Patrick Chin Leong Ng

A Study of Attitudes of Dialect Speakers Towards the Speak Mandarin Campaign in Singapore

Springer

SpringerBriefs in Linguistics

Series editor

Helen Aristar-Dry, Dripping Springs, TX, USA

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/11940

Patrick Chin Leong Ng

A Study of Attitudes of Dialect Speakers Towards the Speak Mandarin Campaign in Singapore

Patrick Chin Leong Ng
University of Niigata Prefecture
Niigata-shi, Niigata
Japan

Foreword

The phenomenon of language defies simple description or categorization. Whether one chooses to think of language as a kind of abstract system of relationships between sounds, morphemes, words and sentences, or as a set of language practices of individuals interacting with one another, it would be misguided to think that one can fully do justice to the phenomenon of language. Language is too multi-faceted to be completely understood in terms of any one intellectual tradition or any one methodology. The university-based discipline of linguistics, even with its relatively narrow focus of interest, has given rise to a plethora of sub-disciplines, competing methods, and alternative understandings of language. Linguistics is characterized more by the proliferation of competing approaches than by convergence of approaches towards one all-encompassing theory of language.

The study of language in a society is one further example of just how complex and challenging the phenomenon of language can be. Bringing the larger societal context into the picture immediately introduces more layers of complexity and more potential interactions of factors. When we seek to understand language in the context of society, we must acknowledge not only the individual language choices that speakers make but also the social and political realities that govern language behaviour. One may very well explore an individual's use of language in this or that context, and how a person's linguistic repertoire expresses the individuality of that person. I may, for example, choose to use a more archaic form of a word in a certain context to create a particular effect, perhaps a comic effect, perhaps a poetic effect. This is an individual's personality at work, expressing itself through choices in the use of language. But the use of language is also governed by societal norms that are both created by speakers and act on speakers. Society imposes certain requirements on its members when it comes to speaking and interacting, sometimes through the subtle effects of barely perceived norms that permeate society and at other times through the blunt force of legal and political imposition. The study of language in the larger setting of the society that supports it amounts to the study of multifarious linguistic, educational, behavioural, psychological, sociological, political, legal, religious, and historical factors. When the study of language is approached in this

manner, we can no longer expect any one discipline, as understood in the context of higher learning, to provide all the answers or to provide a complete ready-made methodology.

It is against this background that the present work should be read and appreciated. At its core, the present work is a study of the Speak Mandarin Campaign in Singapore, a campaign designed to effect a change in the use of language in Singapore. This is a study, in other words, of language in the larger social context and so one must be prepared to consider any number of factors if one is wanting to reach a full understanding of the raison d'être of the campaign, its effectiveness in producing change, and the lasting significance of the campaign. Among other things, such a study will need to duly acknowledge the presence of different varieties of languages in Singapore. Immediately, one must confront issues arising from the use of the English terms *language* and *dialect* in discussions of Chinese languages. These are not neutral, technical terms borrowed from linguistics in the case of discourse about Chinese in Singapore. Rather, they are loaded with deeper cultural meaning which needs to be taken into account. The Speak Mandarin Campaign needs to be appreciated in light of the educational policies promulgated by the Singapore government. Educational needs and goals played an important part in the initial justification of the campaign and continue to do so. Educational policy, in turn, must necessarily be understood in the context of the larger political goals of government. In the case of the Speak Mandarin Campaign, the larger political goals relate, in particular, to the formation of an independent Singapore nation and a perceived need to politically unify the nation.

In any evaluation of government policy, one must consider not just the policy in the abstract but also the policy in practice. In the case of the Speak Mandarin Campaign, this means that it is not sufficient to just look for motivations for the campaign and analyze the components of the policy. One must also explore how the campaign has been received by the target population (dialect speakers of Chinese in Singapore) and to what extent change in language use has been implemented during the years of the campaign. It is this aspect of the campaign, in particular, that is the focus of the research reported on here. It is an aspect that is critical in any evaluation of the campaign, important not just for academic purposes but important, too, for government's own understanding of realities, and for this reason I very much welcome Patrick Ng's book. It is a book that looks beyond public rhetoric and succeeds in penetrating the linguistic realities of speakers, how they think about dialect, Mandarin, and the Speak Mandarin Campaign.

June 2016   Prof. John Newman
                                                                               University of Alberta
                                                                               Edmonton, Alberta

Acknowledgements

Contents

List of Figure

List of Tables

Chapter 1
Introduction

Abstract In 1979, the Singapore government launched the Speak Mandarin Campaign to persuade all dialect speakers in Singapore to discard the use of Chinese dialects and switch to speaking Mandarin. In this study, Mandarin is a term which corresponds to Putonghua spoken in the People's Republic of China while 'dialect' refers to the vernacular variety of the Chinese language spoken by various subgroups in the local Chinese community. The local Chinese community in Singapore is subdivided into various dialect groups: Hokkiens, Teochews, Cantonese, Hakkas, Hainanese, Foochows, Henghua Shanghainese, and Hockchia. However, according to the Singapore government, too many dialects spoken in Singapore would hinder communication among the Chinese. The Speak Mandarin Campaign was implemented to unite all Chinese through speaking Mandarin as a common language. This chapter explains the research background of the study. First, it states the purpose of the study. Next, it explains the research design. The chapter will also discuss the research tools adopted for the study.

Keywords Background · Campaign · Objective · Chinese dialects · Research · Tools

1.1 Background of Research

Research has shown that language attitude changes over time although the process may be slow or gradual. According to Katz (1960), there are various factors effecting language attitude change. Language attitude may change when there is a reward such as gaining employment opportunities. Being a peripheral member of a group may also lead to a change in language attitude. A change in language attitude may arise

---

The original version of this chapter was revised: The erratum to this chapter is available at DOI 10.1007/978-981-10-3443-5_8

when an individual regards a language to be congruent with personal values or when there is an increase in knowledge of the minority or majority culture, social organization, politics, and education. Language policy implementation may effect a change in language attitude. The objective of this study is to examine whether there is a change of attitude amongst individual dialect speakers within a sampled community toward the Speak Mandarin Campaign in Singapore.

In 1979, the Singapore government launched the Speak Mandarin Campaign (henceforth SMC) with the specific objective of persuading the dialect-speaking Chinese population to switch from speaking Chinese dialects to Mandarin. Mandarin, also known as Standard Chinese or Modern Standard Chinese, is the official language of China and Taiwan, and is one of the four official languages of Singapore. Mandarin is also the term used for Modern Standard Chinese which corresponds closely to Putonghua spoken in the People's Republic of China. In the Singapore context, Mandarin and Chinese are used interchangeably. Chinese is a term that refers to a common language spoken in China while Mandarin is a form of Chinese 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 policy aimed at changing a deeply entrenched sociolinguistic habit of Chinese Singaporeans who are long used to speaking Chinese dialects (Pakir 1994). At this juncture, it is important to clarify the contentious nature of the use of 'Chinese dialects' in the Singapore context. Singapore politicians and government leaders often refer 'dialect' as a vernacular variety of the Chinese language spoken by various subgroups of the Chinese community. It is the practice in Singapore to refer 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 because of the mutual unintelligibility between the spoken varieties of Chinese. However, the author has chosen to use the term 'dialects' to be in line with the term used in various discourses discussed in the political and sociocultural context of Singapore.

Gopinathan (1979) observed that while the Malay and Indian communities are homogeneous in outlook due to their language, religion and custom, the local Chinese community is far from being culturally or linguistically homogeneous. The local Chinese community is itself made up of a heterogeneous mix of people whose forefathers came from different parts of China and spoke a multiplicity of Chinese dialects such as Hokkiens, Teochews, Cantonese, Hakkas, Hainanese, Foochows, Henghua, Shanghainese, and Hockchia. Governmental leaders in Singapore have fervently argued that linguistic diversity is incompatible with nation-building (Kuo and Jernudd 1994). There is a perception amongst governmental leaders that too

many Chinese dialect groups within the Chinese community would hinder communication among the Chinese. As a result, the SMC was launched to persuade all ethnic Chinese to switch to speaking Mandarin as a common language. In the official opening ceremony of the SMC on September 7, 1979, the then Prime Minister Mr. Lee Kuan Yew explained the specific purpose of the SMC:

Chinese Singaporeans face a dilemma. The Chinese we speak is divided up among more than 12 dialects. Children at home speak dialect; in school they learn English and Mandarin. After 20 years of bilingual schooling, we know that very few children can cope with two languages plus one dialect, certainly not much more than the 12% that make it to junior colleges. The majority have ended up speaking English and dialect (Lee 1979).

In the first 10 years (1979–1984), the campaign targeted all Chinese Singaporeans. The aim of the campaign 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, hawker centers, and bus interchanges. As its name implies, the SMC was aimed primarily at promoting listening and speaking skills. 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). As reported by Gopinathan (1998), the implementation of the campaign has been marked by wide-ranging activities which included the phasing out of dialect programs over radio and television, the introduction of conversational Mandarin lessons 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. Instead of focusing on Chinese dialect speakers, the campaign began to target at the English-educated Chinese as it was felt that they were most vulnerable to Westernization and the dominance of English. The SMC was launched to prevent English-educated Chinese Singaporeans from losing their Chinese identity.

Since its implementation in 1979, the Speak Mandarin campaign has been held annually in Singapore to raise the consciousness of Chinese Singaporeans on the need to discard Chinese dialects and assimilate Mandarin as a language of use and preference. Some novel strategies were used to celebrate the SMC's third decade of existence, especially among the younger generation of Singaporeans. One such example is the set of advertisements being aired on the national TV network and other forums, featuring Caucasian preschool goers speaking Mandarin in their family and home environment, suggesting the increasing popularity of Mandarin even among the non-Chinese races (see Fig. 1.1).

Fig. 1.1 The Speak Mandarin Campaign poster: Be heard in Chinese

1.2   The Scope and Objectives of the Study

The SMC is the longest campaign in Singapore spanning more than three decades since it was initiated in 1979. Previous formal study on the SMC was conducted in 1985 and focused mainly on the use of Mandarin in public places such as in restaurants and coffee shops (Kuo 1985). The present study examines the current attitudes of Chinese dialect speakers toward the SMC. This book is timely as 2017 marks the 38th anniversary of the launch of the SMC. Given that the SMC is aimed at changing the speech habits of the Chinese community, it is necessary to examine the impact of the campaign on current Chinese dialect speakers and consider their subjective experiences and orientations toward the campaign as a planned language effort. Individual dialect speakers may have diverse opinions and views on the SMC. Some may be highly supportive while others may resist the SMC.

1.3   Data Collection

In this study, the self-administered survey questionnaire (henceforth SAS) is the main tool used to assess whether the SMC has resulted in any changes in language use and attitudes of dialect speakers towards Mandarin. As stated by Ferguson

(1971), the questionnaire is an efficient means of collecting sociolinguistic information from specific subpopulations. Although the SAS can only elicit general information and may not be able to elicit controversial issues related to the SMC, it has the advantage of acquiring information efficiently from a larger population as compared to the interview. The SAS consists of four main parts. Part I of the SAS gathers demographic information of the respondents. It consists of questions concerning the respondent's social class. Part II of the SAS examines respondent's habitual language use in various domains such as family, work, personal, and 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 elicits information on respondents' attitudes toward Mandarin, English, Chinese dialects and their attitudes toward the different language speakers. Part IV of the SAS investigates the respondents' attitudes toward the strategies, goals, and outcomes of the Speak Mandarin Campaign. The SAS was distributed to 150 individual dialect speakers living in the North Eastern part of Singapore. Respondents from the researched community included individuals from different dialect groups such as Hokkiens, Teochews, Cantonese, Hainanese, and others. The respondents for the sociolinguistic survey also included male and female respondents from different socioeconomic backgrounds and ages. (A copy of the final self-administered survey is provided in Appendix A).

Besides the SAS, a semi-structured interview (henceforth SSI) was also used to triangulate data from the SAS. The SSI has a structured overall framework and provides flexibility in changing the order of questions to facilitate an extensive follow-up of responses (Mcdonough and Mcdonough 1997). Although the data collected from the SSI may not represent the views of all members in the dialect-speaking community, it is nevertheless useful as a tool to obtain (a) informants' attitudes toward the goals of the SMC, (b) informants' attitudes toward the continuation of the SMC, (c) informants' views toward the campaign's objective of eliminating Chinese dialects, and (d) informants' views toward the effectiveness of the SMC. A copy of the semi-structured interview schedule is provided in Appendix B.

Data analysis for the present study underwent three levels of data transformation as suggested by Wolcott (1994): description, analysis, and interpretation. Each interview was first translated into English and then described verbatim. Next, the data were described and open coding (Strauss 1987) was deployed to categorize each transcript into the four major themes as mentioned above. The data were analyzed based on the suggestions by Miles and Huberman (1994) and Strauss and Corbin (1990). The data analysis involved three concurrent stages of data analysis. The first phase involved editing, segmenting, and summarizing of data. The second phase included organizing and assembling of data. The third phase involved coding and memoing. Theoretical memos were written to relate a category on the four

major themes. The SSI data were interpreted through "cautious analysis and probing into what is to be made of them" (Wolcott 1994, p. 36). The social, cultural, and historical context of the SMC, the researcher's personal experience and knowledge of the SMC, and theories of language planning were also utilized in the interpretation of the SSI data.

1.4 Conclusion

Given that language-planning efforts are located in a localized context, the results of this study could help to uncover current attitudes, beliefs, and opinions of individual dialect speakers toward the SMC. On a broader scale, this study would contribute to research and teaching in the area of East Asian Studies, language policy, and sociolinguistics, in particular those associated with Bilingualism, Chinese Language studies, and Asian Studies. As the study examines the complex nature of language inheritance and acquisition, which involves language attitudes, identity formation, ideologies and linguistic practices in formal and informal educational contexts, it thus aims to be accessible to nonspecialists in Chinese or East Asian studies, such as academics and students from a variety of fields in the social sciences, including bilingual education, anthropology, cultural studies, political science, psychology, and sociology.

