An evaluation of the Speak Mandarin Campaign within a dialect-speaking community

Patrick Ng Chin Leong,
Master in English Studies
(National University of Singapore)

Thesis submitted as part of the requirement for the degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
University of Leicester
January 2006

I certify that this work is entirely my own and has not been accepted as part of a submission to another degree course."
Word length: (53 224)

UMI Number: U601303

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI U601303
Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Specially dedicated to the

Sion Presbyterian Church
Singapore

Glory Be to God!

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Peter Martin, for his advice and guidance throughout the writing of this thesis. His comments and suggestions have been a great source of strength and inspiration for completing most of my assignments as well as this thesis. I am truly indebted to Dr Peter Martin for his constant words of encouragement and I would really like to say, "Peter, I'm really pleased to have you as my course tutor and supervisor. Thanks so much for guiding me!"

I would also like to thank Reverend Ong Doo Ying for his permission to carry out the study within his church, and I'm truly grateful to the church members who took their time off to participate in this study. To all the church members who participated in this study, "Thanks for your time, patience and efforts in answering the survey questions and the interview questions!" I believe it is through the prayers and support of the church that I am able to complete this study.

I would like to thank Fong Pheng for her statistical support for this study. I would like to specially mention Dr Svalberg for offering to be my supervisor after Dr Peter has left. I am grateful to her for guidance before the viva. I am indebted to Chico and his family for providing accommodation while I was in UK. The trip to UK will not be possible if Chico and his family have not provided the logistics support that enables me to travel to Leicester. I also want to thank Siongyang for his help rendered to me while I was in UK.

Last but not least, I am also grateful to my wife, Rachel, and my son, Jedidiah, for their love and encouragement throughout my study.

Abstract

Scholars have observed that most literature on language planning is framed in the context of government involvement. Fishman (1989) in his landmark work, ascribes language planning to the work of the government by suggesting that language planning be viewed from the societal approach, one that points in societal directions and deals with the authoritative allocation of resources to the attainment of language status and language corpus goals. This study casts the spotlight on a deliberate language planning initiative by the Government in Singapore, the Speak Mandarin Campaign (SMC).

The SMC was initiated in 1979 by the then Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr Lee Kuan Yew. The specific objective of the campaign was to persuade all dialect-speakers in Singapore to discard the habit of speaking Chinese dialects and to speak Mandarin as a common language. The purpose of this study is to assess the effectiveness of the Speak Mandarin Campaign as a deliberate language planning effort by the Singapore government within a dialect-speaking community. It attempts to examine whether individuals in the community have adopted Mandarin in different domains of language use, and whether they have positive attitudes towards the use and status of Mandarin. In addition, the study also examines whether individual dialect-speakers have positive attitudes towards the SMC as a planned effort by the government to influence language usage.

The tools for data collection consist of a sociolinguistic survey and a semi-structured interview. The results from the survey questionnaire and the semi-structured interview converge to show that the deliberate language planning by the government has indeed been effective in changing the linguistic habits of the dialect-speaking Chinese within the researched community and in embracing Mandarin as a language of preference and use.

CONTENTS

	Page
Dedication	**i**
Acknowledgements	**ii**
Abstract	**iii**

Chapter One Introduction
1.1. Background of research.....1
1.2. Issues in the Speak Mandarin Campaign.....2
1.3. The community under study.....4
1.4. The scope and objective of the study.....5
1.5. The research questions.....6
1.6. The research design.....7
1.7. Evaluation of the SMC.....8

Chapter Two Review of literature on Planning for Language
2.1. Sociolinguistics of language use.....10
2.2. Language planning: work of government.....15
2.3. Language planning by government in new and emerging states.....18
2.4. Forces against government intervention in language planning.....19
2.5. Two perspectives to language planning: the macrosociological and the microlinguistic.....21
2.6. Language planning and language management.....24
2.7. Language policies that arise from language planning.....25
2.8. Implementation of language planning policy: top - down versus bottom – up.....27
2.9. Evaluation of language planning.....28
2.10. Conclusion.....29

Chapter Three Singapore : the contextual background
3.1. The sociopolitical background of Singapore.....31
3.2. The sociolinguistic situation in Singapore.....32
3.3. Language planning in Singapore.....34
3.4. The Multilingual Policy.....35
3.5. The Bilingual Policy.....37
3.6. Conclusion.....41

Chapter Four Review of literature on the Speak Mandarin Campaign (SMC)
4.1. Organisation of the SMC..... 43
4.2. Implementation of the SMC.....44
4.3. Critiques of the official arguments of the SMC..... 47
4.4. Resistance towards the SMC strategies..... 50
4.5. Conclusion..... 52

Chapter Five Methodology
5.1. Research Paradigm: positivist versus interpretative.....53
5.2. The case study as a research design.....55
5.3. Method of data collection.....58
5.3.1. The self-administered survey questionnaire (SAS).....59
5.3.2. The semi-structured interview (SSI)..... 64
5.4. Data Analysis.....69
5.5. Data Management..... 71
5.6. Ethical Considerations..... 73
5.7. Conclusion.....74

Chapter Six Quantitative analysis : Reported Language use and attitudes
6.1. Language use.....75
6.2. Attitudes towards Mandarin.....79
6.3. Attitudes towards the status and functions of Mandarin.....82
6.4. Comparison of Attitudes towards English and Mandarin.....84
6.5. Attitudes of respondents towards Chinese dialects.....85
6.6. Attitudes towards the official arguments of the SMC..... 88
6.7. Attitudes towards the planned language efforts.....92
6.8. Discussion on the results of the SAS.....93

Chapter Seven Qualitative analysis : Views towards SMC
7.1. Informants' views on the goals of the SMC.....97
7.2. Informants' views on the continuation of the SMC.....107
7.3. Informants' views on the elimination of dialects.....113
7.4 Informants' views on the effectiveness of the SMC..... 118
7.5. Discussions on the results of the SSI.....124

Chapter Eight: Conclusion
8.1. Has the campaign been effective within the sample community?.....127
8.2. Critiques on governmental's efforts in language management of the SMC.....131
8.3. Repercussions on the decline of Chinese dialects.....133
8.4. Disagreement with the strategy of eliminating dialects.....137

8.5. Implications for nation building.....140
8.6. Future challenges for the SMC.....143
8.7. Future research on the SMC.....145
8.8. Limitations of study.....148

Appendix I Final self-administered survey form..... 150
Appendix II Final Semi-structured interview schedule.....153
Appendix III Theoretical Memos..... 154
Appendix IV Profile of survey respondents..... 156

List of Tables

6.1. Demographic distribution of sample 76
6.1. Language spoken by survey respondents 77
6.1. Use of Mandarin and Chinese dialects by respondents in different domains 78
6.2. Attitudes of respondents towards Mandarin 80
6.2. Age group of respondents (Q14) 81
6.2. Educational background of respondents (Q14) 81
6.3. Attitudes of respondents towards the status and functions of Mandarin 82
6.3. Age group of respondents for Q7 83
6.4. Comparison of attitude towards English and Mandarin 84
6.5. Attitudes of respondents towards Chinese dialects 86
6.6. Views of respondents on the educational argument for Mandarin 88
6.6. Views of respondents on the communicative argument for the Speak Mandarin Campaign 90
6.6. Views of respondents on the cultural argument for the Speak Mandarin Campaign 91
6.7. Views of respondents on the outcome and strategy of the SMC 92
7.1. Profile of SSI informants 98

Bibliography 160

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of research

The literature on language planning has indicated that very little evaluation of language planning activities has been conducted and published (Eggington and Baldauf, 1990; Dogancay-Aktuna, 1995; Gonzalez, 1990). Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) state that evaluation is a neglected area of language planning and suggest that in language planning, it is not sufficient to devise and implement strategies to modify a particular language situation, but it is equally important to monitor and evaluate the success of strategies and progress towards implementation. Kaplan and Baldauf suggest that good language planning involves continued evaluation and revision during the implementation phase. They believe that feedback, assessment and evaluation are important in the initial planning or fact-finding phases to gather information so that appropriate selection decisions can be made in the context of its implementation as well as in execution of the plan. In relation to a variety of target populations and given a variety of social settings, a great deal of micro-evaluation of language planning is necessary to enhance our understanding of language planning. It is with this understanding that this study is conceived. This study is an attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the Speak Mandarin Campaign (SMC) initiated by the Singapore government, within a community of dialect-speakers.

The SMC was first launched in 1979 by the Singapore government and its specific objective was to make all Chinese Singaporeans discard the habit of speaking Chinese [1]dialects and to

[1] Dialects-In the context of Singapore, the term 'dialect' refers to a vernacular variety of the Chinese language, and is spoken by various sub-groups of the Chinese community. In Singapore, all Chinese belong to a dialect group which is inscribed on his/her identity card. Many Singaporean Chinese acquire some knowledge of one or more additional dialects, either through their parents, relatives, friends or neighbours. It is the practice in Singapore to refer to Mandarin as a 'language,' while other varieties of Chinese such as Cantonese or Hokkien are considered to be 'dialects'. Although politicians in Singapore do not recognize dialect' as a language, linguists, on the other hand, view 'dialect' as another variety of language.

speak [2]Mandarin as a common language. Since the launch of the SMC in 1979, the government has tried to encourage all Chinese to use Mandarin instead of dialects in their linguistic habits.

In the context of language planning, the SMC is a deliberate language-planning move aimed at changing a deeply entrenched sociolinguistic habit of Chinese Singaporeans who are long used to speaking Chinese dialects (Pakir:1994). As the SMC has been in existence for more than two decades since it was first launched, an important question to ask is,

> "Has the campaign been effective in changing the linguistic habits of dialect-speaking Chinese?"

It is with the aim of assessing the effectiveness of the SMC that this study is conceived.

In this chapter, I will first outline the issues concerning the SMC which will be followed by some background information on the community under study. Next, I will explain the research objectives and state the research questions. I will also outline the research design. In the final section, I will discuss the justifications for the evaluation of the SMC and explain the organization of the thesis.

1.2. Issues in the SMC

The year 2005 marks the 26th year of the SMC since it was initiated by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew. The SMC is the longest campaign in Singapore spanning more than two decades since it was initiated in 1979. The Singapore government's objective is to promote Mandarin as a lingua franca among all ethnic Chinese for all their inter-Chinese communicative needs. As stated by Kuo (1985), the SMC is envisaged to be a long-term

[2] Mandarin-This is the term used in Singapore for Modern Standard Chinese. It corresponds closely to the standard form of the PRC, the variety which provides the exonormative standard for the Chinese language in Singapore. In mainland China, Mandarin is also called *Putonghua* (common speech). In Taiwan, it is known as *Guoyu* (national language) and in Singapore, it is called Huayu (language of the Chinese). In Singapore, Mandarin is referred to by politicians as the spoken form of Chinese.

endeavour and it is imperative that continual assessments are made to monitor the use of Mandarin in various domains of language use.

In the past, several studies have been conducted to assess the effectiveness of the SMC. However, most studies on the SMC tend to adopt a quantitative approach with the aim of assessing whether Mandarin is being spoken by the target population (Kuo:1985,1988). However, Newman (1988) states that the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of the SMC, which is often based on the amount of Mandarin spoken, may allow a person to easily claim that he/she is now speaking Mandarin, even though that person has only learnt three/four phrases of Mandarin. In addition, most of the studies focus merely on the use of Mandarin in public places such as in restaurants and coffee shops (Kuo:1985).

To examine the effectiveness of the SMC, there is a need to gather more empirical evidence as proof that the campaign has managed to convince the target audience of the need to change their linguistic habits not merely in restaurants and coffee shops. Thus this study aims to investigate whether individual dialect-speakers use Mandarin as a language of preference in various main domains of language use such as in the family, in the workplace, as well as in other public domains such as in [3]hawker centres and in shopping centres.

Although language use is an important criterion in assessing the effectiveness of the SMC, it should also be supported by information concerning speakers' attitudes to Mandarin within the targeted community. As stated by Chiew et al (1995), in the initial years, the explicitly stated goal of the SMC was to use Mandarin to replace, completely, if possible, the Chinese dialects which have been the major communicative tools in oral interactions since the Chinese first started to reside in Singapore. As the SMC has been launched for more than two decades, it is important to examine the current attitude of dialect speakers towards Mandarin. By documenting the attitudes, comparing and understanding them, this study will provide an

[3] Hawker centres-These are open-air complexes where a variety of inexpensive food is sold. The food sold is invariably a vivid reflection of Singapore's Asian heritage. In Singapore, hawker centres are usually located near MRT stations and within clusters of HDB flats. The majority of customers are locals and the main form of communication between customers and the food sellers are Chinese dialects and other vernacular languages.

up-to-date micro-evaluation of the SMC, and thus offer more empirical evidence to assess whether it is effective within the dialect-speaking communities in Singapore.

In addition, this study will also study the orientations and views of individual dialect speakers toward the campaign. This will include their agreement or disagreement with the campaign's goals, their opinions on the strategies adopted by the government to persuade dialect-speakers to speak Mandarin, as well as their perception of the support for the campaign. The views of dialect-speakers toward the official arguments for the campaign will also be investigated as these play a critical role in the act of persuasion. If a majority of dialect-speakers can accept one or more of the three main arguments supporting the campaign, then this will no doubt expedite a linguistic shift to Mandarin among them. In the following section, the community for the study will be discussed.

1. 3. The community under study

As mentioned earlier, the present study seeks to provide greater empirical evidence to assess whether the SMC has resulted in any change in language use and attitude towards Mandarin in a community of dialect-speakers. The community chosen for this study is a discrete dialect-speaking church community located in the Eastern part of Singapore (Changi). To address the ethical issue of anonymity in research, the community under study will also be referred to as the 'sample community'. First, it is important to distinguish the sample community from other dialect-speaking communities.

The sample dialect-speaking community is unlike any dialect-speaking communities in Singapore. It is one of the few remaining dialect-speaking church community in Singapore. It was first established in 1953 when a few dialect-speaking Christians living in the Changi Gulega area decided to set up a mission centre to evangelise to residents living in the area. Members in the community are committed Christians who regularly meet on Sunday for church worship and other religious activities. The religious worship includes the reading of the Bible in Mandarin. On the other hand, most dialect communities in Singapore consist of members from diverse religious backgrounds which include Taoism, Buddhism, and other faiths.

Besides this, the population of the sample community is relatively small. The community has a population of less than 200. Other dialect-speaking communities may have a membership of a few hundred thousands.

In addition, members of the sample community come from diverse dialect-speaking homes and the four main dialects spoken in the community are Hokkien, Teochew, Hainanese and Cantonese. Members communicate with each other in their respective dialects. However, members of other dialect-speaking communities normally use a common dialect to communicate with each other. For instance, members within the Chinatown community, a Cantonese-speaking community, speak mainly Cantonese. On the other hand, the Teochew-speaking community located in Hougang consists of members who habitually use Teochew as the common medium of communication.

1.4. The scope and objective of the study

The SMC can be divided into two phases. In the first ten years (1979-1984), the campaign targeted all Chinese Singaporeans, and the aim was to eliminate dialects and persuade all Chinese to speak Mandarin so that it would become the intra-ethnic language among the ethnic Chinese. In particular, the campaign focused on the dialect-speaking Chinese living in HDB (Housing Development Board) housing estates and at places where dialects were widely spoken such as at markets, [4]HDB estates, hawker centres and bus interchanges. As its name implies, the SMC was aimed primarily at promoting listening and speaking skills and not reading and writing. The campaign emphasizes the use of Mandarin in public and in the workplace through slogans such as "Speak Mandarin. It helps," (1993) "Speak Mandarin, Explore New Horizons," (1996) "Speak Mandarin. It's an Asset. " (1999). (A decade of Mandarin, 1989, p6). As reported by Gopinathan (1998), the implementation of the campaign has been marked by wide-ranging activities. These include the phasing out of dialect programmes over radio and television, the introduction of conversational Mandarin lessons

[4] HDB estates- These are estates with public housing complexes built by the Singapore Government in the 1960s to shelter low-income families. All HDB estates are self-contained and usually include schools, shops and recreation centres. Each housing estate may contain 4 000 to 6000 dwelling units which can accommodate up to 200 000 inhabitants. Chinese dwellers within the estates usually use Chinese dialects to communicate with each other.

over radio and the organization of forums, panel discussions and seminars on the Speak Mandarin theme.

However from 1994, the campaign charted a different course. The campaign was targeted at the English-educated Chinese as it was felt that they were most vulnerable to Westernization and the dominance of English. The SMC began to promote the speaking of Mandarin to prevent English-educated Chinese Singaporeans from losing their Chinese identity. However, this study will only focus on the first phase of the campaign.

Since the SMC is a deliberate language planning move initiated by the Singapore government, its effectiveness in achieving language planning goals need to be evaluated. The present study aims to examine the effectiveness of the SMC in changing the language use and attitudes of dialect speakers towards Mandarin within a dialect-speaking church community. In order to assess the effectiveness of the SMC within the sample community, this study will examine:

i. The prevailing language use of individual dialect-speaking Chinese from different social backgrounds to assess whether Mandarin is used in different domains such as within the home, between friends, work and in the public.
ii. The attitudes of individual dialect-speaking Chinese towards the status and functions of Mandarin, their attitudes towards Mandarin and the learning of Mandarin. As Mandarin does not exist in a linguistic vacuum in Singapore, attitudes of individual Chinese towards other languages such as English and Chinese dialects will also be examined.
iii. The attitudes of individual dialect-speakers towards the goals, outcomes and strategies in the SMC.

1.5. The Research Questions

With the objectives in mind, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Has the Speak Mandarin Campaign been effective in persuading members within a dialect-speaking church community to adopt Mandarin as a language of use?

2. Has there been a shift in attitudes of individual members within the community in favour of Mandarin?

3. Do individual members within the community agree with the goals, strategies and outcomes of the campaign?

1.6. The research design

In this study, the case study is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the SMC within a dialect-speaking church community. As a research approach, the case study has been used in many situations, including policy implementation, public and administrative research as well as management and community studies. In this study, the case study approach is adopted for two reasons. Firstly, the aim of this study is to achieve a deeper analysis of a unit of inquiry, rather than quantitative statistical generalisations. As mentioned earlier, case studies are best used in situations when the investigator has little control over the events and the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real life context. The SMC is a classic example of a language policy unique to Singapore, involving complex relationships in a holistic context and where there is little or previous research. The case study approach would be immensely useful in gaining an in-depth understanding of the contextual conditions and the processes in which the SMC was implemented to achieve its objective within the dialect-speaking church community.

Secondly, a focused investigation into the interpenetration between goals, strategies and outcomes of the SMC would contribute to the evaluation of theory on language planning. As mentioned by Yin (1994), case studies are generalisable to theoretical propositions or universes. It does not represent a 'sample' and the investigator's goal is to expand and generalise theories. The case study approach would help to shed light on whether deliberate language planning by the government is effective in changing the linguistic habits of dialect-speakers within the sample community.

The tools for data collection involve the use of:

a) the sociolinguistic survey-The sociolinguistic survey will be used to provide the most up-to-date sociolinguistic documentation of the sample dialect-speaking community.

The purpose of the sociolinguistic survey includes a description of the existing language situation, measurement of language changes, estimation of the linguistic consequences of government policies and a consideration of the impact of language conditions on political, economic and social conditions (Lieberson: 1980). A self-administered sociolinguistic survey will be distributed to 120-150 individual Chinese within the sample community to assess the effectiveness of the SMC. The sample will include individuals from different dialect groups such as the Hokkiens, Teochews, Cantonese, Hainanese and others. It will also include male and female informants from different socio-economic backgrounds and ages.

b) the semi-structured interview – Given that the SMC is aimed at changing the speech habits of the Chinese community, an evaluation of the campaign will have to consider the subjective experiences and orientation of dialect-speakers toward the campaign as a whole. Within a community of dialect-speakers, there may be diverse opinions and views on the SMC. Some may be highly supportive while others may resist the SMC. The semi-structured interview will also be used to evaluate the response of individual dialect-speakers towards the goals, strategies and outcomes of the SMC. The semi-structured interview will form the main source of the qualitative data.

In this study, the primary goal of data analysis is to locate the general trends in the sample community in the matters of language use and language attitudes. The data analysis is geared towards investigating whether there is a shift in language use towards Mandarin by dialect-speakers within the sample community. A detailed account of data analysis will be stated in Chapter Five.

1.7. Evaluation of the SMC

Since the SMC is a deliberate language planning policy implemented by a government aimed at changing the linguistic habits of a community in Singapore, its effectiveness in achieving language-planning goals needs to be evaluated. Given that language-planning efforts are located in a localized context, a micro-evaluation of the SMC can help to uncover the subjective responses of individual dialect-speakers within the researched community. To assess whether the SMC is effective, it is important to investigate the prevailing attitudes

towards Mandarin. An evaluation of the SMC will also enable planners to change their strategies to improve attitudes and motivations of the target population or to change their goals to be more consistent with the problems that emerge as the language planning is being implemented. In addition, an evaluation of the SMC can enhance our understanding of language planning in a national context, either at the theoretical or practical level.

This study consists of eight chapters. In Chapter One, the background of the research is presented. Chapter Two reviews the literature for language planning by government. It will discuss the various goals of language planning by government, the implementation of language planning and the policies formulated. In Chapter Three, the contextual background of the study is provided. There will be a discussion of the sociopolitical background and the sociolinguistic situation in Singapore. There will also be an overview of language planning in Singapore and a discussion of the Multilingual and Bilingual language policy initiated by the government. Chapter Four reviews the literature on the Speak Mandarin Campaign. It will explain the organization of the SMC and the strategies adopted by the government in its implementation. There will also be a discussion on the critiques on the SMC. In Chapter Five, the methodology of the study is discussed. The research design, method of data collection and data analysis will be explained. In Chapter Six, the results of the self-administered survey will be presented. Chapter Seven presents the results of the semi-structured interview and Chapter Eight provides the conclusion of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON PLANNING FOR LANGUAGE

As mentioned in Chapter One, the SMC is a deliberate language planning initiative undertaken by the Singapore government in an attempt to change the linguistic habits of dialect-speakers in favour of Mandarin. To enhance our understanding of government involvement in language planning, this chapter will explain the sociolinguistics of language use. The discussion will also draw together the disparate themes of language planning activities framed in the context of government involvement. Some of these themes are not exclusive to each other and there are instances where they overlap. This chapter provides a framework for studying language - planning issues in Singapore, and is particularly useful for an evaluation of the SMC.

2.1.Sociolinguistics of language use

To enhance our understanding of individual language choice in a bilingual society, the following section will review the following: language shift and maintenance, societal bilingualism, language choices available to bilinguals, code-switching and the complexities of language choice within as well as across domains, and the difference between additive and subtractive bilingualism.

a)Language shift

According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), there are various forces at work in a language planning activity. Some of these forces include: language death, language survival, language change, language revival, language contact and language shift. As this present study focuses on whether the SMC has caused dialect speakers in the sample community to discard dialects and switch to Mandarin, it is important to review the concept of language shift and language maintenance.

Fishman (1991:1) defines language shift as,

...speech communities whose native languages are threatened because their intergenerational continuity is progressing negatively, with fewer and fewer users (speakers, readers and writers).

By this definition, there is implication that language exposed to shift is threatened. However, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) feel that language shift is not necessarily threatening to the continued existence of a language as there may be various causes for shift. Holmes (2001) outlines several factors contributing to language shift: economic, social, political and demographic. According to Holmes, the social and economic goals of individuals in a community are very important in accounting for the speed of shift. Rapid shift occurs when people are anxious to 'get on' in a society where knowledge of the second language is a prerequisite for success. The shift to another language may be due to greater employment opportunities offered by that language. In addition, demographic factors are also relevant in accounting for the speed of language shift. Resistance to language shift tends to last longer in rural than in urban areas. This is because rural groups tend to be isolated from the centres of political power longer, and they can meet most of their social needs in the ethnic or minority language.

b)Language maintenance

According to Kapan and Baldauf (1997), language maintenance occurs in two contexts: community language maintenance and dominant language maintenance. Community language maintenance occurs when a community language is threatened with extinction, or when a dominant language requires some effort at maintenance to prevent significant language drift away from the standard model. Language maintenance efforts have been

directed at the preservation of a large number of indigenous languages having limited numbers of speakers in North America, Africa, Europe and Australia.

Dominant language maintenance occurs when there is a need to prevent a language from diverging excessively from some mutually agreed upon standard. This is the case of English in some countries where English is taught by some non-native speakers whose pronunciation and grammar are likely to be non-native.

Although the study of language maintenance and shift is recognized as a field of systematic inquiry, it is often studied in relation to bilingualism. In the following section, I will review some important concepts of bilingualism and explain the language choices available to bilinguals.

c) Societal Bilingualism

Societal bilingualism refers to bilingualism in a given society. Various definitions of bilingualism have been developed by scholars. A comprehensive definition of bilingalism is offered by Williams and Snipper (1990:33) who define bilingualism as 'a person's ability to process two languages.'

There are also other definitions of bilingualism but in most definitions, the question of 'competence' often arises. Baker (1996:7) states that

> Simple categorisation is arbitrary and requires a value judgement about the minimal competence needed to achieve a label of bilingual.

In Singapore, bilingualism in essence refers to language competence in English and one of the officially recognized mother tongues (Mandarin, Tamil, or Malay). Effective bilingualism is realized through the educational agency. More details on Singapore bilingualism will be discussed in Chapter Three.

There are two important concepts associated with bilingualism: Additive and Subtractive bilingualism.Lambert (1983) attempts to explain how an ethnolinguistic community is affected by the selection of languages when members in it become bilingual. He coined two terms that succinctly summarise the potential and negative aspects of the bilingual experience: additive bilingualism and subtractive bilingualism.

Additive bilingualism occurs when the linguistic preference enriches people's language experience and bilingualism is associated with accomplishments and positive feelings. Residents within the community may be privileged simply by their membership in a prestigious ethnolinguistic group. Members of this group have an enormous advantage in that they can simply add a second socially relevant language to their repertoire of skills with no need for concern that this would lead to lower standards of the higher prestige language.

On the other hand, subtractive bilingualism is associated with feelings of inferiority or punishment. This occurs when members within some ethnolinguistic minority groups, because of national educational policies and social pressures, are forced to "subtract out" of their basic language in order to develop minimal competence in a national or prestigious international language. For these people, the state of their bilingualism is likely to reflect some degree of subtraction of the basic language and its cultural accompaniments, coupled with an attempt to substitute a new language as the vernacular.

d) Language choices in bilingual communities

In most bilingual communities, people are required to choose a particular code when they speak. There are numerous factors that can affect language choice: participants, situation, content of discourse and functions of interactions (Grosjean: 1982).The language choice in a bilingual society is also determined by the domain of language use. Spolsky (1998:46) defines domain as

> An empirically determined cluster consisting of a location, a set of role relationships, and a set of topics.

However, Holmes (1992) points out that it is simplistic to assume that language choice is determined merely by the domain of language use. There are also other social factors that affect language choice such as the social distance between participants, the content of discourse and the functions of interactions (Grosjean:1982).

In addition, code-switching may also occur within each domain of language use. Code switiching may be defined as "the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation" (Grosjean: 1982:145). When interacting with each other, participants in a bilingual society may decide to mix codes within an utterance resulting in code-switching. According to Wardhaugh (2002), there are various reasons why a speaker decides to switch code. Some of these include solidarity, accommodation to listeners, choice of topic and perceived social and cultural distance.

Having reviewed some important concepts in the sociolinguistics of language use, I will discuss language planning by government.

2.2. Language planning: work of government

Fishman (1989) ascribes language planning to the work of a government by suggesting that language planning may be viewed from the societal approach, one that points 'in societal directions' and deals with the authoritative allocation of resources to the attainment of language status and language corpus goals. Weinstein (1980) explicitly attributes language planning to the efforts by a government authority by explicitly stating that language planning is a government authorized, long-term, sustained, and conscious effort to alter a language's function in a society.

Jernudd and Gupta (1971) conceive language planning as a political and administrative activity by a government for the good of society. As suggested by Jernudd and Gupta (1971: xx):

> Our understanding of language planning implies that decision-makers choose a satisfactory, or even optimal course of action but within limits of given amounts of resources and only in order to reach the goals that has been approved by the political authority. They aspire to find effective solutions to their planning tasks.

Goals of language planning by government

According to Ager (2001), government involvement in language planning is motivated by three reasons :

(a) language is regarded as a right

(b) language is regarded as a resource

(c) language is regarded as a problem

Jernudd and Gupta (1971: 196) explain the need for governmental intervention in language planning by stating that language is recognised as a societal resource. According to Ager (2001), language, particularly the ability to use many languages can represent a major and economic and competitive resource. Thus, there is a need for the government to coordinate the planning of language as a resource for societal development.

In addition, language planning by government is also motivated by problems in language use. According to Fishman (1974), language planning is the pursuit of solutions at the national level.

However, Kaplan and Baldauf observe that some of the problems that language planning is intended to solve are rather complex, ranging from a desire to modernise a language so that it can deal with the vast technological changes that are occurring, to a desire to standardise a language, often with the underlying political motivation to achieve unification.

However, Christian (1994) states that language problems cannot be solved by merely attending to language as

> the alternatives from among which language planning choices have to be made are embedded in the social, economic and political context in which (planners) function.(Christian : 1994: 195).

By framing language planning in the context of decision-making by government authority, there is an implicit assumption that language is a valuable resource and hence necessitates planning by the government. However, not all scholars agree that government involvement in language planning will necessarily lead to social and political progress.

Edwards (1994) states that it may be simplistic to assume that the government, acting in a political context, always knows what is best for the people. He explains that language planning is not an isolated or decontextualised exercise, nor is it necessarily one intended to result in the greatest good for the greatest number. He argues that:

> If we accept that language planning involves the selection and codification of a language variety, followed by its implementation and elaboration, then we should realize that selection and implementation are usually dependent upon powerful policy makers who are, themselves susceptible to political and economic forces of the broadest kind (Edwards 1994: 189).

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) also object to the view that language planning by government will necessarily lead to social progress as they observe that most of the traditional

participants in language planning come from people with power and authority who make language related decisions for groups, often with little or no consultation with the ultimate language users and learners. Bloomaert (1996) observes that language policies and practices usually develop within the context of a set of deep and far ranging ideological presuppositions, and thus are never purely rational, economic or benevolent choices by government. He states that a comprehensive understanding of language decisions and processes can therefore only be achieved if the ideological rationales behind the policies are critically deconstructed and engaged with. Krishna and Abiodun (2002) specify four typical ideologies that may motivate actual decision-making by the government in language planning in any given society. These include linguistic assimilation, linguistic pluralism, vernaculation and internationalism.

Linguistic assimilation is the learning of the dominant language. This is best illustrated in the learning of English in the USA although the constitution does not specify an official language. Linguistic pluralism is the coexistence of different languages. Switzerland employs German, French, Italian and Romansch. On the other hand, vernacularisation is the restoration or elaboration of an indigenous language and its subsequent adoption as an official language. Hebrew in Israel is a case. Internationalism is the adoption of a non-indigenous language of wider communication for the purposes of education and trade. An example is English in Singapore (Krishna and Abiodun: 2002:243). Most of the above language activities couched in the context of ideology are rather broad in scope. The government generally has the power to legislate and the ability to foster incentives to enforce planning decisions.

Most of the discussions on language planning are usually made in the context of older and traditional nations. As the research context for this study is Singapore, a relatively young and independent nation, it is necessary to examine language planning by government in new and emerging states.

2. 3. Language planning by government in new and emerging states

In the late twentieth century, most governments in newly independent nations engaged in language planning. For example, the governments of most of the newly independent states of Sub-Saharan Africa got involved in language planning at the moment of independence. This is because their colonial master had left them with a legacy of linguistically heterogenous population which was generally under-educated. In addition, there is also a widespread use of the language of the former colonial power by the population.

Spolsky (2004) states that in a newly independent nation, there is a concern for the establishment of nationalism, and this is implemented through language planning. Wright (2004) states that the language needs of new nations founded in the wake of decolonization brought about a renewal of interest in the strategy and philosophy of nation building.

Language planning was used by the government as a mobilizing force resulting in the promotion of a national language. The national language takes on an important role in the nation building process as it has a utilitarian role and helps to promote cohesion, allowing the nation to develop a shared culture. For example, governments in countries such as Tanzania and Indonesia instigated language planning to convert the 'nation' to the national language after gaining independence from their colonial masters. Some formal language activities included codification, standardization and elaboration.

However Wright (2004:70) admits that:

> finding the one language that will purportedly promote unity and solidarity with the state was not a simple task. The heterogeneity of the populations presented no simple indigenous solution. In some states, there were literally hundreds of different languages.

In addition there is a need to standardize the orthography, lexicon and syntax of the language chosen. Language planning also involves lexical elaboration and enrichment programmes so that the language could be used in a variety of sectors characteristics of the modern world. However, Bamgbose (1994) observes that there is a mistaken belief that the introduction of

'one people, one language, one state' will achieve socio-cultural cohesion and political unity in multilingual societies.

The process of globalization has also shaped language planning in the new and emerging countries. As a result of globalization, the choice of a language is not dictated by a local planning authority, but by forces outside the control of national political makers. As observed by Kachru (1994:42),

> The spread of English in the various domains is not necessarily planned; it is often 'invisible and 'unplanned'. The invisible and unplanned channels are contributing more to the diffusion and functional range of English than are the planned strategies.

Thus, governments assigning the functions to the varieties of language available in a nation's speech repertoire will experience difficulties as not only do languages and varieties of languages undergo change, but human beings constantly make choices in their use of languages or varieties of languages available to them. In the following section, I will discuss forces at work against government intervention in language planning.

2.4. Forces against government intervention in language planning

Wright (2004) states that there are forces at work that may undermine the efforts of the government in language planning. In the following section, I will discuss two forces that hinder language planning by the government: globalization and 'invisible language planning'. The discussions will include forces at work in language planning activity in Singapore.

