING. Calcutta: Mithila Darshan. Pages 11-27.

_____ and J. V. Neustupný 1987

Language planning: for whom? Laforge, Lorne, ed., PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON LANGUAGE PLANNING, Ottawa, May 25-29, 1986. International Center for Research on Bilingualism A-21. Quebec: Les presses de l'université Laval. Pages 69-84.

Kandiah, Thiru 1981

Lankan English Schizoglossia. ENGLISH WORLD-WIDE 2:1:63-81.

Khoo Chian Kim 1981

RELEASE NO. 2 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, CENSUS OF POPULATION 1980 SINGAPORE. Singapore.

Kuo, Eddie C. Y. 1976

A sociolinguistic profile. Hassan, Riaz, ed., SINGAPORE: SOCIETY IN TRANSITION. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press. Pages 134-148.

_____ 1978

Multilingualism and mass media communications in Singapore. ASIAN SURVEY 18:10, 1067-1083. Reprinted in Afendras, E. and Eddie C. Y. Kuo, eds., LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY IN SINGAPORE. Singapore: Singapore University Press. 1980. Pages 116-136.

_____ 1984a

Mass media and language planning: Singapore's Speak Mandarin Campaign. JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION 34:2, 24-35.

_____ 1984b

Television and language planning in Singapore. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY OF LANGUAGE (Special issue: The impact of Television on language) 48, 49-64.

_____ 1985a

Language in the family domain in Singapore: an analysis of the 1980 census statistics. SINGAPORE JOURNAL OF EDUCATION 7:1, 27-39.

_____ 1985b

Languages and social mobility in Singapore. Wolfson, Nessa and Joan Manes, eds., LANGUAGE OF INEQUALITY. Berlin: Mouton. Pages 337-354.

Kwok Kian Woon 1980

Language planning in education: case study of the 'Speak Your School Language Campaign 1980'. Unpublished Academic Exercise, Dept. of Sociology, National University of Singapore.

Loh Siew Kwi and Godfrey Harrison 1988

The negative dual in Singapore English. Foley, Joseph, ed., NEW ENGLISHES: THE CASE OF SINGAPORE. Singapore: Singapore University Press. Pages 169-188.

Mazrui, Ali 1975

THE POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE: AN AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE. The Hague: Mouton.

Neustupný, Jiří V. 1965

First steps towards the conception of "Oriental Languages". ARCHIV ORIENTALNÍ 33, 83-92.

_____ 1970

Basic types of treatment of language problems. LINGUISTIC COMMUNICATIONS 1, 77-98. Reprinted in Fishman, Joshua A., ed., ADVANCES IN LANGUAGE PLANNING. The Hague: Mouton 1974. Pages 37-48.

_____ 1978

POST-STRUCTURAL APPROACHES TO LANGUAGE. LANGUAGE THEORY IN A JAPANESE CONTEXT. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Noss, Richard (ed.) 1984

AN OVERVIEW OF LANGUAGE ISSUES IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA 1950-1980. Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Pendley, Charles 1983

Language policy and social transformation in contemporary Singapore. SOUTHEAST ASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE 11:2, 46-58.

Singapore Broadcasting Corporation 1987

ANNUAL REPORT 1986/87. Singapore: SBC.

Skyum-Nielsen, Peder 1986

OM SPROGLIG NORMGIVNING [On providing language norms]. Copenhagen: Danmarks Laererhøjskole. Volumes 1 and 2.

Soon Teck Wong 1988

SINGAPORE'S NEW EDUCATION SYSTEM. EDUCATION REFORM FOR NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

WORKING PAPERS

The Department of Sociology of the National University of Singapore publishes, presently under the editorship of Eddie C.Y. Kuo, Chan Kwok Bun and Ho Kong Chong, reports of ongoing research by staff members, postgraduate students and visitors to the Department. Views expressed are the author's, so is the copyright.

1. Riaz Hassan and Geoffrey Benjamin, "Ethnic Outmarriage Rates in Singapore: The Influence of Traditional Socio-Cultural Organisation", 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", 1972, 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 K. Wong, "Job Satisfaction among Higher Non-Expatriate Civil Servants in Hong Kong", 1972, 64p.
10. Peter S.J. Chen, "Modernisation 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, "Penghulu di Minangkabau (Penghulu as Traditional Elite in Minangkabau)", 1973, 41p.
15. Michael A.H. Walter, "A Comparative Examination of Systems of Kinship and Marriage in Fiji", 1973, 41p.
*16. Hans Dieter-Evers and Daniel Regan, "Specialisation and Involvement: The Modernising 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 Stuff 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 C.Y. Kuo, "Industrialisation 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, 28p.
*32. Eddie C.Y. Kuo and Riaz Hassan, "Some Social Concommitants 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, "Urbanisation and Urban Conflict in Southeast Asia", 1974, 16p.
40. Michael A.H.B. Walter, "The Gardening Game", 1975, 15p.
41. Frederic C. Deyo, "Organisation 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. Eckehard 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. Lawrence A. Babb, "Thaipusam in Singapore: Religious Individualism in a Hierarchical Culture", 1976, 19p.
50. Rory Fonseca, "Growth, Transition and the Urban Environment; A Reference Frame for Singapore", 1976, 19p.