Readers will find this book relevant as the study examines a politically imposed language policy within a community of dialect speakers, and the way individual dialect speakers responded to the policy. There are also other factors that make the book of interest to a wider audience:

1. Singapore may be a small nation but its rich linguistic diversity and its unique education system makes it a fertile research site in which to explore self-reported language use and attitudes of dialect speakers toward the different languages (Mandarin, other Chinese-spoken varieties, and English) within the linguistic landscape.
2. The SMC is a deliberate language-planning policy initiated by the Singapore government to change the linguistic habits of the local dialect-speaking community. The impact of and response of dialect speakers to the SMC will enable us to understand the way deliberate language planning can be implemented and the different features of deliberate language-planning policy across time. In addition, the study will also deepen our knowledge on issues related to language maintenance and language shift within the family.
3. The use of a dialect has implications for identity construction and maintenance. As is oftentimes the case, identity construction and maintenance need to be constantly reexamined in the light of changing political and economic situations. This book will shed light on the relationship between culture, language, and identity.
4. The growth of China as an economic powerhouse and the spread of Mandarin world wide suggests that that there is a need to redefine what is meant by the

term 'Chinese language.' In Singapore, the term 'Chinese language' may have different meanings as Chinese Singaporeans use a variety of Chinese dialects in their daily lives. It will also be interesting to examine how different Chinese in Singapore perceive the use of Mandarin.

5. Since the mid-1990s, Singapore has been active in reforming the school curriculum in response to globalization. The success of Singapore's education system has been recognized by international research organizations such as the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This book will provide insights on how government leaders can embark on language planning to equip its citizens with the skills and dispositions needed for an increasingly competitive economic environment.

This study consists of seven chapters. Chapter one presents the background to the research providing information on Chinese dialects in Singapore, problematizes the use of the term 'dialects,' and explains the various phases of the SMC since its inception in 1979. Chapter two reviews the literature on language planning and language management drawing on the work of key scholars in the field. The chapter also explains the different forces that influence language planning in a society. Chapter three provides the sociopolitical background and the sociolinguistic situation of Singapore. The chapter also discusses the policy of multilingualism and the bilingual school policy. Chapter four reviews the literature on the SMC. Drawing on a variety of sources, the chapter questions the official argument of the campaign and discusses its impact within the Singapore Chinese community. Chapter five reports the quantitative data gathered from the self-administered survey. The chapter examines the language choice of dialect speakers in the different domains of language use, their attitudes toward the status and functions of Mandarin, English, and the Chinese dialects, as well as their perceptions toward the SMC as a planned language initiative. Chapter six reports the qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews involving 19 dialect speakers from different age groups and socioeconomic backgrounds. The chapter also discusses the revitalisation of Chinese dialects by young dialect speakers in Singapore. Chapter seven concludes with a robust critical examination of the SMC. The chapter also highlights the repercussions of the loss of Chinese dialects and discusses the future challenges in promoting the use of Mandarin within the dialect-speaking Chinese community.

References

Ferguson, C. A. (1971). National sociolinguistics profile formulas. In B. William (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 309–324). The Hague: Mouton.

Gopinathan, S. (1979). Singapore Language policies: Strategies for a plural society. In L. Suryadinata (Ed.), *Southeast Asian affairs* (pp. 280–295). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Gopinathan, S. (1998). Language policy changes 1979-1997: Politics and pedagogy. In W. K. Ho, S. Gopinathan, A. Pakir, H. W. Kam, & V. Saravanan (Eds.), *Language, society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends* (pp. 309–324). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitude. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*, 163–204.

Kuo, E. C. Y. (1985). *A quantity approach to the study of sociolinguistic situation in multi-linguistic society.* Singapore: Regional English Language Centre.

Kuo, E. C. Y., & Jernudd, B. H. (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* (pp. 70–89). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Lee, K. Y. (1979). Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew Speak Mandarin Campaign Launch speech. http://www.mandarin.org.sg/en/press-room/. Accessed 4 Aug 2014.

Mcdonough, J., & Mcdonough, S. (1997). *Research methods for english language teachers.* London: Arnold.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). London: United Kingdom.

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* (pp. 158–179). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientist.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis and interpretation.* Thousands oaks. CA: Sage.

Chapter 2
Review of Literature on Planning for Language

Abstract This chapter provides a framework for studying the Speak Mandarin Campaign in Singapore. It draws together the following disparate themes of language planning activities inherent in government involvement: the goals of language planning, language planning in new and emerging states, forces against government intervention in language planning, the macrosociological and the microlinguistic perspectives on language planning, status planning as well as the top-down versus bottom-up approach to language planning. Some of these themes are not exclusive to each other and there are instances where they overlap. To enhance our understanding of how individual dialect speakers perceive the use of different languages in multilingual Singapore, there will also be a discussion on the sociolinguistics of language use.

Keywords Policies · Practice · Government · Ideology · Management · Society · Individual

2.1 Language Planning: Work of Government

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) observe that the recognition of language as a societal resource resulted in governmental intervention in language planning. As suggested by Jernudd and Gupta (1971, p. 20): 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 have been approved by the political authority. They aspire to find effective solutions to their planning tasks.

According to Ager (2001), the ability to use a language as a major economic resource requires the government to coordinate the planning of language for societal development. In addition, language planning by government is also motivated by problems in language use. Kaplan and Baldauf state that some of the problems that require language planning are rather complex, ranging from a desire to modernize a language to a need to standardize a language to achieve political unification. However, not all scholars agree that government involvement in language planning will necessarily lead to social and political progress. As Edwards (1994, p. 189) explains: If we accept that language planning involves the selection and codification of a language variety, then we should realize that the implementation of language planning is usually dependent upon powerful policy makers. Bloomaert (1996) observes that language policies and practices implemented by official language planners 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 for the good of society.

Krishna and Abiodun (2002) specified four typical ideologies that may motivate actual decision-making by the government in language planning in any given society: linguistic assimilation, linguistic pluralisation, vernacularisation, and internationalism. Linguistic assimilation is the learning of the dominant language. This is best illustrated in the learning of English in the US, although the constitution does not specify an official language. On the other hand, linguistic pluralism is the coexistence of different languages. For instance, Switzerland maintains four official languages with equal status: German, French, Italian, and Romansch. 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 nonindigenous language of wider communication for the purposes of education and trade. An example is the official language status accorded to English in Singapore (Krishna and Abiodun 2002, p. 243) due to its role as a wider language of communication, trade, and commerce. In Singapore, language planning is based on the ideological assumption that language is a problem and thus necessitates governmental intervention in language planning. Silver and Bokhorst-Heng (2016) reported that language is viewed as a problem when there is a perception that students are not mastering the official language to the level required by the educational system. The SMC was launched in 1979 as official language planners in Singapore believed that it would be impossible for Singaporeans to achieve a high level of Mandarin if they continued to learn a range of dialects (Speak Mandarin Campaign 2015).

In addition, language planning in the new and emerging countries is shaped by globalization. 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. The current spread of Mandarin is the result of globalization with the emergence of China as an economic powerhouse. As a result, Mandarin Chinese was given a higher profile in Singapore as it was perceived that China would be a lucrative strategic and economic partner (Tan 2009). Since 1985, as a result of the growth of China as an economic powerhouse, the SMC began to chart a new course with the slogan, "Speak Mandarin. It's an asset." The government believed that

knowing Mandarin would give Singapore a competitive edge over Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong as well as help to improve and facilitate trade with China. The global spread of Mandarin also has cultural implications for Singapore. On the future importance of Mandarin, former foreign minister George Yeo stated that it is important for Chinese Singaporeans to continue to use Mandarin to preserve their cultural roots. They should be proud to be the inheritors of 5000 years of Chinese civilization, the longest continuous civilization in human history (Latif and Lee 2016). He warned that if young Chinese Singaporeans allow their mother tongue (Mandarin) to degenerate into a second language, they would lose "much of their internal strength and become a weak people with shallow roots." (p. 284). However, it is uncertain to what extent current young generations of Chinese Singaporeans view Mandarin as a repository of Chinese cultural values.

Another societal force that works against governmental intervention in language planning is individual choice and decision in language use. According to Pakir, 'invisible language planning' may arise when individuals interfere nondeliberately with planned changes to the systems of a language code (Pakir 1994, p. 165). The individuals identified by Pakir are parents, children, and teachers. Tollefson (1991, p. 36) cogently argues that individuals may resist language planning efforts by governmental authority as language change involves real people living in history and their personal ideologies may not correspond to the economic logic of cost or benefit.

2.2   Two Perspectives to Language Planning: The Macrosociological and the Microlinguistic

In the literature of language planning, there are two perspectives to language planning: macrosociological language planning and microlinguistic language planning. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) define macrosociological language planning as the body of ideas, laws and regulations, change rules, beliefs and practices intended to achieve a planned change within a community. 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, p. 59). Ager (2001) observes that many macrosociological goals of language planning are carried out to achieve rather abstract objectives related to national policy goals. Kuo and Jernudd (1994, p. 83) suggest that macrosociological language planning is motivated by ideological beliefs and thus justify the need for the governmental intervention in a proactive fashion.

On the other hand, the microlinguistic perspective on language planning constitutes correction of inadequacies that are noted by individuals, and does not 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 microsociologically oriented. This study adopts both the macrolinguistic and microlinguistic perspectives to language planning. For a national language planning policy like the SMC, there is a need to come to terms with the linguistic needs at the microlinguistic level. As Chua and Baldauf (2011) suggested, a 'micro' approach will require official language planners to factor in the various areas of language learning such as the acquisition, retention, and use of language. It is also important to consider the motivation of individuals in learning Mandarin and parents' attitudes toward Mandarin. At the family level, parents must be willing and able to transmit the language to their children.

2.3 Language Planning and Language Management

Most theories of language planning have concentrated exclusively on solving language problems but failed to consider language planning in the more general context of language management. Spolsky (2004) defines language management as the establishment of an explicit plan or policy, usually written in a formal document about language use. However, Spolsky cautions that the existence of an explicit policy does not guarantee that language management will be implemented and will be successful if implemented. Spolsky 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. Ricento (2000) observes that language planning conceived as language management will not result in the intended outcome as there are many uncontrollable variables involved. Ricento argues that language planning should focus on the status and relations of speech communities in defined contexts, in particular why a language has a particular status and the consequences of this status for individuals and the communities (Ricento 2000). There are two types of language policies that arise from language planning by government: status planning and corpus planning. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) define status planning as language planning activities that reflect social issues. They also suggest that status planning involves the positioning of languages in relation to each other. In the case of Singapore, the Republic of Singapore Independence Act of 1965 decreed that Mandarin shall be one of the four official languages in Singapore. However, although the Singapore government has granted an official status to Mandarin, Zhao and Liu (2010) observed that over the years, Mandarin has lost its prestige due to the unbridled dominance of English as an official and administrative language. They cogently argued that the ascription of Mandarin as the official mother tongue of Chinese Singaporeans would not arrest the decline status of the Mandarin Chinese. Instead they believed that there is a need to strike a balance between English and Mandarin Chinese through the wider use of the language in government departments and other public domains. However, the Singapore government has to tread gingerly the interests of the Chinese community. As Singapore is a multiracial nation, other minority ethnic

groups may view the promotion of Mandarin as a preferential treatment accorded to the Chinese ethnic group.

According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), there are two approaches adopted in the implementation of language planning: top-down versus bottom-up. Most traditional language planning activities were implemented using the 'top-down' approach, which involves decision-making at the national level, and governments solving complex problems as their point of departure. However, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) believe that language planning and policy should ideally follow a bottom-up rather than a top-down approach as they believe that no amount of language planning can 'force people' to change their linguistic habit. The Singapore government is aware of the need to adopt a 'bottom-up' approach to promote the SMC. To ensure that the campaign is effective at the grassroots level, the SMC committee has enlisted the help of private organizations and prominent leaders in the Chinese community.

2.4 Sociolinguistics of Language Use

To enhance our understanding of individual choice in a bilingual or multilingual society, there is a need to review some relevant concepts associated with the sociolinguistics of language use: domains of language use, code switching, and language shift and maintenance. In a multilingual society, an individual may use different languages in different situations known as domains of language use. There are various domains of language use such as family, friendship, religion, education, and administration. Code switching is a common occurrence in many bilingual or multilingual societies such as Africa or India or amongst immigrants living in Europe or the United States. Code switching can be defined as the use of 2 or 3 in the same conversation or utterance. There are other factors why people chose a particular code when they speak: participants, situations, content of discourse, and functions of interactions (Grosjean 1982). According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), there are various forces at work in a language planning activity. As Garcia (2009, p. 80) reminds us, language shift or maintenance does not happen in a vacuum; it occurs when there is coexistence of more than one language, or when there are differences in power, value, and status conferred on languages. May (2012) observes that in multilingual societies, a majority language, usually synonymous with greater political power, privilege, and social prestige, will eventually replace the range and functions of a minority language.

Due to the internalization over time of negative attitudes toward their ethnic mother tongue, younger generation of Singaporeans tend to regard English as a language of use and preference. Since gaining independence, the Singapore government has pursued a bilingual school policy. Chinese students have to learn English as a 'First Language' and Chinese as a 'Second Language.' At the initial implementation of the English-knowing bilingual policy, the functional allocation of English and the ethnic mother tongue was clearly defined. However, the

functional allocation has now slipped with English increasingly gaining more domains and the ethnic mother tongue gradually employed in fewer domains in the Singapore society (Ng 2016). Despite the concerns over the lack of interest amongst Chinese students in learning the mother tongue subject in schools, an over-whelmingly large majority of the population continues to support the socioeconomic importance of English.