Wright (2004) states that language planning policy initiated by any government or central authority is subjected to external influences. Global market forces may induce changes in official language policy initiated by the government. Wright states that where there is pre-eminence in philosophy, literature, science, technology and so on within a speech community, the desire to gain access to the knowledge, motivates speakers of other languages to acquire the necessary language competence voluntarily. In addition, Wright also believes that if the acquisition of the prestige language is sufficiently widespread, it becomes a scholarly lingua franca and permits circulation of ideas. Languages may become the lingua

franca of knowledge even when the political and economic preeminence or the belief systems that encouraged them have been eclipsed, as was the case of Latin which continued as the major language of knowledge for centuries after the fall of the Roman Empire. Another instance is Australia, a traditionally English-speaking country, where the government has recently moved away from its monolingual policy to embrace a strong support for languages other than English (LOTE) due to the emergence of Australian markets in Asia.

Parallel to language planning at the official level, another societal force against governmental intervention in language planning has been categorized by Pakir (1994:164) as 'invisible language planning.' According to Pakir, 'invisible language planning' may arise out of a particular situation and may alter the language eco-system making it more difficult for the government to develop accurate and effective planning strategies. She states that 'invisible language planning' is believed to be in progress when individuals interfere non-deliberately with planned changes to the systems of a language code (Pakir: 1994:165).

The individuals identified by Pakir are parents, children and teachers. Pakir cites the example of language planning in Singapore and states that it is the parents, and not the government, which are ultimately responsible for linguistic assimilation. She observes that there has been a recent show of pride in the indigenization of English in Singapore and an increasing confidence among users in the value of SCE. She observes that although formal English is being used in the classrooms, it is being dropped for SCE in spontaneous interaction processes such as in the homes or in peer group interactions. The language planners have given birth to a new breed of Singaporeans who see English as their language, but not the kind of English envisaged by the policy makers. This discrepancy between the official plans and the sociolinguistic reality leads Pakir (1994: 168) to the strong metalinguistic claim that in a multilingual situation, 'real planning can only take place in an invisible manner'. Invisible language planning thus calls into question the very generally accepted view that language planning is deliberate language change. There is a large body of literature on invisible planning in the Singapore context, although this is not the focus of this present study.

However, Pakir's concept of 'invisible language planning' does suggest that language planning by the government should also take into consideration individuals' decisions in language use. As Tollferson (1991:36) suggests:

> Language involves both the code and its use - the person's language and the person. Unlike most other resources, all language change involves real people living in history and organized into groups according to symbols, roles and ideologies that may not correspond to the economic logic of cost or benefit.

To a great extent, I agree with Tollferson that the individual decisions in linguistic choice are important in language planning. More often than not, language is more than an expression of personality and individuality. The individuals may resist the language planning efforts by governmental authority.

2. 5. Two perspectives to language planning: the macrosociological and the microlinguistic

Having discussed two forces at work in language planning, the following section will discuss two approaches to language planning by the government. In the literature of language planning, there are two perspectives to language planning: the macrosociological and the microlinguistic.

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997: xi) view language planning from the macrosociological perspective by defining it as the :
body of ideas, laws and regulations, change rules, beliefs and practices intended to achieve a planned change (or to stop change from happening) in the language use in one or more communities.

Some of the macrosociological goals of language planning include:

> language purification, language revival, language reform, language standardization, language spread, lexical modernization, terminological unification and language maintenance (Kaplan and Baldauf: 1997: 59).

Some of these goals are ideals (language reforms) or objectives (stylistic simplification); others are more specific targets (language standardization). According to Ager (2001), many macrosociological goals of language planning are carried out to reach rather abstract purposes which may be related to national policy goals.

Kuo and Jernudd (1994:83) suggest that

> the macrosociological perspective is indicative of a societal approach on language management that constitutes a highly organized systemic correction of an entire language for both actual and potential users of the language in a national society.

According to Kuo and Jernudd, belief in language planning as a guiding ideology justifies the need for the government to intervene in domains of language communication in a proactive fashion. 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 planning.

There are also other scholars who adopt a microlinguistic approach to language planning. The microlinguistic perspective on language planning, on the other hand, constitutes correction of inadequacies that are noted by individuals in their own discourses, and does require that language problems have already occurred in discourse to create a demand for language planning (Jernudd and Neustupny :1987). Neustupny (1994) points out that because this approach explores the link between individual conduct in discourse and group behavior in communication, this approach is also micro-sociologically oriented.

Pakir (1994) proposes that changes in language planning need to come to terms with the changes at the grass root level and language planning must take into consideration the individual's adjustments of language in discourse, including language acquisition and use in response to language changes brought about by macro-level planning. However, such an approach to language planning is not without any flaws. This approach to language planning

fails to explain how, and under what conditions, language- planning decisions will bring about a linguistic change and instead, posits the notion of natural language change.

Ricento suggests that micro-level research (the sociolinguistics of language) will need to be integrated with macro-level investigations (the sociolinguistics of society) to provide a more complete explanation for language behaviour. He states that researchers need to address some important questions in language planning:

> Why do individuals opt to use (or cease to use) particular languages and varieties for specified functions in different domains, and how do those choices influence- and how are they influenced by- institutional language policy decisions-making? (Ricento :2000:208)

However, Kuo and Jernudd (1994) state that both the micro-linguistic and the macro-sociological approach are complementary to each other in the context of language planning in Singapore.

Although the government intends to change the linguistic habits of the population through a macrosociological perspective of language planning, it is important to realize that certain conditions must exist for a certain language to survive in any linguistic ecology:

(a)Parents must be willing and able to transmit the language to their offspring and must actually do so.

(b)No condition may exist which will cause a more powerful language to be imposed on a less powerful one and functional registers must be retained.

(c)The community of speakers must be vibrant, stable or expanding
(Kaplan and Baldauf :1997: 308).

2.6. Language Planning and language management

Having discussed the two perspectives to language planning, the following section will discuss language planning in the context of language management by the government.

Most theories of language planning have concentrated exclusively on solving language problems and failed to consider language planning in the more general context of language management. According to Spolsky (2004:11), language management refers:

> to the formulation and proclamation of an explicit plan or policy, usually but not necessarily written in a formal document about language use.

However Spolsky states that the existence of an explicit policy does not guarantee that language management will be implemented, nor does implementation guarantee success. He explains that language management efforts may go beyond or contradict the set of beliefs and values that underlie a community's use of language and the actual practice of language use.

On the other hand, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:207) view language management as an activity in operation as they state that:

> language management applies to the totality of some operation (of a very diverse nature) which allows for the specific realization of some defined operation in a particular setting.

According to Kaplan and Baldauf, language planning can be taken to be an aspect of language management as it represents a shift of focus from the concern with finding optimal strategies for government-initiated action, to an interest in explaining how individuals manage language in communication, and uses this as the starting point for community-wide management.

However, Ricento (2000) cautions that language planning conceived as language management is bound to fail as he believes that there are many countless and uncontrollable variables involved, and that there are also difficulties in evaluating the effectiveness of policies. He argues that language planning should focus on the status and relations of speech

communities in defined contexts, to explain why a language had a particular status and the consequences of this status for individuals and the communities. This is because the status and utility of a language, as well as its viability in the short or long term is correlated with the social and economic status of its speakers or suitability for modernization (Ricento:2000: 202).

2.7. Language policies that arise from language planning

This section will discuss the two types of language policies that arise from language planning by government: status planning and corpus planning. Spolsky (2004) states that language-planning policies are:

> clear-cut labeled statements in official documents as in a clause in a national constitution, or a language law, or a cabinet document of an administrative regulation.

Krishna and Abiodun (2002) state that language policy issues have been driven by an interest in how the languages or varieties of languages in a nation's speech repertoire function. According to Ager (2001), language policies may be implemented by individuals in government who have power and authority to implement language planning policies. Some of these individuals include politicians, rulers and opinion-formers who implement language policies based on their own ideologies, preferences and likings. For instance, individuals such as Margarate Thatcher and Adolf Hitler implemented changes in language policies in their respective countries based on a personal view of what should be done. A minister with particular interests in language policies can also exercise considerable influence.

In most theoretical discussion of language policies, a distinction is usually made between the area of status planning and corpus planning. Spolsky (2004:1) defines 'status planning' as the appropriate use for a named variety of language, while 'corpus planning' refers to the choices to be made of specific linguistic elements whenever the language is used. However, Spolsky's definition of status planning fails to situate status planning in the context of decision-making and the implementation by a government. Fishman (1977:36) is more specific and refers to status planning as:

governmental policy decisions concerning the choice of language for different purposes within a country, or a region, as well as the various implementation (enforcing, motivating, influencing) steps taken to support the policy that has been affected.

According to Noss (1994), there are two kinds of conflicts in status planning:

(1) The economic forces that tend to favour foreign or international languages over national indigenous ones, as opposed to social considerations that argue for reversing this emphasis;
(2) The cultural, religious and political forces that foster rivalry between the national language and other indigenous languages – especially the provincial, urban, regional or classical languages of the country (Noss: 1994: 14-15).

Another language policy derived from language planning is corpus planning. Kaplan and Bauldauf (1997) observe that both corpus and status planning are virtually inseparable as any change in the character of a language is likely to result in a change in the use environment, and any change in the use environment is likely to induce a change in the character of a language. Wardhaugh (1998) defines corpus planning as an attempt to seek to develop a language or a variety of language for the purpose of standardization and to provide it with the means for serving every possible language function. According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), corpus-planning is defined as those aspects of language planning which are primarily linguistic. Some of the goals in corpus planning include orthographic innovation (including design, harmonization, change of script and spelling reform), pronunciation, changes in language structure, vocabulary expansion, simplification of registers, style and preparation of language material (Kaplan and Baldauf: 1997: 38).

However, Noss (1994) observes that governments that adopt a new form of language through corpus planning may experience problems in implementing the corpus policy as the oral and written versions of the "same" language often do not match up well, and there are lexial gaps that cannot be anticipated in advance. In addition, corpus decisions cannot be merely announced. They have to be accepted by the people who use the language for communication.

2. 8. Implementation of language planning policy by government: the top-down approach

Having reviewed language-planning policy by language planners, I now proceed to discuss the implementation of language planning policy. According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), most traditional language planning by government has been implemented using the 'top-down' approach, which involves decision-making at the national level, and governments solving complex problems as their axiomatic point of departure. However, Wright (2004) reports that language planning scholars stretched along a continuum of opinion from those who believed that a decision could be taken centrally and imposed top-down through education to those who began to wonder if language practice could greatly be influenced at all.

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) argue that language planning by government must ultimately serve the needs of the community. Otherwise, they will not meet the conditions just enunciated for that language plan to survive. Kaplan and Baldauf believe that no amount of language planning can 'force people' to change their linguistic habit as whatever the language policies are put in place in any country, the ultimate planners are the people themselves (Kaplan and Bauldaf: 1997:150). Kaplan and Baldauf cite examples of micro-planning that involve the individuals such as politicians, powerful community leaders, bureaucrats, consultants and language experts (Kaplan and Bauldaf: 1997:198) For example, in much of Malayan history, language planners were mainly individuals and communities making their own language decisions. The increasingly frequent examples of micro planning show that the planning must implicate the entire structure, and must centrally derive its authority from the community of speakers.

I agree with Kaplan and Baldauf that language planning must ultimately satisfy the interests of the community or it will not meet the conditions just enunciated for that language plan to survive. If we view language planning as a very large-scale activity affecting many individuals in many different communities, it will be absurd to think that language planning can be conducted top-down through the government or a central authority. The whole language planning process should involve a range of academic specialists and the

communities of speakers of all the language and varieties involved. I agree with Tan (1998) that the top-down approach to language planning may be problematic, as the government is merely seen as an authority who decides who uses what language code and when it should be used. Rubin (1994) also states that literature on social and urban planning has suggested that people should not be conceived as targets in language planning. Their reception to change is dependent to some extent on their participation and perception of what the change is and whether the change is appropriate to their needs and lifestyle. Having explained the top-down approach to the implementation of language planning, the following section will discuss the evaluation of language planning.

2.9. Evaluation of language planning

As mentioned in Chapter One, the aim of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the SMC within a sample community. Thus this section will discuss the literature on the evaluation of language planning.

As mentioned in Chapter One, very little evaluation of language planning activities has been conducted and published. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) state that that the literature on language planning is almost silent on the matter of evaluation. However, they also suggest that evaluation is important both in terms of the initial planning or fact-finding phases, to gather information so that appropriate selection decisions can be made, and in the context of its implementation as well as in execution of the plan. They believe that:

> evaluation should occur at every stage of the language planning processes. It should start at the policy development stage and the various stages of the plan should be monitored and checked against reality. Without formal evaluation, the evidence is hearsay and one cannot be sure whether the goals are being reached. Finally having implemented a language-planning policy, questions arise such as: How well is the policy implemented and to what extent? How successful is the implementation? (Kaplan and Baldauf:1997:91).

These questions suggest the need for some means of formal evaluation or assessment of the policy. Noss (1994) also believes that evaluation is necessary and conceives language

planning as a process whereby some authority coordinates and formulates policies on the identification and codification of the language varieties concerned. Subsequently the authority implements these policies and evaluates its implementation.

Alderson and Beretta (1992: 289-9) sums up the importance of language planning evaluation:

> ...they are intended to serve practical ends, to inform decision makers as to the appropriate course of action, and above all to be useful and to be used. In assessing the outcome of specific strategies, evaluation can help establish what the projected outcome is, what the perceived outcome is, what the actual outcome is and what weights are given to each. These may all influence subsequent policy and strategy decisions (Rubin and Jernudd: 1971:228).

Brown (1995:226-34) states that evaluation can be either summative or formative. He states that macro language planning evaluation is almost formative, as programmes are under development for long periods of time and any evaluation, by definition, seeks to improve the programme. Formative evaluation may be used to decide whether to continue or discontinue a particular language activity. However, summative evaluations can also occur at particular points in time which may lead to a shift in emphasis or a change in some goals. This study hopes to provide a summative evaluation of the SMC to enable the government to change their strategies to respond to problems that may emerge as the language planning is being implemented.

2.10. Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed government involvement in language planning. We have seen how language is perceived as a societal resource and thus necessitates government intervention in the management of language resources. We have also examined the various goals of language planning by government. However not all scholars agree that language planning by government is necessarily viewed as an objective and neutral activity for the good of society. Some language planning practices by government may be motivated by ideology. Some of these include linguistic assimilation, linguistic pluralism, vernacularisation and internationalism. We have discussed how globalization and invisible language planning by individuals may interfere in language planning by government. In addition, we have

discussed the macrosociological and microlinguistic approach to language planning. There is a suggestion by some scholars (Ricento : 2000; Kuo and Jernudd: 1994) that both the micro-linguistic (the sociolinguistics of language) and the macrosociological approach (the sociolinguistics of society) need to be integrated and are complementary to each other in language planning. We have also discussed the top-down approach adopted by government in the implementation of language planning policies. However, some scholars (Kaplan and Baldauf) argue that no amount of language planning by government can force the individuals to change their linguistic habits. Finally, formal evaluation of language planning is necessary to ensure goals are reached. Having discussed language planning in the context of government involvement, it is important to examine the context in which language planning is implemented. Thus the following chapter will discuss the research context for the implementation of the SMC.

CHAPTER THREE

SINGAPORE : THE CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the SMC is a deliberate language planning initiative undertaken by the Singapore government to persuade dialect-speakers to adopt Mandarin as a language of use and preference. The objective of this study is to assess the effectiveness of the SMC in changing the language use and attitudes of members within a church community in favour of Mandarin. Bokhorst-Heng (1998) states that as language planning is timely and society-specific, any inquiry into the practices of language planning requires an awareness of the peculiar and historical context in which the language planning measures emerged and were implemented, and the sociopolitical effects of these policies. Thus, it is necessary to discuss the peculiar and historical context in which the language planning measures were implemented (Bokhorst-Heng:1998).

The aim of this chapter, then, is to provide the contextual background of this study. It will first describe the sociopolitical background of Singapore. Next, it will discuss the sociolinguistic situation in Singapore. It will also describe the language planning policies adopted by the government. The focus of the discussion will be on the multilingual and bilingual policies and the ways in which these two policies have evolved and changed, and how they led to the implementation of the SMC. In addition, the importance of English in the linguistic ecology of the Chinese community will also be discussed in the review of the language policies.

3.1. The sociopolitical background of Singapore

Singapore is a small island (633 square km) state located at the tip of the Malay peninsula. With a population of 4 425 720 (Leow: 2000), it is a young country of many races whose forefathers are from Southeast Asia, China, India and the European countries. According to the census in 2000, the four main races in Singapore are the Chinese (76.5%), the Malays (15%), the Indians (6.5%) and Others (2%) which include Eurasians and guest workers from the region as well as from English speaking countries. Singapore's racial diversity can be

traced to immigration trends that formed as a result of colonial commercial practices. When Singapore was founded by the British colonial administrator, Stamford Raffles in 1819, it was a fishing village with about a hundred residents living on the island. However, the strategic location of Singapore as a trading port was recognised by Stamford Raffles who leased it from the Sultan of Johore in 1819. It was later a part of the Straits Settlements (a collection of Malay states) from 1867-1942, and soon it rose from a humble village to a great trading port. As a result of Singapore's increased economic and trading activity, a lot of merchants, entrepreneurs and indentured labourers from regions as diverse as China, India, Malaya and parts of Southeast Asia began to settle in the country. This led to the development of a population characterized by multiracialism, multiculturalism and multilingualism (Bokhorst-Heng, 1998). In 1959, Singapore achieved self-government and was led by the Peoples Action Party (PAP) under the leadership of Lee Kuan Yew. Since self-government, the PAP has run the parliamentary democracy in Singapore as a tight and well-ordered society with little or no opposition being tolerated. Singapore has become a commercial entreport for commerce and finance, and has one of the highest standards of living in Asia after Japan and Brunei (Kaplan and Baldauf: 2003:123). Having outlined the sociopolitical background of Singapore, the following section will provide an overview of the sociolinguistic situation in Singapore.

3. 2. The sociolinguistic situation in Singapore

As mentioned before, Singapore has been a place of settlement for many ethnic groups around the region since its founding as a great trading port by Stamford Raffles. As a result, its racial composition has changed tremendously. The 2000 census lists the three main ethnic groups in Singapore: Chinese, Malays and Indians. Each ethnic group has been ascribed an official mother tongue by the government. Thus the official mother tongue of the Malays is Malay, the Chinese-Mandarin and the Indians-Tamil. These three languages are also accorded the status of official languages in Singapore to grant linguistic and cultural recognition to the multi-ethnic population (Tan: 1998). Students in Singapore are required to master two official languages, that is, English and one of the ethnic mother tongue. In school, English is learnt as a "First Language," while the ethnic mother tongue is learnt as a "Second Language". The official working language is English (Bokhort-Heng: 1998). However, the

English that is used in Singapore is different from the Standard English spoken by native speakers in the United Kingdom. It is an informal type of English known as Singapore Colloquial English (also known as Singlish). Pakir (1994) observes that although Standard Singapore English is used among the higher educated Singaporeans, Singlish is increasingly foregrounded in the consciousness of other English users in Singapore.

The dominant ethnic group is the Chinese who comprise not more than 76% of the Singapore resident population (Lee: 2001:1). Although the Chinese in Singapore form a large demographic majority, they are far from being culturally or linguistically homogenous.
Singapore's Chinese residents were the descendants of immigrants from coastal southeastern China, an area of much linguistic and subcultural variation. The migrants spoke various mutually unintelligible Chinese languages, each of which contained numerous regional dialects. The major dialects in Singapore include : Hokkien, Teochiu, Cantonese, Hainanese, Hakka, Hokchiu, Henghua and Sam Kiang.

Acording to Cheng (1985), the various Chinese dialects differ primarily in phonology, secondarily in lexicon, and least in grammatical structure. Singaporean usage, however, following the common Chinese tendency to assert cultural unity, referred to mutually unintelligible speech systems as "dialects." All the Chinese languages and dialects shared common origins and grammatical structures. There is no written form of dialects (except Cantonese which has a written form). The primary divisions in the immigrant Chinese population therefore followed linguistic lines, dividing the populace into segments that were called dialect communities, speech groups, or even "tribes". At public places, linguistic difficulties arising from different dialects can be rather serious especially for illiterate dialect speakers who stay at one place and have little contact with other dialect speakers. However,most dialect speakers can speak another dialect besides his/her own native dialect.

Having outlined the sociolinguistic situation in Singapore, the following section will provide an overview of language planning in Singapore.

3.3. Language Planning in Singapore

In Singapore, language planning is subsumed as an integral part of national development, serving the needs of nation building, and closely inter-connected with other planning activities (Chua: 1995). Chua states that in Singapore, a pragmatic approach to language planning has developed where much of governmental thinking and decision-making is motivated by and justified as economic instrumental rationality. Thus economic growth is perceived by the government as tantamount to the viability of nationhood and that virtually all policy action is considered in economic terms, including language (Bokhorst-Heng: 1998). Ho and Alsagoff (1998:202) also observe that in Singapore, language choices are dictated by forces of the marketplace. However, as compared to other countries, language planning in Singapore represents a case of centralized planning without a central language-planning agency. Centralised planning implies a top-down approach in decision making and implementation. As reported by Kuo and Jernudd (1994), decisions on language policy, adjustment measures and their implementation are made in the cabinet, parliament and relevant ministries. The political leaders articulate the rationale of major policy decisions, 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 (Kuo and Jernudd:1994).

Kuo and Jernudd (1994) and Gopinanthan (1998) define language planning in Singapore as approaches to language management. They state that the basic strategy adopted by the government for dealing with linguistic diversity in Singapore is to treat language as resources and to engineer language development to targeted needs. Gopinathan (1994) explains that through language management, the government has sought to refine the policies and develop systematic rationales for language roles in the domains of home, school, social occasions and the economy. However, Kuo and Jernudd (1994) admit that Singaporean language planning practice has allowed a gap to develop between the macro-level implementation of language norms and micro-level observation and evaluation of language use. In pursuing the macro-level implementation, individual difficulties in accommodating to the linguistic policies may not have been given the attention they deserve.

The following section will discuss two major language-planning policies adopted by the Singapore government: the Multilingual and the Bilingual Policy.

3.4. The Multilingual Policy

As mentioned earlier, Singapore is a multilingual society where a multiplicity of languages is spoken. However, from the perceptions of the government, language diversity is problematic. Kuo and Jernudd (1994:87) explain why language diversity is problematic in Singapore in the following way:

(a) Linguistic identity is associated with ethnic and cultural identity. Language loyalty could lead to inter-ethnic conflict when the functional status or sentimental values of one's own ethnic language are at stake.
(b) Language diversity weakens communicative integration and generally implies inefficiency in the management of economy and polity which hinder the social, economic and political development of the nation.

In response to such perceived problems, the government adopted a pragmatic approach to language planning in Singapore. A policy of multilingualism was developed resulting in the Republic of Singapore Independence Act of 1965 which decreed that Malay, Mandarin, Tamil and English shall be the four official languages in Singapore. Gopinathan (1998) explains that the strategy of multilingualism has been the adoption of a policy of equal treatment which requires that the languages of the different racial groups be formally given equivalent status. As a result, the entire population is officially constituted into four units of equal status: Chinese, Malays, Indians and 'Others' (Eurasians, etc.). The multilingual policy also entails reconceptualising the internally heterogeneous communities as each definable in terms of one single language, paired with one associated culture (Ho and Alsagoff: 1998). Thus intra-group differences among the Chinese, Malay and Indians were radically reduced by the installation of a single language; each for the 'Chinese', the 'Malays,' and the 'Indians' (Clammer : 1985).

Under the multilingual policy, English was accorded the status of an official language as it is the language of technology and economic development. Although English is the language of former colonial rule, the use of English has been defended as a necessity for its utility in science and technology, i.e. essential to economic development from the early years of Singapore's independence. This view was expressed by the then Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew:

> The deliberate stifling of language (English) which gives access to superior technology can be damaging beyond repair. Sometimes this is done to elevate the status of the indigenous language as much as to take away the supposed advantage a minority in society deemed to have because that minority has already formed a greater competence in the foreign language. This is most damaging. It is tantamount to blinding the next generation to the knowledge of the advanced countries (Bokhorst-Heng: 1988:298).

On the other hand, the ethnic [5]mother tongue was decreed by the government to give Singaporeans an anchor in their cultural traditions so as to avoid the excesses of Westernization and to prevent deculturalisation. Administratively, through language planning, the entire population of Singapore is officially constituted into four units of equal status, that of Chinese, Malays and Indians and 'Others' (Eurasians, etc.), each with a designated mother tongue: Chinese (Mandarin), Malay and Tamil (Ho and Alsagoff: 1998:210).

Although Kuo and Jernudd (1994) agree that the policy of multilingualism does serve the government's goal of establishing equality of all languages, in reality, not all languages are prescribed equality. Pakir (1994) states that English is the premier language in Singapore as government administration, banking, business, law and accountancy are all conducted through the medium of English. In addition, English is the only compulsory language of education, and its status in school is that of First Language, as opposed to the Second Language status delegated to the others. Bokhorst-Heng (1998) observes that in Singapore, English plays a role at three levels: at the national level, English is the pragmatic choice to meet the government's larger economic objectives, at the community level, English is seen to be the obvious choice for inter-ethnic communication and at the individual level, English is important for employment opportunities. In addition, English has been accorded the status of the language of wider communication as it is:

[5] Mother tongue- In Singapore, Chinese (Mandarin), Malay and Tamil are officially designated as the 'mother tongues' of the Chinese, Malay and Indian communities respectively. For an individual, this means that regardles of what language(s) may actually have been spoken in early childhood, the ethnic group of a child's father determines which language is officially assigned to its 'mother tongue'.

the language of government bureaucracy, the language of the courts, the language of international trade, the language of science and technology and the language of business. English is presented as available to all (Bokhort-Heng: 1998:299).

As a result, the popularity of English soared and it has become a dominant language in Singapore.

3.5. The Bilingual Policy

However, the unbridled dominance of English as an official and administrative language has been a cause of concern for the nation. Chua (1995) reported that by the late 1970s, several cultural consequences of the dominance of English were revealed. While English proficiency granted Singaporeans greater economic access to global opportunities, it also created problems for the nation. This was expressed in the words of former President Wee Kim Wee:

> Singapore is wide open to external influences. Millions of foreign visitors pass through our country each year. Books, magazines, tapes and television programmes pour into Singapore every day. Most are from the developed West. The overwhelming bulk is in English. Because of universal English education, a new generation of Singaporeans absorbs their contents immediately without translating or filtering. This openness has made us a cosmopolitan people, and put us in close touch with new ideas and technologies from abroad. But it has also exposed us to alien lifestyles and values (Ho and Alsagoff: 1998:203).

Chua (1995) reported that some of the undesirable Western lifestyle brought about through the dominance of English include drug abuse, sexual permissiveness and political liberalism. In response to the dominance of English, the Singapore government thus promoted:

> the learning of the mother tongue to give students an anchor in their ethnic and cultural traditions, thus avoiding the excesses of westernization and hopefully preventing deculturalisation (Gopinanthan: 1998:21)

A policy of bilingualism was implemented and made compulsory in schools in 1966. The policy was succinctly explained by the former Minister for Education, Dr Tony Tan Keng Yam:

> Our policy on bilingualism – that each child should learn English and the mother tongue - I regard as a fundamental feature of our education system. Children must learn English so that they will have a window to the knowledge, technology and expertise of the modern world. They must know their mother tongue to enable them to understand what makes us what we are today. (Lee: 1983:43)

The implementation of the bilingual policy makes it mandatory for all students in Singapore to study English as a 'first language' and ethnic Chinese students to study Mandarin, their supposed 'mother-tongue,' as a second language. Chiew (1980:238) reported that the imposition of the policy was based on two political objectives. Firstly, the English component in bilingualism is seen as a means towards facilitating interethnic interaction in order to break down communal exclusiveness and to foster a Singaporean identity. Secondly, bilingualism is expected to reduce the inequalities of occupational achievement between the English-educated and the disadvantaged vernacular-educated.

However, the definition of bilingualism is specific to Singapore as it is defined by the government as 'proficiency in English and one other official language' (Pakir:1994: 159). The bilingual policy made English the lingua franca of Singapore, giving the policy the name 'English-knowing bilingualism' (Kachru:1983:42). In essence, the bilingual policy is based on a functional 'division of labour' between languages (Kuo and Jernudd:1994: 30). In Singapore's official terminology, English is a 'working language' while the other official mother tongue caters to the ethno-cultural needs of the three respective ethnic communities, Chinese, Malay and Indian. The mother tongues are a demarcation and embodiment of culture, each serving to re-ethnicise and consolidate separate ethnic communities and acting as a cultural ballast against undesirable Western influences (Rubdy: 2005). In addition, the government stressed the critical importance of the community language-cultural link, while deploring the modern Western baggage that was associated with English,no matter how important that language might be for access to science and technology (Kaplan and Baldauf:2003). Several measures were undertaken by the government to launch the bilingual

education policy. Chinese, Malay and Indian medium schools were required to study their 'mother tongue' community language (Kaplan and Baldauf:2003).

Gopinathan (1998:21) reports that school bilingualism was implemented by a series of detailed guidelines involving exposure time, subject-language matching, examinations and attainment requirements. Television programmes in dialects were replaced by Mandarin to better reflect official policy requirements. Even the counter staff in government departments was deployed to promote Mandarin usage.

However, Teo (2004a) observes that although Mandarin has been decreed by the government as the mother tongue of the Chinese under the multilingual policy, it is not the language first learnt and usually spoken by all Chinese in Singapore. An individual Chinese may speak dialects or English as his/her first language. However, the push for all Chinese Singaporeans to learn and use Mandarin as part of the bilingual policy was given despite the fact that not all Chinese Singaporeans agree with the government that Mandarin is their mother tongue. Although the bilingual policy aimed to give greater emphasis to the mother tongue, most Chinese adopted English as a language of use and preference. As observed by Pakir (1994), English is being used increasingly in the day-to-day interaction between interlocutors who are Chinese in Singapore. English is also the medium of instruction in all schools and the preference for English education implies that the majority of the children will be shifting their preferred language to English, which would become the dominant language in later years. English is also being spoken most frequently in the homes of many school children.
By the late 1970s, it was obvious that the bilingual education policy was not succeeding and the 1978 Goh Report (the most explicit and authoritative critique of Singapore's language policies) concluded that the bilingual education had not had the desired impact. The key findings as they relate to bilingualism were:

(a) Low literacy. At least 25 percent of the Primary 6 population did not attain minimum literacy levels. For early secondary school leavers in the armed forces, only 11 percent of recruits were able to handle English competently.

(b) Between 1975 and 1977, 62 percent of those who sat for the Primary School Leaving Examination and 66 percent of those who sat for the GCE "O" Level Examination failed in either the first or second language.

(c) Students fared badly in Chinese examinations, reading of Chinese books and newspapers.

(d) Various strategies devised to improve language levels were found to be ineffective (Gopinathan: 1998:23).

The principal finding of the Goh Report was that too much was being demanded of too many in terms of language competence. The achievement of the bilingual educational policy was described by its initiator, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, as "patchy and uneven" (Shepherd: 2003:60). Lee observed that effective bilingualism, in the sense of being able to speak, read and write in two languages, was being achieved by only three to five percent of school students. The expectations of the authorities and the aspirations of parents were high and students were not able to cope with the complexities of speaking two school languages. As reported by Kaplan and Baldauf (2003:131), the bilingual policy was a failure as students found it very difficult to learn two languages proficiently, especially when 85 percent of them came from dialect-speaking homes where Mandarin was not spoken. Ang (1998) also observed that although a dialect might help school children to learn Mandarin, having to cope in three languages was hurting students' English performance. The policy of bilingualism being propagated in the schools was undermined by the various languages spoken by students outside schools which included Malay and Chinese dialects.

The failure of the bilingualism policy was also attributed to the attitudes of Chinese Singaporeans towards Mandarin. Ho and Alsagoff (1998) report that in the matter of language attitudes, there are signs of linguistic and cultural discrimination against the Chinese language. As stated by Ho and Alsagoff (1998:205):

> Because English has a great deal more status and prestige than any of the vernaculars in Singapore, it is not uncommon for members of the English-speaking elite to show a negative attitude towards the vernaculars and their users. A case in point is their prejudices against Chinese language.

Similarly, Shepherd (2003) observes that in Singapore, the position of English as the working language seems unassailable, given the ever-increasing trend of globalization and the advent

of the Internet. It would simply not be viable to substitute Chinese for English. Wee (1990) observes that for the local Chinese to embrace Mandarin would mean to identify oneself with a community with less power economically, socially and politically. It also means adopting a less prestigious language (Mandarin) over a prestigious one (English). Mr Ho Kwon Ping, an influential English-speaking Chinese Singaporean, observes that it is the perception of the superiority of English language and culture that underlies an negative attitude towards Chinese-ness. He states that the English-educated elite or intelligentsia tends to see Mandarin as a second-class language which they speak only at hawker stalls (Mandarin: The Chinese Connection: 2000, p23).

Ho also feels that as long as English continues to expand in the linguistic ecology of Singapore, most Chinese will prefer to associate themselves with English and not Mandarin as their linguistic choice. Since language use is a personal preference, any deliberate interference by the government through the bilingual policy may not necessary result in more Chinese learning and speaking Mandarin. Thus the younger generation of Chinese will be reluctant to shift their language habit in favour of Mandarin due to their more individualist orientation in language choice.

Thus, the popularity of English far surpasses Mandarin in Singapore. However, this does not rule out the possibility of Mandarin existing side by side with English in the near future, as the economic benefits of learning Mandarin with regard to business ventures in China is gradually drummed into the consciousness of Singaporeans.