+51. Peter S.J. Chen, "Asian Values in Modernising Society: A Sociological Perspective", 1976, 17p.
+52. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, "A Sociolinguistic Profile of Singapore", 1976, 20p.
+53. Michael A.H.B. Walter, "On Transitional Society", 1976, 20p.
+54. Frederic C. Deyo, "Marital Status, Job Orientation and Work Commitment among Semi-Skilled Female Workers in Singapore", 1976, 20p.
+55. Frederic C. Deyo, "Decision-Making and Supervisory Authority in Cross-Cultural Perspective: An Exploratory Study of Chinese and Western Management Practices in Singapore", 1976, 24p.
+56. John R. Clammer, "Sociological Approaches to the Study of Language and Literacy in Southeast Asia", 1976, 28p.
+57. Peter S.J. Chen, "Ecological Distribution of Social Pathology in Singapore", 1977, 28p.
+58. Aline K. Wong, "The Value of Children and the Household Economy -- A Review of Current VOC Studies in the Developing World", 1977, 24p.
+59. Chiew Seen Kong, "Educational and Occupational Attainment of Singapore's Chinese Women and Men", 1977, 24p.
+60. Peter S.J. Chen, "Population Policy and Social Science Research on Population in Singapore", 1977, 28p.
+61. Michael A.H.B. Walter and Riaz Hassan, "An Island Community in Singapore: A Characterisation of a Marginal Society", 1977, 44p.
+62. Stella R. Quah, "The Unplanned Dimensions of Health Care in Singapore: Traditional Healers and Self-Medication", 1977, 22p.
+63. John R. Clammer, "Islam and Capitalism in Southeast Asia", 1978, 22p.
+64. Robert G. Cooper, "Second World First: The Study of Films and the Use of Film in Social Studies", 1978, 20p.
+65. Peter S.J. Chen, "Ethnicity and Fertility: The Case of Singapore", 1978, 25p.
+66. Rolf E. Vente, "Urban Planning and High-Density Living. Some Reflections on their Interrelationship", 1979, 13p.
+67. William S.W. Lim, "A Case for Low-Rise High-Density Living in Singapore", 1979, 13p.
@68. Mak Lau Fong, "Subcommunal Participation and Leadership Cohesiveness of the Chinese in 19th Century Singapore", 1984, 23p.
@69. Eddie C.Y. Kuo and Huey Tsyh Chen, "Towards an Information Society: Changing Occupational Structure in Singapore", 1985, 29p.
70. Ko Yiu Chung, "Industrial Workers and Class Formation: A Study of Chinese Industrial Workers in North China, 1900-1937", 1986, 31p.
71. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Between Isthmus and Islands: Reflections on Malayan Palaeo-Sociology", 1986, 43p.
72. Habibul H. Khondker, "Is There a Dependency Paradigm?", 1986, 55p.
73. Mak Lau Fong, "The Locality and Non-Locality Organising Principles: A Technical Report on the Taxonomy of Chinese Voluntary Associations in the 19th Century Straits Settlements", 1986, 33p.
74. Chua Beng Huat, "Reading Foucault as a Conservative", 1986, 40p.
75. Vivienne Wee, "Material Dependence and Symbolic Independence: Constructions of Melayu Ethnicity in Island Riau, Indonesia", 1986, 46p.
76. Habibul Haque Khondker, "Famine Response: The 1984-85 Ethopian Famine", 1986, 38p.
77. Allen J. Chun, "Conceptions of Kinship and Kingship in Classical Chou China", 1986, 50p.
78. V. Selvaratnam, "Ethnicity, Inequality and Higher Education in Penisular Malaysia: The Sociological Implications", 1987, 44p.
79. Trevor O Ling, "Buddhism, Confucianism and the Secular State in Singapore", 1987, 42p.

80. Mak Lau Fong, "The Social Alignment Patterns of the Chinese in 19th-century Penang", 1987, 32p.
81. Allen J. Chun, "Durkheim Reconsidered: A Critique of Primitive Structuralism", 1987, 30p.
82. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Process and Structure in Temiar Social Organization", 1987, 46p.
83. Eddie C.Y. Kuo, "Confucianism and the Chinese Family in Singapore: Continuities and Changes", 1987, 32p.
84. Tatsuko Takizawa, "Facets of Musical Activities in Singapore", 1987, 35p.
85. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Notes on the Deep Sociology of Religion", 1987, 37p.
86. Habibul Haque Khondker, "The World According to Wallerstein", 1987, 48p.
87. Mak Lau Fong, "Solidarity Models: A Sociological Framework For Comparative Criminal Organization", 1988, 29p.
88. Geoffrey Benjamin, "Grammar and Polity: The Cultural and Political Background to Standard Malay", 1988, 51p.
89. Viswanathan Selvaratnam, "Limits to Vocationally-Oriented Education in the Third World", 1988, 36p.
90. Vivienne Wee, "What Does 'Chinese' Mean?: An Exploratory Essay", 1988, 41p.
91. Geoffrey Benjamin, "The Unseen Presence: A Theory of the Nation-State and its Mystifications", 1988, 55p.
92. Tong Chee Kiong, "Perceptions and Boundaries: Problematics in the Assimilation of the Chinese in Thailand", 1988, 30p.
93. Allen J. Chun, "Toward a Political Economy of the Sojourning Experience: The Chinese in 19th Century Malaya", 1988, 39p.
94. Chua Beng Huat, "Public Housing Policies Compared: U.S., Socialist Countries and Singapore", 1988, 41p.

NOTES

Issues Nos. 70 onward are available at both Chopmen and Select Books.

* Out of print

\+ Chopmen Publishers
865 Katong Shopping Centre
#05-28 (5th Storey)
Singapore 1543

@ Select Books
19 Tanglin Road
#03-15
Tanglin Shopping Centre
Singapore 1024