2.5   Language and Identity

It is important to understand the link between language, identity, and culture in terms of how speakers allocate their linguistic resources for identity construction, maintenance, and change (Tollefson and Tsui 2007). Leung et al. (1997) suggest that there are three types of relationships that language identity has with the means of communication: language expertise, language affiliation, and language inheritance. Language expertise is the knowledge of a language while language affiliation is the individual's attitudes and affective connection to a language, dialect, or sociolect (Leung et al. 1997). Language affiliation is about the language of the family one is born into or the community one is associated with. Although an individual may inherit a language or dialect, there is no guarantee of a positive affiliation toward the language as one can inherit a language or dialect and yet have no affiliations with it.

Another important concept related to language identity is the mother tongue as the basis for sociolinguistic identity. The mother tongue is defined as the language used to decide whether one is a native speaker (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). The mother tongue is also the language a person has learned from birth or within the critical period, and the language a person speaks the best. It is often the basis for sociolinguistic identity. In some countries, the mother tongue refers to the language of one's ethnic group. However, in the context of Singapore, the mother tongue is defined as the language of one's paternal ancestry, rather than the language of one's socialization experience (Tan 2007). Singapore's language planning policy tends to ignore an individual's linguistic experience on the premise that linguistic ownership is basically a public concern that justifies intervention on the part of the government. However, in recent years, there have been concerns that Chinese students are losing their proficiency in their mother tongue language (Ng 2014). Despite recent government initiatives to maintain the use of the mother tongue language, young Chinese Singaporeans continue to regard English as a language of habitual use.

2.6   Conclusion

This chapter discusses language planning framed within the context of governmental involvement. Language is perceived as a societal resource and thus necessitates government intervention in the management of language resources. Some

language planning practices by government may be motivated by ideological beliefs such as linguistic assimilation, linguistic pluralism, vernacularisation, and internationalism. In addition, language planning can also be influenced by globalization and individuals may interfere in language planning by government. There is a suggestion by some scholars (Ricento 2000; Kuo and Jernudd 1994) that both the microlinguistic (the sociolinguistics of language) and the macrosociological approaches (the sociolinguistics of society) need to be integrated and should be complementary for successful implementation of language planning policies.

The Singapore government has adopted 'a bottom-up' approach to ensure the SMC is effective. However, in order for Mandarin to be 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 by dialect-speaking Chinese in all spheres of life. There is also a need to raise the prestige of Mandarin as a premier language in addition to English. However, although official rhetoric has constantly emphasized the importance of Mandarin in maintaining close economic and political ties with China, it is uncertain whether the lure of China can nurture an environment that will sustain the learning and use of Mandarin beyond the formal school-going years (Ng 2014). Official language planners in Singapore now faces a daunting task in maintaining a higher profile of Chineseness in Singapore's society and ensuring large segments of the Chinese Singaporean population that Mandarin has enduring relevance in the local linguistic landscape. The SMC is a fascinating story of how political leaders in Singapore tried to change a deeply entrenched sociolinguistic habit of Chinese Singaporeans through deliberate language planning.

References

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

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

Chua, C. S. K., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2011). Micro language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 936–951). New York: Routledge.

Edwards, J. (1994). Language planning and education in Singapore and Malaysia. In A. Hassan (Eds.), *Language planning in Southeast Asia* (pp. 176–190). Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Percetakan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grosjean. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Havard University Press.

Jernudd, B. H., & Gupta, J. D. (1971). *Towards a definition of language planning, Reprinted in his edited advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton.

Jernudd, B. H., & Neustupny, J. V. (1987). *Language planning: For Whom?* Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning from Practice to theory*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Krishna and Abiodun. (2002). The case for language policies in multinational corporations. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 4*(7), 241–251.

Kuo Eddie, C. Y., & Jernudd, B. H. (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* (pp. 70–89). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Laforge, L (Eds.). (1986). *Proceedings of the international Colloquim on language planning, Ottawa, 25–29. May 1986* (pp. 71–84). Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Universite laval.

Latif, A., & Lee, H. H. (2016). *George Yeo on Bonsai, Banyan and the Tao*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Company.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealized native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 543–560.

May, S. (2012). *Language policy and minority rights*. UK: Routledge.

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* (pp. 50–69). Singapore. Times Academic Press.

Ng, P. (2014). Mother tongue education in Singapore: Concerns, issues and controversies. *Journal of Current issues in Language Planning, 15*(4), 1–15.

Ng, P. (2016). Singapore's English-knowing bilingual policy: A critical evaluation. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 265–280). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

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* (pp. 158–179). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policies and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 2*(4), 196–213.

Silver and Bokhorst-Heng. (2016). *Quadrilingual education in Singapore*. Singapore: Springer International.

Skutnabb-Kangas. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education or worldwide diversity and human rights? Mahwah*. NJ & London, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Speak Mandarin Campaign (2015). *A mandarin anchor in a changing world*. http://mandarin.org.sg/en/content/anchor. Retrieved 30 September 2016.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tan, K. B. (2007). The multilingual state in search of the nation: The language policy and discourse in Singapore's nation building. In H. G. Lee & S. Leo (Eds.), *Language and development in South East Asia* (pp. 75–95). Singapore: Institute of South East.

Tan, K. B. (2009). Chinese-Singaporean identity: Subtle change amidst continuity. In B. Welsh, J. Chin, A., Mahizhnan, & T. T. How (Eds.), *Impressions of the Goh Chok Tong years in Singapore* (pp. 324–335). Singapore: NUS Press.

Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality*. London: Longman.

Tollefson, W., & Tsui, A. (2007). *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Weinstein, B. (1980). Language planning in Francophone Africa. *Language Problems and language Planning, 1*(4), 55–77.

Zhao, S., & Liu, Y. (2010). Chinese education in Singapore Constraints of bilingual policy from the perspectives of status and prestige planning. *Language Problems & Language Planning, 34*(3), 236–258.

Chapter 3
Singapore: The Contextual Background

Abstract Singapore's racial diversity is the result of early immigration trends brought about by past colonial commercial practices. Under British administration, it became a vibrant metropolis attracting a lot foreign workers from regions as diverse as China, India, Malaya, and parts of Southeast Asia. There are currently three major ethnic groups residing in Singapore: Chinese, Malay, and Indians. The dominant ethnic group is the Chinese who comprise approximately more than 74% of the resident Singapore population. However, the Chinese community in Singapore is far from being culturally or linguistically homogeneous. Within the Chinese community, there are various subgroups such as the Hokkiens, Teochews, Cantonese, Hainanese, Hakkas, Hokchiu, Henghua, Hockchia, Shanghainese, and Foochows. This chapter explains the sociopolitical background and the sociolinguistic situation in Singapore. It also describes in general the language-planning policies adopted by the government. The importance of English in the linguistic ecology of Singapore will also be discussed in the review of the language policies.

Keywords Sociopolitical · Sociolinguistic · Language planning · Multilingual · Bilingual policy

3.1 The Sociopolitical Background of Singapore

Singapore is a small island (712 km^2) state located at the tip of the Malay peninsula. With a population of approximately 5.08 million (Department of Statistics 2010), it is a young country of many races whose forefathers are from Southeast Asia, China, India, and the European countries. Singapore's racial diversity can be traced to immigration trends 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. Stamford Raffles soon realized that Singapore's location is a center point for trade and thus decided to lease it from the Sultan of Johore. Singapore then became a part of the Straits Settlements (a collection of Malay states) from 1867 to 1942.

Although Singapore had no natural resources to export, it soon rose from a down-and-out tropical outpost to a vibrant metropolis attracting a lot of merchants, entrepreneurs, and indentured laborers from regions as diverse as China, India, Malaya, and parts of Southeast Asia. This led to the development of a population characterized by multiracialism, multiculturalism, and multilingualism (Bokhorst-Heng 1998). In 1959, led by the People's Action Party (PAP) under the leadership of Lee Kuan Yew, Singapore achieved self-government. Since self-government, the PAP has run the parliamentary democracy in Singapore as a tight and well-ordered society. Under the leadership of the PAP, Singapore has transformed into a commercial port of entry for commerce and finance, and has one of the highest standards of living in Asia.

3.2   The Sociolinguistic Situation in Singapore

As mentioned earlier, 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. There are three major ethnic groups residing in Singapore: Chinese, Malay, and Indians.

The dominant ethnic group is the Chinese who comprise approximately more than 74% of the resident Singapore population. However, the Chinese in Singapore are far from being culturally or linguistically homogeneous. Singapore's Chinese residents are the descendants of immigrants from coastal southeastern China who spoke various mutually unintelligible Chinese dialects. As mentioned in Chapter one, the term 'Chinese dialect' refers to a vernacular variety of the Chinese language, and is spoken by various subgroups of the Chinese community. The following are some major dialects in Singapore: Hokkiens, Teochews, Cantonese, Hainanese, Hakkas, Hokchiu, Henghua, Hockchia, Shanghainese, and Foochows. In addition to their own dialects, many Singaporean Chinese acquire some knowledge of other dialects through their parents, relatives, friends, and neighbors.

The Hokkiens are the largest Chinese dialect groups in Singapore. About 40% of the Chinese are classified as Hokkiens. The next two largest groups are the Teochews and Cantonese (Wong 2011). In the past, due to the multiplicity of languages spoken in Singapore, it was necessary for an individual Chinese to communicate in several speech repertoires in different social settings. For example, when speaking to a hawker at a hawker center, an individual Chinese would speak the Hokkien dialect—the main language for intra-ethnic communication within the Chinese community. In other events such as attending funeral wakes or when participating in Ching Ming festival (a festival that marks the remembrance of the dead), the home ancestral dialect would be spoken among family members and relatives. The following section will provide an overview of language planning in Singapore.

3.3   Language Planning in Singapore

In Singapore, language planning is an integral part of national development, serving the needs of nation-building, and closely interconnected with other planning activities. According to Chua (1995), a pragmatic approach to language planning has developed in Singapore where much of governmental thinking and decision-making is motivated and justified as economic instrumental rationality. As is oftentimes the case, language choices in Singapore are to a large extent dictated by forces of the marketplace (Ho and Alsagoff 1998). However, compared to other countries, language planning in Singapore represents a case of centralized planning where decisions on language policy and their implementation are often articulated in cabinet or parliament by political leaders (Kuo and Jernudd 1994). Consultation with specialists is done on a confidential, ad hoc, and piecemeal basis. Since gaining independence, the Singapore government has implemented two major language-planning policies: the multilingual and the English-knowing bilingual school policy.

3.4   The Policy of Multilingualism

Since the early years of Singapore, language diversity has been perceived as 'problematic.' From the perceptions of the Singapore Government, language loyalty could lead to interethnic conflict when the functional status or sentimental values of a particular ethnic language are at stake. In addition, language diversity could weaken communicative integration and hinders the social, economic, and political development of the nation. In response to such perceived 'problems,' the Singapore 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) explained that the strategy of multilingualism has required that the languages of the different racial groups be formally given equivalent status. The policy of multilingualism also entailed reconceptualizing the internally heterogeneous communities as a single language, paired with one associated culture (Ho and Alsagoff 1998). Each ethnic group was assigned a single mother tongue (Clammer 1985) to cater to the ethnocultural needs of the three respective ethnic communities, Chinese, Malay, and Indian (Rubdy 2005).

In addition to the three ethnic languages, English was accorded the status of an official language. Despite being the language of former colonial rule, the use of English has been defended as a necessity for its utility in science and technology in the early years of Singapore's independence. This 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 1998, p. 298).

Although the policy of multilingualism serves the government's goal of establishing equality of all languages, in reality, not all languages are prescribed equality (Kuo and Jernudd 1994). Over the years, English has become the premier language in Singapore due to its pervasive use in society. Bokhorst-Heng (1998) observed 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 while at the community level, English is seen to be the obvious choice for interethnic communication. In addition, English is also important for employment opportunities at the individual level. English has also been accorded the status of the language of wider communication as it is considered the language of government bureaucracy, the courts, international trade, science, technology, and business in Singapore. Although the spread of English in nonnative English-speaking countries has been regarded as a form of linguistic hegemony (Phillipson 1992), the Singapore population has willingly adopted English as the key accumulation of cultural, political, and economic capital.

3.5   The English-Knowing Bilingual School Policy

However, by the late seventies, the unbridled dominance of English as an official and administrative language had become a cause of concern 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 programs 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, p. 203).

Chua (1995) reported that the undesirable Western lifestyle brought about through the dominance of English includes drug abuse, sexual permissiveness, and political liberalism. In response to the dominance of English, the Singapore government promoted the learning of the mother tongue to help Singaporeans avoid the excesses of Westernization (Gopinathan 1998). A policy of bilingualism was implemented and made compulsory in schools in 1966. Former Minister for

Education, Tony Tan Keng Yam explained the rationale of the bilingual school policy:

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, p. 43).

The implementation of the bilingual policy made it mandatory for all students in Singapore to study English as a 'First Language' and their supposed 'mother tongue,' as 'Second Language.' However, the definition of bilingualism is specific to Singapore and is defined by the government as 'proficiency in English and one other official language' (Pakir 1994, p. 159). The bilingual policy made English the lingua franca of Singapore, giving the policy the name 'English-knowing bilingualism' (Kachru 1983, p. 42). In essence, the bilingual policy is based on a functional 'division of labor' between languages (Kuo and Jernudd 1994, p. 30). Gopinathan (1998) reported that the English-knowing bilingual school policy was implemented by a series of detailed guidelines involving exposure time, subject-language matching, examination, and attainment requirements. Television programs in dialect were replaced by Mandarin to shape home language use. However, by the late 1970s, it was obvious that the bilingual education policy was not succeeding.