3.6. Conclusion

This chapter provides the contextual background for the present study. In particular, it focuses on the language policies that gave rise to the SMC. We have seen that under the multilingual policy, English has been designated the official working and administrative language in Singapore. As a result, English has become the dominant language in Singapore. However, the Singaporean government perceived the dominance of English as problematic. English has been accused of leading Chinese Singaporeans to undesirable Western influences such as drug abuse and moral decay. In order to counteract the influences of these undesirable Western influences, the mother tongue was given more emphasis in schools to

curb the erosion of Chinese cultural values as a result of the dominance of English. Thus the government implemented the bilingual educational policy in schools. Under the bilingual policy, it was mandatory for all students to study English as 'first language' and Mandarin or the mother tongue as a 'second language'.

However, the policy of bilingualism propagated in schools was undermined by the speaking of Chinese dialects and other languages outside the schools. As Mandarin was being promoted as the cultural carrier for Chinese, it was necessary for Chinese students to speak Mandarin at home. The following chapter will provide greater details on the organization and implementation of the SMC.

CHAPTER FOUR

REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON THE SPEAK MANDARIN CAMPAIGN (SMC)

As mentioned in Chapter Three, the SMC was a result of the failure of the bilingual policy. The continual use of dialects hinders the learning of Mandarin in schools. As a result, the then Prime Minister, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, kickstarted the SMC in 1979 by proclaiming that within five years, the campaign aimed to make all young Chinese, especially those in schools, university and who have just finished school or university to discard the use of Chinese dialects and speak Mandarin instead. The aim of this chapter is to review the literature on the SMC. I will first explain the organization of the SMC and then describe the measures undertaken by the government to implement it. Next, I will examine some critiques by academicians on the goals and strategies adopted in the implementation of the campaign. A conclusion will be provided at the end of the chapter.

4.1. Organisation of the SMC

When the SMC was first launched in 1979, it was spearheaded by the then Ministry of Communication and Information (later renamed the Ministry of Information and the Arts). The promotion of the SMC also involved various grassroot organizations such as Citizens' Consulative Committees and their Advisors, the Community Centre Management Committees, Residents' Committee and Chinese civic/clan organizations. In addition, various organizations in the media such as the Chinese newspaper, Lianhe Zaobao, the Redifusion (S) Pte Ltd (a private broadcasting station), Singapore Broadcasting Corporation, Singapore News and Publication Ltd and The Straits Times (1975) Ltd. were also involved in the promotion of the campaign.

There was also participation from private organizations and statutory boards such as the Educational Publications Bureau Pte Ltd, Esso Singapore Pte Ltd, National Trade Union Congress, Singapore Bus Service Ltd, Singapore Chinese Chamber of Commerce Foundation and Singapore Federation of Chinese Clan Associations. Other organizations included various ministries from the public sector such as the Chinese Language and Research Centre,

the Hawkers Department, the Ministry of the Environment, the Ministry of Education, the People's Association and the Public Utilities Board.

The Speak Mandarin Campaign is implemented through a secretariat in the Ministry of Communications and Information (currently known as the Ministry of Information and the Arts). The Ministry of Communications and Information coordinated the campaign in close cooperation with other governmental agencies such as the Ministry of Education, as well as with the media, community organizations and interests groups (Kuo and Jernudd : 1988). Decisions on the SMC are often articulated by political leaders, particularly the Prime Minister himself and other reporting of ministerial statements of language policies first appear as detailed in press releases (Bokhorst-Heng : 1998).

In addition, a Committee to Promote the Use of Mandarin was also established to implement the campaign at the grassroots level. The Committee to Promote the Use of Mandarin works with secretariat support from the Ministry of Communications and Information. The members included public figures holding key positions in society such as politicians, Members of Parliament, professionals as well as high ranking officers in the public and private sector (A decade of Mandarin: 1989, p4-6).

4.2. Implementation of the SMC

Having explained the organization of the SMC, the following section will review the various strategies adopted by the Singaporean Government to promote the campaign.

Since 1979, the SMC has spawned a number of measures in a vigorous attempt at generating awareness among the public of the need to promote Mandarin. In this section, I will review the various strategies adopted by the Singapore government to persuade dialect-speakers to discard the use of dialects and adopt Mandarin as a language of habitual use and preference.

In the first phase of the campaign, from 1979 to 1989, the main strategy adopted by the SMC was to phase out Chinese dialects in Singapore. Dialect programmes over radio, TV and Rediffusion were phased out, except for some news broadcasts on radio and Rediffusion for those who did not understand Mandarin. The aim was to persuade Chinese Singaporeans to

discard dialects and to speak Mandarin so that they could better understand and appreciate their culture and heritage. Various slogans were used in the campaign messages to encourage the Chinese community in Singapore to use Mandarin instead of Chinese dialects. For example, in 1979, the campaign slogan was, "Speak More Mandarin and Less Dialect." In 1983, the campaign targeted at markets and food centers with the slogan, "Mandarin's In. Dialect's Out." Other campaign slogans to eradicate Chinese dialects in the Chinese community included, "Start with Mandarin, not Dialect (1986)," "Better with more Mandarin, less Dialect," and "More Mandarin, Less Dialect. Make it a way of life (1989)" (AA decade of Mandarin: 1988, p3).

In addition, all mass media were involved in the implementation of the SMC throughout the years. Mandarin lessons were broadcasted over radio and television. Mandarin lessons were also published in local newspapers. There was also the transmission of the Dial for Mandarin lessons daily on a 24-hour basis by phone during the campaign month. Ministries and statutory boards also deployed sufficient numbers of Mandarin-speaking officers to replace those ethnic officers who did not speak Mandarin at public counters. In addition, Hanyu Pinyin names, instead of dialect transliterations in English for Chinese children, were used in the textbooks as well as in schools (Ang: 1998). There were also publicity materials to promote the campaign and they included posters, stickers, hanging mobiles, leaflets, badges, bookmarks, calendars, campaign song sheets, cassette tapes, T-shirts, TV commercials, advertisements on buses and in newspaper and roadside banners. (Mandarin: The Chinese Connection: 2000).

The campaign also targeted specific places. For example in 1983, the SMC was promoted in hawker centres and in the markets (PuruShotam: 1998). The rationale for this extension was the need to use Mandarin as a tool in nation building, to strengthen cultural cohesiveness and to support the cultural identity of Chinese Singaporeans (Kaplan and Baldauf: 2003). Visits were also made by Members of Parliament (MP) and members of grassroots organizations such as the Citizens Consulative Committees, Community Centre Management Committees and Resident Committees to the markets and hawker centres to distribute publicity materials and encourage the Chinese community to speak Mandarin instead of dialects.

Other administrative measures were also adopted by the government to promote the use of Mandarin in government offices. The government has increased the number of Mandarin-speaking officers to replace the ethnic Chinese officers at public counters who do not speak Mandarin and also Chinese officers have been asked to stop using dialects during duty hours when dealing with the Chinese-speaking public, whenever possible. There is also the introduction of dialect transliteration in English for food items on signboards, new companies and businesses, new HDB towns and street names, private estate and building names, new-born Chinese babies' names and identity cards of children aged 12 on first registration (A decade of Mandarin,1989, p4-6).

The following is a summary of the focus of the SMC in the first ten years of the campaign since its launch in 1979:

1979 - Launch of the first SMC. It called on the dialect-speaking Chinese community to speak Mandarin instead of dialects.

1982 – The SMC sought to promote Mandarin at the workplace. Chinese civil servants who could not speak Mandarin attended Mandarin classes.

1983 – The SMC sought to promote Mandarin in the wet markets and food centres.

1984 – The SMC focused on Chinese parents.

1985 – The SMC focused on public transport workers.

1986 – The SMC focused on the food and drinks establishment.

1987 – The SMC focused on shopping centres.

1989 – The campaign targarted at the Chinese community in general.

(Mandarin: The Chinese Connection, 2000, p185-186)

The campaign was reported to be successful in urging dialect-speakers to speak Mandarin. The percentage of Chinese households where Mandarin was spoken rose sharply from 13.1% in 1980 to 30 % in 1990. During the same period, the use of Chinese dialects in Chinese households fell sharply in use from 76.2% to 48.2% (Anon, 2000, p132).

4.3. Critiques of the official arguments of the SMC

However, since the launch of the SMC, there have been several critiques of the official arguments as well as the strategies adopted by the government in promoting the campaign. The following section will discuss some of the critiques of the SMC by academicians on the three official arguments for the SMC: the educational, cultural and communicative argument.

According to the educational argument, the speaking of dialects at home hinder the learning of Mandarin in schools. The Singapore language policy regarding Chinese dialects was that Chinese dialects will have no place in the education system. There will be decreasing availability of them in the media and increasing exhortations not to use Chinese dialects (Pakir: 1994). The goal was that dialects are to be eliminated within ten years. However, Newman (1988:441) points out that one major problem with the educational argument is the assumed subservience of the society at large to the demands of the education system, leading to a conflict between an established pattern of behaviour in society (the use of dialect) and the education policy. Newman argues that the solution being advanced is not to tailor the education policy to suit society, but to transform society so that education policy can be made effective.

Another issue of contention in the educational argument revolves around the mother tongue. In Singapore, one's officially allocated 'dialect group' normally corresponds to the paternal ancestral language, although it does not necessarily correspond to the individual's personal experience. However the SMC promotes Mandarin as the official mother tongue of all Chinese in Singapore. Gupta (1998) observes that Mandarin, the mother tongue ascribed by the government, corresponds neither to the individual's childhood languages, nor to the individual's ancestral language. This is because a majority of Singapore Chinese are descendants of immigrants from Southern China, and hence many Chinese will naturally embrace the Southern Chinese dialects such as Hokkien, Teochew, Cantonese and Hainanese as their mother tongue. It is the Southern Chinese dialects that most local Chinese use in their daily lives. Thus, Gupta argues that the government's definition of the mother tongue differs from the linguists', where the mother tongue is the language a child learns before learning any other language.

The communicative argument put forward as another reason for the implementation of the SMC. The government launched the SMC believing that it would foster the use of Mandarin as a media of interdialect communication within the Chinese community. The government perceived that there were too many dialect groups in Singapore which hinder communication among the Chinese. Dr Ow Chin Hock (then Parliamentary Secretary for Culture) explained the problem of a diversified Chinese community:

In Singapore's context, there is no such thing as a Chinese language. Eighty six percent of the Chinese speak dialects-not one dialect but twelve dialects. There is no such thing as a common language in the Chinese community. Unlike in Hongkong, where there is one dominant dialect, Cantonese, there is no lingua franca among Singaporean Chinese (Asiaweek: 1980:38).

However, Newman (1988) questions whether a common language is needed to facilitate communication among the Chinese in Singapore. According to Newman, it is wrong to assume that Chinese Singaporeans who speak different dialects are unable to communicate effectively with each other. This is because many, probably most, Singapore Chinese who claim the ability to speak a dialect would also have some competence in one dialect or another (Newman: 1988:443). Thus Newman argues that the verbal repertoire of a Chinese is not restricted to one particular Chinese dialect. Platt (1980) studied the verbal repertoire of Chinese Singaporeans and discovered that a Singapore Chinese can speak various dialects listed as follows:

(1) His/her own native Chinese dialect spoken at home
(2) The dominant Chinese dialect (Hokkien)
(3) One or more additional Chinese dialects

Platt's study suggests that it would be wrong to assume that when two Singapore Chinese meet, they would not be able to communicate if they speak different dialects. In addition, besides Chinese dialects, some individual Chinese may be relatively versatile in English and Malay (based on their educational and socioeconomic backgrounds).

It must be noted that for the elderly Chinese Singaporeans, dialects are still used in the private domains of language use (Xu et al :1998). The older generation of Singaporeans continues to communicate in Chinese dialects. Zhang (1993) assessed the impact of the SMC

on elderly Chinese Singaporeans. His study highlighted that the phasing out of Chinese dialect TV programmes and the problem of communication with their English/Mandarin grandchildren had hurt the interest of the elderly Chinese.

Chua (2004) also states that dialects are still an important communication tool for politicians during election time. In certain parts of Singapore, such as in Hougang, in the Northeastern part of Singapore, the Teochew dialect is still widely used resulting in a Teochew speaking community, and in the local Chinatown, the Cantonese dialect is still used among the Chinese forming a Cantonese-speaking community. Lee (2001) reported that the Cantonese dialect still remains the most commonly used language at home among Chinese in the dialect community. The Singapore government must have understood the importance of dialects in the local Chinese community, as dialects are still used in election campaigns.

There was also disagreement with the cultural argument that the SMC will enable Chinese Singaporeans to retain their Chinese cultural heritage to counter-balance the effects of Westernisation and the dominance of English (Bokhort-Heng: 1998). In an article, Eastern versus Western values, (The Straits Time, 1992, p3), a member of Parliament, Walter Woon points out that the Eastern versus Western values debate is 'sterile' and 'dangerously simple-minded.' Woon argued that there can be both good and bad things in every culture, and Singapore, being a cosmopolitan society, is in a position to pick the best from both East and West. The real question is how to promote good values while suppressing bad ones.

Newman (1988) also casts doubt on the cultural argument for Mandarin by questioning whether one must be literate in Mandarin in order to preserve Chinese value systems. Although Newman recognises that a full appreciation of Chinese 'high culture' may only come about if one is literate in Modern Chinese, he argues that this does not apply to the 'low culture' of everyday life. Newman also feels that one does not need to be literate in Mandarin in order to understand and practise Chinese values such as filial piety, habits of thrift or respect for authority. All other dialects except Cantonese have no written forms. Chiew (1980) observes that cultural change in Singapore takes place mainly at the institutional level, through the school, family, or mass media and not through a language. The individual Chinese acquires Chinese values and norms more from the school, the family and from the community. Thus both Newman and Chiew state that it is questionable whether the Chinese community in Singapore needs Mandarin in order to acquire Chinese values. This is because

the traditional values that most Chinese in Singapore are familiar with are still very much rooted in the customs and practices that are dialect-based. Kuo (1985:160) argues that

> In Singapore, a great part of Chinese cultural traditions and values are associated with and transmitted through the use of dialects and not Mandarin. He believes that a weakening of dialects may in fact mean the weakening of the cultural base.

A personal observation confirms that a majority of Chinese in Singapore still have affiliations with the Chinese dialects that provide them a sense of their Chinese identity. Within the Chinese community, dialects are still used in events such as birth rites, wedding and funeral customs, and these best find expression in the dialect. For most Chinese, losing the dialect will mean losing their Chinese roots. Obviously, this desire to affiliate with Chinese dialects is contrary to the SMC goal to eliminate dialects. Thus, not all Chinese agree with the government that speaking Mandarin will help them retain their Chinese cultural roots.

Some also feel that the suggestion by the government that English lacks cultural authenticity and legitimacy is highly debatable. Pakir (1994) reports that among the younger generation of Chinese, English is widely spoken and generally embraced as a language of habitual use and preference. Even today, the researcher observes that the younger generation of Chinese habitually embraces English as a language of use and preference. The younger Chinese generation will not be easily persuaded by the cultural argument that English is problematic in Singapore.

4.4. Resistance towards the SMC strategies

Shepherd (2003) reported that there was resistance by some local Chinese to the strategies adopted by the government to eliminate Chinese dialects within the Chinese community.
This is because a top-down approach was adopted in the implementation of the SMC. Decisions on language planning policies were made with little consultation with the Chinese community. For instance, in the initial stage of the campaign, the government adopted a drastic move to phase out TV programmes in Chinese dialects despite protests from the public. There was resentment by some dialect-speakers at the introduction of the requirement that most of the dialect programmes on radio and television should be dubbed in Mandarin.

The hardest hit by this measure were the elderly, many of whom spoke no Mandarin and who were often not willing or able to learn it at an advanced age (Tan: 1999).

In addition, there was also resistance of the codification of food items into [6]Hanyu Pinyin. The campaign secretariat compiled a list of Mandarin food items used in hawker centres and the wet markets. However, many of these items are of purely local origin with no previous Mandarin lexical precedent. As old habits die hard, many hawkers and customers simply did not use the Hanyu Pinyin when purchasing food (Kuo and Jernudd: 1988).

There was also resentment on the requirement that children starting school should be registered under the Pinyin version of the names, with the dialect form added in brackets. For instance, an individual Chinese with the name, "Ng Chin Leong" will be known as "Wu Qingliang" in Hanyu Pinyin. Hanyu Pinyin of personal names was systematically applied in schools and 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 used at home and among peers. As a result of the resistance by parents, this requirement was eventually rescinded in 1991 (Gopinanthan 1998:27).

In addition, the use of Mandarin in the workplace was conceived by some that the government was actively encouraging one segment of the population to communicate in a language that shut out the rest of the population (Tan: 1999). Ng (1981) studied the short-term impact of the SMC and stated that the campaign had evoked both positive and negative emotional reactions from the target and non-target groups in society. He pointed out that the attempts to promote Mandarin in the speech domains of shops and hawker centres are likely to escalate the aspirations of the Chinese-educated for increasing formal linguistic roles for Mandarin. However, Ng's study was written only slightly more than a year after the

[6] Hanyu Pinyin (拼音,, pīnyīn) literally means "join together sounds" (a less literal translation being "poeticized", "spell" or "transcription" in Chinese. It is a system of romanization (phonetic notation and transliteration to roman script) for Mandarin used in the People's Republic of China. Hanyu Pinyin was approved by the government 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 to facilitate the SMC.

implementation of the campaign, and did not study the long-term implications of the campaign.

4.5. Conclusion

This chapter provides a discussion on the organization and administrative measures undertaken by the Singapore government to promote the SMC. The approach adopted by the government has been top-down and the directives for the campaign stem from the Ministry of Communications and Information. The mass media play an important role in promoting the campaign. The main strategy adopted is the eradication of dialects within the Chinese community through the phasing out of dialect programmes over the mass media. However, not all Chinese agree to the strategy adopted. There was resentment by some dialect-speakers due to some strategies such as the dubbing of dialect TV programmes and the introduction of the Hanyu Pinyin.

There was also disagreement with the official arguments for the promotion of the campaign. One controversial issue is the promotion of Mandarin as the official mother tongue of all Chinese regardless of whether Mandarin is spoken in the homes of dialect-speakers. For some dialect-speakers (particularly the elderly), dialects represent their Chinese culture. For most elderly Chinese, the emotional attachment to their dialects remains strong.

While the official figures seem to proclaim unqualified success of the SMC in engineering a large-scale language shift in Singapore, there were relatively few reports on the actual perceptions and attitudes of individual dialect-speaker towards the campaign's goal, strategies and outcomes. The intent of this study is to probe beneath official statistics to examine the individual's use and attitudes of Mandarin. As mentioned in Chapter one, the two main methods of data collection for this study are the self-administered survey and the semi-structured interview. The following chapter will discuss the methodology for this study in greater detail.

CHAPTER FIVE

METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the SMC within a dialect-speaking community. In this chapter, a description of the research methodology used in this study is provided. First, I will locate this study within its research paradigm. Next, I will discuss the use of the case study as the research design and then proceed to give an account of the method of data collection through the self-administered survey questionnaire (SAS) and the semi-structured interview (SSI). I will then proceed to a discussion of the data analysis. This is followed by a description of the data management. A conclusion will be provided at the end of the chapter.

5.1. Research Paradigm: positivist versus interpretative

The present study involves an integration of the positivist and interpretive paradigms. In this section, I will review the positivist and the interpretative research paradigm.

The term 'positivism,' as stated by Cohen and Manion (1989:12), implies a particular stance concerning the social scientist as an observer of social reality and that the end-product of investigation can be formulated in terms of social reality. Some key features of the positivist paradigm include:

i. The world is external and objective

ii. The observer is independent

iii. Science is value free

iv. The focus is on facts and the search is for causality (Easterby-Smith et al, 1994:80)

The positivist research paradigm tends to favour the use of research tools such as experiments, surveys, censuses, formal interviews, written questionnaires, and often requires the use of quantitative measures and inferential statistical analysis.

On the other hand, the interpretive paradigm in research emphasizes that the subjective experience of the individual is important. It is the perception of the individual that bestows meaning, rather than there being any external objective meaning. This stems from the view that:

> the world and reality are not objective and exterior, but that they are socially constructed and given meaning by people (Easterby-Smith et al., 1994:76).

According to Cohen and Manion (1994:39), the interpretative paradigm, in contrast with its positivist counterpart, is characterized by a concern for the individual. The interpretative paradigm assumes that all human action is meaningful,

> and hence has to be interpreted and understood within the context of social practices. (Usher:1996:18)

Some key features of the interpretative paradigm include:

i. small scale research
ii. researcher is personally involved
iii. understanding action meanings rather than causes

(Cohen and Manion:1994:39)

Researchers in the interpretative paradigm often adopt a qualitative methodology, and tend to study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. It involves the use of a variety of approaches such as case studies, personal experiences, introspection, life stories, interviews, observations and visual texts.

This study will adopt both the qualitative and quantitative method of data collection. As mentioned in Chapter one, the objective of this study is to assess whether the SMC has been effective within a dialect-speaking church community.

To assess the extent the SMC has been effective within the researched community, this study will first examine whether Mandarin is adopted as a language of use and preference by individual dialect-speakers in the different domains such as family, friends, colleagues/classmates, hawker centres and shopping centres. Secondly, this study will also examine whether individual dialect-speakers have favourable attitudes towards Mandarin. In

addition, the attitudes of individual dialect-speakers towards Chinese dialects and English will also be examined and a comparison will then be made to assess whether Mandarin is the preferred language. Finally, the orientations of individual dialect-speakers towards the campaign's goals, strategies and outcomes will be studied to assess whether members within the sample community support the SMC. Having outlined the research design, the following section will discuss the case study as a research design.

5.2 The case study as a research design

The case study is adopted as the research design for this study. The purpose of the case study is to achieve a deeper analysis of a unit. For this study, the unit of inquiry is the SMC. As mentioned by Yin (1994), a case study is

> an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (Yin : 1994: 12) .

There are different types of case studies, used for different research purposes. Yin (1994) distinguishes three types of case studies:

a) Descriptive case studies- to produce detailed descriptions of a phenomenon

b) Explanatory case studies- to pose competing explanations for the same set of events and to indicate how such explanations may apply to other situations

c) Exploratory case studies- to evaluate a phenomenon.

This study is an exploratory case study framed in the context of an evaluation of the SMC.

However, although the case study is recognised as a distinctive form of empirical inquiry, its use in research endeavour has been rather controversial. There are basically two opposing views towards the use of case study as a research approach : those in favour and those that oppose.

Yin (1994:8) favours the case study as a research approach, and proposes that,

> the case study's unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence- documents, artifacts, interviews and observations - beyond what might be available in the conventional historical study.

Yin specifies that a case study is highly relevant as a research strategy when a "how" or "why" question is being asked about a contemporary set of events over which the investigator has little or no control. Mcdonough (1994) outlines the advantages of qualitative case study as 'user-friendly' research, particularly in the field of education. He states that case study is 'strong in reality.' and can form the archive of descriptive material available for reinterpretation by others.

However, there are also criticisms regarding the case study as a comprehensive research approach. Adelman et al (1983) state that although case study data are strong in reality, they are difficult to organise as they are down-to-earth. Hamel (1993:23) notes that as a research study, the case study has been faulted for:

a) its lack of representativeness of the case used as a point of observation for the social phenomenon or issue constituting the object of study;

b) its lack of rigour in the collection, construction and analysis of the empirical materials that give rise to this study. This lack of rigour is linked to the problem of bias. Such bias is introduced by the subjectivity of the researcher, as well as of the field informants on whom the researcher relies to get an understanding of the case under investigation.

As a result of the biasness of the investigator, Orum et al (1991) conclude that the case study can be at best be descriptive because it can invoke no more general principles than those supplied by its own data. Therefore the interpretations and claims of qualitative research are likely to be too unreliable to permit the construction of solid scientific evidence. However, Dimmock (2002) states that it is possible to generalise from qualitative case study research, if:

a) the case chosen is typical of the phenomenon,

b) a unit of analysis has been defined, a random sample with the unit of analysis can be sampled.

c) the responsibility for generalising is placed on the reader rather than the researcher.

Another criticism of the case study is that it fails to meet the conventional research criteria of external validity. Yin (1994:92) argues that the most important advantage of the case study research strategy is the use of multiple sources of evidence, which aid in the development of

converging lines of inquiry. With triangulation, the potential problem of construct validity is addressed, as the multiple use of evidence in case studies essentially provides multiple measures of the same phenomenon. External validity is achieved through the specification of theoretical relationships, from which generalisations can then be made.

Previous research on the use of case studies

As a qualitative approach to research, the case study has been used in various studies pertaining to various fields. As mentioned earlier, case studies have made use of both qualitative and quantitative methods. However, in this section, I will confine my discussion to past qualitative case studies in the field of language shift and language planning.

Gupta and Siew (1995) adopted the case study approach in their study of language shift in a Singapore Chinese family that had experienced language shift from Cantonese to English. The study was designed to examine the attitudes and societal pressures that resulted in the shift and to show how family members dealt with the discrepancies in language repertoire. The family was informed that their everyday conversation would be investigated. Gupta and Siew collected their data mainly through participant observation on the everyday speech pattern within family members. Through the case study approach, Gupta and Siew were able to gather a rich source of information on the language repertoires between members of different generations in the family. Li and Saravanan (1997) also used the case study approach to investigate a language shift in the Chinese community in Singapore. Their study was aimed at the Teochew Chinese community in Singapore, the second largest sub-group within the dominant Chinese community. Li and Saravanan adopted the case study to investigate the variations and change in language use within the family. Their study was conducted in a much larger scale, across seventeen families.

In addition to its use in family research pertaining to language use, the case study approach has also been used in language planning at the national level. One of the earliest case studies on language planning was conducted by Nah (1981). Nah adopted the case study approach to study the SMC from the perspective of language planning and communication planning. His research design was aimed primarily at describing the SMC rather than to test hypotheses. Nah collected his data for his study through interviews and the analysis of available documents to study the SMC in detail. The documents he gathered for analysis included

official records, reports and newspaper articles about the campaign. The strength of the case study is that data were collected through a variety of documents that would provide contextual completeness for the study.

Similarly, Lin (1995) also adopted the case study for a qualitative study on the SMC, but the focus of her study was on the success of the SMC as a persuasive form of communication in Singapore. Lin adopted the case study approach to achieve a closer analysis of the actual processes and operations of the SMC, and to identify the salient characteristics for its success. Lin gathered her data from in-depth interviews with campaign organisers and audience members, documentary information from newspapers, speeches made by Ministers, archival records of the SMC and publicity materials distributed during the campaign.

Besides the SMC, the case study approach has also been used to investigate other language planning policies. Kwok (1981) applied the case study to investigate the effects of a language planning policy in a school. Kwok adopted the case study approach for two reasons:

i. a micro-level case study on the execution of the campaign in one school would uncover the processes involved in the implementation of language planning and the subjective responses of members of the target population.

ii. the case study approach would allow a focused investigation into the interpenetration between goals, strategies and outcomes of the campaign and would help to contribute to the evaluation of language planning.

5.3. Method of Data collection

As mentioned earlier, this study involves an investigation of the use of Mandarin by individual dialect-speaking Chinese, and their attitudes towards the SMC. The instruments employed for the study include the self-administered survey (SAS) and the semi-structured interview (SSI). In the following section, I will discuss the use of the SAS. Next, I will explain the fieldwork procedure used in the pilot study. I will also describe the actual implementation of the SAS.

5.3.1. The self-administered survey questionnaire (SAS)

As stated by Ferguson (1971), the questionnaire is an efficient means of collecting sociolinguistic information from specific subpopulations. It has the advantage of acquiring information efficiently from a larger population as compared to the interview. For this study, the self-administered survey questionnaire (SAS) is the main tool used to assess whether the SMC has resulted in any changes in language use and attitudes in favour of Mandarin. The purpose of the SAS is to:

a) report the language choice of individual dialect-speakers in different domains of language use. This will reveal their use of Mandarin within the community.
b) examine the attitudes of individual dialect-speakers towards the status and function of Mandarin as well as their attitudes towards Chinese dialects and English. The findings will reveal whether members within the community have a favourable attitude towards the targeted language (Mandarin).
c) study the orientations of individual dialect-speakers towards the campaign. This will reveal whether they agree with the goals, strategies and outcomes of the SMC.

In the following section, I will describe the design of the SAS.

The SAS consists of three main parts. Part I of the SAS is aimed at gathering demographic information of the respondents. It consists of questions concerning the respondent's social class. However in Singapore, the concept of social class is highly complex and can be problematic as it consists of a number of variables such as educational attainment, income, type of occupation and type of residence, among others. For this study, educational attainment, type of occupation and resident type will be taken as indicators of the social class of respondents.

Part II of the SAS asks for information on the respondent's habitual language use in various domains such as family, work, personal and in the public domain. It consists of five questions that require respondents to report on their habitual language use in the family, and in other specific domains such as shopping centers and hawker centers. Questions asked were of a general nature as:

What language/dialects do you frequently use when communicating with your parents?

What language/dialects do you frequently use when talking to your colleagues?

Part III of the SAS is aimed at eliciting information from respondents on their:

i. perceptions on the functions of Mandarin
ii. attitudes towards Mandarin
iii. attitudes towards English and Chinese dialects
iv. attitudes towards the different language speakers
v. attitudes towards the learning of Mandarin

Part IV of the SAS is aimed at investigating the respondents' attitudes towards the strategies, goals and outcomes of the Speak Mandarin Campaign. (A copy of the final self-administered survey is provided in Appendix I)

To ensure some measure of evidence of content validity for the self-administered survey, the following measures were adopted:

i. the questions for this study were adopted from various studies of language use and language attitudes in Singapore. They included Kuo's (1985) assessment of the SMC, Xue et al. (1998) survey of language use and language attitudes in the Singapore Chinese community, and Kwok's (1981) case study of Speak Your School Languages Campaign.
ii. The nature, wording, sequence of questions and answer options were reviewed several times before the first draft was conceptualised. It was again reviewed by several researchers experienced in test construction in language teaching. Items that were considered to be unsuitable or irrelevant were removed, and new items were added. In addition, attention was also given to the length, the format, and the textual presentation of the questionnaire.
iii. A pilot study was conducted prior to the implementation of the survey to ensure that data on attitudes and opinions about the SMC could be elicited from informants.
iv. The Chinese survey questionnaire was checked thoroughly several times by a translator to ensure the accuracy of the translations. Before distributing the questionnaires to the respondents, the Chinese survey questionnaires were again checked by several native Mandarin speakers for grammatical accuracy.
v. To enhance the validity of the study, the procedures of an audit trail was also recorded.

vi. The 43 items were also randomized and arranged in a Likert-type scale. This technique has demonstrated that it produces highly reliable results (Summers et al: 1970, Nunnaly: 1978).

Internal Validity and reliability of the SAS

The value and significance of this study depended heavily on the validity of the measuring instrument and reliability of the data obtained through the survey questionnaire and the semi-structured interview. Hence, this section will describe the attempt made to validate the survey questionnaires. The most common goal of surveys is to measure attitudes. However, Weisberg et al. (1996:152) state that questions intended to measure attitudes may measure non-attitudes. Non-attitudes may be defined as responses by respondents to questions to which they have no genuine opinion or responses by respondents trying to be polite to the interviewer who is expecting an answer (Converse, 1964). Thus questions in the SAS are carefully designed to measure strong attitudes towards the SMC.

Weisberg et al. (1996:154) state that attitude strength may be measured in a number of ways. Respondents can be asked:

i. how important an issue is to them personally
ii. how knowledgeable they feel on the issue
iii. how certain they are of the opinion
iv. how much they have thought about the issue

In addition, respondents can also be given counterarguments to ensure consistency in their response (Sniderman et al.: 1996).

Sample population of the SAS

As mentioned in Chapter One, the aim of this study is to investigate the attitudes of individuals in the sampling community towards the SMC. Although a drawn sample of the population will allow sound generalization, information pertaining to particulars of church members was not available. As the aim of the SAS is not to generalize, but to study the language use and attitude of individual members within the community, convenience sampling was adopted. The participation of the SAS was voluntary and once members agreed to participate in the study, the SAS forms were distributed to them. The SAS was administered to 150 individual church members between the age of 12 to 70 who speak either

one or a combination of the various dialects such as Hokkien, Teochew, Cantonese, Hainanese and others. As mentioned in Chapter 1.3, the main difference between the sample community and other dialect-speaking communities is that it is a Christian community. In addition, members within the community speak a number of dialects compared to other communities where members speak one major dialect.

The implementation of the SAS

In the following section, I will provide a detailed account of the procedure used to distribute the survey questionnaire.

A pilot study was carried out before conducting the main questionnaire-survey. Due to the fact that the researcher is more proficient in English than Mandarin, the questionnaires were first constructed in English and later translated into Mandarin to cater to non-English speaking respondents. The pilot survey consisted of 43 questions, and the targeted time for respondents to complete the survey was about 10-15 minutes. The researcher first approached some members of the church community for participation in the pilot study. The researcher tried to include members from different age groups and different educational backgrounds. Once members agreed to be involved, they were given the pilot survey forms. Respondents were given a choice whether they want to respond in English or Mandarin. Out of the 15 respondents, 7 respondents answered the pilot survey in English while 8 respondents answered the pilot survey in Mandarin.

The feedback on the pilot survey questionnaire included both criticisms and positive comments. There was some criticism of the Chinese version of the survey questionnaires. A few respondents did not agree to the way some questions were phrased. Although the questionnaires were comprehensible to them, they felt some questions were phrased rather awkwardly. There were also problems with understanding the instructions in the survey questionnaires. An important finding in the pilot study was that some respondents indicated the frequent use of more than one language in the various domains (family, work and social etc.). In addition, several questions were identified by a few respondents as being hard to understand. However, most respondents agreed that the questions were generally easy to answer and they were able to complete the survey within 10 minutes.

The pilot survey questionnaire allowed the researcher to move towards answering the research questions and is geared towards examining the language use and attitudes of respondents towards Mandarin. With the comments and the answers from respondents, the format of the pilot survey questionnaires was modified for implementation among members in the sample community. In the following section, I will discuss the actual implementation of the self-administered survey questionnaire.