The 1978 Goh Report—the most explicit and authoritative critique of Singapore's language policies concluded that bilingual education had not produced the desired outcome. The key findings in the report included: (i) At least 25% of the Primary 6 population did not attain minimum literacy levels, (ii) 62% of those who sat for the Primary School Leaving Examination and 66% of those who sat for the GCE "O" Level Examination from 1975 to 1977, failed either in the first or second language, (iii) A majority of students fared badly in Chinese examinations, reading of Chinese books and newspapers, and (iv) The strategies devised to improve language levels were also found to be ineffective (Gopinathan 1998, p. 23).

The principal finding of the Goh Report was that too much was being demanded of too many in terms of language competence while the achievement of the bilingual educational policy was described by its initiator, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, as "patchy and uneven" (Shepherd 2003, p. 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. Kaplan and Baldauf (2003, p. 131) reported that the bilingual policy was a failure as students found it very difficult to learn two languages proficiently, especially when 85% of them came from dialect-speaking homes where Mandarin was not spoken. Ang (1998) 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 also undermined by the various languages spoken by students outside schools which include Malay,

Mandarin, English, and Chinese dialects. To reduce the linguistic burden of dialect-speaking children who had to speak two official languages English and Mandarin upon entering schools, the SMC was implemented in 1979 to make all young Chinese discard Chinese dialects and speak Mandarin as a language of use and preference.

In recent years, despite the promotion of the SMC, there has also been a report on the decline of the literacy level of the Chinese language amongst ethnic Chinese students. The low Chinese literacy has been attributed to the lack of curriculum time for Chinese students to read and write in Chinese and an overemphasis on the importance of English language in Singapore's society (Kirkpatrick 2010). A report conducted by the Chinese Language Curriculum and Pedagogy Review Committee in 2004 showed that 77% of P6 students from English-speaking homes find learning Chinese difficult, compared to 50 and 36% of those who speak some or mostly Chinese at home, respectively (Chinese Language Curriculum and Pedagogy Review Committee 2004, p. 23). As English has a higher status and prestige than any of the vernacular languages in the local linguistic landscape, it is not uncommon for young Singaporeans to align themselves with English. Currently, as English has elevated demands in academic performance, it is necessary for students to attain a high proficiency of English to gain admission to tertiary education (Ng 2016). It would be true to say that for a majority of young Chinese Singaporeans, to embrace Mandarin would mean to identify oneself with a community with less power economically, socially, and politically. It would also mean adopting a less prestigious language (Mandarin) over a prestigious one (English).

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter provides the contextual background for the present study. In particular, it focuses on the language policies that give rise to the SMC. 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 Singapore government perceived that the dominance of English would lead 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 the school to curb the erosion of Chinese cultural values as a result of the domination of English. Thus in 1966, the Singapore 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 the mother tongue as 'Second language.' However, the bilingual school policy was undermined by the continuing use of Chinese dialects by students outside the school environment. As a result, the Singapore Government implemented the SMC in 1979 to encourage all young Chinese to discard Chinese dialects and switch to speaking Mandarin.

References

Ang, B. C. (1998). The teaching of the Chinese language in Singapore. In W. K. Ho, S. Gopinathan, A. Pakir, H. W. Kam, & V. Saravanan (Eds.), *Language, society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends* (pp. 335–352). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Bokhorst-Heng, W. (1998). Language planning and management. In J. A. Foley (Ed.), *English in new cultural contexts* (pp. 287–309). Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Chinese Language Curriculum and Pedagogy Review Committee. (2004). *Report of the Chinese language curriculum and pedagogy review committee*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Chua, B.-H. (1995). *Communitarian ideology and democracy in Singapore*. London: Routledge.

Clammer, J. (1985). *Singapore: Ideology, society, culture*. Singapore: Chopmen Publishers.

Department of Statistics. (2010). Singapore: Ministry of Trade and Industry. http//www.singstat.gov.sg. Accessed 23 Sept 2012.

Gopinathan, S. (1998). Language policy changes 1979-1997: Politics and pedagogy. In W. K. Ho, S. Gopinathan, A. Pakir, H. W. Kam, & V. Saravanan (Eds.), *Language, society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends* (pp. 19–44). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Ho, C. L., & Alsagoff, L. (1998). English as the common language in multicultural Singapore. In J. Foley (Ed.), *English in new cultural contexts* (pp. 201–217). Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1983). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2003). *Language and Language in education planning in the Pacific Basin*. London: Klumer Academic Publishers.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as an lingual franca in Asean*. Hongkong: Hongkong University Press.

Kuo, E. C. Y., & Jernudd, B. H. (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* (pp. 70–89). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Lee, K. C. (1983). *Language and education in Singapore*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Ng, P. (2016). Singapore's English-knowing bilingual policy: A critical evaluation. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 265–280). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

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* (pp. 158–179). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rubdy, R. (2005). Creative destruction: Singapore's speak good english movement. *World Englishes, 20*(3), 341–356.

Shepherd, J. (2003). *Striking a balance: The management of language in Singapore*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Wong, W. K. (2011). *Census of Population 2010*. Singapore: Department of Statistics.

Chapter 4
Review of Literature on the Speak Mandarin Campaign (SMC)

Abstract The SMC is the longest campaign held in Singapore, spanning more than 30 years since it was initiated in 1979. In an attempt to persuade dialect speakers to embrace Mandarin, the Singapore Government proposed three official arguments for the implementation of the campaign: the education, communicative, and cultural argument. Various campaign strategies were adopted to promote Mandarin. In the first phase of the campaign, from 1979 to 1989, the main strategy adopted by the SMC was to eradicate Chinese dialects in Singapore. Chinese dialects were banned in mass media such as television. The campaign also made use of several campaign slogans such as "Speak More Mandarin and Less Dialect" to persuade Chinese Singaporeans to discard dialects and switch to speaking Mandarin. This chapter reviews the literature on the SMC. The chapter opens with an explanation of the organization of the SMC. Next, it describes the measures undertaken by the government to implement the campaign. It then proceeds to examine some impacts of the SMC.

Keywords Organization · Implementation · Strategies · Official arguments · Eradication Chinese dialects · Impact

4.1 Organization 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 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). The decisions on the SMC were made mainly by political leaders; other news reports such as ministerial statements of the SMC were reported in press releases (Bokhorst-Heng 1998). The promotion of the SMC also involved various grassroots organizations such as the Citizens' Consultative Committee (including advisors), the Community Centre Management

Committee, Residents' Committee, and some Chinese civic/clan organizations. In addition, various organizations in the media were also involved in the promotion of the campaign such as Lianhe Zaobao (local Chinese newspaper), the Redifusion (S) Pte Ltd. (a private broadcasting station), Singapore Broadcasting Corporation, Singapore News and Publication Ltd., and The Straits Times (1975) Ltd.

There was also participation from private organizations and statutory boards such as the Educational Publications Bureau Private Limited, Esso Singapore, 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. In addition, a Committee to Promote the Use of Mandarin was established to implement the campaign at the grassroots level. The Committee to Promote the Use of Mandarin worked 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 (MP), professionals as well as high-ranking officers in the public and private sectors.

4.2 Implementation of the SMC

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 the first phase of the campaign, from 1979 to 1989, the main strategy adopted by the SMC was the eradication of Chinese dialects in Singapore. Chinese dialects were banned on television and radio as the government adopted an aggressive strategy to eliminate Chinese dialects in the local linguistic landscape. To promote the SMC, popular Hong Kong Cantonese drama serial such as 'Legend of the Condor Heroes' were dubbed into Mandarin. However, the dubbing of Cantonese drama serial into Mandarin was unpopular and resulted in a number of protests in the local newspapers. Various campaign slogans were used to persuade Chinese Singaporeans to discard dialects and switch to speaking Mandarin. For example, in 1979, the campaign slogan was, "Speak More Mandarin and Less Dialect." In 1983, the campaign targeted markets and food centers with the slogan, "Mandarin's In. Dialect's Out." To persuade dialect speakers to discard the use of Chinese dialects, the following slogans were used: "Start with Mandarin, not Dialect (1986)," "Better with more Mandarin, less Dialect," and "More Mandarin, Less Dialect. Make it a way of life (1989)". The mass media were also mobilized to spread the campaign message. Mandarin lessons were broadcast over the radio and television; the 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 staff who did not speak Mandarin at public counters.

To encourage Singaporeans to speak Mandarin, customer service officers in government buildings were instructed to wear badges that stated they could speak Mandarin. In 1981, the government distributed about 50,000 'I could speak Mandarin' badges to civil servants to promote the campaign (Lee 2011). Instead of dialect transliterations in English, Hanyu Pinyin names were used in the textbooks as well as in schools (Ang 1998) The 'Hanyu Pinyin' was also used to show food items on signboards and for registering the name of new companies, newborn Chinese babies, identity card holders, street and housing estate. Different types of publicity materials were used to promote the campaign: 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. However, the use of the Hanyu Pinyin to register the name of a newborn child was unpopular with Chinese parents who felt that the name of their child sounded differently when converted into Hanyi Pinyin. Many of them spoke up against the idea and eventually, the government decided to abolish the use of Hanyi Pinyin names.

The campaign also targeted specific places. For example in 1983, the SMC was promoted in hawker centers and in the markets (PuruShotam 1998). MP and members of grassroots organizations such as the Citizens Consultative Committees, Community Centre Management Committees, and Resident Committees made several visits to the wet markets and hawker centers to distribute publicity materials in an effort to encourage dialect speakers within the local community to switch to speaking Mandarin instead of dialects. Dialect-speaking staff were also instructed to stop using dialects during duty hours when dealing with the public.

4.3   The Official Arguments of the SMC

In an attempt to persuade dialect speakers to embrace Mandarin, the Singapore Government has proposed three official arguments for the SMC: the educational, communicative, and cultural arguments (Bokhorst-Heng 1998). The educational argument holds that the continual use of dialects in the home would hinder the learning of Mandarin in schools. As a result, Chinese dialects should have no place in the education system. However, Newman (1988) points out that one major problem with the educational argument is that there is an assumed subservience of the society at large to the demands of the education system. In proposing the SMC, governmental leaders in Singapore have suggested that there is a conflict between the use of dialects and the learning of languages (Mandarin and English) in schools. Newman argues that the solution being advanced is not to tailor the education policy to suit society, but to transform society so that school policy can be made effective. Another issue of contention in the educational argument revolves around the mother tongue. In the SMC, Mandarin is promoted as the official mother tongue of Chinese in Singapore. However, Gupta (1998) points out that Mandarin corresponds neither to the childhood languages, nor to the ancestral language of a

majority of Chinese Singaporeans who are descendants of immigrants from southern China. It is the southern Chinese dialects that most local Chinese embrace in their daily lives and thus many Chinese will naturally consider the southern Chinese dialects such as Hokkien, Teochew, Cantonese, and Hainanese as their mother tongue.

The communicative argument was also put forward as another reason for the implementation of the SMC. As there were too many dialect groups in Singapore, the government believed that the campaign was necessary to promote the use of Mandarin as a medium of interdialect communication. Wong (2011) reported that there are several dialects spoken in Singapore: Hokkien, Teochew, Cantonese, Hakka, Hainanese, Foochow, Henghua, Shanghainese, and Hockchia.

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, as most Singapore Chinese who claim the ability to speak a dialect would also have some competence in more than one dialect or another (Newman 1988). Platt (1980) studied the verbal repertoire of Chinese Singaporeans and discovered that an individual Chinese can speak his/her own native Chinese dialect, the dominant Chinese dialect (Hokkien), and one or more additional Chinese dialects. In addition, besides Chinese dialects, some individual Chinese may be relatively fluent in English and Malay. On the other hand, it was felt that the promotion of Mandarin has marginalized the elderly Chinese speakers who could only converse in their Chinese dialects.

The cultural argument was also proposed as a further rationale of the SMC. Although political leaders believe that English is necessary for Singapore's economic survival, the spread of English in the local linguistic landscape has also opened the country to liberal democratic values. Government leaders in Singapore believed that the promotion of the SMC would help to reinforce traditional Asian values and thus counterbalance the 'negative' effects of Westernization. However, Ho and Alsagoff (1998) argued that although English is not a native language of Singaporeans, dismissing it as superficial, decadent, or imperialistic would amount to sheer ethnocentrism and chauvinism. Some scholars suggest that the neat compartmentalization of the Western versus Eastern values is simplistic as cultural identification and practice are much more complex (Gopinathan 1979). 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. Chiew (1980) observes that cultural change in Singapore takes place mainly at the institutional level and believes that the individual Chinese acquires Chinese values and norms more from the school, the family, and the community. Thus both Newman and Chiew question whether the Chinese community in Singapore needs Mandarin in order to acquire Chinese values. Kuo (1985) observes that the traditional values of Chinese Singaporeans are still very much rooted in Chinese dialects. He suggests that a weakening of dialects may in fact mean the weakening of the local Chinese cultural base.

4.4   Conclusion: Impact of the SMC

The promotion of the SMC has been rather forceful in the past decades and its success is felt within the Chinese community. Gupta (1994) observed that Mandarin is heard from the Chinese in Singapore in volumes unimaginable in the 1970s. However, with the successful unfolding of the SMC, a majority of young Chinese are unable to converse in dialects with the elderly (Gupta and Siew 1995). To discourage the use of dialects within the Chinese community, the government has described dialects as vulgar, divisive, and having no value either culturally or economically. However, some dialect speakers feel that dialects can establish a sense of intimacy, and promote family, and clan identity amongst dialect speakers (Bokhorst-Heng 1999). Shepherd (2003) reported that there was resistance by some local Chinese to the strategies adopted by the government to eliminate Chinese dialects. In addition, some dialect speakers were unhappy with the banning of television programs featuring Chinese dialects from Hongkong and Taiwan, and the dubbing of these programs into Mandarin. There was also resentment of the requirement that children starting school should be registered under the Hanyu Pinyin version of the names. As a result of the resistance by parents, this requirement was eventually rescinded in 1991.

References

Ang, B. C. (1998). The teaching of the Chinese language in Singapore. In W. K. Ho, S. Gopinathan, A. Pakir, H. W. Kam, & V. Saravanan (Eds.), *Language, society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends* (pp. 335–352). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Bokhorst-Heng, W. (1998). Language planning and management. In J. A. Foley (Ed.), *English in new cultural contexts* (pp. 287–309). Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Bokhorst-Heng, W. (1999). Singapore's Speak Mandarin Campaign: Language ideological debates in the imagining of the nation. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 235–266). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chiew, S. K. (1980). Bilingualism and national identity: A Singapore case study. In A. Afendras & E. Kuo (Eds.), *Language and society in Singapore* (pp. 233–253). Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Gopinathan, S. (1979). *Singapore language policies: Strategies for a plural society. Southeast Asian affairs* (pp. 280–295). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Gupta, A. (1994). A framework for the analysis of Singapore English. In S. Gopinathan et al. (Eds.), *Language, society and education in Singapore* (pp. 119–132). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Gupta, A. (1998). A standard for written Singapore English? In J. Foley (Ed.), *English in new cultural contexts* (pp. 75–99). Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Gupta, A. F., & Siew, P. K. (1995). Language shift in a Singapore family. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 4*(16), 301–313.

Ho, C. L., & Alsagoff, L. (1998). English as the common language in multicultural Singapore. In J. Foley (Ed.), *English in new cultural contexts* (pp. 201–217). Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Kuo, C. Y. E. (1985). *A quantity approach to the study of sociolinguistic situation in multi-linguistic society.* Singapore: Regional English Language Centre.

Kuo, E. C., & Jernudd, B. H. (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.

Lee, K. Y. (2011). *My lifelong challenge: Singapore's bilingual journey*. Singapore: Straits Times Press.

Newman, J. (1988). Singapore's speak Mandarin campaign. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 9*(5), 437–448.

Platt, J. (1980). Multilingualism, polyglossia, and code selection in Singapore. In E. A. Afendras & E. C. Y. Kuo (Eds.), *Language and society in Singapore* (pp. 201–217). Singapore: Singapore University Press.

PuruShotam, N. C. (1998). *Negotiating language, constructing race*. New York: Mouton de Gruyere.

Shepherd, J. (2003). *Striking a balance: The management of language in Singapore*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Wong, W. K. (2011). *Census of population 2010*. Singapore: Department of Statistics.

Chapter 5
Quantitative Analysis: Reported Language Use and Attitudes

Abstract The self-administered survey (henceforth SAS) is the main instrument used to examine the current attitudes of dialect-speakers towards the SMC. In this study, the SAS is used to report the 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 of the SMC as a planned language effort. The results of the study showed that the SMC has made an impact on the linguistic repertoire of dialect speakers. Except for the home domain, a number of dialect speakers reported that they use dialects less in public places such as the hawker centres and shopping centres. In addition, a majority of them believe that Mandarin is an economically viable language for business dealings with China. However, although dialect speakers regard Chinese dialects as having low instrumental values compared to Mandarin, amongst the elderly dialect speakers, the affective values of Chinese dialects remain strong. This chapter discusses the results of the self-administered survey questionnaire (SAS).

Keywords Language use · Domains · Mandarin · Attitude · Status · Function · Dialects

5.1 Demographic Distribution of Sample

A mentioned in Chapter one the SAS was distributed to 150 dialect speakers. The final sample of the SAS is 126. The demographic distribution and the language background of the sample for the SAS are shown in Tables 5.1 and 5.2.

As the SMC has been in operation for more than three 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

---

Table 5.1 Demographic distribution of sample

	Percentage (100%)
Sex	
Male	65
Female	35
Age	
12–20	18.9
21–30	6.3
31–60	51.2
61 and above	23.6
Occupation	
Student	22.0
Professional and managerial	18.9
Administrative and technical	9.4
Clerical	3.1
Sales and services	11.0
Housewife	11.8
Production and related workers	3.9
Others	19.9
Language medium of education	
English	47
Chinese	53
Residence type	
HDB	71.2
Condominium	19.6
Terrace	5.5
Semi-Detached	1.5
Bungalow	1.5
Others	0.7

Table 5.2 Language spoken by survey respondents

Language	Percentage
English	4.8
Mandarin	21.4
Hokkien	4.8
Teochew	19.0
Cantonese	1.6
Hainanese	22.2
Others	26.2

in various domains of language use: close friends, colleagues/classmates, parents, hawker centres and shopping centres. The domains of language use and hawker and shopping centres were considered as the 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 considered as the private

Table 5.3 Reported language use in different domains

Question: What language do you frequently use when communicating with your parents, close friends, colleagues/classmates, at hawker centres and shopping centres?

	Mandarin (%)	Chinese dialects (%)	Others (English, Malay etc.) [%]
Parents	29	58	13
Close friends	62	3	35
Colleagues/classmates	40	3	57
At hawker centres	75	11	14
At shopping centres	34	5	61

domains of language use. In order to examine whether Mandarin has replaced Chinese dialects, this section will compare the linguistic preference of respondents' in the various domains of language use. Q1–Q5 of the SAS was 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 5.3 summarises the language use of respondents in the five domains. The figures (in percentage) show the proportion of respondents using Mandarin and Chinese dialects when speaking to different interlocutors in different domains.

   Table 5.3 shows that Mandarin is used in all domains. 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 (Gopinathan 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 show that 11% of dialect-speakers within the sample community continue to speak dialects at hawker centres while 58% of dialect-speakers continue to communicate in dialects with parents. However, it is interesting to note that only a small percentage of dialect speakers use dialects in other domains: Close friends (3%), Colleagues/classmates (3%) and Shopping centres (5%).

5.2   Attitude of Respondents 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 impact of the SMC within the

Table 5.4 Attitudes of respondents toward Mandarin

	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)
Q12. I like speaking Mandarin	31	51.6	13.4	2.4	1.6
Q14. I think Mandarin is easy to learn	11.1	44.4	22.2	15.9	6.4
Q18. I want my children Mandarin	28.6	52.4	14.3	3.2	1.5
Q28. I think learning Mandarin is useful	24.9	59.5	14	1.6	0

researched community, 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 results for Question 12, 14, 18, and 28 are shown in Table 5.4.

It is clear from Table 5.4 that more than half of the respondents (55.5%) think that Mandarin is easy to learn (Q14) while 15.9% of respondents disagree and 6.4% of respondents strongly disagree with the statement. The findings from the SAS also indicate a positive attitude towards speaking Mandarin. About 82.6% of respondents state they like speaking Mandarin (Q12) and 81% want their children to speak Mandarin (Q18). About 84.4% of respondents also agree that it is useful for them to learn Mandarin (Q28). 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 a majority of dialect speakers have accepted Mandarin into their linguistic repertoires. There are also differences in response between the different age groups for Q14. Table 5.5 shows the breakdown in age for those who responded to the statement that "Mandarin is easy to learn" (Question 14).

From Table 5.5, 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 (32.2%). 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. As English is the defacto working language in Singapore, it is not

Table 5.5   Age group of respondents for Q14 (Mandarin is easy to learn)

	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)
12–20	21.4	46.4	32.2
21–30	25	25	50
31–60	69.6	13.9	16.5
61 and above	55.6	22.2	22.2

surprising that the 21–30 age group-mainly young working adults think it difficult to learn Mandarin due to their limited exposure to Mandarin in the working world. On the other hand, those who agree that Mandarin is easy to learn are from those aged 31 and above. This is because in the past, a majority of the elderly members were educated in Chinese and thus would have greater exposure to Mandarin.

5.3   Attitudes of Respondents Toward the Status and Functions of Mandarin

As mentioned in Chap. 4, the SMC is a deliberate language planning policy aimed at raising the status and functions of Mandarin within the Chinese community. Thus, it is important to investigate respondents' perceptions of the status and functions of Mandarin. Their perceptions of the status and functions of Mandarin will have a bearing on the effectiveness of the SMC. Q7–10 was designed with the purpose of measuring respondents' perceptions of the status and functions of Mandarin. The results for Q7, 8, 9, and 10 are shown in Table 5.6.

From the table above, it is evident that about 46.6% of respondents indicate that Mandarin will have a superior status in Singapore in the future (Q7). As observed by Ho and Alsagoff (1998), Singaporeans being pragmatic people will embrace a

Table 5.6   Attitudes of respondents toward the status and functions of Mandarin

	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)
Q7. Mandarin will have a superior status in Singapore in the future	7.9	39.7	26.2	24.6	1.6
Q8. Mandarin will be an important international language in the 21st century	15.1	61.1	15.1	7.9	0.8
Q9. Mandarin will be useful for my future job opportunity	14.3	53.2	21.4	11.1	0
Q10. Mandarin will benefit Singaporeans' business dealings with China	61.1	34.9	3.2	0.8	0

Table 5.7 Age group of respondents for Q7 (Mandarin will have a superior status in Singapore in the future)

Age group	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)
12–20	28.5	35.7	35.8
21–30	16.7	75	8.3
31–60	59.4	13.9	26.7
61 and above	42.8	42.8	14.4

language that accords them greater economic opportunity and career advancement. Despite official rhetoric that Mandarin is important for business dealings with China, a majority of dialect speakers still consider English as having a higher status than Mandarin. However, although Mandarin is perceived as having lower status than English in the Singapore linguistic landscape, most respondents have favorable attitudes towards its functions. From Table 5.6, it can be observed that about 76.2% feel that Mandarin will be an important international language in the twenty-first century (Q8). 67.5% 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. There are also differences in response between the different age groups for Q7, as reflected in Table 5.7.

From Table 5.7, 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 (59.4%) and those aged 61 and above (42.8%). This could be due to their past affiliations with Mandarin as a majority of elderly dialect speakers were educated in Chinese. Only about 16.7% 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%) of respondents between the age of 21–30 neither agree nor disagree that Mandarin will have a superior status in future. Moreover, only 28.5% 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.

5.4   Comparison of Attitudes Toward English and Mandarin

As mentioned in Chapter Two, both English and Mandarin are the two official languages in Singapore. Q21 in the SAS seeks to compare respondents' attitudes towards English and Mandarin. The responses for Q21 are shown in Table 5.8.

Table 5.8 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	68.3	8.7	23

From Table 5.8, it is evident that a majority of respondents (68.3%) 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. It will be true to say that the current school policy attaches more importance to the learning of English than the mother tongue subject. To gain admission to local universities such as the National University of Singapore and Nanyang Technological University, students must attain a good pass in General Paper (English Language), failing which they must sit for an English Proficiency exam. In addition, with English gaining more prestige in recent years, an increasing number of Singaporeans would naturally align themselves with the language. In addition, parents, who are the agents for transmission of languages, will prefer their children to speak more English than Mandarin believing that a good command on English will open doors to higher education and employment.

5.5 Attitudes of Respondents Toward the Transmission of Chinese Dialects

Another aim of the SAS is to investigate whether respondents in the researched community agree with the campaign's objective to eradicate Chinese dialects within the Chinese community. Questions 30, 31 and 33 were designed to examine respondents' attitudes toward the transmission of Chinese dialects. The results for Questions 30, 31, and 33 are shown in Table 5.9.

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

Table 5.9 Attitudes of respondents towards Chinese dialects

	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)
Q30. Do you agree that dialect is your mother tongue?	4	27	26.2	36.5	6.3
Q31. If I have children, I want them to learn dialect	19	35.7	29.4	11.1	4.8
Q33. Chinese Singaporeans need to speak dialects to preserve Chinese culture	19	40.5	22.2	14.3	4

dialects as their ancestral language. A possible reason for this may be the fact that dialects are seen as pragmatically useless and having a low prestige (Gupta and Siew 1995). Parents in Singapore are pragmatic and instead of the Chinese dialects, they prefer their children to be proficient in English or Mandarin.

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 (54.7%) of the respondents have a desire for 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. Thus, the affective values of dialects are still strong within the sample community. In addition, about 59.5% of respondents agree that Chinese Singaporeans need Chinese dialects to preserve Chinese culture (Q33). Although dialects have low instrumental functions, there are still a fairly large number of elderly dialect speakers who regard dialects as an important agent for cultural transmission. 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 and believed that their dialects are the core markers of their Chinese identity. The use of Chinese dialects on certain social occasions such as during Chinese New Year, Chinese weddings and Chinese funeral services, can evoke greater immediacy and emotive power amongst elderly dialect speakers. On the other hand, for many elderly dialect speakers, Mandarin is considered as an imported Chinese language variety with little or no associations with their past linguistic habits. However, although some elderly dialect-speakers still have strong emotional attachment to their dialects, a majority of them support the SMC's objective to embrace Mandarin as a language of use. Thus as Xu et al. (1998) suggest, the attitudes of elderly dialect speakers towards Chinese dialects may be regarded more of a sentiment rather than a determinant for action.

5.6   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 individual dialect-speakers agree to the educational, communicative, and cultural argument for the implementation of the SMC. In the educational argument proposed for initiating the SMC, Mandarin was promoted as a mother tongue for all Chinese students in schools as it was

Table 5.10 Views of respondents on the educational argument for Mandarin

	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly aisagree (%)
Q19. Mandarin is the mother tongue of the Chinese Singaporean	27.8	58.7	4	7.1	2.4
Q32. Dialect will hinder the learning of Mandarin or English among school children in Singapore	3.2	15.1	26.2	32.5	23

perceived that the speaking of dialects would hinder the learning of Mandarin. Q19 and Q32 in the SAS examine whether respondents agree with the educational argument for the SMC. The results for Q19 and Q32 are shown in Table 5.10.