A letter was first written to the pastor of the researched church community to seek permission to conduct the study. After the nature of the research study had been clearly explained to the pastor, an announcement was made in the church to appeal for participation from church members. An announcement was also made in the Sunday class where younger church members were briefed on the study by the researcher. Once the members were aware of the study, permission to conduct the survey was then established through phone calls, emails or word of mouth. Having been a member of the church for a number of years, it was not difficult for me to gain acceptance and trust by the church members. Many members expressed their support and were willing to accede to my request to participate in the study.

The survey forms were first distributed to an individual church member, who then helped to re-distribute them to other members in his/her family and other church friends and peers. The completed survey forms were mainly collected by hand. However, some members sent their forms to the researcher's email address. The collection of the survey forms took three to four months.

To ensure internal validity and reliability, a number of samples were rejected. Samples with incomplete answers were also eliminated. In addition, the response for each question was also checked for consistency. The final survey collection from respondents was 126 out of the 150 questionnaires that were distributed. This constitutes a response rate of 84.6%. According to Babbie (1992), a response rate of 70% is considered very good for analysis.

Having explained the methodology for data collection through the SAS, in the following section, I will discuss the methodology for data collection through the SSI.

5.3.2. The semi-structured interview (SSI)

Besides the questionnaire survey, a semi-structured interview was also used to evaluate respondents' response to the SMC. The SSI has a structured overall framework and allows flexibility in changing the order of questions to facilitate an extensive follow-up of responses (Mcdonough and Mcdonough: 1997). At the same time, the SSI is able to achieve depth of information as it provides opportunity for the interviewer to probe and expand on the informants' responses (Hitchcock and Hughes: 1989). For this study, the SSI is used as a tool to obtain the views and opinions of dialect-speakers on the goals, strategies and outcomes of the SMC.

Sample population of the SSI

In the following section, I will describe the sampling procedure for the SSI.

As mentioned earlier, the aim of the SSI is to investigate the views of dialect-speaking Chinese individuals from different social classes towards the SMC. To ensure that the sample is not biased towards a certain age group or socio-economic backgrounds, purposive sampling was adopted for the selection of informants. The sample for the semi-structured interview includes individuals:

(a) from dialect-speaking homes, who speak a variety of dialects.
(b) from different socioeconomic and demographic characteristics.
(c) from different social backgrounds (age, sex, education medium and occupation) and those
(d) who are willing to participate in the study.

The pilot interview schedule consists of the following three parts:

a) The first part is aimed at eliciting information from the informants about their perceptions of the SMC. Informants were asked whether they are aware of the goals and their personal opinions of the SMC.
b) The second part seeks to investigate informants' opinions of the various strategies adopted by the SMC committee, and whether they agree with these strategies.

c) The third part asks for perceptions and opinions of informants on whether the campaign has achieved its goals.

Ensuring trustworthiness of the SSI

To achieve trustworthiness of the SSI, the following were carried out during the semi-structured interview:

(a) A piloted semi-structured interview was conducted.

(b) Field notes on the nature of the interview were made so that responses could be put in context. For instance, if the respondent seemed distracted, this would be recorded. If the respondent indicated difficulty in understanding question, the information was also recorded.

(c) Check questions and probes were added to the interviews to ensure that consistent responses were received as well as to clarify ambiguous information.

(d) Reporting style was adopted - The transcript was written in the first-person to allow readers to empathise with the views and feelings of informants.

(e) The interview comprised of a series of friendly, casual conversations and the interviewer was recognized as a conversational partner who asked and answered questions. Adopting an insider's perspective also enabled the interviewer to collect a number of 'volunteered' statements to enhance the validity of data collected.

(f) The semi-structured interview was constructed in the language most familiar to interviewees. Two colleagues from the People's Republic of China who are effectively bilingual in both English and Chinese, helped check the accuracy of the translation in the interview question. Besides English, Mandarin and Chinese dialects were used to increase the validity of the data collected. When conducting the interview in a dialect, a translator was present to verify the language used by informants.

(g) The trustworthiness of the semi-structured interview was further strengthened by the triangulation of data from the survey questionnaires.

There were also measures taken to enhance the reliability of the SSI. To further enhance the validity of the data collected, interviewees were also asked to explain their responses. Additional probings were also used in order to obtain a full reply. There were also extended probings to get interviewees to elaborate on what they have already answered in response to a given question (Berg: 2004:86).

Implementation of the piloted SSI

The pilot interview was conducted amongst four female and four male dialect-speaking Chinese between the ages of 18 to 65. All but two are working adults. Prior to conducting the interview, informants were briefed on the research purpose, the type of information to be elicited, and how the results of the piloted interview would be used. In addition, anonymity and confidentiality of information rendered was also guaranteed to informants. Each interview lasted between twenty to thirty minutes.

The aim of the pilot interview was to find out whether informants experienced any difficulties in understanding the interview questions, as well as to check the grammatical accuracy of the questions. In the following section, I will evaluate the effectiveness of the piloted interview schedule.

Part 1: Goals of the SMC

Overall, part one of the pilot interview schedule was effective as informants generally understood the questions. There was not much prompting by the interviewer. Most informants could understand the questions and were able to comment freely on the questions posed to them. However, there was a problem in the way questions were phrased in the second part of the SSI.

Part 2: Strategies of the SMC

The question, "Do you know what strategy has been used to encourage the Chinese community to speak Mandarin?" was not effective as one or two informants could not understand the meaning of 'strategy' in English. One informant responded to the question by stating that dialect-speaking Chinese were speaking too many dialects and if everybody learn dialect, then they won't communicate across their dialect groups. The informant did not mention the strategies adopted by the Singapore government to promote the SMC. Thus the word 'measure' was used instead.

Part 3 Outcome of the SMC

There were not many problems in part three of the interview schedule. However, some informants experienced difficulties in responding to the question,

"In your opinion, do you think many of your friends and colleagues/family members gave support to the SMC?"

The interviewer then realized that the phrase 'gave support' appeared vague to informants. More than half of the informants asked for clarification on that phrase. Thus the interviewer had to rephrase the question to,

"In your opinion, how many of your friends and colleagues/family members spoke Mandarin during the SMC?"

However, not all informants equated speaking Mandarin as a form of support for the campaign. Two informants felt it was not necessary for Chinese Singaporeans to show their support for the SMC by speaking Mandarin. The interviewer also encountered some problems while conducting the pilot interviews. For instance, initially, it was rather difficult to elicit the relevant information from some informants who did not understand some terms such as 'strategies'. The interviewer also made mistakes in formulating the questions and realized that wording questions in an interview can be tricky. On reflection, the interviewer discovered that interviewing is not a simple skill but it requires a lot of tact and sensitivity.

The final interview schedule is a revised version of the piloted interview schedule, which incorporated comments from colleagues in language research (A copy of the final interview schedule is provided in Appendix II). In the following section, I will describe the implementation of the SSI.

The researcher first approached an individual church member and explained the purpose of the SSI. After the church member had understood the nature of the study, the researcher asked for permission to conduct the SSI. The researcher also assured the church member that all information would be treated as confidential and anonymity would be guaranteed. After the church member had agreed to participate in the study, permission to tape the interview was also sought. Once the church member had agreed to the interview being taped, the researcher discussed the date, time and venue for the interview to be conducted.

At the appointed day and time, the researcher proceeded to conduct the interview. Most of the interviews were conducted at the home of the informant. However, some interviews were

conducted in church. After a few minutes of greetings and exchange, the researcher asked for permission to start the interview. Once the informant gave the approval, the interview began.

The SSI was conducted in the language or dialect preferred by the informant. Besides English and Mandarin, the researcher is functionally competent in the Cantonese and Hokkien dialect. However, for other dialects such as Teochew and Hainanese, an interpreter was used. The researcher had no difficulty in finding one as the church has a number of interpreters who are competent in both the Teochew and Hainanese dialects. The use of dialects was particularly important as it helped to promote greater willingness of dialect-speaking informants to share their views and personal opinions of the SMC spontaneously. As most informants had been briefed on the study, the researcher was able to establish effective communication and rapport with them quickly. The SSI comprised of a series of friendly and casual conversations and information was elicited in a non-threatening way resulting in data that were valid, rich and substantial. As permission for tape-recording the interview was sought prior to conducting the interview, there was no objection from informants for the interview to be tape-recorded.

However, there were some problems encountered by the researcher during the fieldwork. The major problem faced by the researcher was fixing interview appointments. As the informant is usually not available in the day, the researcher had to conduct the interview in the evening at the time stipulated by the informant. Some informants requested that the interview be conducted in the church premises. There were times when the appointment had to be cancelled as the informant was engaged in other activities and could not turn up for the interview. It was also quite difficult to interview the elderly as the researcher discovered that some were hard of hearing. When transcribing the data collected, there were occasions where the researcher had difficulty understanding certain words or phrases by the individual informant. The researcher had to listen to the tapes several times before he could comprehend the data. In addition, translating the data from dialects into English was also rather tedious and time-consuming. The researcher had to consult an interpreter particularly when certain expressions could only be understood in the cultural background of the dialect-speaker. However, on the whole, the interviews were conducted effectively and a lot of useful information pertaining to the personal opinions of informant was collected. Having described the method of data collection, the following section will explain the method of data analysis.

5.4. Data Analysis

In discussing the method for data analysis, I will first introduce the general approach to the analysis of the SAS and the SSI data.

As the aim of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of the SMC within a dialect-speaking church community, the data analysis was geared towards the following goals of the study:

a) Locating the general trends in the sample in the self-report of respondents in language use and language attitudes. The data analysis will help to assess whether Mandarin is used and whether there are positive attitudes towards Mandarin as a language.

b) Documenting individuals' orientations towards the SMC. In particular, the analysis was geared towards investigating whether the sample agree with the goals, strategies and outcomes of the campaign.

Analysis of the SAS

Data from the self-administered survey are analysed to investigate the following:

i. the most frequently use language by respondents with regards to Mandarin, English and Chinese dialects
ii. the domain distribution of the various languages or Chinese dialects
iii. the use of Mandarin within different social classes of the Chinese-dialect speaking community

In addition, the data from the SAS are also used to shed light on the attitudes of individual dialect-speakers towards the status and functions of Mandarin, attitudes towards Mandarin speakers, and attitudes towards English, Mandarin and Chinese dialects. Finally, the data are also used to investigate the perceptions of respondents towards the official arguments of the SMC as well as the goals, strategies and outcomes of the SMC.

SPSS version 12, a software package for conducting statistical analyses, was used to summarize data from the survey questionnaire. In the following section, I will discuss the analysis of the SSI data.

Analysis of the Semi-structured interview (SSI)

As mentioned earlier, the purpose of the SSI is to obtain insights on how informants perceive the SMC as well as to capture their subjective experiences of the campaign. The data from the SSI will be used to investigate the attitudes of informants towards the goals, strategies and outcomes of the SMC. In the following section, I will describe the specific procedures involved in the data analysis.

Data analysis for the present study underwent three levels of data transformation as suggested by Wolcott (1994): description, analysis and interpretation. In order to investigate the various attitudes of informants on the SMC, each interview was first translated into English and then described verbatim. Next, the data were described and open coding (Strauss 1987) was employed to categorize each transcript into three major themes:

a) attitudes of informants towards the goals of the SMC,

b) attitudes of informants towards the strategies adopted by the government, and

c) attitudes of informants on the outcome of the SMC.

Different colour codes were used for each theme. The attitude of informants towards the goals of the SMC was coded in red. The attitude of informants towards the strategies adopted by the government was coded in purple and the attitude of informants on the outcome of the SMC was coded in yellow.

The data were analysed based on the suggestions by Miles and Huberman (1994) and Strauss and Corbin (1990). It involves three concurrent stages of data analysis. The first phase involves editing, segmenting and summarizing of data. The second phase includes organizing and assembling of data. The third phase involves coding and memoing. I will elaborate on the analysis of data using coding and memoing in the following section.

(I) Coding - Coding is the first process in data analysis. Codes are labels placed on pieces of data; these may be single words, sentences or paragraphs. The purpose of assigning labels is to attach meaning to the data so that themes can be identified. In this study, two types of codes are used: descriptive and inferential codes. Descriptive codes are

early labels requiring little or no inference beyond the data itself, while inferential codes are interpretative and require some degrees of inference beyond data (Miles and Hubermann: 1994). Open Coding is the part of analysis that pertains specifically to the naming and categorizing of phenomena through a close examination of data. During open coding, the data are broken down into discrete parts, closely examined, and compared for similarities and differences. Questions are asked about the phenomena as reflected in the data (Strauss and Corbin:1990:62). Through open coding, the potential themes or categories are identified by pulling real examples from the text.

(II) Memoing is the second basic technique used to record relationships among themes. A memo is the theorizing write-up of ideas about codes and their relationships as they strike the analyst (Miles and Huberman 1994:206). Denzin and Lincoln (2000:783) suggest two types of memos that can be used in analyzing qualitative data: Substantive and Theoretical memos. Substantive memos suggest directions to take the coding further and deeper and Theoretical memos which helps move from the empirical to the conceptual.

In this study, theoretical memos are written to relate a category on the three themes pertaining to the goals of the SMC, strategies adopted by the government and the perception on the outcome of the SMC. A copy of the theoretical memos is attached as Appendix III.

The data are interpreted through "cautious analysis and probing into what is to be made of them" (Wolcott 1994:36). The social cultural and historical context of the SMC, the researcher's personal experience and knowledge and literature review of the SMC, and theories of language planning were also brought into the interpretation of the data. In the following section, I will explain the management of data.

5.5. Data Management

As suggested by Lofland and Lofland (1995), the first step in data analysis involves an establishment of some kind of filing system. By filing, Lofland and Lofland mean a physical means of maintaining and indexing coded data and sorting data into coded classification. There are two main processes involved in data management: formatting and indexing. In the following section, I will explain these two processes involved in data management.

a) Formatting

Each interview was tape recorded and listened to several times before it was translated and transcribed verbatim on paper. For interviews conducted through dialects, the recording of data was more tedious as the researcher had to listen to the taped interview several times before it was translated into English. At times, an interpreter was sought to decipher certain words or phrases by the informant, but on the whole, there was minimal attempt to enlist the help of an interpreter as the researcher was able to understand most of the information articulated by informants although they spoke in different dialects. The data were then stored as a word document file. Each file was given a name indicating the nature of the file and a reference number. For example, the file that contains the first transcript was named IM1. To ensure anonymity of informants, only the reference number was stated. Memos were written to record relationships among themes.

(b) Indexing

A systematic indexing procedure was adopted along the lines of Glaser and Berg (1980). Firstly, the informants' attitudes to the SMC were listed separately in several sheets of paper known as the index sheet. Each index sheet contains a code identifying the transcript in which it has been located and a brief verbatim (no more than a sentence). A typical index sheet is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1 Goals of the Speak Mandarin Campaign [Major theme]

Subthemes		
Encourage the speaking Of Mandarin #IM1	Facilitate communication among dialect speakers #IM5	Maintain cultural heritage #IM12

To ensure transparency, consistency-coherency and communicability of data, the interview audio tapes, transcripts, coding notes and memos are retained for confirmation by an independent auditor. In the following section, I will discuss the ethical considerations for the study.

5.6. Ethical considerations

There were ethical considerations in every stage of this study. Oppenheim (1993:83) states that a basic principle governing ethical considerations in research is that no harm should come to the informants as a result of their participation in the research. If for example, an informant has been upset by some of the questions in an interview, then the interview may have to be abandoned rather than risk upsetting the informant further. In this study, I was aware that language issue can be rather sensitive for some informants, and thus when framing questions for the SSI, great care was taken to ensure that questions posed do not embarrass the informants or put them in a bad light. As language use and attitudes can be a matter of personal choice and preference, I was also conscious of my potential to intrude and tried to avoid any form of intrusive questioning when interviewing informants.

The principle of obtaining informed consent is considered to be one of the most important ethical issues in educational research. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) define "informed consent" as receiving consent by the subject after having carefully and truthfully informing him about the research. For this study, I first sought the permission of the pastor of the church for permission to conduct the study after explaining the nature of the research project. Next, an announcement was made in church to explain to individual church members what the research is about, why it is being undertaken, and how it is to be disseminated.

Another major ethical issue in educational research is confidentiality. According to Berg (2004: 65),

> Confidentiality is an active attempt to remove from the research records any elements that might indicate the subjects' identities.

In this study, great care has been taken to ensure confidentiality of participants' identities.

5.7. Conclusion

In this chapter, I provided an account of the methodology involved in this study. I located my study within the positive and interpretative paradigm and explained the two principal methods of data collection : the survey questionnaire (SAS) and the semi-structured interview (SSI). The issue of validity and reliability for both methods of data collection was described and explained. In addition, the method of data analysis through coding and memoing was also discussed. The analysis of the data, based on Miles and Hubermman (1994)'s method, was also described.

However, the researcher does acknowledge some limitations in the methodology. It would be more effective if observation of language use in all domains of language use is carried out to triangulate data from the sociolinguistic survey and the semi-structured interview. However, in Singapore, language is a rather sensitive issue and is a matter of personal choice. The researcher is conscious of the intrusive potential of using observation data and participants involved in the study may feel uncomfortable knowing that they are being observed, and that their privacy is intruded upon. The method of participation observation was not used as the researcher feels that data collection may not reflect the natural language use of dialect speakers. However, it is still possible to include personal observation of language use in all domains if the researcher has developed a certain level of trust and rapport with the respondents.

In addition, the researcher also acknowledges the limitations of using 'snapshot' data in tracking diachronic change in language use of dialect speakers in the sample community. The SMC has undergone different phases since its implementation in 1979. Thus there may also be a shift in emphasis and a change in goals of the SMC in the near future. The collection of data for this study occurs at a particular point in time and reflects the views of dialect speakers at the point of data collection. The views of dialect speakers may change with changes in policy of the SMC. In the next chapter, I will discuss the findings of the SAS and the SSI.

CHAPTER SIX

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS : REPORTED LANGUAGE USE AND ATTITUDES

In Chapter Five, the research design, the method of data collection and the analysis for this study were discussed. To recapitulate, the objective of this present study is to provide empirical evidence on whether the SMC has resulted in individual members in the sample community switching to Mandarin. The self-administered survey (SAS) is one of the main instruments for data collection in this study. It is used to report the stated language choice of dialect-speakers in the different domains of language use, their attitudes towards the status and functions of Mandarin, English and the Chinese dialects, as well as their perceptions towards the SMC as a planned language effort. This chapter will discuss the results of the self-administered survey questionnaire (SAS).

6.1. Language use

The final sample of the SAS is 126. A profile of the survey respondents is provided in Appendix IV. The demographic distribution and the language background of the sample for the SAS are shown in Table 1 and 2.

Table 1 : Demographic Distribution of sample

	Percentage(%)
Sex	
Male	65%
Female	35%
Age	
12-20	19%
21-30	6%
31-60	51%
61 and above	24%
Occupation	
Student	22%
Professional and Managerial	19%
Administrative and Technical	9%
Clerical	3%
Sales and services	11%
Housewive	12%
Production and related workers	4%
Others	20%
Language medium of education	
English	47%
Chinese	53%
Residence Type	
HDB	69%
Condominium	20%
Terrace	6%
Semi-Detached	2%
Bungalow	2%
Others	1%

Table 2: Language spoken by survey respondents

Language	Percentage
English	5
Mandarin	21
Hokkien	5
Teochew	19
Cantonese	2
Hainanese	22
Others	26

As noted in Chapter One, the SMC was initiated in 1979 and the objective was to eliminate Chinese dialects and replace Mandarin in the linguistic habits of dialect-speakers. As the SMC has been in operation for more than two decades, it is necessary to investigate whether dialect-speakers within the researched community have switched to speaking Mandarin. Thus, a major aim of the SAS is to investigate whether the SMC has resulted in any change in language use of the individual dialect-speaker in various domains of language use as that of close friends, colleagues/classmates, parents, hawker centres and shopping centres. The domains of language use in the hawker and shopping centres were chosen because these are public domains and they were areas associated with high dialect usage prior to the launch of the SMC. The domains of close friends, colleagues/classmates and parents were chosen as these are private domains of language use.

In order to examine whether Mandarin has replaced dialects, this section will compare the linguistic preference of respondents' in the various domains of language use.

Q1 to Q5 of the SAS were designed to compare respondents' use of Mandarin within the following five domains of language use:

i. Parents
ii. Close Friends

iii. Colleagues/classmates

iv. Hawker centers

v. Shopping centers

Table 3 below is a summary of the 5 questions of the SAS. The figures (in percentage) show the proportion of respondents using Mandarin and Chinese dialects when speaking to different interlocutors in different domains.

Table 3: Use of Mandarin and Chinese dialects by respondents in different domains

Language	Parents	Close Friends	Colleagues or classmates	At hawker centers	At shopping centres
Mandarin	29	62	40	75	34
Dialects	58	3	3	11	5
Others (Malay, English)	13	35	57	14	61

The table above shows that except for the domain of parents, Mandarin is used most often in all other domains: Close Friends (62%), Colleague/classmates (40%), Shopping centers (34%) and Hawker centers (75%). It should also be noted that a great majority of respondents (75%) use Mandarin instead of Chinese dialects in the hawker centers. As mentioned in Chapter One, before the launch of the SMC in 1979, dialects were used mainly in the more informal settings such as in the hawker centers and wet markets and in the HDB estates (Gopinanthan:1998). In its earlier years, the goal of the SMC was to eradicate the use of dialects and to encourage the use of Mandarin in the hawker centers. The results also show that except for communicating with parents, the dialect-speakers within the sample community use less dialect as compared to Mandarin in public places such as at hawker centres (11%) and at shopping centres (5%).Thus, the use of dialects has declined within the sample community.

6.2. Attitudes toward Mandarin

As stated by Rubin and Jernudd (1971), the success of language planning is evident through the positive attitudes displayed by the target members towards the planned language product. This is because there is a natural connection between language use and language attitudes. Thus to assess the effectiveness of the SMC within the researched community, the SAS seeks to measure the attitudes of respondents towards Mandarin; that is, whether they have positive or negative attitudes towards the language.

Several questions in the SAS were designed for the purpose of investigating whether respondents:

i. like speaking Mandarin (Q12)
ii. agree that Mandarin is easy to learn (Q14)
iii. want their children to learn Mandarin (Q18)
iv. think learning Mandarin is useful (Q28)

The question on whether Mandarin is easy to learn (Q14) and the usefulness of learning Mandarin (Q28) are basically aimed at investigating the attitudes of respondents with regard to the acquisition of Mandarin. The results for Question 12, 14, 18 and 28 are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Attitudes of respondents toward Mandarin

	Q12 I Like speaking Mandarin	Q14 I think Mandarin is easy to learn	Q18 I want my children to speak Mandarin	Q28 I think learning Mandarin is useful
Strongly Disagree	2	6	2	0
Disagree	2	16	3	2
Neither agree Nor disagree	13	23	14	13
Agree	52	44	52	60
Strongly Agree	31	11	29	25

It is clear from Table 4 that more than half of the respondents (55%) think that Mandarin is easy to learn (Q14) while 16% disagrees. The findings from the SAS also indicate a positive attitude towards speaking Mandarin. About 83% of respondents state they like speaking Mandarin (Q12) and 81% want their children to speak Mandarin (Q18). About 84% also agree that it is useful for them to learn Mandarin (Q28). On the whole, respondents reported positive attitudes towards Mandarin. The positive attitudes of dialect-speakers toward Mandarin can be possibly due to the practical use of Mandarin within the community. As mentioned earlier, Mandarin is used in most domains of language use within the researched community. In addition, Mandarin also serves other useful purposes within the wider Chinese community as it is an essential language for business dealings with China and other Chinese countries such as Taiwan. The positive attitudes displayed by respondents show that Mandarin is being accepted in the linguistic habits of dialect-speakers. There are also differences in response between the different age group for Q14. Table 5 shows the breakdown in age for those who responded to Q14 (Mandarin is easy to learn).

Table 5 Age group of respondents for Q14 (Mandarin is easy to learn)

	Agree %	Neither agree disagree %	Disagree %
12-20	21	47	32
21-30	25	25	50
31-60	70	13	17
61and above	56	22	22

From Table 5, it can be observed there is a difference in response between the different age groups for Q14. A majority of those who disagree that Mandarin is easy to learn are from 12 to 20 (32%). 50% of respondents between the age of 21-30 also disagree that Mandarin is easy to learn. The younger generation of dialect-speakers (12-20) may find it hard to learn Mandarin because most of the subjects they study in schools are taught in English, except for the mother tongue, Mandarin. The 21-30 age group which consists of young working adults, may find it difficult to learn Mandarin because of their limited exposure to Mandarin in the working world. As mentioned in Chapter Three, the official working language in Singapore is English. On the other hand, those who agree that Mandarin is easy to learn are from those aged 31 and above. This could possibly be due to the fact that a majority of the elderly members were educated in Chinese-medium schools where the medium of instruction is Mandarin..

Table 6 Educational background of respondents for Q14 (Mandarin is easy to learn)

	Agree %	Neither agree nor disagree %	Disagree %
Primary	44	45	11
Secondary	57	19	24
Post secondary	57	24	19
University and above	54	21	25

The results also show that the more educated respondents agree that Mandarin is easy to learn. Those with post-secondary education (57%) generally agree that Mandarin is easier to learn compared to those with primary education (44%). However, those that have a higher education (university and above) also report the highest percentage of disagreement to the statement (25%). Those with primary education reported the least percentage (11%). Thus, it can be observed that highly-educated respondents can either have a positive or negative attitude towards the learning of Mandarin.

6.3. Attitudes towards the status and functions of Mandarin

As mentioned in Chapter Four, the SMC is a deliberate language planning policy designed to raise the status and functions of Mandarin within the Chinese community. Thus, another aim of the SAS is to investigate respondents' perceptions on the status and functions of Mandarin. Their perceptions towards the status and functions of Mandarin will have a bearing on the effectiveness of the SMC. As mentioned by Ho and Alsagoff (1998), Singaporeans being pragmatic people will embrace a language that accords them greater economic opportunity and career advancement. Thus, Q7-10 was designed with the purpose of measuring respondents' perceptions of the status and functions of Mandarin. The results for Q7-10 are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Attitudes of respondents towards the status and function of Mandarin

	Q7 Mandarin will have a superior status in Singapore in the future	Q8 Mandarin will be an important international language in the 21st century	Q9 Mandarin will be useful for my future job opportunity	Q10 Mandarin will benefit Singaporeans' business dealings with China
Strongly Disagree	2	1	0	0
Disagree	25	8	11	1
Neither agree Nor disagree	25	15	22	3
Agree	40	61	53	35
Strongly Agree	8	15	14	61

From the table above, it is evident that less than half of the respondents agree that Mandarin will have a superior status in Singapore in the future. Only about 48% of respondents indicate that Mandarin will have a superior status in Singapore in the future (Q7). There are also differences in response between the different age group for Q7, as reflected below.

Table 7 : Age group of respondent for Q7
(Mandarin will have a superior status in Singapore in the future).

	Agree %	Neither agree disagree %	Disagree %
12-20	29	35	36
21-30	17	75	8
31-60	59	14	27
61and above	43	43	14

From Table 7, it can be observed that a majority of respondents who agree that Mandarin has a superior status are mainly between the age of 31-60 (59%) and those aged 61 and above (43%). Only about 17% of respondents between the age of 21-30 agree that Mandarin will have a superior status in Singapore in the future. In addition, a high majority (75%) between the age of 21 to 30 neither agrees nor disagrees that Mandarin will have a superior status in future. Moreover, only 29% of respondents aged 12-20 agree with the statement. This seems to confirm the observation by Gupta (1994) that while Mandarin may be replacing dialects, its social status among younger Chinese Singaporeans is low, with few regarding Mandarin as a language with a superior status in society.

However, although Mandarin is perceived as having low status in the community, most respondents have favourable attitudes towards its functions. From Table 7, it can be observed that about 76% feel that Mandarin will be an important international language in the 21st century (Q8). 67% of respondents also feel that Mandarin is useful for their future job opportunity in Singapore (Q9). A great majority of respondents, 96%, feel that Mandarin will benefit Singaporeans' business dealings with China (Q10). The promotion of Mandarin as a language for economic ties with China was a strategy adopted in the 1985 SMC. This shows that dialect-speakers within the sample community are convinced of the economic value of Mandarin.

6.4. Comparison of attitudes toward English and Mandarin

As mentioned in Chapter Two, both English and Mandarin are the two major languages in the linguistic ecology of the Chinese community. Thus the aim of the SAS is to compare respondents' attitudes towards the two languages. Q21 in the questionnaire is designed for the purpose of comparing respondents' attitudes towards English and Mandarin. The responses for Q21 are shown in Table 8.

Table 8 Comparison of attitudes of respondents towards English and Mandarin

	Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Q21	In Singapore, English is more important than Mandarin	68	9	23

From table above, it is evident that a majority of respondents, 68%, agree that English is more important than Mandarin. This is not surprising as English is the first school language for the majority of the young generation of respondents. The bilingual educational policy has raised the status of English more than any other languages. More

time is spent in the learning of English than any other subject in schools. In addition, the grade for English is also taken into account by the gatekeepers at institutions of higher learning (Pakir 1993). At the moment, students gaining admission to Nanyang Technological University and National University of Singapore must attain at least a B4 grade in General Paper (English Language), failing which they must sit for an English Proficiency exam. The status of English is rising rapidly as an increasing number of Singaporeans are shifting to the language for more functions (Pakir 1991a). Parents, who are the agents for transmission of languages, will prefer their children to speak more English than Mandarin as they believe that English is more important than Mandarin in the workplace.

As stated by Minister Mentor, Mr Lee Kuan Yew in an article, 'Keep Mandarin alive at home,' (The Straits Times, 14 Dec 2004,p1-2), more Singaporean Chinese parents are switching to speaking English at homes as a result of the growing dominance of English in the workplace. As more parents are tertiary-educated in English at the universities and polytechnics, they tend to speak English to their children at home. In addition, English is also the people's choice (Lam: 1994). It is also an official working language in Singapore. Gupta (1994) also suggests that while English is ethnically neutral, ability in it is a class marker. Thus compared to Mandarin, it is not surprising that respondents prefer to embrace English as it is perceived to have more instrumental use in society.

6. 5. Attitudes of respondents towards Chinese dialects

As mentioned in Chapter Four, the main strategy adopted by the government in the SMC was to eradicate Chinese dialects from the linguistic habits of the Chinese dialect speaking community. Thus, another aim of the SAS is to investigate whether respondents in the researched community agree with the government's call to eradicate dialects within the Chinese community. Questions 30, 31 and 33 were designed to examine respondents' attitudes toward Chinese dialects. The results for Questions 30, 31 and 33 are shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Attitudes of respondents towards Chinese dialects

	Q30 Do you agree that dialect is your [7]mother tongue?	Q31 If I have children, I want them to learn dialect	Q33 Chinese Singaporeans need to speak dialects to preserve Chinese culture
Strongly Disagree	6	5	4
Disagree	37	11	14
Neither agree Nor disagree	26	29	22
Agree	27	36	41
Strongly Agree	4	19	19

From the table, it can be observed that only about 31% of respondents agree that dialect is their mother tongue (Q30). This means that a majority of respondents do not consider dialects as their ancestral language. A possible reason for this may be due to the fact that dialects are seen as pragmatically useless and having a low prestige (Gupta & Siew: 1995). Parents in Singapore are pragmatic and will definitely want their children to be proficient in English or Mandarin rather than in the Chinese dialects.

The SAS also aims to investigate whether parents are willing to transmit dialects to their children (Q31). As mentioned by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), the survival of a language greatly depends on the willingness of the parents to transmit the language. If parents are unwilling to transmit dialects to their children, it is likely that in future, the use of dialects will decline within the community.

The results for Q31 show that slightly more than half (55%) of the respondents would like their children to learn Chinese dialects. This shows that although some parents regard dialects as having low instrumental value, they do not want them to be totally eradicated from their children's linguistic repertoire. This indicates that dialects are still important for some dialect-speakers within the community. Thus, the affective values of dialects are still strong within the sample community.

[7] Mother tongue refers to the native dialect spoken by respondents since birth. It also refers to the ancestral language of dialect-speakers.

In addition, about 60 % of respondents agree that Chinese Singaporeans need Chinese dialects to preserve Chinese culture (Q33). This shows that although dialects have low instrumental functions, they have high affective values. Some dialect-speakers within the community agree that their dialects are able to help them maintain their Chinese heritage. This appears to be contrary to the government's call to associate the Chinese heritage through Mandarin. Under the SMC, Mandarin is promoted to be the second language of education for all Chinese in schools and its value lies not only in being a cultural ballast against excessive Westernisation, but also as an agent in promoting intra-Chinese communication and the nurturing of cultural roots (Pakir:1994). However, the results show that not all dialect-speakers within the community regard Mandarin as an agent for cultural transmission.

It is not difficult to understand why not all dialect-speakers within the community are willing to discard dialects from their linguistic use. It must be remembered that Chinese dialects have long been the communicative tools in oral interactions since early Chinese immigrants from China arrived in Singapore in the nineteenth century. The older generation of Chinese grew up speaking their dialects. For the elderly dialect-speakers, their dialects are the core markers of their Chinese identity. This is because dialects, if used on certain social occasions such as during Chinese New Year and certain church events such as weddings and funeral services, can evoke greater immediacy and emotive power. On the other hand, Mandarin can never completely replace Chinese dialects as it is basically an imported language (a Beijing variety), which does not have the associations with the past linguistic habit of dialect speakers within the church community.

For some Chinese dialect-speakers (especially the elderly), Mandarin will always be an acquired language and no matter how fluently they speak the language, it will be rather difficult for them to assimilate it as a language for cultural transmission.

However, although most respondents indicate that they want their children to learn dialects, their attitudes towards Chinese dialects are regarded more of a sentiment (Xu et al: 1998). As the results of the SAS show in section 6.1, the status of Chinese dialects is

low and their use is mainly confined to the family in communication with parents. Although some dialect-speakers still have strong emotional attachment to their dialects, in general, respondents support the call of the government to embrace Mandarin as a language of use. Having discussed the attitudes of respondents towards dialects, I will proceed to discuss their attitudes toward the three official arguments of the SMC in the following section.