From the Table 5.10, it appears that a majority of the respondents consider Mandarin as their mother tongue (about 86.5%) and only less than 10% disagree with the statement. In addition, only a small percentage (4%) was uncertain about the adoption of Mandarin as their mother tongue. It is interesting to note that more than half (55.5%) of the respondents disagree with the educational argument that dialects hinder the learning of Mandarin or English among school children in Singapore.

The survey also examines respondents' attitudes toward the communicative argument of the SMC. At the early stage of the SMC, it was felt that a common language was needed to facilitate communication among the various dialect groups within the Chinese community. Thus, one of the explicitly stated goals of the SMC was to promote Mandarin as a common language among dialect-speakers. Q38 investigates whether respondents agree that Mandarin should be spoken as the common language among the various dialect groups in Singapore. The findings for Q38 are shown in Table 5.11.

The results show that a majority of respondents (77%) agree with the official argument that Mandarin should be used for unifying the various dialect groups in Singapore. Only a small percentage of respondents (about 9.5%) disagree with the statement. A possible reason why a majority of respondents agree to the communicative argument for Mandarin may be because with the decline of dialect usage,

Table 5.11 Respondents' views on the communicative argument for the Speak Mandarin Campaign

	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)
Q38. Mandarin should be spoken as a common language among the various dialect groups in Singapore	25.4	51.6	13.5	8.7	0.8

Table 5.12 Views of respondents on whether Chinese Singaporeans should speak Mandarin to preserve Chinese cultures and traditions

	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)
Q43. Chinese Singaporeans should speak Mandarin to preserve Chinese cultures and traditions	34.9	51.6	10.3	1.6	1.6

English has become the lingua franca within the Chinese community. Respondents in the researched community may want to avoid a situation where they have to use only English among themselves. The attitude of respondents towards the communicative argument shows that Mandarin has been accepted as a language of solidarity within the sample community. This is certainly a desired outcome of the language planning effort by the Singapore government.

The SAS also investigates respondents' attitudes towards the cultural argument for Mandarin. In the cultural argument for the promotion of the SMC, Mandarin is needed to counterbalance the negative effects of Westernization and the dominance of English. The government perceived that Chinese Singaporeans were losing their Chinese identity as a result of increased exposure to English (Chua 1995). Thus they needed a cultural ballast to protect their Chinese identity; Mandarin was seen to be the key to that identity. Q43 investigates whether respondents agree that Chinese Singaporeans should speak Mandarin to preserve Chinese cultures (see Table 5.13).

From Table 5.12, it is obvious that a large majority of respondents (86.5%) 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 Mandarin as a language for cultural transmission.

5.7   Attitudes Toward the Planned Language Efforts

One of the aims of the SAS is to investigate the views of respondents towards the SMC as a planned language effort. Thus it is necessary to 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 toward the SMC as a planned language effort are shown in Table 5.13.

The results showed that about 84.1% of respondents agreed that Mandarin is of great use in their daily lives (Q37) and 73% agreed that Mandarin has become more commonly used among Chinese in the past two years as a result of the campaign (Q39). About 59.6% of the respondents feel that the SMC has succeeded in persuading more Chinese Singaporeans to speak Mandarin (Q40). In addition, about

Table 5.13   Views of respondents on the outcome and strategy of the Speak Mandarin Campaign

	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)
Q37. Mandarin is of great use in my daily life	84.1	11.1	4.8
Q39. Mandarin has become more commonly used among Chinese in the past two years	73	17.5	9.5
Q40. The Speak Mandarin Campaign has succeeded in persuading more Chinese Singaporeans to speak Mandarin	59.6	23.3	16.6
Q41. The Speak Mandarin Campaign should be continued	86.5	11.9	1.6

86.5% agree that the campaign should be continued (Q41). Thus, on the whole, most respondents have positive orientations toward the SMC as a planned language effort.

5.8   Discussion of the Results of the SAS

The results of the SAS showed that respondents have positive attitudes towards Mandarin. A majority of respondents like speaking Mandarin and would like their children to learn Mandarin. A majority of respondents also believed that Mandarin will gain status as an international language in future. In addition, almost all respondents believed that Mandarin is important as a 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. As reported by Leong (2002), the instrumental value of Mandarin is emphasized through the campaign's message-Mandarin is not merely a gateway to understanding Chinese culture, it is also an important language that will help Singaporeans 'plug into' the China business connection. However, although the emphasis on the economic value of Mandarin is an appeal to linguistic instrumentalism (Wee 2008), official language planners have recognized that the ability to speak Mandarin could only allow Singaporeans to communicate with China at a superficial level.

Since 2004, official language planners have realized that it is important to nurture a cultural elite steeped in understanding Chinese culture that would enable Chinese Singaporeans to reach 'deep' inside China (Lee 2011). However, an overt emphasis on the instrumental value of Mandarin may undermine the complementary role of English and Mandarin and threaten the relationship of equivalence amongst the other mother tongues (Wee 2008). There has also been evidence that an increasing number of Chinese parents hold an unambiguous belief in the benefits

of developing the English language in terms of providing overt socioeconomic opportunities for their children (Curdt-Christiansen 2014). Influenced by Singapore's pro-English educational policy, some dialect speaking parents felt inclined to place a strong instrumental value on English and expect their children to "make way" for English. In the process, Mandarin becomes stigmatized as a hurdle for developing English proficiency.

The results of the SAS also indicated that the use of dialects have declined in the researched community except in the family domain where some dialects are still used to communicate with dialect speaking parents. 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 led to a common perception amongst young dialect speakers that dialects are viewed as pragmatically useless and having low prestige. Currently, young Chinese Singaporeans tend to identify themselves as Chinese Singaporeans rather than acknowledge themselves as Hokkien, Teochew, Hainanese, or Cantonese Singaporeans. In this regard, the importance of Chinese dialects for maintenance of cultural identity has limited viability for a majority of young Chinese Singaporeans.

In addition, the success of the SMC in its earlier years has exacerbated a divisive role played by Mandarin and the Chinese dialects. Older Chinese especially those above 55 years old tend to speak only dialects and lack competence in Mandarin, while those in the 20–24 age band tend to speak Mandarin or English (Department of Statistics 2006). It will be true to say that over the years, Chinese dialects have 'lost out' to the two major languages in Singapore-English and Mandarin. However, there are still a number of Chinese Singaporeans who continue to embrace Chinese dialects as a language of use. A majority of elderly Chinese dialect-speakers could identify with dialects in their socialization experiences as they grew up speaking dialects.

Even today, dialects are still used by a majority of Chinese Singaporeans especially in the home domains. For some local Chinese, the function of dialect does not merely lie in speaking it at home. Chinese dialects are still currently spoken amongst elderly dialect speakers during festive occasions such as Chinese New Year and Chinese funeral wakes to evoke a sense of intimacy (Ng 2014). From the perspective of dialect speakers, their language identities are characteristics that they gain through birth, and which remain stable and consistent throughout their lives. Thus, there is an inclination for most elderly dialect speakers to regard the Chinese dialects as their mother tongues since dialects are frequently spoken in their socialization experiences. Their emotional attachment with Chinese dialects remains strong despite the Government's ascription of Mandarin as the official mother tongue of the Chinese in Singapore. However, Singapore's language planning policy tends to ignore an individual's linguistic experience on the premise that linguistic ownership is basically a public concern that justifies intervention on the part of the government (Wee 2002). This has resulted in a somewhat anomalous situation where some dialect speakers may be willing to treat Mandarin as their mother tongue, but may be unwilling to consider themselves as native speakers of Mandarin.

References

Chua, B.-H. (1995). *Communitarian ideology and democracy in Singapore*. London: Routledge.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2014). Family language policy: Is learning Chinese at odds with learning english in Singapore. In X. L. Curdt-Christiansen & A. Hancock (Eds.), *Learning Chinese in Diasporic communities: Many pathways to being Chinese* (pp. 35–58). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Department of Statistics. (2006). Singapore: Ministry of Trade and Industry. http://www.singstat.gov.sg. Accessed 2012.

Gopinathan, S. (1998). Language policy changes 1979-1997: Politics and pedagogy. In S. Gopinathan, A. Pakir, W. K. Ho, & V. Saravanan (Eds.), *Language, society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends* (pp. 35–58). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Gupta, A. (1994). A framework for the analysis of Singapore English. In Gopinathan et al. (Ed.), *Language, society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends* (pp. 119–132). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Gupta, A. F., & Siew, P. Y. (1995). Language shift in a Singapore family. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 16*(4), 301–313.

Ho, C. L., & Alsagoff, L. (1998). English as the common language in multicultural Singapore. In J. Foley (Ed.), *English in new cultural contexts* (pp. 201–217). Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, Jr, R. B. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Lee, K. Y. (2011). *My lifelong challenge: Singapore's bilingual journey*. Singapore: Straits Times Press.

Leong, L. (2002). Who says what to whom: Language and society in Singapore. In C. K. Tong and K. F. Lian (Eds.), *The making of Singapore sociology: Society and state* (pp. 351–370). Singapore: Times media Pte. Ltd.

Newman, J. (1988). Singapore's speak Mandarin campaign. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *9*(5), 437–448.

Ng, P. (2014). Mother tongue education in Singapore: Concerns, issues and controversies. *Journal of Current Issues in Language Planning, 15*(4), 1–15.

Rubin, J., & Jernudd, B. (1971). *Can Language be planned?*. Honolulu: East West Centre Press.

Wee, L. (2002). When English is not a mother tongue: Linguistic ownership and the Eurasian community in Singapore. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 23*(4), 282–295.

Wee, L. (2008). Linguistic instrumentalism in Singapore. In P. K. W. Tan & R. Rubdy (Eds.), *Language as commodity: global Structures, local marketplaces* (pp. 31–43). London: Continuum Publishing.

Xu, D., Chew, C. H., & Chen, S. (1998). Language use and language attitudes in the Singapore community. In Gopinathan et al. (Ed.), *Language, society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends* (pp. 133–155). Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Chapter 6
Qualitative Analysis: Views Towards the Speak Mandarin Campaign

Abstract The semi-structured interview (henceforth SSI) is the main source of qualitative data collection. Its purpose is to investigate the attitudes of individual dialect speakers toward the campaign goals, the continuation of the SMC and their perceptions towards the elimination of Chinese dialects. The SSI was conducted among 19 dialect speakers from different age groups and socioeconomic backgrounds. The results of the SSI also showed that a majority of informants supported the official arguments for the implementation of the SMC. A majority of dialect speakers agree that Mandarin is necessary to help Chinese Singaporeans preserve their Chinese culture and identity (the cultural argument). Most dialect speakers also accept the government's ascription of Mandarin as the official tongue mother tongue of all Chinese in Singapore. More than half of dialect speakers believe that the impact of the campaign has been positive as they observe that more Chinese are speaking Mandarin instead of Chinese dialects in public places such as the hawker centers. This chapter also discusses the restoration of Chinese dialects by young dialect speakers in Singapore.

Keywords Views · Dialect speakers · Campaign goals · Outcomes · Continuation · Restoration · Chinese dialects

6.1 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 informants is shown in Table 6.1.

As mentioned in Chap. 3, 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 favor 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. The

Table 6.1 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	Postgraduate	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	Postgraduate	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

analysis of 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 perceive that the Chinese in Singapore, especially the English-educated Chinese, are in danger of losing their Chinese roots. Thus they believe that the campaign is necessary to remind the English-educated Chinese of their Chinese roots and identity. Other informants believe that the promotion of Mandarin will serve to deepen Singapore's economic ties 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 in Singapore as a result of the overwhelming dominance of English in present day Singaporean society.

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

> 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 people will know that Mandarin is important to us and they will speak the language (Extract 1 IM4).

Another informant mentions that she has seen some SMC TV advertisement in the mass media and 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 Mandarin. Although she thinks that the campaign is necessary, she feels strongly that the SMC should target at the English-speaking and dialect-speaking Chinese. She observes that the younger Chinese generation is speaking too much English and believes that the SMC will encourage them to speak Mandarin instead:

> 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 communicate through Mandarin. As for the young people, a lot of them now speak English and even despise Mandarin. I believe this is the main reason why the government decided to promote the SMC. 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 (Extract 2 IM10).

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

Some informants also agree that the government should promote Mandarin as a language for economic survival. They believe that Singaporeans will benefit from the growth of China's economy if they can speak Mandarin.

One male informant believes that the campaign's message is to encourage people to speak Mandarin as Mandarin will be an important language in the future. However, 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 enabling

Chinese Singaporeans to communicate with Chinese nationals when doing business in China. When asked about his views regarding the SMC, his reply was:

> 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 (Extract 3 IM17).

Another informant agrees with the implementation of the SMC. He thinks that the campaign is actually an embarrassment for Chinese Singaporeans as they should 'naturally' be able to speak Mandarin. He feels that there has been a wrong perception amongst the local Chinese that English is more important than Mandarin. He also states that the current educational policy in Singapore places too much emphasis on the learning of English in schools. He also observes that parents often encourage their children to speak English rather than Mandarin at home. As a result, the use of Mandarin has declined in Singapore's linguistic landscape. 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:

> 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 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 (Extract 4 IM15).

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

Several informants also agree that the campaign is necessary as they observe that more and more Chinese Singaporeans are speaking English instead of Mandarin. They are worried that the local Chinese will lose their Chinese cultural heritage if the government does not promote the SMC. One informant states that he supports the campaign as he observes that Mandarin is currently not widely spoken by most Chinese. He feels that the campaign is one of the ways to create an awareness of the importance of Mandarin within the local Chinese community. He also thinks the campaign will serve to remind Chinese Singaporeans of their Chinese roots and traditions. When asked whether the campaign serves a useful purpose, his response was:

> 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-like the learning of English at the moment. It is easier to learn English if the language is spoken at home (Extract 5 IM8).