6.6. Attitudes toward the official arguments of the SMC

According to Newman (1988), the success of the SMC will hinge on whether Chinese Singaporeans agree to the three official arguments for the SMC. If Chinese Singaporeans can accept the three arguments forwarded by the government, then the success of the campaign will be greatly enhanced. In the SAS, three questions were specially designed to investigate whether members of the dialect-speaking Chinese community agree to the educational, communicative and cultural argument for the SMC. In the educational argument for the SMC, Mandarin was promoted as a mother tongue for all Chinese students in schools as it was felt that the speaking of dialects would hinder the learning of Mandarin. Q19 and Q32 in the SAS are aimed at investigating whether respondents agree with the educational argument for the SMC. The results for Q19 and Q32 are shown in Table 10.

Table 10 Views of respondents on the educational argument for Mandarin.

	Q19 Mandarin is the [8]mother tongue of the Chinese Singaporean	Q32 Dialect will hinder the learning of Mandarin or English among school children in Singapore
Strongly Disagree	2	23
Disagree	7	33
Neither agree Nor disagree	4	26
Agree	59	15
Strongly Agree	28	3

[8]. Under the multilingual policy, Mandarin was ascribed as the official mother tongue of all Chinese Singaporeans.

From the table above, it appears that a majority of the respondents consider Mandarin as their mother tongue (about 87%) and only less than 10 percent disagree on the statement. In addition, only a small percentage (4%) was uncertain about accepting Mandarin as their mother tongue.

Moreover, more than half (55%) of the respondents disagree with the educational argument that dialects hinder the learning of Mandarin or English among school children in Singapore. On the other hand, only a minority of the respondents (18%) agrees that dialects hinder school children's learning of Mandarin or English. According to the educational argument, it was perceived that school children would have great difficulties coping with English, Mandarin and dialects (Ang:1998).Thus to lighten the burden of school children, the government proposed that dialects be totally eliminated in the Chinese community. However, that not all respondents agree to the educational argument.

The survey is also aimed at finding respondents' attitudes toward the communicative argument of the SMC. At the initialization stage of the SMC, it was felt that there were too many Chinese dialect groups in Singapore and a common language was needed to facilitate communication among the various dialect groups. Thus, one of the explicitly stated goals of the SMC was to promote Mandarin as the common language among dialect-speakers. Thus the survey questionnaire also aims to investigate how respondents respond to the communicative argument; whether they agree that Mandarin should be spoken as the common language among the various dialect groups in Singapore (Q38). The findings for Q38 are shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Views of respondents on the communicative argument for the Speak Mandarin Campaign.

	Q38 Mandarin should be spoken as a common language among the various dialect groups in Singapore
Strongly Disagree	1
Disagree	9
Neither agree Nor disagree	13
Agree	52
Strongly Agree	25

It is obvious from Table 11 that a majority of respondents (77%) agrees with the official argument that Mandarin is important for unifying the various dialect groups in Singapore. Only a small percentage (about 10%) disagrees that Mandarin should be spoken as a common language. A possible reason why a majority of respondents agree to the communicative argument for Mandarin may be because with the decline of dialect usage, English will become an intra-franca language within the Chinese community (Gopinathan: 1974:71). As stated by the initiator of the SMC, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, in his launching speech of the 1979 campaign:

Because Singapore is 25 percent non-Chinese, English will be the common language between different ethnic Singaporeans. And if we continue to use dialects, then English will tend to become the common language between Chinese of different dialect groups. (Lee:1978:5).

Thus respondents in the researched community may want to avoid a situation where they have to use only English among themselves. The positive attitude by respondents on the communicative argument shows that Mandarin has been accepted as a common language of communication among the different dialect groups within the sample community. This is certainly a desired outcome of the language planning effort by the Singapore government.

The survey also investigates respondents' attitudes towards the cultural argument for Mandarin. As mentioned earlier, in the cultural argument, Mandarin is needed to counterbalance the effects of Westernisation and the dominance of English. The government perceived that Chinese Singaporeans were losing their Chinese identity as a result of Westernisation and the negative effects of English dominance. Thus they needed a cultural ballast to protect their Chinese identity and Mandarin was seen to be the key to that identity (Lee :1996).

Thus, another aim of the survey questionnaire is to investigate whether respondents agree that Mandarin is needed for transmitting Chinese cultural values. Table 12 shows the views of respondents on whether they agree that Chinese Singaporeans should speak Mandarin to preserve Chinese cultures (Q43):

Table 12. Views of respondents on the cultural argument for the Speak Mandarin Campaign.

	Q43 Chinese Singaporeans should speak Mandarin to preserve Chinese cultures and traditions
Strongly Disagree	2
Disagree	2
Neither agree nor disagree	9
Agree	52
Strongly agree	35

From Table 12, it is obvious that a large majority (87%) agree that Mandarin is important for maintaining Chinese cultures and traditions. Thus, contrary to the argument that

Mandarin is not the ancestral language of most local Chinese, most respondents nevertheless accept it as a language for cultural transmission. Thus, the results from Q43 send a strong signal that respondents generally agree with the cultural argument for the SMC.

6.7. Attitudes towards the planned language efforts

As mentioned in Chapter One, one of the aims of the SAS is to investigate the views of respondents towards the SMC as a planned language effort. This section will examine the views of respondents on the outcome and strategy of the SMC - whether they perceive that the SMC has been effective in persuading dialect-speakers to embrace Mandarin as a language of use and preference. The results of respondents' attitudes towards the SMC as a planned language effort are shown in Table 13.

Table 13: Views of respondents on the outcome and strategy of the Speak Mandarin Campaign.

Question	Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
37	Mandarin is of great use in my daily life	84	5	11
39	Mandarin has become more commonly used among Chinese in the past two years	73	10	17
40	The Speak Mandarin Campaign has succeeded in persuading more Chinese Singaporeans to speak Mandarin	60	17	23
41	The Speak Mandarin Campaign should be continued	87	2	11

From Table 13, it is obvious that on the whole, respondents support the SMC. This is evident as about 84 % of respondents also agree that Mandarin is of great use in their daily lives (Q37) and 73% agree that Mandarin has become more commonly used among Chinese in the past two years as a result of the campaign (Q39). About 60% of the respondents feel that the SMC has succeeded in persuading more Chinese Singaporeans to speak Mandarin (Q40). In addition, about 87 percent agree that the campaign should be continued (Q41). Thus, on the whole, most respondents have positive orientations towards the SMC as a planned language effort.

6. 8 Discussion on the results of the SAS

This section provides a summary of the results of the SAS on language use and language attitudes of respondents. The most important findings are presented in the discussion below:

With the exception of communicating with parents, the most frequently used language in the sample community is Mandarin. Mandarin surpasses the use of Chinese dialects in most domains such as in the hawker centres and shopping centres, and with close friends and colleague/classmates. This shows that the majority of respondents believe that Mandarin has instrumental value. According to Xu et al (1998), within the Chinese community, Mandarin is important for the following purposes:

(a) Communication across dialect groups
(b) Doing business abroad
(c) Inheriting cultural values and traditions
(d) Facilitating the learning of Chinese in schools
(e) Showing a characteristic of Chinese Singaporeans.

The results of the SAS are similar to those of Xu et al. A majority of respondents (77%) agree that Mandarin should be spoken as a common language among the various dialect groups in Singapore (Q38). 96% of respondents also agree that Mandarin will benefit

Singaporeans' business dealings with China (Q10). A majority (87%) also agrees that Mandarin helps Chinese to inherit Chinese cultural values (Q43) and a majority of the respondents (87%) also agree that Mandarin is the mother tongue of the Chinese in Singapore (Q19). However although Mandarin has instrumental value within the sample community, a majority (68%) nevertheless agrees that English is more important than Mandarin (Q21).

In addition, most dialect-speakers in the community generally have a favourable attitude toward Mandarin. Mandarin is perceived to be useful, interesting and easy to learn. Most dialect-speakers also like to speak Mandarin and would like their children to learn the language. There are also differences in attitudes among respondents towards the learning of Mandarin. The results for Q13 (Mandarin is easy to learn) indicate that those with a higher level of education find Mandarin an easy language to learn. This is hardly surprising as the educational policies in Singapore since the 1980s have explicitly demanded the replacement of ethnic languages with Mandarin as an official second language in schools. Thus there is evidence that language planning in the public domains (society) has affected language practice in the domestic domain of dialects speakers within the sample community.

In addition, a majority of respondents agree with the communicative argument (Q38) and 75% of respondents also observe that Mandarin has become commonly used among Chinese (Q39). Most respondents (87%) also agree with the cultural argument that Mandarin is important for preserving their Chinese roots and traditions (Q43). Although most consider Mandarin as their mother tongue, a majority do not agree with the educational argument that the speaking of Chinese dialects at home will hinder the learning of Mandarin. However, nearly all respondents agree with the economic argument for Mandarin. They consider Mandarin as an important language for business dealings with China. This is due mainly to the emergence of China as a major economic power and Singapore's deepening economic involvement with China.The results also show that the use of dialects have declined in the community. Dialects are used mainly in the family domain when communication with parents. There are several possible reasons for the decline of dialects within the researched community.

According to Gupta and Siew (1995), the decline of dialects within the Chinese community can be attributed to the following reasons:

i. A decrease in the status of dialects within the Chinese community
ii. Negative attitudes towards transmission of dialects
iii. Lack of support for dialects from government and the school.

As noted in Chapter 3, under the multilingual policy, Mandarin was recognized as an official language of all Chinese in Singapore. The intra-group differences of dialects among the Chinese were reduced by the installation of a single language for all Chinese in Singapore. Mandarin was decreed the official mother tongues of all Chinese Singaporeans. Although the multilingual policy elevates Mandarin to the status of the official mother tongue for all Chinese, it has also resulted in a lowering of status of the Chinese dialects. In addition, under the bilingual school policy, it is compulsory for all Chinese students in Singapore to study English as a first language and Chinese (Mandarin) as a second language. In the past few years, the status of Chinese dialects has continued to decline while the importance of Mandarin has continued to rise.

According to Gupta and Siew (1995), the promotion of Mandarin over other varieties of Chinese in the annual SMC, and the requirement to learn Mandarin at school has two effects on attitudes to dialects. One is that dialects are seen as pragmatically useless and the other is that they are seen as of low prestige (Gupta and Siew: 1995: 312).

In the past, dialects were the agents for transmission of values when grandparents used to tell their grandchildren stories associated with their cultural backgrounds and their linguistic traditions. However, Gupta and Siew (1995) observe that with Mandarin and English being used more and more frequently by the younger generation of Chinese Singaporeans, the difference in language repertoires between members of different generations has resulted in impediments to communication and interaction between members of different generations. This has led to a reduced ability to transfer traditional and cultural values from the oldest to the youngest generation.

Although the results indicate that most respondents use Mandarin in most domains of language use, they nevertheless use dialects as a medium of communication with their

parents within the family. The results of the SAS show that more than half of the respondents (58%) still use dialects when communicating with parents. Thus, the findings from this study confirm the observations by Xu et al. (1998) : that dialects are important as a medium of communication within the family. Some dialect-speakers, especially the elderly, still have strong emotional attachment to dialects. They would not want the young generation of dialect-speakers to lose the linguistic and emotional bond with their native dialects. However, respondents have affective feelings for their Chinese dialects. More than half of the respondents want to maintain the use of Chinese dialects as they believe that their dialects will help to preserve Chinese cultures and traditions. In addition, most respondents continue to use dialects to communicate with their parents. Thus, the majority's favourable answer towards the propagation of dialects can be taken as a revelation of the affectionate attitudes of the dialect-speakers within the sample community towards the dialects used (Hokkien, Teochew, Cantonese and Hainanese).

Thus, in most aspects, the results of the SAS indicate that the SMC has been effective in causing dialect-speakers to discard dialects and switch to Mandarin within the researched community. In this chapter, the effectiveness of the SMC is measured through quantitative data on reported language use and attitudes. However, as mentioned in Chapter Five, the qualitative approach has also been adopted to assess the effectiveness of the SMC. The qualitative data for this study is obtained through the semi-structured interviews. In the following chapter, the results from the semi-structured interview will be analysed.

CHAPTER SEVEN

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS : VIEWS TOWARDS THE SMC

As mentioned in Chapter One, the aim of this study is to examine whether the SMC has been effective in changing the language preference of dialect-speakers in the sample community in favour of Mandarin. The quantitative results on reported language use of individual dialect-speakers within the sample community were discussed in Chapter Six. Most individuals within the community report that they are using Mandarin.

Besides the SAS, the semi-structured interview (SSI) was also adopted as a source of data collection and its main use is to investigate the attitudes of individual dialect-speakers toward the campaign goals, their opinions on the strategy adopted by the government to promote the campaign, and their views on the SMC as a planned government effort.

In this chapter, I will first present the SSI findings on the views and attitudes of informants towards the goals/official arguments of the SMC. Next, I will report the informants' views on the strategy of the SMC and whether they agree that the SMC should be continued. I will also examine the informants' views on the strategy adopted by the government to eliminate dialects in the Chinese community. In the following section, I will examine the informants' views on the outcome of the campaign : whether they agree that the SMC is effective in persuading dialect-speaking Chinese to speak Mandarin. In the conclusion, I will provide a summary of the SSI findings.

7.1. Informants' views on the goals of the SMC

The SSI was conducted among 19 informants selected from the 126 respondents in the SAS. The profile of the SSI informant is given Table 14:

Table 14 : Profile of SSI informants

Code	Age	Sex	Education Level	Occupation	Resident Type	Language/Dialect Spoken at home
IM1	18	M	Polytechnic	Student	HDB	English, Hokkien, Mandarin
IM2	57	F	Post Graduate	Teacher	HDB	English, Mandarin, Hokkien
IM3	15	F	Secondary Three	Student	Condominium	English, Mandarin, Hainanese
IM4	15	F	Secondary Three	Student	HDB	English, Mandarin, Hokkien
IM5	28	F	Diploma	Housewife	HDB	English, Mandarin, Hokkien
IM6	31	M	University	Project Officer	HDB	English, Mandarin, Hokkien, Cantonese
IM7	32	M	Post Graduate	IT Applications Manager	HDB	English, Mandarin, Hokkien
IM8	32	M	University	Teacher	HDB	English, Mandarin, Hokkien, Teochew
IM9	36	M	University	Civil Servant	Condominium	Mandarin English Cantonese
IM10	40	F	"O" Level	Nurse	HDB	Mandarin Hokkien
IM11	48	F	"O" Level	Church Worker	HDB	Hokkien Teochew
IM12	49	M	"O" Level	Manager	Condominium	English, Hokkien
IM13	51	M	"O" Level	Business	Semi-detached	Mandarin Hainanese
IM14	55	M	"A" Level	Accountant	HDB	English, Mandarin, Hokkien
IM15	60	M	"A" Level	Pastor	HDB	English, Mandarin, Hokkien
IM16	18	M	Polytechnic	English	Condominium	English, Mandarin Hokkien
IM17	12	M	Primary	Student	Condominium	English, Hokkien
IM18	14	M	Secondary Two	Student	HDB	English, Mandarin, Hokkien, Teochew
IM19	21	M	University	Student	HDB	English, Mandarin Hokkien

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the SMC was targeted at all dialect-speaking Chinese in its initial years. The goal of the campaign was to make all dialect-speaking Chinese Singaporeans discard the use of Chinese dialects and embrace Mandarin as a language of use and preference. In addition, the government also promoted the three official goals of the campaign:

a) Promote Mandarin as a mother tongue at school and replace Mandarin with Chinese dialects at home (the educational argument)

b) Promote Mandarin as a common language for interdialect communication within the Chinese community (the communicative argument) and
c) Promote Mandarin to preserve the Chinese culture and Chinese identity (the cultural argument) (Bokhorst-Heng :1998).

In addition, as mentioned in Chapter Three, since 1985, an additional goal of the SMC was to promote Mandarin as an economic tool for business dealings with China. As stated by Newman (1988), the success of the campaign will hinge on whether the local Chinese can accept one or more of the official arguments. If they are convinced of the official arguments, they will change their linguistic habits in favour of Mandarin. Thus, Part One of the SSI was aimed at eliciting informants' views on whether they were aware or agree with the official goals/arguments for the campaign.

Arising from the analysis of data, the results of the SSI shows that most informants agree with the goals of the campaign. Several common themes on the goals of the SMC were identified.
In the following section, the transcripts of the SSI will be presented and discussed.

The campaign serves to remind the Chinese in Singapore to speak Mandarin
Several informants agree with the government in promoting the SMC. They support the campaign and believe that it is necessary to encourage the Chinese community in Singapore to speak more Mandarin. Some informants feel that the Chinese in Singapore, especially the English-educated Chinese, are in danger of losing their Chinese roots and hence they believe the campaign is necessary to remind the English-educated Chinese of their Chinese roots and identity. Some informants also believe that the campaign is important to the economy as the promotion of Mandarin will benefit Singaporeans in business dealings with China. Some informants also support the call of the government to speak Mandarin as they perceive that the Chinese language is losing its relevance and importance as a result of the dominance of English in the country.

A secondary three female student feels that the Chinese in Singapore are speaking too much English. She states that she has seen some of the SMC advertisements in her school library and in the public bus-stop. She observes that more people in Singapore are speaking English

instead of Mandarin. She believes that the campaign helps to remind the Chinese community in Singapore to speak Mandarin instead of English:

Extract 1 IM4/8 Nov 04

> *We should change our language habit to speaking Mandarin. The campaign is good as it encourages us to speak Mandarin. People will remember that we are speaking Chinese. We are in Singapore and we should speak Chinese. If we emphasize the campaign, then the people will know that Mandarin is important to us and they will speak the language.*

One female informant, a nurse, relates that she has seen some SMC TV advertisement in the mass media and also in the hospital where she works. She states that the SMC has a useful purpose in persuading the younger and older generations of Chinese to communicate through a common language using Mandarin. She also agrees that the campaign is necessary but she feels strongly that the SMC should target more at the English-speaking and dialect-speaking Chinese to encourage them to speak Mandarin. She observes that the SMC is necessary as she observes that the younger Chinese generation is speaking English and she believes that the SMC will encourage them people to speak Mandarin instead:

Extract 2 IM10/15 Dec04

> *This type of campaign-the target is important. If it is to the Chinese-educated, the campaign is not important. It should be directed at the general public, especially the young and the old. If the elderly speak dialects, the young people will not understand them and so it's important for them to speak Mandarin to communicate. As for the young people, a lot of them now speak English and even despise Mandarin. Because of this, the SMC campaign organizers want to encourage them to speak Mandarin. So I think the purpose of the campaign is to encourage these two groups of people to speak Mandarin. That's my opinion regarding the campaign.*

The campaign helps to promote Mandarin as a language for economic survival.

Some informants also agree with the economic argument for promoting the SMC. They argue that Mandarin will help Singapore to improve trade relations with China and thus, they believe that Singapore will benefit from the growth of China's economy if Chinese Singaporeans speak Mandarin.

A young secondary one male student recounts that he has seen some SMC advertisements but he could not remember where he has seen them. However, he believes that the campaign's message is to encourage people to speak Mandarin as Mandarin will be an important language in the future. He admits that his classmates do not really pay much attention to the campaign. He also observes that nowadays, most Chinese Singaporeans dislike Mandarin. However, he believes that the SMC will play a great role in the future in enabling Chinese Singaporeans to communicate with Chinese nationals from China when doing business in China. When asked about his views regarding the SMC, his reply was:

Extract 3 IM17/ 29Oct04

> *It's quite good to have the campaign, as nowadays, people don't like Chinese. It will increase the number of people speaking Chinese. In future, China seems to be an important country so Singaporeans may set up business there; if we want to earn more money, we must actually go there, we must communicate in Mandarin with the people there.*

An elderly male informant, a grandfather, also agrees with the implementation of the SMC. He admits that the campaign is an embarrassment for Chinese Singaporeans. He feels that as Chinese, Chinese Singaporeans should naturally be able to speak Mandarin. He explains that in the past, the various educational policies in Singapore tend to emphasize more on the learning of English. As a result, there has been a wrong perception among the local Chinese that English is more important than Mandarin. He also observes that at home, children are often encouraged by their parents to speak English rather than Mandarin. This has caused a majority of young children to think that Mandarin is difficult and hence they are not willing to master it. However, he believes strongly that it is important for the Chinese to speak Mandarin as there is economic value in learning the language. He believes that the goal of the

campaign is not merely to promote Mandarin as a language for business dealings with China, but also for general economic survival:

Extract 4 IM15 /19 Oct04

> *Given the current economic situation, where China is a rising economic power, and also in Singapore where Mandarin is a major language, if we Chinese Singaporeans only know one language without knowing Mandarin, we are destroying ourselves. If we know Mandarin, it's to our advantage. Thus our citizens should internalize the value of Mandarin. People should not speak Mandarin just because the government launched the campaign. Even if the government stops the campaign, we should all the more continue to learn Mandarin enthusiastically or else we will be ostracized and alienated from the world. Thus, the government should still launch the campaign. At least with the campaign, we will be prompted to know that if we don't speak Mandarin, we will be disadvantaged in society.*

The campaign serves to promote Mandarin and to preserve Chinese traditions and culture .

Several informants also agree that the campaign is necessary as they perceive that Singapore is becoming too Westernised. Most believe that too many Chinese in Singapore are speaking English instead of Mandarin, and there is a fear that the local Chinese will lose their Chinese cultural heritage if the government does not promote the SMC.

When asked whether the campaign serves a useful purpose, a male informant, a Hokkien-speaking male schoolteacher, states that he is in favour of the campaign. He observes that Mandarin is being under- utilized by most Chinese, and hence feels there is a need for the campaign. He feels that the campaign is one of the ways to create awareness of the importance of Mandarin as the mother tongue of the local Chinese and also to remind them of their Chinese roots and traditions. When asked whether the campaign serves a useful purpose, his response was:

Extract 5 IM8 /8Dec04

Useful? More or less. The message is to speak Mandarin; Chinese must speak Mandarin. It reminds us of our Chinese roots and traditions. We Chinese need to speak Mandarin as our mother tongue... At the moment, it's obvious that English is more important than the mother tongue (Mandarin) in schools and also at home. There is a need for the government to create the awareness that speaking the mother tongue at home is useful and important. Just like the learning of English at the moment. It is easier to learn English if the language is spoken at home.

Another informant, a Cantonese-speaking male logistic planner in his late twenties, observes that the aim of the SMC is to not only to encourage the Chinese to speak Mandarin, but also to read materials in Mandarin. He feels that over the years, as a result of the campaign, most people now speak Mandarin in the workplace. When asked if the SMC serves a useful purpose, he states that the campaign did reach out to many people. He also agrees that too many young Chinese are speaking English, and that the aim of the SMC is to enforce the cultural roots and identity of the Chinese:

Extract 6 IM6/27Oct04

Being a Chinese, we should be able to speak Mandarin or listen to Mandarin. It's good to hold on to your Chinese roots; it helps to reminds us of our Chinese identity.

A male informant, a Hainanese-speaking businessman in his early fifties and who is educated in Chinese, feels that the Chinese language is fast disappearing in Singapore and believes that that the government is promoting the SMC to encourage the local Chinese to speak Mandarin. However, he feels that the campaign should also target the English-educated Chinese to remind them of their Chinese cultural heritage:

Extract 7 IM 13/5Dec04

The campaign should target specifically at the English-educated Chinese. It is necessary for the campaign to target at the right group, more at the English-educated Chinese as they have less exposure to Mandarin and therefore would need the campaign to remind them that they are Chinese. They need to speak Mandarin lest they forget their Chinese roots.

The campaign aims to preserve the Chinese language in Singapore

Several informants also believe that the campaign is necessary to maintain the use of Mandarin in the Chinese community. They are worried that if the government does not implement the campaign, Mandarin will gradually lose its importance in the Chinese community. Some informants also feel that the standard of spoken Mandarin has deteriorated and hence there is a need for the government to promote the SMC to improve the quality of spoken Mandarin.

A male civil servant believes that the objective of the campaign is to encourage more Chinese Singaporeans to use Mandarin as a language of habitual use and to increase the public perception of the usefulness of speaking Mandarin. He also believes that the campaign will reinforce the importance of Mandarin in society as well as emphasize the importance of speaking standard Mandarin:

Extract 8 IM9 27Dec04

The SMC is good because it reinforces and encourages the importance of Mandarin in our society. It's useful to some extent as it helps to increase the perception of the public on the usefulness of Mandarin-that Mandarin is important. We should have it every year to drive further the message the usefulness of Mandarin and also the correct usage of speaking standard Mandarin.

The campaign helps to improve communication and increases unity among various dialect groups in Singapore

Some informants agree with the communicative argument for the use of Mandarin. They believe that Mandarin is necessary for different dialect groups to communicate and will ensure greater unity within the Chinese community.

A female informant, a school teacher who speaks Hokkien at home, believes that Mandarin is the mother tongue of all Chinese people not only in Singapore but also in the Chinese community in other countries. She feels that the campaign encourages the Chinese community to speak Mandarin as their mother tongue so that they will develop a close sense of bonding and unity. Her views on the SMC are:

Extract 9 IM2/7Nov04

I suppose we Chinese should speak to each other in our mother tongue so that we have the same ethnic feeling. We Chinese can have bonding with each other. If I go to China, or other country, where Mandarin is spoken, Mandarin will cause us to have a natural bonding in these places and you will feel people there will be close to you... In the past, people in Singapore speak dialects with each other, but if they speak Mandarin, there will be greater homogenity among the people.

Another informant, a Hainanese-speaking businessman, believes that most dialect-speakers in the community will support the SMC. He also agrees that the elimination of Chinese dialects is necessary for the unity of the Chinese community:

Extract 10 IM13/5Dec04

The SMC has been useful in encouraging people to speak less dialects, and people now speak less dialects. The elimination of dialects will result in greater unity among Chinese.

In the following section, I will summarise the findings of Part One of the SSI.

Part One of the SSI reveals that most informants agree with the goals of the SMC. A majority of the informants believe that the goal of the SMC is to encourage all Chinese speak Mandarin with each other, and to establish Mandarin as a language of use in the public places. In addition, some informants also feel that the target of the campaign include both the dialect-speaking Chinese (the main target group in the first ten years of the campaign). However, some informants also feel strongly the target of the SMC should focus on the English-educated Chinese (the new target group of the SMC since 1991). In addition, most informants also agree to the cultural argument for promoting Mandarin. As the results of the SSI show, a majority of informants can understand the government's goals in promoting the SMC. Most agree that Mandarin is needed to preserve the Chinese culture that is fast eroding because of increased Westernisation in the Chinese community. Most feel that a majority of Chinese now habitually speak more English and the campaign serves to remind ethnic Chinese in Singapore to switch to speaking Mandarin instead.

Almost all informants support strongly the economic goal of the SMC, which is to promote Mandarin for business dealings with China. This shows that the economic benefits of learning Mandarin is an important factor for persuading informants to support the SMC. The

results from the SAS thus confirm the observation by Pakir (1994) that the rise of Mandarin in Singapore is linked to global events such as the increasing importance of languages for wider communication for purposes of trade, industry and technology. Mandarin is now recognized by most informants as a potential language for trade, industry and technology. This shows that Mandarin is also gaining in importance as an economically viable language, although English is still the de facto working language in Singapore. The results of the SSI confirm the findings from the SAS which revealed the popularity of Mandarin as language for business ventures in China. This reflects the success of the campaign in promoting Mandarin as a viable economic language in the dialect-speaking community.

Several informants also agree with the communicative argument for the SMC. As mentioned in Chapter Four, one of the goals of the SMC is to promote Mandarin as an in-group communication for all dialect-speakers. The goal is to unify all dialect-speakers through a common language, Mandarin. A major critique of the communicative argument is the assumption that linguistic diversity hinders communication and that most dialect-speaking Chinese speak and understand only one dialect (Platt: 1980). Nevertheless, some informants believe that there is a need to unify the various dialect groups through a common language. As mentioned in Chapter Four, when the SMC was first initiated in 1979, about 86% of the Chinese communicate with each other through dialects. In addition, the various dialect groups also have not only linguistic differences but cultural differences as well (Anon: 1980: p13). Although dialects are currently spoken among the older generations of Chinese Singaporeans, the results from the SSI reveal that most dialect-speakers prefer Mandarin over Hokkien as an interdialect language. As the results of the SAS show, Mandarin is used in most domains of individual dialect-speakers within the sample community. This is because Mandarin has a higher status than the local Chinese dialects. In addition, Mandarin is also the official mother tongue of all local Chinese in schools.

The results of part one of the SSI also indicate that a majority of informants agree with the educational argument for Mandarin. As mentioned in Chapter Four, the Singapore government forwards the educational argument for the SMC, and states that the learning of Mandarin will be stifled by the use of dialects in the homes. Mandarin was promoted as the mother tongue of all the Chinese in Singapore. As mentioned in section 4.1, a major issue of contention in the educational argument revolves around the mother tongue. Although there

have been protests that Mandarin does not correspond to the childhood languages of individual dialect-speaker (Gupta:1998), nevertheless the results of the SSI show that a majority of informants regard it as the mother tongue. This sends a powerful indication that informants agree with the educational argument for Mandarin.

7.2. Informants' views on the continuation of the SMC

Another purpose of the SSI is to examine informants' views on the strategy adopted by the government : whether they agree with the continuation of the SMC. Their agreement with the continuation of the campaign will indicate their support for the SMC. The following question was asked to investigate whether informants agree that the SMC should be continued :

> "Do you think we should have it (the campaign) every year or should the government stop it?"

The following are the views of informants:

The SMC should be continued

All but one informant agree that the SMC should be continued. Some feel that although the number of dialect-speakers speaking Mandarin has increased, they feel that the English-educated Chinese are still indifferent to the campaign. Others feel that Mandarin has some relevance in their daily lives and they believe the campaign is necessary to remind the Chinese of the value of speaking Mandarin. There are others who feel that the campaign is necessary to remind local Chinese of their cultural heritage and identity.

One informant in his early twenties, a polytechnic student, observes that more Chinese in Singapore are speaking English and not Mandarin. He also discloses that before the campaign, he often spoke Hokkien at home with his family members. However, since the launch of the SMC, he uses Mandarin to converse with his parents at home. He feels that the campaign should be continued as currently, most Chinese students tend to speak only English in schools. He explains that this is due to the widespread effort by the government to encourage students to speak English in the Speak Good English movement. However, he feels that the government should strike a balance in promoting both English and Mandarin:

Extract 10 IM1/3Nov04

> *I think the campaign should continue because more and more people speak English. We should ask the school to encourage the school children to speak more Mandarin. Currently, the school emphasizes only on getting school children to speak more English. There should be a balance - have school children speak both English and Mandarin.*

Another informant, a female student in a secondary school, also agrees that the campaign should be continued. She feels that Singapore is fast becoming an English-speaking country as most people speak English. To her, the campaign is a reminder that Mandarin is the second language of the Chinese in Singapore and thus it should not be forgotten:

Extract 11 IM3/8 Nov04

> *Of course, we should have it every year. Nowadays, there have been a lot of cases about people who know English and speak only English. This will reflect badly on us Chinese. The campaign is useful. It helps us to remember to speak Mandarin as people tend to speak a lot of English. However a lot depends on whether people really practise the message in the advertisement.*

Another informant, a first-year electrical engineering student, also agrees that the SMC should be continued so that the Chinese in Singapore will be motivated to speak Mandarin. He feels that there is an advantage in speaking Mandarin as Mandarin will allow the Chinese community to appreciate the Chinese language. He feels that the campaign is an effective strategy used to persuade the local Chinese to speak Mandarin. If there is no campaign, Chinese Singaporeans will not learn Mandarin on their own:

Extract 12 IM19/6Oct04

> *There should be a campaign like this or else there will be nobody to push and motivate us to speak more Mandarin. Our society is basically English-speaking and so most of us often speak English as a habitual and daily language. The purpose of the campaign is to encourage us to speak more Mandarin.*

Another informant, a female nurse in her late thirties, also agrees that the campaign should be continued as the Chinese in Singapore need to be reminded that Mandarin is still important in the society:

Extract 13 IM10/15Dec04

> *Yes, there's a need to have it every year. If we completely stop it, there will be people who completely do not speak Mandarin. In the past, our Prime Minister Mentor, Lee Kuan Yew, kept emphasizing the importance of English. Singapore needs English and so English is important. As a result, Mandarin becomes less important in our society. If the SMC continues, people will know that Mandarin is still important in our society and that we should try to preserve the language.*

Another informant, a male civil servant in his early thirties, feels that the campaign should be continued as it will spread the importance and usefulness of speaking Mandarin, as well as encouraging the local Chinese to speak standard Mandarin:

Extract 14 Im9/27Dec04

> *I think we should have it every year as a reminder to drive further the message the usefulness of Mandarin and also the correct usage of speaking standard Mandarin.*

There are others who feel that the campaign will serve as a good reminder that Mandarin is important to the Chinese. One female informant, a polytechnic graduate and a young mother of two, feels that the campaign will serve as a reminder to the local Chinese that they are Chinese in descent, and should be proud of their Chinese identity. She also expresses concern that with English being extensively spoken by the younger generation, Mandarin will be gradually phased out in Singapore. Although she still speaks Hokkien at home, she wholeheartedly supports the SMC and believes that it will enable young Chinese Singaporeans to appreciate their Chinese roots and respect the Chinese culture.

Extract 15 IM5 26Oct04

> *I think we should continue it every year. Chinese should speak Mandarin. If the government emphasizes only English and neglects Mandarin, the people will speak only English. We should learn Mandarin, especially the young generation of Chinese should learn it to know their Chinese roots.*

Another informant, a grandfather, feels that the campaign should not only be continued but should be reinforced to remind Chinese of their cultural identity. However, he cautions that the campaign should not emphasize merely speaking Mandarin. He feels that the learning of

English is still important. If the Chinese in Singapore speak only Mandarin among themselves, other racial groups may feel threatened:

Extract 16 IM15/19Oct04

> *It is not sufficient to encourage people to speak Mandarin all the time. A lot of Chinese don't even recognize the Chinese characters. The campaign should not only be continued but it should be reinforced...We speak Mandarin because we are Chinese. It's our responsibility. Thus we don't need others to encourage us to speak Mandarin. If we need the government to encourage us to speak Mandarin, then is because of the past where English has been commonly used. We should not let the campaign create a distance between us Chinese and other racial groups. This will be dangerous in Singapore, and so English is necessary. We should not give up the learning of English, which is a neutral language in our society. If we give up the learning of English completely and embrace Mandarin totally, then it will have an effect-Malay and the Indian will see Chinese as threatening. This will cause Singapore to become a fragmented society.*

There are also others who feel that the campaign should be continued as Mandarin is increasingly becoming an important economic tool, especially in the conduct of business dealings with China. For instance, a young executive working as an IT programmer in a logistic company, and in his early thirties, states that as Singapore embraces globalization, the campaign should help people to internalize the value of Mandarin as an important language for business dealings with China. He feels that for the campaign to be effective, people must see the value behind it. Although he speaks Hokkien to his friends and family members, he believes Mandarin is important and there are advantages in learning it. When asked whether the SMC should be continued, his response was:

Extract 17 IM7/6Dec04

> *Have it every year as the global environment is changing. China's market is growing very fast and our economy is moving towards one that is Mandarin-based. Mandarin is important if we want to do business in countries where Mandarin is spoken.*

Continue the campaign but not throughout the year

Some informants believe that the campaign should not be implemented throughout the year. They feel that the campaign has achieved its goal in persuading the Chinese in Singapore to speak Mandarin. They believe that although the campaign is still necessary, it should not be implemented throughout the year.

One male informant in his early thirties, a project officer, feels that the campaign message will have been drummed in by now, and hence there is no necessity to have it run annually. He feels that while the campaign will allow the Chinese to preserve their Chinese roots, it should only be confined to certain months and not throughout the year:

Extract 18 IM6/27Oct04

> *I think we should have it every year but it should be moderate; that is, have it every year but not throughout the year. If it is too long, it will be too boring.*

The campaign should be discontinued

Two informants feel that the campaign should be discontinued as the campaign has been implemented for too many years and many Chinese in Singapore are now heeding the call of the government to speak Mandarin.

One informant, a Hokkien-speaking middle-aged man working as a manager in a shipping firm, suggests that the campaign should stop as it has met its objectives. He feels that continuing the campaign will be a waste of resources and will not have any impact on the local Chinese. He claims that in the past, the campaign was necessary as Chinese Singaporeans were afraid to speak Mandarin for fear that they would be branded 'communist.' The Chinese were also afraid to speak Mandarin, because other racial groups, particularly the Malays, were suspicious and worried that the campaign would cause racial disharmony in Singapore. However, such fears and worrries are no longer valid as people now recognise that Mandarin is an important economic tool and there are advantages in speaking the language. Thus he is against continuing the SMC as it has achieved its aim. This was reflected in his comments:

Extract 19 IM12/21Dec04

Yes, the government should stop it as we have been having it every year. It has done its job. People are now using Mandarin and not dialect. It has achieved its goal; overdoing it is a waste of resources and will have no effect on the people; people now know China is coming up, and now there is no misunderstanding about being pro-Communist if we know Mandarin. Now even the Malay wants to know it...Certainly the same thing has been running for many years, about ten years I think. Over the years, most places use Mandarin, even the auntie (a colloquial term for elderly housewife in Singapore) speaks Mandarin now.

Echoing a similar view, a female schoolteacher in her early fifties, feels that the campaign should stop. She agrees that Mandarin has helped her to develop a closer bond with her Chinese friends in China, and in other countries where Mandarin is spoken. However, she feels it is not necessary to have it every year as the importance of speaking Mandarin would have already been drummed into the people:

Extract 20 IM2/7 Nov04

After one or two years the message will be drummed in by then; maybe the campaign should stop for a while. Initially people need to know about the campaign during the first five years when it was launched but now even all the children speak Mandarin everywhere so it is not necessary to have it every year.

In general, the findings of the SSI on informants' views on the strategy of the SMC indicate that almost all informants support the campaign and would like the government to continue the campaign. Although the campaign was launched more than two decades ago, most informants believe that the campaign is still necessary as there is a perception that Mandarin is gradually losing its importance in the Chinese community as a result of the dominance of English in Singapore. In addition, several informants feel that the English-educated Chinese are rather indifferent to the campaign and thus they fully support the continuation of the campaign believing that it will serve to remind English-educated Chinese Singaporeans of the importance of Mandarin as a marker of their Chinese identities. In addition, most informants are also aware of the campaign's goal in instilling Chinese values. Thus, the call for the continuation of the campaign by most informants reflects the effectiveness of the SMC in changing the language habits of the dialect-speakers within the researched community. Having discussed the views of informants on whether the SMC should be

continued, I will proceed to discuss the informants' views on whether they agree with the campaign strategy of eliminating Chinese dialects within the Chinese community.

7.3. Informants' views on the elimination of Chinese dialects

Before the launch of the SMC by the government, most Chinese Singaporeans spoke their own dialects such as Hokkien, Teochew, Hainanese, Hakka, Cantonese and Foochow (Gopinathan: 1998). The various dialects were spoken in places such as the hawker centers and the wet markets. In addition, dialects were also spoken within the family.

Thus, one of the major aims of the SSI is to investigate the reactions of the dialect-speaking Chinese towards the campaign's strategy of eliminating dialects. Question 2b of the SSI was aimed at finding out whether informants agree with the issue expressed in the 1983 campaign slogan, "Mandarin In. Dialect Out."

The results of the SSI show that almost all informants are not in favour of the strategy adopted by the government to eliminate Chinese dialects within the Chinese community. This was reflected in their disagreement with the campaign slogan "Mandarin in. Dialects out". The following are some reasons why informants disagree with the strategy of eliminating dialects:

Chinese dialects are important for communicating with the older generation

A young Hokkien-speaking polytechnic student who lives in a condominium disagrees with the campaign slogan, "Mandarin In. Dialect Out." He feels that although his parents and his uncles now speak more Mandarin as a result of the SMC, his younger relatives continue to speak English. Thus he feels that dialects are still important as they allow the old and young generations to communicate through a common language. Thus he is against the idea of eliminating dialects as reflected in his comments:

Extract 21 IM16/2Nov04

I don't quite really agree with the advertisement. We should speak some kind of dialect. The older generation speaks some dialects and so we should know at least some dialects. Besides, Mandarin and dialects are pretty similar.

Another informant, an IT programmer in his thirties, also disagrees with the slogan. He observes that as a result of the SMC, the use of Chinese dialects in Singapore has decreased over the years. However, he argues that dialects are still relevant in the local Chinese community especially in communicating with the older generation. He feels that the campaign should focus on persuading local Chinese to speak less dialect, and not push for a total elimination of Chinese dialects. Thus he disagrees with the campaign slogan, "Mandarin In. Dialects Out". This is reflected in his response:

Extract 22 IM7/6 Dec04

Why not, "Mandarin In, Less Dialect"? The use of dialects has diminished over the years and so there's no need to reduce the use of dialects further. Dialects and Mandarin are two major languages among the Chinese. It should not be eliminated further; Dialect is also important for communication with the older generation of Chinese. If you know dialect, you know another language and so it's to your advantage.

Dialects are important within the grassroots organisation

There are also others who feel that dialects are still relevant to Singapore especially among the grassroots organizations (IM1, 2, 9). One informant, a male polytechnic student, protests against the elimination of dialects. He feels that although most of his friends from English-speaking home backgrounds have started to speak Mandarin as a result of the SMC, there are situations where dialects are required. He cites the examples of using dialects to communicate with his supervisor when he was doing his final year project while studying in the polytechnic. His response was:

Extract 23 IM1/ 3Nov04

...we must learn both Mandarin and dialect. The older generation speaks dialects; some businesses also use dialects. For my Final Year Project, my company supervisor English is not so good so we talk in dialects and it's much easier for us to communicate.

A female informant also disagrees with the campaign's strategy of eliminating Chinese dialects within the Chinese community. She feels that both the elderly and the young should continue to speak dialects. She believes that the campaign slogan will not have any impact on elderly Chinese in their fifties or sixties as they will continue to speak only dialects with or without the campaign. She also feels that less educated Singaporeans such as the hawkers, and those who are not proficient in the Mandarin, will feel left out if all Chinese within the Chinese community speak only Mandarin.

Extract 24 IM2/7Nov04

> *It's wrong as old people or the older generation can only speak dialects and not Mandarin; they will be left out of society as they can't speak Mandarin. But for the younger generations, especially those who are still schooling, or those in their twenties, I think they should not only speak Mandarin but also a bit of dialect. Occasionally, we do need a few words of dialects for camaraderie or for family bonding. Even Goh Chok Tong (former Prime Minister of Singapore) speaks dialects to identify himself with the people.*

One informant, a male civil servant, feels that although the campaign slogan, "Mandarin in. Dialects out," is direct and concise in spelling out the objective of the SMC, it is rather offensive. He observes that the number of people speaking Mandarin has increased and dialects are now less spoken as compared to the past. However, he thinks that dialects are still relevant in the Chinese community.

Extract 25 IM9/27 Dec04

> *The slogan is offensive as the dialects are still important in our society. We should not eliminate dialects because dialects have important roles. Dialects are commonly used in different generations, especially among the old folks. Dialects are also important in other levels of society, especially in grassroots level and also in other countries.*

Dialects are necessary for communication with one's parents in the family

Two informants oppose the campaign strategy of eliminating dialects. They believe that it is necessary for the government to implement the campaign to encourage the Chinese to speak

Mandarin but disagree with the strategy of eliminating Chinese dialect as dialects are important for communication within the family:

Extract 26 IM12/21Dec04

> *This is not a good way to promote the campaign because you are 'hitting' at the dialect; Knowing dialect is not bad, the wording for the campaign should not be in the form of 'hitting' at dialect, as dialect is still important for communication for family; 'hitting' at dialect is not the best way to get people to speak Mandarin.*

Another informant also disagrees with the strategy of eliminating Chinese dialects as he feels there is nothing wrong for dialect-speakers to converse with each other in dialects.

Extract 27 IM15/19Oct04

My personal opinion-Mandarin can enable individual Chinese to communicate with each other but as for dialects-like Teochew, Hokkien, Hainanese, if we speak them, there is nothing wrong. Mandarin is the common language of the Chinese, but in the family, if members speak dialects to each other, there's nothing wrong.

Dialects facilitate the learning of Mandarin

There are also others who feel that dialects can facilitate the learning of Mandarin, as both languages are similar to each other. A male Hainanese-speaking businessman, in his fifties, feels that it is not necessary to eliminate dialects as those who speak dialects will eventually switch to speaking Mandarin:

Extract 28 IM13/5 Dec04

> *There's no need to discriminate against Chinese dialects, as dialects and Mandarin are closely linked. If a Chinese speaks dialect, it will encourage him to speak Mandarin eventually.*

A Hokkien-speaking informant, in his fifties, and a father of two, states that Chinese dialects are phonetically similar to Mandarin . He also feels that if a Chinese who is not conversant in Mandarin continues to speak dialects, he will eventually be able to speak Mandarin:

Extract 29 IM14/25 Oct04

> *Mandarin and dialects are related. If people use dialects, then they will be able to relate in Mandarin. Both Mandarin and dialects cannot replace each other. Both*

are important. I do not support the slogan. You should not restrict dialects or Mandarin. They will naturally come together. If you speak dialects, then you will also learn Mandarin because they have similar sounds. A lot of English-educated can speak Mandarin because they also know dialects. They may not be able to read in Mandarin but they can speak it.

Dialects help to transmit local Chinese cultural values and traditions

There are others who oppose to the campaign's goal of eliminating Chinese dialects as they feel that dialects are the cultural language of the Chinese in Singapore.

A female informant, a secondary three student, disagrees with the campaign slogan as she feels that dialects are also important agents for cultural transmission:

Extract 30 IM3/8Nov04

Mandarin is like our mother tongue and dialect is about our cultural language. So we should preserve both. We should not get rid of them.

Dialects accord the various sub-sections of the Chinese community their cultural identities

A male informant studying in the university also echoes a similar view. He explains that the Chinese community is a huge community and within it, there are various other sub-groups with their unique characteristics. Through speaking different dialects, the various sub-groups within the Chinese community are able to distinguish themselves from each other:

Extract 31 IM19/6Oct04

I feel that speaking more Mandarin is good. But in some Chinese communities where Hokkien or Cantonese are spoken, if they don't use dialects, they won't be able to have their special identities. They will also not be able to communicate with each other if Mandarin is spoken. Dialect is derived from Chinese culture; this shows that Chinese culture is varied. Actually Mandarin is good but if we neglect dialect, then we'll lose the dialect tradition. Instead of total elimination, why not ask the people to focus more on speaking Mandarin?

In general, most informants protest against the strategy of elimination Chinese dialects within the Chinese community. Their resistance towards the elimination of Chinese dialects may be attributed to the fact that dialects are still relevant in the community. As shown in question 6.1. of the SAS, dialects are an important means of communication with one's parents and the elderly. In addition, most local Chinese customs are conducted in dialects. Most local Chinese will agree that a weakening of the dialects may result in a weakening of their Chinese cultural base (Kuo and Jernudd: 1994). On the other hand, the Chinese culture that is promoted through Mandarin is different from the local Chinese culture. In fact, some dialect-speakers may feel that the SMC has caused the erosion of their Chinese cultural heritage. As a result of the loss of dialects, there has been a loss of a means of communication with the elderly who constitute important agents in the cultural transmission of local Chinese. Thus, some dialect-speakers find the strategy of eliminating Chinese dialects offensive and they resist the SMC. The following section will discuss the perceptions of informants on the outcome of the SMC.

7.4. Informants' view on the effectiveness of the SMC

Part Three, Question 3a of the SSI was aimed at investigating the perceptions of informants on the outcome of the SMC; whether they agree that the campaign is effective in persuading the Chinese in Singapore to embrace Mandarin as a language of use and preference. The results show that there are diverse views on the effectiveness of the SMC:

The SMC is effective in persuading the Chinese to speak Mandarin

Several informants agree that the SMC has been effective in encouraging the local Chinese to speak Mandarin. One female informant is positive about the effectiveness of the campaign as she observes that more people are speaking Mandarin:

Extract 32 IM5/ 26Oct04

> *Yes, it has a positive effect. Now more people speak Mandarin in recent years (Informant stresses that more people speak Mandarin and not people speak more Mandarin). Because of the campaign, in recent years, the Chinese music industry has become very popular and also when two Chinese meet each other, they will speak Mandarin.*

A male informant also agrees that the SMC has been effective as he observes that the number of people speaking Mandarin has increased and the number of people speaking dialects has decreased since the campaign was launched two decades ago:

Extract 33 IM9/27 Dec04

> *Yes, the number of people speaking Mandarin has increased as compared to the past. Now dialects are less spoken. In hawker centers, more people now speak Mandarin and less dialect. Also when another Chinese meet another Chinese, they converse with each other in Mandarin unlike in the past where dialects are used.*

One informant believes that the SMC is effective as it has created an awareness of the importance of Mandarin among the local Chinese. He feels that the campaign should aim at persuading the Chinese to internalize the value of knowing Mandarin:

Extract 34 IM7/6 Dec04

> *Yes, the message creates awareness, but people must see the value behind it before the campaign can be effective. For example, the message must help people to realize the value of Mandarin in doing business in the China market...Personally, people have become more aware of Mandarin and they also embrace the Chinese values. Generally, people support the SMC-there's no resistance or objection by the people. Most people generally kept silent about the campaign; they do acknowledge where the government is heading in the campaign.*

The campaign is only effective during certain periods

One informant feels that the campaign is only effective during the months when the campaign is launched:

Extract 35 IM19/6 Oct04

> *I don't see a lot of people speaking Mandarin around me. It's only for a period of time when the campaign is on, and if there are people encouraging us to speak Mandarin. After the campaign is over, the 'hot wave' of the campaign will die away. If the campaign is on, there will be more people around to encourage you to*

speak Mandarin, and so you will speak the language. In a way, the campaign is successful as people speak more Mandarin during the campaign.

The SMC is not effective

There are also those who feel that the strategy is not effective as the government is not directly involved in the campaign. Several informants also feel that the campaign is not effective as they observe that most of the English-educated Chinese consider Mandarin to be less important than English and hence remain indifferent to the campaign. A male informant in his fifties feels that governmental organizations should set an example by using Mandarin as a medium of communication with the public:

Extract 36 IM13/5 Dec04

The SMC is rather superficial; it's not 'deep' enough to be effective as the campaign is only implemented through social organizations and not through the government. But the government is afraid that the campaign can be sensitive and so do not really enforce the campaign. The campaign should involve the government for it to be effective.

Several informants feel that the campaign is not effective as Singapore is basically an English-speaking society, and unless there is opportunity to use Mandarin, the campaign will not be effective. One male informant feels that the campaign is not effective as the functions and uses of Mandarin in the society are limited:

Extract 37 IM14/25 Oct04

I think the campaign is not effective, as we need to take into account not just the reactions of the people but also the language situation of our society. There's a close connection between the functions of Mandarin in the society and the campaign. If you promote the campaign, but do not use Mandarin, then there is no effect. There should be opportunity for people to speak Mandarin and to read materials in Mandarin. In public counters, there are people who speak Mandarin, but I personally observe that in most public counters, the service personnel are usually either Malay or Indian; there are few Chinese around- usually one or two only; the Chinese personnel are all in high executive positions and are not found in the service counters. So naturally, people will use English to communicate with the

Malay or Indian personnel, as they can't afford to wait for the Chinese personnel to attend to them.

Another informant feels that the campaign is not effective, as Mandarin is not used widely in the media. He also observes that government leaders within government departments seldom use Mandarin.

Extract 38 IM15/19 Oct04

If we consider the fact that the campaign has been implemented for a long period, I feel it's not effective. This is because in the media and within government departments and among government leaders, Mandarin is not commonly used. Although the campaign encourages people to speak Mandarin, Mandarin is not being commonly used by government leaders in government departments and by other top-level management in organizations. Government leaders should set an example by speaking Mandarin first.

One elderly female informant also echoes similar views. She feels that the campaign is not effective as she feels the politicians and government leaders do not attempt to use Mandarin to communicate with the public:

Extract 39 IM11/17 Nov04

The government conducted some activities in the hawker center to encourage people to speak Mandarin. However, there's not much effect on the people as I feel the government is merely 'acting.' ...Even in elections, the politicians still use English.

Another informant feels that the campaign is not effective and as it is not implemented in schools. He feels that the impact of the SMC will be greater in schools where there is an emphasis in the learning of languages, and also because most students speak English rather than Mandarin in schools. He observes that people are still speaking English. He feels that the SMC does not really make any difference as students continue to speak English in schools. He believes that there is an awareness of the SMC but is uncertain whether parents from English-speaking home backgrounds encourage their children to speak Mandarin. He feels that for the campaign to be successful, the government should persuade more English-

educated parents to recognise the importance of Mandarin as a mother tongue and to be used not only in schools but also at home:

Extract 40 IM8/8 Dec04

Maybe it's good to get parents to see the importance of Mandarin as the mother tongue in the schools. Parents must pass the message to their children and the government should provide motivation for school children to learn Mandarin as the mother tongue. At the moment, it's obvious that English is more important than the mother tongue in schools and at home. There's a need to create the awareness that speaking the mother tongue at home is useful and important, just like the learning of English, which will be much easier for school children to acquire if the language is spoken at home.

A female informant also thinks that the campaign is not effective at all. She feels that the campaign has no visible effect, as people are generally indifferent to the campaign. She also observes that the campaign has created resentment. She also feels that the English-educated Chinese are still indifferent to the campaign:

Extract 41 IM10/15 Dec04

To me, I don't see any visible effect. It is only recently when the government emphasized the campaign in the newspaper that I could see its effect. But my nephew becomes resentful-the more the campaign is emphasized; the less he will speak Mandarin. It has the opposite effects. On the whole, the effect is not so obvious, and the government still needs to emphasize the message. From the newspaper, we could see that the Chinese Chamber of Commerce encourages people to speak Mandarin and even conduct Mandarin classes. However, there's still a need to emphasize the campaign as people may know the message, but they still have not opened their mouths to speak Mandarin...I heard there's an increase in the number of people speaking Mandarin but the effect is not very strong. I think there are a lot linguistic burden due to their non-Mandarin speaking backgrounds. For example, the English-educated, they feel Mandarin is difficult and even though the government encourages them, they still will not speak Mandarin. Just like a couple in the church, the husband still refuses to utter a word of Mandarin claiming that Mandarin is difficult.

Another informant, a Hainanese businessman in his fifties, feels that the SMC's goal of eliminating Chinese dialects will not have much effect on the older generation. He believes that as society progresses dialects will no longer be used in Singapore even without the campaign:

Extract 42 IM13/5 Dec04

> *For the dialect-speakers, and mainly those elderly and uneducated, the campaign has not much effect, as dialects will automatically decrease in use as society progresses, so the SMC will not have much effect on them. These people will not resist the campaign nor will they oppose it, as they are usually not as vocal as the English-educated.*

Another informant, a male university student, feels that the campaign is not effective as most Chinese in Singapore still regard English as being more important than Mandarin:

Extract 43 IM19/6 Oct04

> *Just normal effect-It doesn't have much effect at all. Those deeply rooted in Chinese education will support the campaign but the average Singaporean will not be affected at all even though there is a SMC. To them, Mandarin is not an important issue. English is more important for them as they can use it to communicate in all situations.*

Another informant also feels that the campaign is ineffective as Singapore is basically a predominantly English-speaking nation. The Chinese are already struggling to master English and so they will not pay much attention to the SMC:

Extract 44 IM14/25Oct04

> *I personally feel there is not much effect. Singapore is still very much English-speaking, like any other Western country. People are struggling with English, so how can you expect them to master Mandarin? It depends on your social experience and your job-English is still important.*

It is uncertain whether the campaign is effective

One informant expresses uncertainty whether the SMC is effective. A male informant, a schoolteacher from a Hokkien and Cantonese speaking home background, claims he is not

sure whether more people speak Mandarin as a result of the SMC. He feels there could be other factors that cause more people to speak Mandarin:

Extract 44 IM8/8 Dec04

> *It's difficult to gauge. I'm not sure. I don't know whether people speak Mandarin as a result of the campaign; it might be due to policy changes. In my school, a number of my colleagues speak Mandarin, but I don't know whether it's the environment or the SMC that cause them to speak the language. Maybe, it's due to the Chinese TV artists that appear on the SMC advertisements. What they say is quite influential and thus they are able to motivate people to speak Mandarin.*

7.5. Discussions on the results of the SSI

In the following section, I will discuss some important findings of the SSI.

In general, most informants agree with the goals of the SMC. Most indicate that they would like the government to continue the campaign. The analysis of the SSI shows that a majority of the informants have become more aware of the usefulness and importance of Mandarin through the SMC. In addition, most informants have no objections to the official arguments for the implementation of the SMC. Nearly all informants agree that Mandarin is required for preserving Chinese culture and identity in Singapore. Some informants were able to state the importance of Mandarin for uniting the various dialect groups (the communicative argument). Most informants also agreed that Mandarin is the official mother tongue of all Chinese in Singapore, although they did not comment on the educational argument that dialects hinder the learning of Mandarin in schools. There could be a few reasons why the majority of informants support the campaign.

Several informants feel that the campaign is useful as it helps to reaffirm the importance of Mandarin in the Chinese community. They are afraid that with the dominance of English in the Singapore society, there will be a loss of Mandarin within the Chinese community in the future. Some informants also think that Mandarin has a higher status than dialects as it is the official language of the Chinese community. As Mandarin is also the official second language in schools, some informants (mainly parents) indicated that they will want their children to master Mandarin to perform well in their studies.

Some informants, especially the elderly dialect-speakers, have observed that the younger Chinese being educated in English are resistant to speaking Mandarin. There is a fear among the elderly, that the younger generation of Chinese will stop communicating in Mandarin and will eventually lose their Chinese cultural heritage. Thus some informants feel that the SMC is important as it serves to prevent the younger generation of Chinese from losing their Chinese roots.

In addition, a majority of informants support the SMC because they perceive that Mandarin will become an economically viable language that will offer them job opportunities in the future. Many dialect-speakers are convinced of the economic argument offered by Mandarin. This is a result of the 1985 campaign where Mandarin is promoted as an important asset for business dealings with China. With the rise of China as an economic powerhouse and the perception that Mandarin will become an international language in future, most informants feel that the learning of Mandarin is a necessity.

Another probable reason why informants support the goal of the campaign could be attributed to the use of Mandarin in the Christian faith. Mandarin is still the language of the Bible for Chinese converts and most Christian literature is written in Mandarin. The teaching of the Bible is conducted in Mandarin in Sunday school among the children in the church. In addition, Mandarin is also necessary for dialect-speakers within the community to relate their Christian faith and to evangelise to other non-believers outside the community. However, although most informants agree with the goals of the campaign, they do not agree to the strategy of eliminating Chinese dialects within the community. A majority of informants feel that dialects are still relevant in their community. They feel that dialects are still necessary as a medium of communication with parents in the family as well as with elderly members within the community who cannot speak Mandarin. Some informants also associate dialects as a core marker of their Chinese identities. They believe that the removal of dialects within the community will lead to a loss of their Chinese heritage (Kuo: 1985). Thus, although dialects are perceived to be having lower instrumental values compared to Mandarin, the emotional attachment of informants with dialects is rather strong.

In general, more than half of the informants agree that the outcome of the SMC has been positive. They observe that more Chinese are speaking Mandarin compared to the past where dialects are used instead. Those who agree that the campaign is effective observe that dialects are currently less spoken in the community. On the other hand, Mandarin is spoken in more public places such as in the workplace, in hawker centers and by less educated Chinese. However, there are some who feel that the campaign is not effective as they perceive that some English-speaking Chinese are still indifferent to the official call to speak Mandarin. In addition, those who feel that the campaign is ineffective also think that most government leaders and politicians do not use Mandarin to communicate with the public. They feel that the campaign should adopt a top-down approach for it to be effective. Several informants feel that Singapore is basically an English-speaking country and thus the priority is for them to embrace English. Most informants are aware that in terms of economic benefits, English surpasses Mandarin as the language associated with the global world. They also observe that some English-educated parents within the community will not support the SMC as they prefer their children to master English which is used in education, trade and technology. In this chapter, I have discussed the findings of the SSI. In the following chapter, I will discuss the implications of the findings from both the SSI and SAS.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

In this concluding chapter, I will address the research question to examine whether the SMC has been effective within the sample community. Next, I will provide a critique of the efforts of the government in the language management of the SMC. I will then discuss several repercussions on the decline of Chinese dialects within the Chinese community in Singapore. I will also discuss the various reasons for the resistance towards the SMC. There will also be a discussion of the implications of the loss of Chinese dialects for nation building. I will then discuss some future challenges for the SMC followed by some suggestions for future research. Finally, a discussion on the limitations of this study will be provided at the end of the chapter.

8.1. Has the campaign been effective within the sample community?

To recapitulate, this study seeks to investigate the extent to which the SMC has been effective in changing the language habits of a community of dialect-speakers. The research questions for this study are:

(1) Has the Speak Mandarin Campaign been effective in persuading members within a dialect-speaking church community to adopt Mandarin as a language of use?"

(2) Has there been a shift in attitudes of individual members within the community in favour of Mandarin?"

(3) Do individual members within the community agree with the goals, strategies and outcomes of the campaign?"

In order to answer the research questions, this study examined the reported habitual and specific use of individual dialect-speaker in various domains (family, work, friends, hawker

centers and shopping centers) to assess whether there has been a change in language habits in favour of Mandarin. In addition, the study investigated whether dialect-speakers within the community have positive attitudes towards the language-planning product (Mandarin). The study also examined the views of members on the SMC as a planned effort by the government to influence their language use. The two main methods of data collection include both the self-administered survey (SAS) and the semi-structured interview (SSI). The results and analysis of these two instruments were discussed in Chapters Six and Seven respectively.

The results from the SAS show that a majority of dialect-speakers in the researched community stated that they use Mandarin instead of Chinese dialects in most domains. As mentioned in section 6.2, most dialect-speakers currently use Mandarin in the hawker centres and in the shopping centres. Mandarin is also used in the domain of close friends, colleagues and classmates. It is important to note that before the launch of the SMC in 1979, dialects were used mainly in the more informal settings such as in hawker centres, wet markets and [9]HDB void decks (Gopinathan: 1998). Most users of Chinese dialects were the residents in HDB housing estates. The initial goal of the SMC was to eradicate the use of Chinese dialects and to encourage the use of Mandarin in the hawker centres (Lee: 1996). The results from the SAS indicated that about 74.6% of dialect-speakers in the community now use Mandarin instead of Chinese dialects in the hawker centres. The results of the SAS also indicated that the dialect-speakers in the sample community speak less Chinese dialects and more Mandarin as compared to before the launch of the SMC. Within the sample community, the use of dialects has declined and its use is mainly confined to the home domain and in communicating with parents.

In addition, the results of the SAS also reveal that respondents reported positive attitudes towards Mandarin. A majority of respondents like speaking Mandarin and would like their children to learn Mandarin. Many also believe that Mandarin is a useful language for them to acquire. Almost all respondents believe that Mandarin is important as a language for business

[9] HDB void deck-A large proportion of Singaporeans live in blocks of high-rise apartments known as 'flats'. At the ground floor of every block of flats is an open, common atrium where people can meet and congregate; where children can play hop-skotch and ping pong, and where old folks sit around resting their tired legs after returning from the market. Sometimes the void deck is used as a place to conduct funeral wakes by Chinese HDB dwellers.

dealings with China. Many respondents also believe that Mandarin will be useful for their employment opportunities as they feel Mandarin will gain status as an international language in future.

Finally, the analysis of results of the SSI also indicated that most informants reported favourable attitudes towards the SMC. In general, they agree with the goal of the SMC to encourage the Chinese to speak Mandarin. However, most informants do not agree with the strategy of eliminating dialects within the Chinese community. Some informants feel that dialects are still relevant for communication within the family and also with the elderly. On the whole, the informants also support the campaign and would like the government to continue promoting Mandarin within the Chinese community.

Although, the results of the data analysis show a shift to Mandarin among dialect speakers in the sample community, it is difficult (if not impossible) to prove a primary cause for it. The researcher may believe very strongly that it is due to the launch of the Speak Mandarin campaign since 1979 that dialect speakers switch to speaking Mandarin. However, based on the data from the sociolinguistic survey and the semi-structured interview, it is rather difficult to conclude to what degree the SMC has contributed to the shift to Mandarin. It is possible that other factors such as the bilingual educational policy and China's increased economic power have contributed to this shift. In addition, within a span of 25 years since the start of the campaign, some of the Chinese (especially those above 60) will have disappeared from the population. It is thus difficult to state the specific reasons for the switch to Mandarin within the community.

The promotion of the SMC has been rather forceful in the past decades and its success is not merely confined to the sample community but to the larger Chinese community as well. Commenting on its success within the Chinese community, Gupta (1994:151) observes:

> Mandarin is heard from the Chinese in Singapore in volumes unimaginable in the 1970s. Families where parents knew Mandarin have switched to a domestic use of Mandarin on a massive scale after more than two decades of the SMC.

The success of the SMC has put to test notions traditionally held by linguists that

> Linguistic habits are slow to change or even that entrenched language habits cannot be changed (Pakir: 1994: 165).

To bring about a radical change in the speech habits of the Chinese community within such a relatively short span of time is indeed a remarkable achievement. This is only possible with the clear and focused vision of the government (Shepherd:2003).

There are several reasons why deliberate language planning by the government has been effective in encouraging a linguistic shift to Mandarin in the dialect-speaking communities in Singapore. A major reason why Mandarin is accepted by dialect-speakers may be attributed to the efforts of the government to promote Mandarin as having instrumental value in the international community. As a result of the economic rise of China, Mandarin is highly esteemed by countries all over the world. In Singapore, Mandarin has been promoted as a language that will benefit Singaporeans' business dealings with China. As mentioned in Chapter Four, Mandarin was promoted as an economically viable language in business dealings during the 1985 SMC. The slogan of the campaign was "Speak Mandarin. It's an asset." In the sample community, nearly all respondents agree that Mandarin is important for business dealings with China. Thus the acceptance of Mandarin among dialect-speakers is engineered by the rise of China as an economic powerhouse.

In addition, Mandarin is able to survive within the dialect-speaking community as the government constantly emphasizes the practical usage of the language. Through the various SMC campaigns, dialect-speakers in Singapore have been encouraged to use Mandarin in various domains within the community: hawker centers, shopping centers, work, and among friends. In addition, the government also promotes Mandarin as an intra-lingual language to facilitate communication among dialect-speakers from different groups. The results from the SAS also indicated that a majority of dialect-speakers agree that Mandarin should be spoken as a common language among the various dialect groups in Singapore.

8.2. Critiques of governmental's efforts in language management of the SMC

Although the SMC is effective within the sample community, there are some critiques of the government's efforts in the language management of the SMC.