Another informant believes that the campaign is necessary as it will encourage the Chinese to speak Mandarin and motivate them to read materials in Mandarin. He observes that most people now speak Mandarin in the workplace, and states that the campaign serves to enforce the cultural roots and identity of the Chinese:

> Being a Chinese, we should be able to speak Mandarin or listen to Mandarin. It's good to hold on to our Chinese roots; it helps to reminds us of our Chinese identity (Extract 6 IM6).

Another informant feels that the Chinese language is fast disappearing in Singapore and believes that that the government should promote 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:

> The campaign should target specifically at the English-educated Chinese. It is necessary for the campaign to target 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 (Extract 7 IM13).

The campaign aims to preserve the Chinese language in Singapore

Several informants also believe that the campaign is necessary to help Chinese Singaporeans maintain the use of Mandarin. 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 declined and hence there is a need for the government to improve the quality of spoken Mandarin through the SMC.

An informant believes that the objective of the campaign should focus on encouraging more Chinese Singaporeans to use Mandarin as a language of habitual use. He also thinks the campaign should aim to increase the public perception of the usefulness of speaking Mandarin. He believes that the campaign will reinforce the importance of Mandarin in society as well as emphasize the importance of speaking standard Mandarin:

> 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 (Extract 8 IM9).

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 to ensure greater unity within the Chinese community.

One female informant believes that Mandarin is the mother tongue of all ethnic Chinese not only in Singapore but also throughout the world. She feels that the campaign will encourage local Chinese to speak Mandarin, and thus they will develop a close sense of bonding and unity. Her views on the SMC are:

> I suppose we Chinese should speak to each other in our mother tongue so that we have the same ethnic feeling. We Chinese can establish a deeper 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 (Extract 9 IM2).

Another informant believes that most dialect speakers in the community will support the SMC. He also agrees with the elimination of Chinese dialects for the purpose of unifying the Chinese community:

> 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 (Extract 10 IM13).

Summary of findings for 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 the campaign is important to establish Mandarin as a language of use in the public places. In addition, some informants also feel that the target of the campaign should 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 the increased Westernization 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.

The results of the SSI also showed that 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 in persuading informants to support the SMC. The results from the SSI 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, trade, industry, and technology. It will be true to say that a majority of informants recognize Mandarin as an economically viable language, although English is still the de facto working language in Singapore. This reflects the success of the campaign in promoting Mandarin as a viable economic language within the researched community.

Several informants also agree with the communicative argument for the SMC. As mentioned in Chap. 4, one of the goals of the SMC is to promote Mandarin as an in-group communication for all dialect speakers. A major critique of the communicative argument is the assumption that linguistic diversity hinders communication and that most dialect-speaking Chinese speak and can 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 Chap. 4, when the SMC was first initiated in 1979, about 86% of the Chinese communicated with each other through various dialects. Although dialects are currently spoken among the older generations of Chinese Singaporeans, the results from the SSI reveal that most dialect speakers prefer to regard Mandarin as an interdialect language. 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 Chap. 4, Mandarin was ascribed the official mother tongue of all the Chinese in Singapore. 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 —a powerful indication that informants agree with the educational argument for Mandarin.

6.2 Informants' Views on the Continuation of the SMC

Another purpose of the SSI is to examine informants' views on the continuation of the SMC. Their agreement with the continuation of the campaign will indicate their support for the SMC. Informants were asked the following question:

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

The following section reports the views of informants.

The SMC should be continued

All except two informants agreed with the continuation of the SMC. Some informants feel that although there are more dialect speakers speaking Mandarin, the English-educated Chinese are still indifferent to the campaign. Several informants feel that Mandarin has some relevance in their daily lives. They also believe the campaign is necessary to remind the Chinese of the value of speaking Mandarin. Some informants think that the campaign is necessary to remind local Chinese of their cultural heritage and identity.

One informant 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 has started to use Mandarin to converse with his parents at home. He feels that the campaign should be continued as he observes that 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:

> 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 (Extract 10 IM1).

One female informant agrees that the campaign should continue as she perceives that Singapore is fast becoming an English-speaking country with many people speaking English in their daily lives. She feels that the campaign serves as a reminder to Chinese Singaporeans to speak Mandarin:

> 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 (Extract 11 IM3).

Another informant agrees that the SMC should be continued so that the Chinese in Singapore will be motivated to speak Mandarin. He feels that Chinese Singaporeans will appreciate the Chinese language if they speak Mandarin. He also believes that Chinese Singaporeans will not be motivated to switch to speaking Mandarin if the campaign is not launched:

> 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 (Extract 12 IM19).

Another informant also agrees that the government should continue the campaign to remind Chinese Singaporeans that Mandarin is still important in Singapore society:

> 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 (Extract 13 IM10).

Another informant feels that the campaign should continue as it will spread the importance and usefulness of speaking Mandarin:

> 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 (Extract 14 IM9).

There are others who feel that the campaign will serve as a good reminder that Mandarin is important to the Chinese. One female informant supports the SMC wholeheartedly as she believes the campaign will enable young Chinese Singaporeans to appreciate their Chinese roots. She also expresses a concern that with English being extensively spoken by the younger generation, Mandarin will be gradually phased out in Singapore.

> I think we should continue it every year. Chinese should speak Mandarin. If the government emphasizes only English and neglects Mandarin, most people will speak only English. We should learn Mandarin, especially the young generation of Chinese should learn it to know their Chinese roots (Extract 15 IM5).

One male informant 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 stop people from speaking English because if the Chinese in Singapore speak only Mandarin among themselves, other racial groups may feel threatened:

> 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 (Extract 16 IM15).

There are also informants who feel that the campaign should continue as Mandarin is increasingly becoming an important economic tool, especially in the conduct of business dealings with China. A particular informant states that as Singapore embraces globalization, the campaign will help people internalize the value of Mandarin as an important language for business dealings with China. He feels that people must see the real purpose of the campaign to be effective:

> 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 (Extract 17 IM7).

Continue the campaign but not throughout the year

Some informants agreed that the campaign should continue but it should not be implemented throughout the year as the campaign has achieved its goal in persuading a majority of Chinese Singaporeans to speak Mandarin.

One male informant states that the campaign message will have been drummed in by now, and hence he thinks it is not necessary to launch the campaign 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:

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 (Extract 18 IM6).

The campaign should be discontinued

Two informants feel that the campaign should be discontinued as it 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 suggests that the government should cease the campaign 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:

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's economy is growing, 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, more and more people are speaking Mandarin; even the auntie (a colloquial term for elderly housewife in Singapore) speaks Mandarin now (Extract 19 IM12).

Another female informant also thinks that the government should discontinue the campaign. She agrees that Mandarin has helped her develop a closer bond with her Chinese friends from China and other parts of the world. However, she feels it is not necessary to continue the campaign every year as the importance of speaking Mandarin would have already been drummed into the people:

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 (Extract 20 IM2).

In general, the findings of the SSI indicate that almost all informants support the campaign and would like the government to continue the campaign. Although the campaign was launched for more than two decades, 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 due to the dominance of English in Singapore. In addition, several informants feel that the English-educated Chinese are rather indifferent to the campaign. They think that the campaign should continue as they believe that it will serve to remind English-educated Chinese Singaporeans of the importance of Mandarin as a core marker of their Chinese cultural identity. 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. The following section discusses informants' views on whether they agree with the campaign's objective of eliminating Chinese dialects within the Chinese community.

6.3   Informants' Views on the Campaign's Objective of Eliminating Chinese Dialects

Before the launch of the SMC by the government, most Chinese Singaporeans spoke various dialects such as Hokkien, Teochew, Hainanese, Hakka, Cantonese and Foochow mainly at homes, hawker centers and the wet markets (Gopinathan 1998). A main objective of the study is to investigate the reactions of dialect-speaking Chinese towards the campaign's objective of eliminating dialects. Question 2b of the semi-structured interview 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 against the elimination of 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 are against the objective of eliminating dialects:

Chinese dialects are important for communicating with the older generation

A male informant 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, he is against the idea of eliminating dialects. He feels that dialects are still important in Singapore as they allow the old and young generations to communicate through a common language:

> 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 (Extract 21 IM16).

Another male informant also disagrees with the campaign's objective to eliminate Chinese dialects. He states that the use of Chinese dialects in Singapore has decreased over the years due to the SMC. However, he argues that dialects are still relevant in the local Chinese community especially in communicating with the older generation. Thus he disagrees with the campaign slogan, "Mandarin In. Dialects Out":

> 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 (Extract 22 IM7).

Dialects are important within the grassroots organisation

Several informants feel that dialects are still relevant to Singapore especially among the grassroots organizations. One informant 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 explains how he had used Chinese

dialects to communicate with his supervisor when he was doing his final year project while studying in the polytechnic:

> We must learn both Mandarin and dialect. The older generation speaks dialects; some businesses also use dialects. When I was working on my Final Year Project, I spoke dialects with my supervisor as he is not so fluent in English; it's much easier for us to communicate using dialects (Extract 23 IM1).

A female informant also disagrees with the campaign's objective of eliminating Chinese dialects within the Chinese community. 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 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 be marginalized in society if Chinese Singaporeans speak only Mandarin.

> It is wrong as old people or the older generation can only speak dialects and not Mandarin; they will be left out of society as they cannot 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 and family bonding. Even Goh Chok Tong (former Prime Minister of Singapore) speaks dialects to identify himself with the people (Extract 24 IM2).

One informant feels that the "Mandarin in. Dialects out," is offensive. He observes that the number of people speaking Mandarin has increased and Chinese dialects are now less spoken in Singapore as compared to the past. However, he thinks that dialects are still relevant in the Chinese community:

> 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 (Extract 25 IM9).

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

One informant disagrees with the campaign's objective of eliminating dialects. He believes that it is necessary for the government to encourage the Chinese to speak Mandarin but disagrees with the campaign's strategy of eliminating Chinese dialect. He feels dialects are important for communication within the family:

> 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 (Extract 26 IM12).

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

> My personal opinion-Mandarin can enable individual Chinese to communicate with each other but there is nothing wrong with speaking dialects such as Teochew, Hokkien, and

Hainanese. Although Mandarin is the common language of the Chinese, we should not stop family members from speaking dialects with each other (Extract 27 IM15).

Dialects facilitate the learning of Mandarin

Several informants state that dialects can facilitate the learning of Mandarin, as both languages are similar to each other. A male informant feels that it is not necessary to eliminate dialects as those who speak dialects will eventually switch to speaking Mandarin:

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 (Extract 28 IM13).

A male informant states that Chinese dialects are phonetically similar to Mandarin. He believes that a Chinese who is unable to speak Mandarin will eventually be able to do so through speaking dialects:

Mandarin and dialects are related. If people use dialects, they will be able to relate with each other in Mandarin. Both Mandarin and dialects 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 (Extract 29 IM14).

Dialects help to transmit local Chinese cultural values and traditions

Several informants are against the campaign's objective of eliminating Chinese dialects as they feel that dialects are the cultural language of the Chinese in Singapore. A female informant disagrees with the campaign slogan as she feels that dialects are also important agents for cultural transmission:

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 (Extract 30 IM3).

Dialects accord the various subsections of the Chinese community their cultural identities

A male informant also disagrees with the strategy to eliminate Chinese dialects. He explains that the Chinese community in Singapore is a huge community with various Chinese dialect groups. Each dialect group has its unique culture. Through speaking different dialects, the various subgroups within the Chinese community will be able to distinguish themselves from each other:

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 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? (Extract 31 IM19).

In general, most informants are against the objective of elimination Chinese dialects within the Chinese community. Their resistance towards the elimination of Chinese dialects may be attributed to a strong belief that dialects are still relevant in Singapore society. As mentioned in Chap. 5, a majority of dialect speakers still consider dialects as a means of communication with one's parents and the elderly. As a result of the loss of dialects, there has been a loss of a means of communication with the elderly. In addition, as most local Chinese customs are conducted in Chinese dialects, dialects are considered as important agents in the cultural transmission of local Chinese customs. 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 the SMC seeks to promote is somewhat 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. Thus, some dialect speakers find the objective of eliminating Chinese dialects as offensive. The following section will discuss the perceptions of informants on the outcome of the SMC.

6.4 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:

> Yes, it has a positive effect. Now more people speak Mandarin in recent years. In recent years, because of the campaign, Chinese music industry has become very popular and also when two Chinese meet each other, they will speak Mandarin (Extract 32 IM5).

A male informant also agrees that the SMC has been effective. 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 decades ago:

> 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 would converse with each other in Mandarin. In the past, people would communicate with each other in Chinese dialects (Extract 33 IM9).

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 Chinese Singaporeans to internalize the value of knowing Mandarin:

> Yes, the message creates awareness, but for the campaign to be effective, people must see the value behind the campaign. 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 (Extract 34 IM7).

The campaign is only effective during certain times of the year

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

> 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, people will forget about speaking Mandarin. When 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 (Extract 35 IM19).

The SMC is not effective

There are also those who feel that the SMC 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 tend to consider Mandarin to be less important than English and hence remain indifferent to the campaign. A male informant feels that for the campaign to be effective, the government should set an example by using Mandarin to communicate with the public:

> 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 (Extract 36 IM13).

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

> 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 staff are usually either Malay or Indian; there are few Chinese around- usually one or two only; the Chinese staff are usually in high executive positions and are not stationed in the service counters. So naturally, people will use English to communicate with the Malay or Indian staff (Extract 37 IM1).

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.

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, Mandarin is not commonly used. Although the campaign encourages people to speak Mandarin, government leaders and politicians hardly communicate with the public in Mandarin. Government leaders should set an example by speaking Mandarin first (Extract 38 IM1).