A major critique of the promotion of the SMC is that it has created an added burden to dialect-speakers. This problem arises as a result of the inadequacy of the social and cultural contexts to sustain Mandarin within the dialect communities. As a result, the SMC hastens the shift in younger members towards English (Tsou: 1988). Another major criticism of the SMC is that the campaign to promote Mandarin has created an East-is good-and West-is bad dichotomy. In the campaign for promoting Mandarin, English is presented as a carrier of undesirable Western values and a threat to the identity and Asian-ness of Singapore (Bokhorst-Heng:1998). As mentioned in Chapter Four, the official argument for the SMC is that Mandarin is needed as a cultural ballast to protect the Chinese cultural identity. Within the framework of the SMC, there is also an emphasis on Asian values and on Confucianism. However such a perspective is questionable. A few questions remain when assessing the government's intervention in the SMC:

> How is goodness/badness defined?
> Are there any universal, objective criteria? Is there a culture-neutral or noncultural position from which to interpret and assess different cultures?
> How should possible discrepancies be settled between the opinions of the ordinary folk and those of the elite, those of the insiders and those of the outsiders?
> (Gopinathan : 1979: 289)

The neat compartmentalization of the Western versus Eastern values is simplistic. As pointed out by educator, S. Gopinathan, this neat compartmentalisation of the Western versus Eastern values as seen to be transmitted through those languages does not quite square with reality for cultural identification and practice are much more complex than suggested by a listing of supposedly characteristic values. Gopinathan (1979:292-293) contends that:

> such cultural formulae ignore the obvious fact that truly human values exist in every major culture. Furthermore, talk about the superficialities of western culture seems to have blinded us to the quite evident triviality and pseudo-moralising of much of

> what passes for Asian culture...[as such], one needs to talk about cultural values with a great deal more caution.

As mentioned in Chapter Four, there are both good and bad things in both Eastern and Western culture. The real question is how to promote the good values of Western culture while suppressing the bad ones. As stated by Ho and Alsagoff (1998),

> English in Singapore can be seen as an invaluable transmitter of cultural tradition along with Mandarin.. Although English is not a native language of the major racial communities in Singapore, dismissing it, from an ethnic standpoint, as rootless, superficial, decadent, or imperialistic is sheer ethnocentrism and chauvinism.
> (Ho and Alsagoff : 1998: 215)

In a similar vein, Chiew (1980) suggests that to foster a Westernised Asian society, the government should take the best from both Asian and Western cultures. Core values of both Chinese and Western culture consistent with nation building should be maintained.

In addition, the campaign for the elimination of the Chinese dialects in the SMC goes against the official norms of multilingualism. As mentioned in Chapter Three, the guiding principle in the government's policy on ethnicity is multilingualism, which means equal status and treatment of all languages and cultures. Administratively, the official language stance is that the entire population is constituted into four units of equal status, viz. Chinese, Malays, Indians and Others (Eurasians, etc), each with a designated mother tongue and heritage culture.

However, although the SMC has improved the extent and use of Mandarin within the Chinese dialect communities in Singapore, it has also reduced diversity, and thus reduced multilingualism (Rubdy:2005:5). While the SMC has succeeded in persuading dialect-speakers to switch to Mandarin, in future, there are likely to be fewer Chinese with repertoires of more than two school languages. As Gupta (1994) points out that, ironically,

> this reduction of repertoire is often misleadingly described by politicians, educationalists and sociolinguists as an increase in bilingualism in Singapore, whereas, in fact multilingualism has decreased (Gupta : 1994: 151).

Thus it is evident that the rational centralized, top-down language planning in Singapore reveals a major discrepancy with the realities on the ground.

Although the campaign has been successful within the sample community, there are several implications that have emerged from this study. Firstly, the decline of Chinese dialects has resulted in several repercussions. Secondly, the study also revealed that some dialect-speakers disagree with the strategy of eliminating dialects within the Chinese community. Thirdly, there are also implications for nation building as more dialect-speakers embrace Mandarin as a language of use and preference. The following section will discuss these implications.

8.3. Repercussions on the decline of Chinese dialects

Both the results of the SSI and the SAS indicated that there has been a switch to Mandarin within the researched community. In the first decade of its existence, Shepherd (2003) reported that the SMC targeted different areas: the workplace, markets, shopping centres and hawker centres. However, since the first phase of the SMC from 1979 to 1989, Chinese dialects have declined in Singapore (see section 4.2). The government had made it mandatory that all dialect programmes be banned in the mass media. The aim was to persuade dialect-speakers to discard the use of dialects and speak Mandarin instead. Since the launch of the SMC, the use of dialects has gradually declined. There are several repercussions arising from the attempts by the government to eliminate Chinese dialects in Singapore. This section will reflect on the repercussions of the decline of Chinese dialects.

Firstly, the decline of dialects implies a loss of linguistic assets in Singapore. Singapore has been known as a "fortress of dialect" because of its extensive use of Chinese dialects (Chia: 1994). Before the SMC, Singapore was formerly one of the few places where many people could speak more than one, and sometimes several Chinese dialects. It is one of the few remaining countries where there is a diverse range of Chinese dialects and thus provides a rich and fertile context for research into Chinese dialects.

It must be remembered that the first generations of Chinese immigrants came from southern China and they brought with them their native dialects (Hokkien, Teochew, Cantonese,

Hainanese etc.) intending to pass them on to their children and grandchildren. However, as observed by Gupta and Siew (1995), a major effect of the SMC within the Chinese community has been the shift towards the use of Mandarin instead of Chinese dialects. With the successful unfolding of the SMC, the linguistic diversity has been declining to the extent that the majority of young generation of Chinese is unable to converse in dialects. Thus the promotion of the SMC has led to a sacrifice of the mother tongues (the various Chinese dialects) of the early immigrant Chinese resulting in a loss of the 'precious assets' they have brought from their motherland. Rubdy (2005) points out that :

> while the intention of the government is to manipulate and shape a specific linguistic reality in the Chinese dialect-communities, paradoxically launched in the name of 'pragmatic multilingualism,' it has invariably resulted in a language shift and language loss, leading to the reduction of linguistic diversity, to unequal access to discourse resources and differential access to power networks (Rubdy:2005:10).

As the results of this study show, although the promotion of the SMC has caused an increase in the use of Mandarin, there is also a corresponding decline in the use of Chinese dialects in the researched community. Although the promotion of Mandarin to replace dialects has a homogenizing effect, this has been at the expense of Chinese dialects and thus the rich linguistic environment of former times has been lost forever (Shepherd: (2003).

In addition, the decline of Chinese dialects also means a loss of communication for the 'silent majority.' As often used by politicians in Singapore, the term 'silent majority' refers to the majority of the low-income HDB dwellers whose main grouse is that they have suffered years of a combination of economic disadvantage, socio-political alienation and cultural dislocation due to their language handicap in both English and Mandarin. They are 'silent' because they have difficulty using English or Mandarin to communicate with the ruling English-speaking elite (Bokhorst-Heng: 1998). Attention swung to this group after the 1991 elections when three seats fell to dialect-speaking opposition MPs. Mr Lee Kuan Yew, then Senior Minister, observed that the election results showed the persistence of dialect loyalties. Opposition politicians who won wards were those who were able to use dialects to woo dialect-speaking voters. Thus while Mandarin is useful at the public level, at the private level,

dialect has an emotional appeal and can evoke a sense of empathy with dialect-speaking voters.

The election results sent a powerful signal to the government that there is a need to communicate with the 'silent majority' in Chinese dialects instead of English. An increasing number of politicians in Singapore are aware of the importance of dialects as a medium of communication when speaking to the general public. For instance, in the last outbreak of SARS (Severe acute respiratory syndrome) in June 2004, ministers and members of parliament used dialects to inform the HDB heartlanders of the dangers associated with the disease. History was also made when the local TV stations, MediaCorp Channel 8 and U Channel, televised live call-in forums in dialects to discuss the prevention of SARS. In addition, in 2001, the CPF (Central Provident Fund) board commissioned dialect commercials to explain its Top-up Scheme to reach out to elderly Singaporeans who are handicapped in both English and Mandarin. The reason for this is connectivity : the government realises there is a sense of intimacy that comes with communicating in dialects. Dialects connect one Chinese to another whereas Mandarin is unable to do so to the same extent. Thus, if Chinese dialects continue to decline in the Chinese community, political leaders may not find it an advantage to use dialects to communicate with the ordinary Chinese citizens.

Thirdly, the decline of dialects also implies a loss of economic tool. This is because Chinese dialects are still used extensively by the vast population of ethnic Chinese over Mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macao and other parts of the world. For instance, Hokkien is still used in Fujian in Mainland China as well as in Taiwan, while Cantonese is still a lingua franca in Hongkong and Macau. For the past few years, a large number of Hongkong immigrants have come to Singapore for business ventures with the local businessman. As they are not accustomed to speaking Mandarin, traders have to speak in Cantonese to do business with them (Goh: 1999). Thus the loss of dialects will put Chinese Singaporeans at a disadvantage when engaging in business dealings with these countries. It also contradicts the government's policy of encouraging Chinese Singaporeans to go abroad for economic development and in building up global economic connections.

Fourthly, the decline of dialects also results in a loss of a cultural vehicle within the dialect-speaking community. In the SMC, Mandarin is promoted as a carrier of the Chinese culture. However, the Chinese culture that is promoted through the SMC is different from local Chinese culture as it attaches more importance to Chinese literature, philosophy and value system in China. For some local Chinese, the function of dialect does not merely lie in speaking it at home; there is a whole way of cultural importance attached to it. As a dialect-speaker, the researcher has witnessed the use of dialects in most local Chinese customs such as during funeral wakes, in Chinese New Year, ChingMing festival (a festival that honours one's ancestors) etc. In addition, the various traditional values such as filial piety, honesty and thrift are embedded in local Chinese dialects.

Shepherd (2003:59) observes that the loss of dialects brought with it an accompanying loss of a rich variety of folk traditions, many of which were specific to a particular dialect group and which were transmitted orally through that dialect.The cultural roots that came with the different dialects groups in terms of festivals, food, customs etc. will soon be nostalgic things of yesterday. In future, as a result of the success of the SMC, the present generation of Mandarin speakers will readily embrace Mandarin rather than Chinese dialects, but they would have lost the rich ethnic and cultural heritage that was part of their forefather' culture, and perhaps would take less pride in being a Chinese. There will come a time when the Chinese dialects and the culture they embody will be irretrievably lost.

Finally, the decline of dialects also creates a breakdown of communication between different generations of dialect-speakers within the Chinese community. As a result of the SMC, the younger generation of dialect-speakers has switched to Mandarin while a majority of the elderly continues to communicate with each other in dialects. It must be noted that most dialect-speakers in Singapore speak southern dialects which differ from the Beijing dialect (Mandarin) which differ greatly in terms of grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. Thus most elderly dialect-speakers are unable to communicate with their grandchildren through a common language. In the past, dialects were the agents for the transmission of Chinese values when grandparents used to tell their grandchildren stories associated with their cultural background and their linguistic traditions. Rubdy (2001) reports that one of the outcomes of the SMC today is that many grandparents are unable to communicate with their grandchildren as a result of the loss of the mother tongue. According to Teo (2004:25),

the Mandarinising of Singapore will doubtless continue with the government's unrelenting promotion of Mandarin.

The 'generation gap' problem will eventually pass when the present generation of 'bilingual' students grow into adulthood and become parents and grandparents themselves. They will then no longer face the awkward communication rift that their parents and grandparents had encountered. However, the future generation of young Chinese will have less linguistic competency, and their speech repertoire may well be limited to merely English and Mandarin.

8. 4. Disagreement with the strategy of eliminating dialects

Another significant implication from this study is that although most dialect-speakers in the sample community support the SMC, not all of them agree to the campaign strategy of eliminating dialects within the Chinese community. In this study, some forms of objections against the strategy of eliminating dialects within the Chinese community were observed among informants during the SSI. As stated in Chapter Seven, several informants find the strategy of eliminating Chinese dialects as offensive and thus object to it. Among those who object to the strategy of eliminating dialects are parents who want their children to continue to acquire dialects, even though the government pushes for a total elimination of Chinese dialects in the SMC. This section will discuss the various reasons why some dialect-speakers object to the strategy of eliminating dialects.

One reason why some dialect-speaking Chinese object to the campaign strategy to eliminate dialects within the Chinese community is because they still consider dialects and not Mandarin as their ancestral language. For some dialect-speakers, it is dialects that they grew up with and can identify with in their socialization experience. On the other hand, Mandarin is a foreign language that they are unfamiliar with. Slogans such as "Mandarin is Chinese," (1985) "Start with Mandarin, not Dialect" (1986) may be offensive to some dialect-speaking Chinese who may feel that the campaign is all out to destroy their ancestral languages. It must be remembered that most dialects in Singapore originated from Southern China and are thus different from Mandarin which originated from Northern China.

Another reason why some dialect-speakers disagree with the strategy of eliminating dialects is because dialects are still an important means of communication within some dialect-speaking Chinese communities. As reported in the *Straits Times* (7 May, 2003) in the article, "It's high stakes when dialects come into play", about a third of Cantonese speakers still use Cantonese at home, while among the Hokkiens and Teochews, more than a quarter still use their dialects at home (Chua:2003:7). This means that a total of almost 600 000 Chinese Singaporeans continue to use dialects in their daily lives.

The elderly dialect-speaking Chinese also do not support the elimination of dialects as they are used to speaking Chinese dialects and have developed a deep attachment to their dialects over the years. Moreover, it is extremely difficult for them to learn a new language again. The SMC may intimidate and alienate some elderly dialect-speaking Chinese whose level of Mandarin proficiency is low. Some elderly folks are worried that they will not be able to communicate with the younger generation of Chinese if there is a loss of dialects within the Chinese community. The elderly are also afraid that Mandarin will destroy the ancestral culture that they identify through their dialects.

Even today, much of the local Chinese customs and practices are deeply embedded in the Chinese dialects. As one writer puts it:

> At the end of the day, it is still one's affiliation with the dialect group that will give a sense of who one is. There are birth rites, wedding and funeral customs and the arts which are peculiar to certain dialect groups only and which best find expression in the dialect. Lose the dialect, and you lose the very access to that bit of your roots (Teo: 2004:23).

> The call for a revival of dialects has been rather strong in the past few years. As reported by Goh (1999), in recent years, there have been calls in Parliament for a restoration of dialect names in public places and a resumption of dialect news broadcast. This indicates a desire of some dialect-speakers to restore dialects within the Chinese community. While comments on the elimination of dialects were rare in the past, the restoration of dialects has now been called into question publicly.

> However, Goh (1999) states that the restoration of dialects will make it difficult to sustain the habit of speaking Mandarin which has begun to take root within the Chinese community. The success of the campaign is a result of great efforts of the government in persuading dialect-speakers to discard dialects and switch to Mandarin. If dialects are allowed to be used in news broadcast or in public places, this may send the wrong signal to Chinese Singaporeans that the government has made a mistake in launching the SMC. Although the government in Singapore promotes the SMC to woo dialect-Chinese speakers in Singapore to embrace Mandarin, individual's preference for language use may go against the official call to embrace the language. As reported by the *Straits Times*, (10 Dec 2004), there is still a number of Chinese people who will remain indifferent to the efforts by the government to promote the SMC. According to the report, about 25% of the Chinese people do not think it necessary for them to speak Mandarin at all. Some dialect-speakers who are not persuaded by the arguments and goals of the campaign will continue to be indifferent to the campaign believing that not speaking or knowing Mandarin will not hinder them in any way culturally or economically (Ho:2004a, p1).

In Singapore, language attitudes can be rather complex. People do not generally hold opinions about languages or dialects in a vacuum. They develop attitudes towards languages or dialects which reflect the contexts and functions with which they are associated. For a majority of elderly dialect speakers, Mandarin will never replace their dialects because it lacks the associations with the past. Mandarin has no roots in the local Chinese culture. Although dialect speakers may speak Mandarin, it will be difficult for them to learn the language.

Pakir (1990) reports that although the SMC has been implemented since 1979, the eradication of dialects has proved impossible since a large proportion of the Chinese population, besides having switched to Mandarin (usually for literacy function), still do speak Hokkien, Teochew, Cantonese or some other dialect. This shows that although the government tries to eliminate Chinese dialects through the SMC, dialects continue to flourish within the dialect-speaking community. Although Mandarin has gained the status of the most used language in the community, some dialect speakers will want their dialects to be maintained.

If the proposal by some politicians to allow dialects to be used in the local Chinese community,in the foreseeable future, there will be greater competition between Mandarin and dialects as dialects gain greater visibility in the public domains. This may result in a blurring of the Mandarin/Dialect diglossia. A new trend of additive bilingualism bilingualism may emerge. Just as in China where mainland Chinese speak Mandarin as well as their dialects, Mandarin and Chinese dialects will continue to exist side by side in the linguistic ecology of the local Chinese community.

8.5. Implications for nation building

Although the SMC aims to change the linguistic habits of the Chinese community in Singapore, there are other implications involved in nation building if it is successfully implemented. This section will discuss the implications for nation building if all Chinese in Singapore speak Mandarin as a result of the success of the SMC.

A major implication of the success of the SMC is that it may cause unease among other ethnic groups in Singapore. Zainuri (1998) investigated the opinions of the Malay Singaporeans towards the SMC. Zainuri argued that given Singapore's multi-ethnic

composition, the implementation of the policy directed at the majority of Chinese will inevitably bring about inter-ethnic implications. To a great extent, this is true because as more Chinese choose to identify their ethnic identity through speaking Mandarin, Singapore will be divided into two blocs: Mandarin-speaking and non-Mandarin speaking. This may create tension among the non-Mandarin minority racial groups, such as the Indians and the Malays, and the Mandarin speakers. The Indian or Malay Singaporeans may feel more threatened by the increasing domination of Chinese over them and would rather deal with the Chinese community as a fragmented rather than a united group. If all dialect-speakers in Singapore speak Mandarin as a common language instead of their dialects, the non-Mandarin groups would feel threatened and become marginalized. In the long-term, the promotion of the SMC might even have the effect of tearing at the multi-ethnic and multi-cultural fabric of Singapore's sociological make-up.

In Singapore, nation building has long been understood as a process of de-ethnicizing the population with the gradual blurring of racial, linguistic and cultural differences and establishing a national identity among all Singaporeans (Chiew: 1980). In concrete terms, this is a process in which the Malays, Indians and Chinese in Singapore gradually become Malay, Indian and Chinese Singaporeans respectively, and all ethnic Singaporeans eventually become 'just Singaporeans'. As stated by the White Paper on Shared Values accepted by Parliament in 2 January 1991, the following are the core principles for forging the national Singapore identity:

Nation before community, and society before self; family as the basic unit of society; regard and community support for the individual; resolving major issues through consensus and not conflict; racial and religious harmony (Bokhorst-Heng: 1998:309).However, Riney (1998) observes that the national value system proposed by the government is not uniquely Chinese, nor is it conveyed through the medium of Chinese.

Ho and Alsagoff (1998) state that the proposed view of nation-building, ethnicity and nationhood constitute a 'fundamental contradiction.' This is because the perception of ethnicity-nationhood relationship is premised on the assumption of a lack of national identity. That is, the more the identity is associated with an ethnic community, the less with the nation and vice versa. Thus although the government promotes Mandarin within the Chinese

community, they should not downplay the importance of English in the forging of the national identity. Being able to speak Mandarin is an asset, but over-emphasizing it may detract from efforts to build a Singapore identity.

Quah (1990:45) suggests that the arduous task of building a Singaporean national identity will become more difficult when the Chinese ethnic group is made even more conscious of their ethnic identity. This will reinforce the cleavages among the various ethnic groups in Singapore.

For the individual dialect-speaking Chinese who has switched to speaking Mandarin, there may be a tension between assuming an ethnic and national identity. As mentioned by Chiew (1980), nation building is perceived in terms of the cultivation of a national Singapore identity that will surmount all the chauvinistic pulls of the Chinese, Malay or Indian identity. While Chinese identity is taken as an issue of specific practical use in nation building, it is also something to be contained at the same time. The promotion of the Chinese ethnic identity will serve to enhance the economic competitiveness, political stability, racial harmony and social cohesion as well as insulate the populace from the influx of 'undesirable Western influences.' However, the promotion of Mandarin and Chinese culture has also been regarded as 'communal,' 'parochial,' 'potentially divisive' and 'disruptive' (Ho and Alsagoff: 1998:208). Ho and Alsagoff believe that ethnicity is taken as synonymous with 'outpost nationalism' (as the Chinese orientate themselves towards China), as against Singapore-centred loyalty. Since nation building is conceived in terms of the nurturing of the Singapore identity (Quah: 1990), the task of establishing a national identity becomes more difficult.

On the other hand, ethnic communities are the building blocks of the nation, and ethnic cultures are sources to draw from in the construction of a national culture (Ho and Alsagoff:1998). Essentially, the concept of ethnic building block must be understood within the context of the ideology of multiracialism, which, simultaneously, reassures the various ethnic communities that their languages and cultures will be safeguarded. Thus, a major challenge of the SMC is to maintain a balance between strengthening of the ethnic identity as well as reinforcing the larger national supra-ethnic Singapore identity (Kuo and Jernudd: 1994:134).

8.6. Future challenges for the SMC

Much still remains to be done to promote the use of Mandarin in all domains of language use especially within the dialect-speaking Chinese community. There are several challenges for the SMC.

A major challenge of the SMC is to ensure that Mandarin is able to hold its own against the encroachment of English in the home. As reported in an article, Keep Mandarin alive at home (*The Straits Times*,14 Dec 2004, p1-2), Mandarin is gradually losing out to English in the homes. Almost half of the Chinese children entering Primary One now speak English at home, overtaking those who speak Mandarin. According to the report, children in young Chinese families tend to speak more English. For instance, it was reported that the number of Primary One children from English-speaking homes has risen to 49.8%, more than those speaking Mandarin. This is a worrying trend as English is already the lingua franca of vast swathes of Singapore life. English-educated parents who maintain that learning Mandarin is an extra burden for their children will resist the campaign, and this will also affect the attitude of their children in the learning of Mandarin. Thus for Mandarin to survive in the dialect-speaking communities in Singapore, it has to be a natural mode of communication for the younger generation of Chinese at home.

In addition, the globalization of Singapore economy may also hinder the efforts of the government to promote the SMC. As a result of globalization, the government has repeatedly emphasized the need for higher standards in English in order for Singapore to attain world-class economic levels and to present Singapore as a "world-class" participant in the global economy (Shepherd: 2003). Speaking at the National Day Rally in August 1999, former Prime Minister, Mr Goh Chok Tong, announced:

> Our new goal is to become a first-world economy. In simple terms, this means a place where businesses thrive, where good jobs can be found and where the people enjoy a developed country's standard of living. It means we are able to compete with the best of the world in high-tech industries and sophisticated services. (Shepherd: 2003:188)

The former Deputy Prime Minister, Lee Hsien Loong, in his review of the teaching of Chinese, states that :

> Globalization and the knowledge economy are putting a premium on internationally mobile talent. Successful Singaporeans have many opportunities to work overseas. This makes it more critical to develop among them a sense of Singaporean identity and belonging and learning the mother tongue. But it also means being more careful to make realistic demands on pupils learning Chinese, so that parents do not associate a Singaporean education with burdensome Chinese requirements (Shepherd: 2003:189)

Thus Singaporeans, being a pragmatic people, will embrace English as it is deemed a language that is critical to the country's economic competitiveness in the global marketplace (Ho and Alsagoff: 1998). In recent years, the focus of the SMC has been on encouraging the English-educated Chinese to speak Mandarin. For instance, the target of the 1993 campaign was to encourage those English-educated Chinese who can understand Mandarin but feel more comfortable using English to speak more Mandarin instead. However, the 'necessity' of English will cause the younger generation to adopt English rather than Mandarin as a language of use. This will undermine the efforts of the government to promote the SMC.

Another challenge of the SMC is to ensure that the standard of Mandarin spoken is acceptable within the dialect-speaking communities. At the moment, a majority of dialect-speakers can merely speak sufficient Mandarin for ordering food in the hawker centres and in the coffee shops. However, most are unable to speak Mandarin on formal occasions or use Mandarin to write Chinese essays. As stated by the Chairman of the Promote the Mandarin Council, Wee Chow How, the council still had work to do in "levelling up the quality of the spoken language" (Ho: 2004a:5). However, high levels of Mandarin can only be attained if there is an environment for naturalistic interactions in Mandarin. At present, there are sufficient native speakers of Mandarin in Singapore. However, it is unsure whether in the future, there are sufficient native speakers fluent in Mandarin which will sustain Mandarin in the linguistic ecology of dialect-speakers. The challenge for the government is to ensure that the linguistic ecology for the use of Mandarin is maintained beyond the superficial level.

In addition, new changes to educational policies pertaining to language learning may also affect the promotion of the campaign. The constant need for fine-tuning and adjustments to the balance of the needs of the several languages was apparent in 1999 (Shepherd: 2003). During a parliamentary session on January 20, 1999, Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong announced a series of changes to the teaching of Chinese, resulting from a year-long review by the Ministry of Education. A multi-tiered approach to the learning of Chinese was outlined. Students who have good results in Chinese were encouraged to learn Mandarin as a higher mother tongue (Higher Chinese for students who can cope with both English and Mandarin). For the majority of students, where Mandarin is not spoken at home, there is a lowering of the proficiency of oral Mandarin. An alternative Chinese Language "B" Syllabus" was introduced to help students who face exceptional difficulties in Chinese to ease the learning process. More emphasis was placed on aural and oral skills with simpler texts and a shorter word list (Shepherd: 2003:136). Thus, the future challenge of the SMC is to cater to the new approach of teaching the Chinese language to promote the standards of oral competency among dialect-speakers. However, if the campaign continues to stretch for another decade, it may send the wrong signal that a majority of dialect-speaking Chinese has not switched to the "Mandarin" camp. Thus, this will mean that the campaign has not been successful.

To ensure that Mandarin is consolidated as a language for social interactions within the Chinese community, the government will have to ensure that Mandarin is established as a language used extensively by dialect-speaking Chinese in all spheres of life.

8.7. Future Research on the SMC

The aim of this current study is to assess the effectiveness of the SMC within a dialect-speaking community. As a logical follow up to the evaluation of the SMC as a language planning initiative, future research can look into the following areas:

a) The impact of recent educational changes on the future orientation of the SMC. As mentioned earlier, the initial launch of the SMC was a result of the failure of the bilingual policy in schools. It was felt that Chinese pupils were unable to attain proficiency in English and Mandarin in schools. The SMC was implemented to enforce the learning of Mandarin as

a mother tongue, and Chinese pupils were expected to master both English and Mandarin. However, in an article, Updating the Chinese Language policy (The Straits Time, 24 Oct 2004,p24), the government has admitted that few people in Singapore can master both English and Mandarin effectively (The government has announced that the teaching of Chinese (Mandarin) will be made more flexible in order to allow schools to take into account students' home language backgrounds and aptitudes. A modular approach will be adopted to cater to pupils' background with help for those who do not speak Mandarin at home. Chinese students from non-Mandarin speaking homes can opt for special modules to help them catch up in Mandarin, while those who need extra help can take additional modules. Chinese language teaching will also focus on reading, speaking and listening and less on the writing and memorizing of Chinese characters.

However, it is uncertain how the future direction of the SMC will be charted following this change. Will the SMC be able to persuade dialect-speaking Chinese in Singapore to speak Mandarin as fervently as in its initial phase, or will it scale down to fall in line with the new changes in educational requirements in the learning of the mother tongue? I speculate that with the changes in educational policies, in future, the SMC may play a minor role when it comes to persuading people to change their linguistic habits. Perhaps future research can investigate the implications of the new educational changes for the future direction of the SMC.

b) Perceptions of dialect-speaking Chinese toward their Chinese identity. In the SMC, there is an attempt to relate Mandarin as a core marker of the Chinese identity. Mandarin is also specifically associated with identifying the Chinese ethnic culture. This is particularly evident through slogans such as, "Mandarin is Chinese," and "If you're a Chinese, make a statement in Chinese." However, there has been little study on how dialect-speakers perceive their Chinese identity. Several questions come to mind:

> "How do local dialect-speaking Chinese perceive their Chinese identity?"
>
> "Do dialect-speakers define their Chinese identity in terms of literacy in Mandarin, as in being able to speak and write Mandarin, or do they define their Chinese identities in terms of bilingualism (speaking both English and Mandarin)?"

"Do local dialect-speaking Chinese agree that the impetus for their Chinese identity should come from China, or from other Chinese communities (such as Taiwan or Hongkong) in the world?"

"Do dialect-speaking Chinese agree with the official argument that speaking Mandarin will enable them to cultivate their Chinese identity, and speaking no/less Mandarin will cause them to lose their Chinese identity?"

Perhaps future researchers of the SMC can direct their efforts in investigating these questions. An understanding of the response of dialect-speakers to these questions will enable the government to implement better strategies to encourage dialect-speakers to embrace Mandarin as a core marker of their Chinese cultural identity.

c) The use of the campaign as a strategy to promote Mandarin. As mentioned earlier, the main strategy adopted by the Singapore government in promoting the SMC is through the use of a campaign. In Singapore, a campaign is a conscious, organized and intensive effort by the Singapore government to inform, educate and persuade the mass target audience towards social and development-oriented objectives (Chua: 1995:15). However, the prevalence and frequency of campaigns in recent years may have led to an overkill effect on the population. Since 1979, dialect-speakers have been bombarded with the SMC messages that they may not respond to the call to speak Mandarin. Some possible questions for future research include:

(a) "In the future, will the campaign be an effective strategy to persuade dialect-speakers to adopt Mandarin as a language of use and preference?"
(b)"What more can the campaign achieve after more than two decades of promoting Mandarin?"
(c)"Besides the campaign, are there other effective ways of promoting Mandarin?"

8.8. Limitations of study

One of the main limitations of this study is that it is conducted as a one-off case study. One of the critiques against the use of a one-off case study is that

> it fails to meet the conventional research criteria of generalisability and external validity (Mcdonough and Mcdonough, 1997:216).

The one-off case study fails to incorporate features such as sampling or experimental treatment that would allow extrapolation to a wider population. However, the purpose of this study is not to generalize but to report the language use and attitudes of a discrete dialect-speaking church community. This will serve as an entry point for future research on other dialect-speaking church communities in Singapore. The data will provide a useful baseline for further analysis of language use in individual dialect-speaking communities for comparative purposes.

The results of the findings from the survey and the interview also have to be treated with caution, as they are based mainly on self-reports of language use with no observation of actual language use recorded. According to Trudgill (1974), self-reported language use can differ markedly from actual language use. Consequently, the validity of such language data can only be assumed. However, the language data from the SAS do provide valuable information for an overall picture of the sociolinguistic situation of the researched community. Perhaps, to overcome a general skepticism over the reliability of questionnaire survey data, future research can include the observation of language use in the homes of individual dialect-speakers.

In addition, the language use of respondents is basically restricted to the domains of language use such as in the home, work or public places. It does not take into consideration other factors that may influence the linguistic preference of dialect-speakers. The language use by respondents may be influenced by other factors besides the domains of language use. As Platt (1980) observes, in Singapore, there are many reasons that reflect a speaker's attitudes to various choice of code such as emotive (like-dislike), linguistics (vocabulary range) and pragmatic (usefulness in communicating) etc. In addition, the study also does not take into consideration code-switching that is often used by individuals in a multilingual society such

as Singapore. It is assumed that dialect-speakers within the sample community use only one language/dialect to communicate with each other in different domains of language use.

Another major limitation of the study is that data collection on individual opinions of the SMC is based on the use of the SSI. It should be remembered that the interview method suffers some limitations when it is used to collect data on language behaviour. It must be noted that language use and language attitudes are often influenced by several conditions and factors which may change from year to year.

Despite these limitations, the findings are still important for a contemporary evaluation of the SMC. Data from this study can be used as a starting point for future research on the evaluation of governmental efforts in the language management of the Chinese community.

Appendix I Self-administered survey form

About yourself

1. Sex: Male/Female (please circle/underline/tick)

2. Age (please circle/underline/tick one of the following)
a) 12-20 b)21-30
c) 31 -60 d)61 and above

3. Occupation: _____

4. Home language (please circle/underline/tick more than one if there are a few languages spoken) : English/Mandarin/Hokkien/Teochew/Cantonese/Hainanese
(Others: Please specify:_____)

5. Type of Home(please circle/underline/tick)

HDB	
HUDC	
Terrace	
Semi-Detached	
Bungalow	
Others (please specify)	

Language Use
Please use these categories to answer Q1-Q5

English	1
Mandarin	2
Chinese Dialects	3
Others	4
Not applicable	5

1(a).What language do you frequently use when communicating with your parents?
---( )
(b) What language do you frequently use when communicating with your siblings?( )
2.What language do you frequently use when talking to your close friends about personal matters?--- ( )
3. What language do you frequently use when talking to your colleagues/classmates? ( )
4. What language do you frequently use when you buy food/drinks at a hawker centre?
( )
5.What language do you frequently use when talking to a sales personnel at a shopping centre?--- ( )

Functions and Attitudes towards Mandarin

Please use these categories to answer the following questions/statement.

Strongly agree	5
Agree	4
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

6.Mandarin will be as important as English in Singapore in the near future ( )
7.Mandarin will have a superior status in Singapore in the future( )
8.Mandarin will be an important international language in the 21st century ( )
9.Mandarin will be useful for my future job opportunity in Singapore ( )
10. Speaking Mandarin will benefit Singaporeans' business dealings with China ( )
11. Mandarin is an interesting language ( )
12. I like speaking Mandarin ( )
13. I like to watch Mandarin TV programmes --- ( )
14. Mandarin is easy to learn - -- ( )
15. If given a choice to be fluent in English or Mandarin, I will choose Mandarin --( )
16. Mandarin is a prestigious language--( )
17. Chinese Singaporeans who speak Mandarin are more refined than those who speak dialects --( )
18. If I have children, I want them to speak Mandarin ----( )
19. Mandarin is the mother tongue of Chinese Singaporeans -----( )

Attitudes towards English & Mandarin speakers

* Please use these categories to answer the following questions/statement.

Strongly agree	5
Agree	4
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

20. In Singapore, English is more important than dialect---( )
21. In Singapore, English is more important than Mandarin---( )
22. If I've the choice, I will converse in English---( )
23. Chinese Singaporeans who speak Mandarin are generally considerate of the feelings of others--- ( )
24. I like to communicate in Mandarin with other Mandarin-speakers---( )
25. Chinese Singaporeans who speak Mandarin are more sincere and honest-( )
26. Chinese Singaporeans who speak Mandarin are generally more cheerful and good humoured ---( )

27. Chinese Singaporeans who speak Mandarin are trustworthy and dependable ---( )

* Please use these categories to answer the following questions/statement.

Strongly agree	5
Agree	4
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

28. I feel that learning Mandarin is useful to me---( )
29. Chinese Singaporeans should speak dialects instead of Mandarin---( )
30. Dialect is my mother tongue---( )
31. If I have/I want my children to learn dialect---( )
32. Dialect will hinder the learning of Mandarin or English among school children in Singapore ( )
33. Chinese Singaporeans need to speak dialects to preserve Chinese culture ( )

The Speak Mandarin Campaign

* Please use these categories to answer the following questions/statement.

Strongly agree	5
Agree	4
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

34.The campaign has received wide support from the public---( )
35.The government has done its best in implementing the campaign---( )
36..The dialect-speaking Chinese is largely indifferent to the campaign--- ( )
37.Mandarin is of great use in my daily life---( )
38.Mandarin should be spoken as a common language among the various dialect groups in Singapore---( )
39.Mandarin has become more commonly used among Chinese in the past two years---( )
40..The Speak Mandarin Campaign has succeeded in persuading more Chinese Singaporeans to speak Mandarin---( )
41.The Speak Mandarin Campaign should be continued---( )
42.Mandarin should be spoken more often to improve communication across dialect groups---( )
43..Chinese Singaporeans should speak Mandarin to preserve Chinese cultural values and traditions---( )
44. Mandarin is the only language that shows a characteristics of Chinese Singaporeans---( )

Thanks very much for participating in this survey!

Appendix II Semi-structured interview schedule

Part I- Goals of the Speak Mandarin Campaign (SMC)

1a). Have you seen any Speak Mandarin Campaign advertisement before?

Probe: What do you think is the advertisement trying to tell you?

b) What are your views on the SMC?

Prompt: Does the campaign serve a useful purpose?

Probe: What other purposes do the campaign have?

c) Do you think we should have it every year or should the government stop it?

Prompt: Should the SMC be continued?

Probe: Why or why not?

Part II- Strategies of the SMC

2a). Besides TV advertisements, do you know of other ways introduced by the government to get people to speak Mandarin?

Prompt: Besides the TV advertisements, how do people know about the campaign?

Probe: Do you think they are effective?

Probe: Why do you think they are/are not effective?

b) What do you think of the SMC advertisement, "Mandarin In. Dialect Out?"

Prompt: Do you agree or disagree with the slogan?

Probe: Why or why not?

Part III-Outcomes of the SMC

3a). On the whole, do you think the campaign has any effect on Chinese in Singapore?

Probe: If yes, what kinds of effect?

If no, why do you think there is little effect?

b) Do you think more people speak Mandarin as a result of the campaign?
Prompt: Do you think more Chinese speak Mandarin because of the SMC?
Probe: Why do you say so?

Appendix III Theoretical memos

Theoretical memos

a) Goals of SMC 13 February

Most informants are aware that the goal of the SMC is to get the Chinese to speak Mandarin. The reason given is that too many Chinese are speaking English, especially the younger generation. Some were able to cite the cultural reason for the SMC: to reinforce the cultural roots and identity of the Chinese (IM3, 5,6, 8, 10, 13, 15,18), and to enforce Mandarin as the mother tongue of the Chinese.

There are also others feel that the SMC is targeted specifically at certain groups of Chinese such as English-speaking Chinese who speak English only (IM10,13) and dialect-speaking Chinese (IM11,13)

There are also others who cite the economic goals of the SMC: to promote Mandarin as an language to develop business dealings with China(IM5,7,15). There are also others who believe that the goal of the SMC is to promote Mandarin as an important language in Singapore(Im12). Some reason cited is that Mandarin will advance one's career in Singapore(IM5,7,9)

b) Strategy of SMC

There are two major concerns regarding the strategy of the SMC:

a) whether the SMC should be continued - Some feel that the SMC should be continued (IM1, 3,8,16) the reason being that more Chinese are speaking English and not Mandarin and also the campaign will be a good reminder that Mandarin is important to the Chinese (IM4, 5, 6,). Most state that it is important for Chinese to know Mandarin as it is an important economic tool and also, the campaign will remind them to speak Mandarin to retain their Chinese identity. However one informant (IM120) feels that the campaign should be stopped as it has met its objectives and continuing it would be a waste of resources and that it will not have anymore impact on the Chinese. In addition another informant (IM2) feels that the campaign should not be continued throughout the year as the message has been drummed in by now.
b) whether the strategy of eliminating dialects and promoting Mandarin is effective-reactions range from disagreement(all), applicable to old people who speak dialect only (IM6,11), protest (IM1) to offense(IM9).
c) Almost all informants disagree with the slogan "Mandarin in. Dialects out." The reasons given is that
    i. Dialects are still important for communicating with the older generation(IM6,7,16)
    ii. Dialects are still important in Singapore society especially in grassroots organizations (IM1,2,9)
    iii. Dialects are important for communication in the family (IM2,12, 15)

iv. Dialects can facilitate the learning of Mandarin as both languages are similar (Im3,8,13,14)).
v. Dialects help to preserve Chinese cultures and traditions-IM 4, 8

d) whether the SMC is effective as a strategy-
i. The campaign is effective in getting Chinese to speak Mandarin (IM16,1,5,6, 9,12,
ii. The SMC does create awareness of the importance of speaking Mandarin but it is not sufficient; it should aim to encourage Chinese to speak Mandarin (IM7,8,10,11)
iii. The approach should be top-down to have greater impact-IM13, 14)
iv. The campaign will not be effective if there is no opportunity to use Mandarin (IM2, 3,7,14, 15)
v. For the campaign to be effective, the importance of Mandarin should be internalised (IM2, 7, 8,9)
vi. The campaign will be more effective if is implemented through education (IM1,3,5,13,16)

c) Outcomes of SMC 12 February

Basically, informants feel that there are both visible and invisible effects of the SMC:

1) The visible effects are:
i. Dialects are less spoken among the Chinese (IM12, 13)
ii. Mandarin is spoken in more places such as in the workplace, hawker centers and at the lower ends of society (Im2,6,8,9)
iii. Mandarin is being spoken by more often among Chinese (Im1, 5)
iv. More people want to learn Mandarin (IM5)

2) The invisible effects are:
i. Greater awareness and also a reminder of the importance of Mandarin (IM7)
ii. Accepting and remembering Mandarin as a mother tongue (IM3,4)

However, there are others who feel that the there is no effect of the SMC, as
i. Politicians and government leaders still speak English during elections(IM11)
ii. The older generations (among the fifties to the seventies) still speak dialects-(IM2, 4, 10)
iii. Staff in government offices use English and not Mandarin (IM13, 14, 15)
iv. Singapore is still basically an English-speaking country(IM14)

Appendix IV Profile of self-administered survey respondents

Code	Age	Sex	Education Level	Education Stream	Occupation	Resident Type	Language /Dialect Spoken
S1	12	M	Primary	English	Student	Condominium	English
S2	12	F	Primary	English	Student	Terrace	Mandarin, English
S3	13	F	Secondary 1	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin,
S4	13	M	Secondary 1	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English
S5	14	M	Secondary 2	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English
S6	14	M	Secondary 2	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin
S7	14	M	Secondary 2	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin
S8	14	F	Secondary 2	English	Student	Condominium	Mandarin, English
S9	14	F	Secondary 2	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English
S10	14	M	Secondary 2	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien Teochew
S11	14	F	Secondary 2	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English
S12	15	F	Secondary 3	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English , Hokkien
S13	15	F	Secondary 3	English	Student	Condominium	Mandarin, English
S 14	15	F	Secondary 3	English	Student	Condominium	Mandarin, English, Hainanese
S15	15	M	Secondary 3	English	Student	Condominium	Mandarin
S16	15	F	Secondary 3	English	Student	Condominium	English
S17	15	F	Secondary 3	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin
S18	16	M	Secondary 4	English	Student	Semi-Detached	Mandarin, English
S19	16	M	Secondary 4	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin
S20	16	M	Secondary 4	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English
S21	16	M	Secondary 4	English	Student	Condominium	Mandarin, English
S22	16	M	Secondary 4	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English
S23	16	M	Secondary 4	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English
S24	16	M	Secondary 4	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English
S25	18	M	Polytechnic	English	Student	HDB	English
S26	18	M	Junior College	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, Hokkien
S27	18	M	Polytechnic	English	Student	Condo	Mandarin, English ,Hokkien
S28	19	F	University	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English
S29	20	M	Secondary 5	English	Store Assistant	HDB	Mandarin
S30	20	M	Secondary 4	English	NS	HDB	Mandarin, English , Hokkien
S32	21	M	University	English	Student	HDB	Mandarin, English , Hokkien
S33	21	M	University	English	Engineer	HDB	Mandarin, Hokkien
S34	21	F	Diploma	English	Graphic designer	HDB	Mandarin, English
S35	23	M	Postgraduate	English	Civil Servant	HDB	Mandarin, Hokkien
S36	25	F	University	English	Engineer	HDB	Mandarin
S37	25	M	University	English	Engineer	HDB	Mandarin, Teochew
S38	28	F	Diploma	English	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S39	30	M	University	English	Doctor	Condo	Mandarin
S40	30	F	University	English	Pharmacist	Condo	Mandarin

S41	31	F	Secondary 4	English	Secretary	HDB	Mandarin, English
S42	31	F	Diploma	English	Housewife	Terrace	Mandarin, English
S43	31	F	University	English	Customer Support Executive	HDB	English
S44	31	M	University	English	Project Officer	HDB	Mandarin, English , Hokkien, Cantonese
S45	31	F	Diploma	English	Administrator	HDB	Mandarin
S46	31	F	Diploma	English	Child Care	HDB	Mandarin
S47	31	F	Secondary 4	English	Clerk	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S48	31	M	Diploma	English	Self-Employed	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S49	32	M	Postgraduate	English	IT Applications Manager	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S50	32	M	University	English	Teacher	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien, Teochew
S51	33	M	University	English	Analyst	Terrace	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S52	34	F	Postgraduate	English	Doctor	Townhouse	Mandarin, English, Hokkien Cantonese
S53	34	F	University	English	Teacher	Terrace	Mandarin, English, Teochew
S54	34	F	University	English	Teacher	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien E/M/H
S55	34	F	University	English	Lecturer	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S56	35	M	University	English	Financial Controller	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S57	35	F	Secondary 4	English	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin, English
S58	35	F	Primary	English	Unemployed	HDB	Mandarin
S59	35	F	Secondary 4	English	Clerk	HDB	Mandarin, Hokkien
S60	35	M	Secondary 4	English	Taxidriver	HDB	Mandarin, English, Teochew
S61	36	F	University	English	Finance Manager	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S62	36	F	University	English	Bank Officer	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S63	36	M	University	English	Civil Servant	Condominium	Mandarin, English, Cantonese
S64	36	M	Secondary 4	English	Sales (Electronic)	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien Cantonese
S65	36	F	Secondary 4	English	Housewife	Condominium	Mandarin, Hokkien
S66	37	F	Primary	English	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin, Hokkien
S67	39	M	A level	English	Salesman	HDB	Mandarin, English
S68	39	F	Secondary 4	English	Teller	HDB	Mandarin
S69	40	F	Secondary 4	English	Nurse	HDB	Mandarin, Hokkien
S70	40	F	O level	English	Clerk	Terrace	Mandarin, English, Hainanese
S71	40	F	O level	English	Clerk	HDB	Mandarin, Hainanese
S72	40	F	O level	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S73	40	M	University	Chinese	Teacher	Terrace	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S74	40	M	Diploma	Chinese	Supervisor	HDB	Mandarin
S75	41	F	University	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin
S76	41	F	O level	Chinese	Technician	HDB	Mandarin, Hokkien
S77	41	F	Diploma	Chinese	Piano	HDB	Mandarin, English,

					Teacher		
S78	41	M	Dipomal	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin
S79	42	F	O level	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin, Teochew
S80	42	F	O level	Chinese	Apprentice	XHDB	Mandarin, Hokkien
S81	43	F	University	English	HR Manager	Condominium	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S82	44	F	O level	Chinese	Childcare Teacher	HDB	Mandarin, Hokkien
S 83	44	M	O level	English	Cameramen	HDB	Mandarin, English
S84	44	M	O level	Chinese	Preacher	HDB	Mandarin
S85	44	F	O level	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin, Teochew
S86	44	F	O level	Chinese	Housewife	Condo	Mandarin
S87	44	M	A level	Chinese	Businessman	Condo	Mandarin
S88	45	M	O level	Chinese	Businessman	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S89	45	M	O level	Chinese	Self-employed	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S90	45	M	O level	Chinese	Counsellor	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien Teochew
S91	45	M	A level	Chinese	Technician	HDB	Mandarin, Teochew
S92	45	M	O level	Chinese	Contractor	HDB	Teochew
S93	45	M	Primary	Chinese	Self-employed	Bungalow	Mandarin, Hokkien
S94	45	M	O level	Chinese	Church worker	Terrace	Mandarin,, Hokkien
S95	45	M	O level	Chinese	Lifeguard	HDB	Mandarin, English
S96	45	E	Diploma	English	Lab Technician	HDB	Mandarin, English
S97	48	F	O level	English	Church worker	HDB	Hokkien, Teochew
S98	49	M	University	English	Broker	Condo	English, Hokkien
S99	49	F	A level	English	Business	Bungalow	Mandarin
S 100	49	M	O level	English	Manager	Condo	English
S101	50	M	O level	Chinese	Businessman	Condo	Mandarin, Hokkien
S102	50	M	University	English	Director, IT	HDB	Mandarin, English
S102	50	M	University	English	Director, IT	HDB	Mandarin, English
S103	50	F	O level	Chinese	Business	Condo	Mandarin, English, Hokkien Teochew
S104	50	F	Diploma	English	Nurse	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S105	50	F	O level	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin, Hokkien
106	50	M	O level	Chinese	Self-employed	Condo	Mandarin, Hainanese
S 107	50	F	O level	Chinese	Housewife	Cond	Mandarin, Hokkien
S108	51	M	Postgraduate	Chinese	Lecturer	Condo	Mandarin, English, Teochew
S109	51	F	University	Chinese	Teacher	Condo	Mandarin, English, Hokkien Teochew
S110	52	M	Diploma	English	Operation Manager	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S 111	52	M	Diploma	Chinese	Self-employed	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S112	52	M	University	Chinese	Business	Semi-detached	Mandarin
S 113	52	F	Primary	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Hokkien
S114	53	F	Primary	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin
S115	55	M	A level	Chinese	Accountant	HDB	Hokkien
S116	55	M	A level	Chinese	Accountant	HDB	Hokkien

S117	55	F	O level	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin, English, Hokkien
S118	55	M	Primary	Chinese	Carpenter	HDB	Mandarin, Cantonese
S119	55	F	Primary	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin, Hainanese
S 120	60	M	O level	Chinese	Daycare Teacher	Condominium	Mandarin
S121	60	M	A level	Chinese	Pastor	HDB	Mandarin, Hainanese
S122	60	M	A level	Chinese	Daycare Teacher	Condominium	Mandarin
	63	M	O level	Chinese	Carpenter	HDB	Mandarin
S123	63	M	Primary	Chinese	Contractor	HDB	Mandarin
S124	64	F	Primary	Chinese	Retiree	HDB	Hokkien
S125	65	M	Primary	Chinese	Taxi-driver	HDB	Mandarin/Teochew
S126	65	F	Primary	Chinese	Housewife	HDB	Mandarin/Hainanese

Bibliography

A decade of Mandarin (1979-1989).1989. Committee to promote Mandarin Campagin. Ministry of Information and Communication.

Adelman, C. Jenkins, D. & Kemmis, S. 1993. Rethinking case study: notes from the second Cambridge conference. In *Case Study: an overview.* Deakin University. Deakin University Prinery.pp1-10.

Ager, Dennis (2001). Motivations in language planning and language policy. *Multilingual Matters.* Cromwell Press Ltd. Great Britain.

Alderson, J.C & Beretta, A.(1992).*Evaluating Second Language Education.* Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

Ang Ben Choo (1998).The teaching of the Chinese language in Singapore. In Gopinathan, S.A. Pakir, W.K. Ho and V. Saravanan (Eds.), *Language, Society and Education in Singapore : Issues and Trends.* , Singapore: Times Academic Press, pp335-352.

Babbie, E. (1992). *The Practice of Social Research.* Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth Publishing.

Baker, C. (1996). *Foundations of Bilingual education and Bilingualism.* Clevedon, Avon. Multilingual Matters.

Bamgbose, A. (1994). Pride and Prejudice in multilingualism and development. In R. Fardon and G. Furniss (eds) *African Languages, Development and the State.* London : Routledge.

Berg, Bruce L. (2004). *Qualitative Research Methods.* New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Bloomaert, J. (1996). The politics of multilingualism and language planning. *Antwerp papers in Linguistics.* Antwerp: university of Antwerp, pp3-23.

Bokhorst-Heng, Wendy. (1998). Language Planning and Management. In Foley, J.A, (Eds.), *English in New Cultural Contexts*, Singapore : Oxford University Press, pp. 287-309.

Brown, J.D (1995) Language programme evaluation:Discussions,problems and solutions in W.Grabe et al (Eds).*Annual Review of Applied Linguistics.*Vol 15, pp227-248, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, Lim Keak . (1995). *Geographic analysis of the Singapore population.* Singapore: Dept. of Statistics.

Chia S.Y. (1994). *Reflections upon the success of the Speak Mandarin Campaign in Singapore.* Paper presented at the 14th International Conference on the Teaching of Chinese Language convened by World Chinese language Association. Taipei: Taiwan 27-30 Dec 1994.

Chew C.H. Xu D.M. Chen S. (1995). *A Survey of Language Use and Language Attitudes in Singapore Chinese community.* Singapore. Centre for Chinese language and culture, Nanyang Technological University.

Chiew S.K. (1980). Bilingualism and National Identity: A Singapore Case Study. In A. Afendras, & E. Kuo (Eds.), *Language and Society in Singapore.* Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp233-253.

Christian, D. (1994). Language planning: The View from Linguistics. In T. Kandiah & J. Kwan-Terry (Eds.), *English and Language planning: A Southeast Asian contribution. Singapore. Times Academic Press,* pp282-304.

Chua, Beng-Huat. (1995).*Communitarian Ideology and Democracy in Singapore.* London: Routledge.

Chua, Lee Hoong . (2003). It's high stake when dialects come into play. *The Straits Times.* 7 May, p1-2.

Chua, Ying. (1999). *What they say: A study of the Straits Times and Lainhe Zaobao readers' perceptions of the Speak Mandarin Campaign.* Unpublished acadedmic exercise. School of Communications Study, Nanyang Technological University, Dec 30.

Chua Mui Hoong, (2004). Chinese Teaching To Go Flexible. *The Straits Times*, 12 October 2004, p4.

Clammer, J. (1985). *Singapore: Ideology, Society, Culture.* Singapore: Chopmen Publishers.

Cobarrubias, J. (1983) Ethical issues in status planning. In Cobarrubias, Juan and Joshua A. Fishman. *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives.* Berlin: Mouton p3-26.

Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1994). *Research Methods in Education.* London: Routledge.

Converse, P.E. (1964). The nature of belief system in mass politics. In D.E. Apter, *Ideology and Discontent.* Glencoe, CA: Free Press, p206-261.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousands Oak, California, Sage.

Dimmock,C (2002). Qualitative and Case Study Research. *EdD in Educational Management*, Leicester, University of Leicester, School of Education (EMDU)

Dolgancay-Atkuna, S. (1995). An evaluation of the Turkish reform after sixty years. *Journal of Language problems and planning*, vol 19, pp221-249.

Easterby-Smith, M, Thorpe, R and Lowe, A. (1994). The Philosophy of Research Design. In Bennette, N, Glatter, R. and Levacic, R. (Eds.). *Improving Educational Management through research and consultancy.* London: Paul Chapman.

East versus Western values. *The Straits Times*. 1992, 13 Sept, p6.

Edwards, John. (1994) Language planning and Education in Singapore and Malaysia. In Hassan, A. (Eds.), *Language planning in Southeast Asia.* Malaysia. Percetakan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Kuala Lumpur, pp 176-190.

Eggington, W. and Baldauf, R. B. Jr (1990). Towards evaluating the aboriginal bilingual education programme in the Northern Territory. In R. B. Baldauf , Jr and A. Luke. *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp89-105.

Ferguson, Charles, A. (1971). National sociolinguistics profile formulas. In Bright, William (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics*. The Hague: Mouton, pp 309-24.

Fishman, J. A. et al. (1989). *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistics Perspective.* Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Fishman, J.A. (1974). Language planning and language planning research:The state of the art. In Fishman, J. A. (Eds.) *Advances in language planning.* The Hague: Mouton, pp 15-36.

Fishman, J.A. (1977). A comparative Study of language planning : Introducing a survey. In Fishman, J. C. Ferguson, J. Das Gupta, B. Jernudd and J. Rubin (Eds.) *Language planning processes.* The Hague: Mouton, pp 15-36.

Fishman, J.A. (1991).*Reversing Language shift: The theoretical and empirical foundations of Assistance to Threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Glaser B and Berg, B.L. (1980). How Jews avoid alcohol problems. *American Sociological Review*, vol 45 , no 1, pp 647-664.

Goh Nguen Wah.(1999).*Mother Tongue. Singapore*: South East Printing Private Limited.

Gonzalez, A. FSC (1990). Evaluating Bilingual Education in the Philippines: towards a multidimensional model of evaluation in language planning. In R. B. Baldauf , Jr and A. Luke. *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp319-334.

Gopinathan, S. (1974). *Towards a national system of education in Singapore 1945-1973.* Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Gopinathan, S. (1979). Singapore Language policies: Strategies for a plural society. *Southeast Asian Affairs*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, pp 280-295.

Gopinathan, S. (1998) Language Policy Changes 1979-1997: Politics and Pedagogy. In Gopinathan et al. (Eds.) *Language, Society and Education in Singapore: Issues and Trends.* Singapore: Times Academic Press, pp19-44.

Grosjean,F. (1982). Life with two languages.London and Cambridge. Mass:Havard University Press.

Gupta, A. (1994). A framework for the analysis of Singapore English. In Gopinathan et al . (Eds.) *Language, Society and Education in Singapore.* Singapore: Times Academic Press, pp119-132.

Gupta, A. (1998). A standard for written Singapore English?, In J. Foley (Eds.). *English in New Cultural Contexts.* Singapore: Oxford University Press, pp 75-99.

Gupta, A. (2001) English in the Linguistic Ecology of Singapore paper presented at the GNELMAVEN Conference on the *The Cultural Politics of English as a World Language Conference, Frisburg,* June 6-9,2001.

Gupta, Antheas Fraser and Siew, Pui Yeok. (1995). Language shift in a Singapore family. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* vol 16, no. 4, pp 301-313.

Hamel, Jacques. (1993). *Case study Methods*. US. Sage Publications, Inc.

Hassan, Abdullah. (1994). *Language planning in Southeast Asia.* Malaysia, Perspustakaan Negara: Perspustakaan.

Ho Ai Li,(2004a). Mandarin Popular Among The Young. *The Straits Times*, 10 December 2004, p5.

Ho Ai Li,(2004b). Twenty five percent No for Chinese to speak Mandarin. *The Straits Times*, 10 December 2004,p1.

Ho, C. L. & Alsagoff, L, (1998). English as the Common Language in Multicultural Singapore. In J. Foley (Eds.). *English in New Cultural Contexts.* Singapore: Oxford University Press, pp 201-217.

Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* London. Longman.

Jernudd, B & Gupta, J. Das, (1971). Towards a definition of language planning, (reprinted in his edited *Advances in Language Planning,* The Hague: Mouton, pp 21-51.

Jernudd B.H. and J.V. Neustupny . (1987). Langauge planning: For Whom? In Laforge, L (Eds.) *Proceedings of the international Colloquim on language planning,* Ottawa, 25-29 May 1986. Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Universite laval, pp71-84.

Kachru, Braj B (1983). *The other tongue: English across cultures.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kachru, Braj. B. (1994). Englishization and Contact Linguistics: Dimensions of the Linguistic Hegemony of English. In T. Kandiah & J. Kwan-Terry (Eds.), *English and Language planning: A Southeast Asian contribution.* Singapore: Times Academic Press, pp 19-49.

Kaplan and Baldauf. (1997). *Language Planning from Practice to Theory.* Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Kaplan and Baldauf. (2003) *Language and Language in Education Planning in the Pacific Basin.* London: Klumer Academic Publishers.

Keep Mandarin alive at home. *The Straits Times,* 14 Octber 2004,p1

Krishna and Abiodun (2002). The case for language policies in multinational corporations. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal,* vol 7, no. 4 pp241-251.

Kuo, CY, Eddie. (1985) *A Quantity Approach to the Study of Sociolinguistic Situation in Multi-linguistic Society.* Singapore: Regional English Language Centre.

Kuo and Jernudd. (1988). *Language management in multilingual state: The case of planning in Singapore.* Working Papers. Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Department of Sociology. National University of Singapore.

Kuo and Jernudd. (1994). Balancing Macro and Micro-Sociolinguistic Perspectives in Language Management: The Case of Singapore, In T. Kandiah & J. Kwan-Terry (Eds.), *English and Language planning: A Southeast Asian contribution.* Singapore: Times Academic Press. pp70-89.

Kwok, K.W. (1981). *Language planning in education: A case study of the 1980 Speak Your School Languages Campaign 1981.* Unpublished Academic Exercise. Mass Communication Programme. National University of Singapore, 12 Dec.

Lambert, W. (1983).Additive versus subtractive forms of bilingualism: Confusions regarding programes of immersion.In S.S.Seider (Ed).*Issues of Language Assessment.* Illinois: State Board of Education.

Lam, S. L. (1994) Language Education in Hongkong and Singapore: A comparative study of the role of English. In T. Kandiah & J. Kwan-Terry (Eds.), *English and Language planning: A Southeast Asian contribution. Singapore: Times Academic Press,* pp182-196.

Language changes enter decisive round of debate, *The Straits Times*, November 25, p1.

Lee K.C. (1983). *Language and education in Singapore.* Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Lee K.Y. (1970). *The Twains have met.* The Dillingham Lecture, Prime Minister speeches, Press Conferences Interview, Statements, 11 November. Singapore: PM's office.

Lee K.Y. (1978). Mandarin: Lingua Franca for Chinese Singaporeans. In *A monthly selection of ministerial speeches.* Vol 1, No. 10. Singapore: Ministry of culture.

Lee, K.Y. (1996). *Lee Kuan Yew on the Chinese community in Singapore.* Singapore: Singapore Federation of Chinese Association.

Lee, K. Y. (2001). *Census of population 2000: education, language and religion.* Statement release 2. Department of statistics, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Singapore.

Lieberson, Stanley (1980). Procedures for improving sociolinguistics surveys of language maintenance and language shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* vol 25, pp 11-27.

Li, Wei, Vanithamani Saravanan, and Julia Ng Lee Hoon. (1997). Language shift in the Teochew Community in Singapore: A Family Domain Analysis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development.* Vol 18, 5. pp364-384.

Lin, Y.P. (1995). National Campaigns as Persuasive Communication in Singapore: A Critical Analysis. Unpublished academic exercise, Mass Communication Programme, National University of Singapore.

Lofland, J and Loftland, L.H. (1995). *Analysing social Change.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishers.

Mandarin: The Chinese Connection. 2000, Promote Mandarin Council. Singapore: Ministry of Information and the Arts.

Mcdonough, J and Mcdonough, S. (1997). *Research Methods for English Language Teachers*. London: Arnold.

Miles and Huberman (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (second edition). London: United Kingdom.

Nah, C. H. (1981). The Speak Mandarin Campaign as a Mass Campaign: A Case Study. unpublished Academic Exercise. Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. National University of Singapore, 30 December.

Neustupny. (1994). Problems of English Contact Discourse and Language planning. In T. Kandiah & J. Kwan-Terry (Eds.), *English and Language planning: A Southeast Asian contribution*. Singapore. Times Academic Press, pp50-69.

Newman, J. (1988). Singapore's Speak Mandarin Campaign, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* vol 9, no. 5, pp. 437-448.

Ng, K. M. (1981) The Speak Mandarin Campaign: Aspects of Public Policy, unpublished paper for the Bachelor of Arts (Political Science) programme, National University of Singapore, 30 December.

Noss, Richard B. (1994). The unique context of language planning in South East Asia. In Abdulah Hassan (Eds.), *Language Planning in South East Asia.* Singapore: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, pp1-52.

Nunnaly, Jum C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: Mcgraw Hill.

Oppenheim (1992).*Questionnaire, Design, Interviewing and Attitude measurements*. UK. Printer Publisher.

Orum, Feagin, & Sjoberg. (1992). *The Nature of the Case Study.* In Feagin.(Eds). A Case for the Case Study. US. The University of North Carolina Press pp1-26.

Pakir, A. (1991). The range and depth of English-knowing bilingualism in Singapore. *World Englishes* 10, pp167-179.

Pakir, A. (1993). *The English Language in Singapore: Standards and Norms.* Singapore: Unipress.

Pakir, A. (1994). Education and Invisible Language Planning: The case of English in Singapore. In T. Kandiah & J. Kwan-Terry (Eds.), *English and Language planning: A Southeast Asian contribution.* Singapore: Times Academic Press, pp158-179.

Platt, J. (1980). Multilingualism, Polyglossia, and Code selection in Singapore. In Afendras, E.A. and Kuo, Eddie C.Y. (Eds.) *Language and Society in Singapore*, Singapore: Singapore University Press, pp 63-83.

PuroShotemp,N.C. (1998). *Negotiating Language, Constructing Race.* New York: Mouton de Gruyere, pp 30-74.

Quah, Jon S.T. (1990). *In Search of Singapore National Values.* Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Ricento, Thomas.(2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policies and planning. *Journal of sociolinguistics,* vol 4, no 2, pp 196-213.

Riney,Timothy (1998). Towards more homogenous bilingualism: Shift phenomenom in Singapore. *Journal of Multilingualism,* vol 17,no. 1., pp1-23.

Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B. (1971). *Can Language be planned?* Honolulu: East West Centre Press.

Rubdy, R. (2001). Creative Destruction: Singapore's Speak Good English Movement, *World Englishes,* vol. 20, no 3 , pp.341-356.

Rubdy, R. (2005). Remaking Singapore for the New Age: Official Ideology and the Realities of Practice in Language-in-Education, In A. M. Y. Lin and P. W. Martin (Eds.) *Globalization, De/Neo-Colonization and Language-in-Education: Policies and Practices.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Shepherd, Janet. (2003). *Striking a balance: the management of language in Singapore.* Berlin: Peter Lang.

Speak Mandarin Campaign: Ushering in the 10th year. 1988. Singapore: Ministry of Communication

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative Analysis for social scientist.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A.L. and Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Summers, F. Gene. Lauren H, Seiler, Glen Wiley.(1970). Validation and population leadership by the multitrait-multinational matrix. In Edgar F. Burgalta and George W. Bohnstedt. *Sociology Method.* San Francesco: Jossey Bass. Pp170-181.

Tan Keng Yau. (1996). Voice of Resistance towards the SMC. Unpublished Academic Exercise. Unpublished acadedmic exercise. School of Communications Study, Nanyang Technological University, Dec 30.

Tan Su Hwi (1998). Theoretical Ideals and ideological reality in language planning. In Gopinathan et al. (Eds.) *Language, Society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends.* Singapore, Singapore University Press, pp 45-62

Teo, P. (2004a). Mandarinising Singapore: A critical analysis of slogans in Singapore's Speak Mandarin Campaign, unpublished paper, National Institute of Education, Singapore, Dec 20.

Teo, Laurel.(2004b). Prime Minister: Chinese Community Has Key Role. *The Straits Time*s, 20 October 2004, pp1.

The Tongue surgeons. *Asiaweek (Hongkong)*, 1980,November 14, pp36-41.

Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning Language, Planning inequality.* London: Longman.

Trudgill, Peter. (1974). *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich* .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsou, B. (1988). Chinese dialects overseas: Indo-pacific and other parts of the world. In Wurm, S.A. L*anguage Atlas of China. Hongkong: Longman.*

Updating the Chinese Language policy, *The Straits Times*, 2004, 24 October, p24.

Usher, P. (1996). Feminist approaches to research. In Scott, D and Usher R. (Eds.) *Understanding Educational Research.* London: Routledge, pp1-20.

Wardhaugh, R. (1998). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Wee Hock Ann, Lionel. (1990). Language and Ethnicity among First-year Chinese Undergraduate in Singapore. unpublished paper for the Bachelor of Arts (English Studies) programme, National University of Singapore, 10 November.

Weinstein , B. (1980). Language planning in Francophone Africa, *Language Problems and language Planning*, vol 4, no.1.pp55-77.

Weisberg, Herbert F. Kronick Jon A. Bruce D. Bowen (1996). *An introduction to survey research, polling, data analysis.* Thousands Oak: Sage Publication.

Williams, J.D&Snipper, G.C (1990). *Literacy and Bilingualism.Longman.*New York.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data. Description, analysis, interpretation.* Thousands oaks, CA: Sage.

Wright, S. (2004). *Language policies and Language planning.* Polgrave : Macmillan.

Xu Daming, Chew Cheng Hai and Chen Songcen, (1998). Language use and Language Attitudes in the Singapore Community. In Gopinathan et al. (Eds.) *Language, Society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends.* Singapore: Singapore University Press,pp133-155.

Yin, R.K.(1994). *Case Study Research. Design and Methods* .US: Sage Publications, Inc

Zainuri bte Zaidah. (1998) Speak Mandarin Campaign-A study of the opinions of Malay Singaporeans, unpublished paper for the Bachelor of Arts (English Language and Literature) programme, National University of Singapore, 30 December.

Zhang, M. (1993). *Speak Mandarin Campaign and Senior Citizens Among Chinese Singaporeans.* Paper presented at the Third Malaysia-Singapore Forum, 1-4 November 1993. Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, National University of Singapore.