One elderly female informant also agrees that the campaign is not effective as she observes that politicians and government leaders are not really interested in using Mandarin to communicate with the public:

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 paying lip service to the campaign. Even in elections, the politicians communicate with the voters in English (Extract 39 IM11).

Another informant feels that the campaign is not effective and as it is not implemented in schools. He feels that the SMC will be more effective if it is held in schools where there is greater emphasis in the learning of languages. The campaign will also have greater impact on students as most of them tend to speak English rather than Mandarin. He observes that Chinese students are still speaking English amongst themselves. He also believes that although parents are aware of the SMC, he is not sure whether parents from English-speaking home backgrounds recognize Mandarin as their mother tongue and encourage their children to speak Mandarin. He also feels that for the campaign to be successful, the government should persuade more English-educated parents to speak Mandarin with their children at home:

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 (Extract 40 IM8).

A female informant also thinks that the campaign is not effective at all as she feels that the campaign is not effective as people are generally indifferent to the campaign:

I don't see any visible effect. 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 impact is not very strong. Some Chinese Singaporeans think it's a burden to speak Mandarin due to their family background. For example, some English-educated Chinese feel Mandarin is not an easy language to learn. Even though the government encourages people to speak Mandarin, they will not speak the language-just like a couple in my church, the husband still refuses to utter a word of Mandarin claiming that Mandarin is difficult (Extract 41 IM10).

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, Chinese dialects will be phased out even without the campaign:

For the dialect-speakers- mainly those elderly and uneducated dialect speakers- the campaign has not much effect. Chinese dialects will naturally decrease in use in Singapore as society progresses. The SMC will not have much effect on them. The elderly and uneducated dialect speakers will not resist the campaign, as they are usually not as vocal as the English-educated (Extract 42 IM13).

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

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 bothered whether there is a SMC or not. Speaking Mandarin is not an important issue to them at all. Many of them consider English as a language that is necessary for them to 'get on' in life. English is important in all situations in Singapore (Extract 43 IM19).

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

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? English is still important for Singaporeans to advance their career (Extract 44 IM14).

It is uncertain whether the campaign is effective

A male informant states that he is unsure whether the SMC is effective in persuading more Chinese to speak Mandarin. He thinks there are other factors that cause more people to speak Mandarin:

It's difficult to tell. 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 due to the SMC or the influence of the Mandarin-speaking artists that appear on television. What they say is quite influential and thus they are able to motivate people to speak Mandarin (Extract 44 IM8).

6.5   Discussions on the Results of the SSI

The results of the SSI also showed that a majority of informants have no strong objections to the implementation of the SMC. Nearly all informants agree that Mandarin is necessary to help Chinese Singaporeans preserve their Chinese culture and identity (the cultural argument). Most informants also agree that Chinese Singaporean should consider Mandarin as their mother tongue. More than half of the informants agree that the outcome of the SMC has been positive as they observe that more Chinese are speaking Mandarin instead of Chinese dialects in public places such as the hawker centers.

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 mother tongue of Chinese Singaporeans. As Mandarin is also the official second language in schools, a majority of informants indicated that they have a desire for their children to obtain good grades in the Chinese language subject in schools. Some informants feel that the SMC is important as it serves to prevent the younger generation of Chinese from losing their Chinese roots. They are worried that younger Chinese who are educated in English will resist speaking Mandarin and may eventually lose their Chinese cultural heritage.

In addition, a majority of informants support the SMC because they perceive that Mandarin will become an economically viable language with the rise of China as an economic powerhouse. However, although most dialect speakers support the SMC, not all of them agree to the campaign's objective of eliminating Chinese dialects. Several informants felt that the objective of eliminating Chinese dialects was offensive and thus objected to it. Among those who are against the elimination of Chinese dialects are parents who want their children to continue to acquire dialects, despite efforts by the Government to ban the use of Chinese dialects in the media. Some elderly dialect-speaking Chinese also objected to the campaign objective of eliminating dialects because they still consider dialects and not Mandarin as their ancestral language.

Thus contrary to official stance that dialects are to be discarded, Chinese dialects continue to demonstrate a streak of resilience, entrenching their relevance and utility amongst some dialect speakers in Singapore (Tan 2007). Some young Chinese Singaporeans believe that dialects are still productive linguistic resources in specific situations. Stroud and Wee (2012) reported that some medical workers in the hospital continue to use Chinese dialects to reach out to elderly patients. In addition, Chinese dialects have been featured in local films and can fulfill instrumental functions in business dealings with China (Lim 2009). Chinese dialects are also being used in religious and ritual practices amongst the local Chinese (Chiang 2014). The usefulness of Chinese dialects is best appreciated during elections. In

the general election in 2015, candidates from both the PAP and opposition parties continued to 'pepper' their speeches with Chinese dialects such as Hokkien and Teochew, in a bid to reach out to elderly dialect-speaking Chinese citizens.

In recent years, the strong emotive associations with dialects have resulted in some young dialect speakers calling for the Government to acknowledge the use of Chinese dialects in the public sphere through social media such as the "Heritage Language of Singapore Facebook" website. Although there is no negative response to the use of Mandarin, there is currently an unofficial Speak Dialect movement in the social media. Some dialect speakers have attributed the decline of the various Chinese dialects to the Government's definition of Chinese-as-Mandarin in schools and society. There are other dialect speakers who lamented that the cultural loss of Chinese dialects is potentially irreversible as the opportunity for young generation of Chinese to learn and practise dialects will become extinct with the dying breed of older dialect speakers.

Despite the call to restore the use of Chinese dialects, the official stance is that dialects are "added burden" and "negative interference" to the learning and speaking of Mandarin in school. As the educational minister, Mr. Heng Swee Keat, explained: "I don't think you want a system where we get our kids to start learning in an even more complicated language environment. As it is, our language environment is already very complex" (Fang 2013). However, not all Singaporeans are convinced with the official stance that dialects will interfere with the learning of Mandarin in schools. Some Singaporeans may believe that with the elimination of Chinese dialects, Singapore school children are learning to study the Chinese language outside what was their natural cultural environment.

Over the years, the public discourse about Chinese dialects has 'leaned' more in favor of restoring Chinese dialects. There is currently a movement to urge the government to lift the ban on Chinese dialects on local radio and television programmes as evident in an online website, "Petition to Reintroduce Dialects on Local TV/Radio Programs in Singapore." Several reasons were cited for the call to lift the ban on Chinese dialects: (i) The official argument that the learning of dialects interferes with the mastery of Mandarin and English is no longer valid (ii) There is linguistic evidence to show that it is possible for young children to be multilingual (iii) Singaporean youths may lose out from the increasing global economic competition and the rise of China if they are only fluent in English and Mandarin (iv) Disallowing dialects on local radio and television programs would further marginalize the elderly from society (v) Chinese dialects play an important role in enriching Singapore's linguistic and cultural diversity (iv) Chinese dialects can also fortify the cultural knowledge of younger Singaporeans.

Young Singaporeans have been calling on the government to relook the dialect policy as they are worried that dialects might eventually die out in the Singapore's linguistic landscape. However, the Singapore Government continues to maintain its current stance to renounce the use of Chinese dialects. In the 35th Anniversary of the SMC, when asked whether it is possible to relax the use of Chinese dialects, Prime Minister Lee Hsieng Loong reiterated the official stance that it is not possible

to restore the use of Chinese dialects in society as doing so would undermine the achievement of the SMC. Although the restoration of Chinese dialects has been viewed as nostalgia for traditional ethnic culture amongst some young Singaporeans, it is unsure whether the sentimental ties with Chinese dialects will continue to grow given Singaporean's concern for access to social economic goods in the late modernity. However, the vociferous defense of Chinese dialects does raise the issue of whether Mandarin is in fact the more practical version of the Chinese language (Goh 2013).

References

Chiang, W. F. (2014). Speaking in (whose) tongue. *Pragmatics and Society, 5*(1), 22–49.

Fang, J. (2013). Dialects will burden kids more. *My Paper*. April 22, 2013.

Goh, R. B. H. (2013). Uncertain locale: The dialectics space and the cultural politics of English in Singapore. In L. Wee, R. B. H. Goh & L. Lim (Eds.), *The politics of English* (pp. 125–144). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Gopinathan, S. (1998). Language policy changes 1979–1997: Politics and pedagogy. In W. K. Ho, S. Gopinathan, A. Pakir, H. W. Kam, & V. Saravanan (Eds.), *Language, society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends* (pp. 19–44). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Gupta, A. (1998). A standard for written Singapore English? In J. Foley (Ed.), *English in new cultural contexts* (pp. 75–99). Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Kuo, E. C. Y., & Jernudd, B. H. (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* (pp. 75–99). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Lim, L. (2009). Beyond fear and loathing in SG: The real mother tongues and language policies in multilingual Singapore. In L. Lim & E. Low. (Ed.), *Multilingual, globalizing Asia. AILA review 22* (pp. 52–71). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Newman, J. (1988). Singapore's speak Mandarin campaign. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 5*(9), 437–448.

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* (pp. 75–99). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Platt, J. (1980). Multilingualism, polyglossia, and code selection in Singapore. In E. A. Afendras & E. C. Y. Kuo (Eds.), *Language and society in Singapore* (pp. 75–99). Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Stroud, C., & Wee, L. (2012). *Style. Identity and literacy*. Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Tan, K. B. (2007). The multilingual state in search of the nation: The language policy and discourse in Singapore's nation building. In H. G. Lee & S. Leo (Eds.), *Language and development in South East Asia* (pp. 75–95). Singapore: Institute of South East.

Chapter 7
Conclusion

Abstract The SMC has been in existence for more than three decades in Singapore. Various surveys conducted by the government have shown that the campaign has been successful in persuading Chinese dialect-speakers to discard the use of Chinese dialects and switch to speaking Mandarin. However, a main repercussion of the campaign is the decline in use of Chinese dialects within the local Chinese community. As a result of the SMC, a majority of elderly dialect speakers are unable to communicate with the ruling English-speaking elites in society due to their handicap in English and Mandarin. Although the campaign has been successful, there are some challenges that may threaten the impact of the campaign. Due to the encroachment of English in the home environment, younger generation of Chinese are aligning themselves with English more than Mandarin. In addition, an increasing number of students from English-speaking homes are also experiencing some difficulties in learning the Chinese language. This chapter discusses the various issues that arise as a result of the success of the SMC. The chapter concludes with some possible areas for future research on the SMC.

Keywords Repercussions · Decline · Dialects · Challenges · Future research

7.1 Repercussions on the Decline of Chinese Dialects

The results of the SAS and the SSI indicated that a majority of dialect speakers displayed positive attitudes towards the SMC. Although some dialect speakers are against the elimination of Chinese dialects, a majority of them support the campaign and would like the government to continue promoting Mandarin within the Chinese 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. When asked to give his assessment of the SMC, Prime Minister Lee Hsieng Loong, stated that the campaign objective has been achieved (Speak Mandarin Campaign 2015). He observed that very few young people now speak dialect and many elderly could understand Mandarin although they may find

it easy to express themselves in Chinese dialects. The success of the SMC has put to test notions traditionally held by linguists that entrenched language habits cannot be changed (Pakir 1994).

Although the SMC has been successful in persuading a majority of dialect speakers to switch to speaking Mandarin, there are several repercussions arising from the elimination of Chinese dialects in Singapore. First, 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. Before the launch of the SMC, Singapore was formerly one of the few places where many people could speak 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. 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 languages. Finally, 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 three major units of equal status—Chinese, Malays, and Indians—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 invariably resulted in a language shift and language loss, leading to the reduction of linguistic diversity in the local linguistic landscape (Rubdy 2005). As the results of this study show, the promotion of Mandarin this has been at the expense of Chinese dialects and thus the previous rich linguistic environment of the local linguistic landscape has disappeared (Shepherd 2003).

In addition, the decline of Chinese dialects also means a loss of communication for the majority of Singaporeans who have difficulty using English or Mandarin to communicate with the ruling English-speaking elite (Bokhorst-Heng 1998). 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 Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in June 2004, ministers and members of parliament used dialects to inform elderly dialect speakers of the dangers associated with the disease. Local TV stations such as MediaCorp Channel 8 and U Channel televised live call-in forums in dialects to discuss the prevention of SARS when it was first identified in Singapore in February 2003. In addition, in 2001, the Central Provident Fund (CPF) board commissioned dialect commercials to explain its Top-up Scheme to reach out to elderly Singaporeans who are handicapped in both English and Mandarin. In the lead-up to the celebration of Singapore's fifty years of independence in 2015, the Ministry of Communications and Information produced videos in various Chinese dialects to explain the Pioneer Generation Package, which provides medical subsidies to honor elderly Singaporeans for their contributions to the country. The government has realized that dialects play an important role in connecting with local Chinese 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 lose an important source of communication with ordinary Chinese citizens.

The decline of dialects also implies a loss of economic tool as Chinese dialects are still used extensively by the vast population of ethnic Chinese in various 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. Some younger generation Singaporeans are learning Chinese dialects for the purpose of doing business in China (Lim 2009). Thus the loss of dialects will put Chinese Singaporeans at a disadvantage when engaging in business dealings with these countries.

The decline of dialects has also resulted 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. Shepherd (2003) observes that the loss of dialects had led to a 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 and customs will soon be nostalgic things of yesterday. As a result of the success of the SMC, there is a possibility that future generations of Chinese Singaporeans will lose the cultural heritage associated with their ancestors, and may take less pride in being a Chinese.

The decline of dialects also creates a breakdown of communication between different generations of dialect speakers within the Chinese community. Cavallaro and Ng (2014) observed that as Chinese vernaculars became increasingly displaced by English within the Chinese community, elderly Chinese who speak only Chinese dialects are finding it increasingly difficult to forge meaningful bonds with younger Chinese who speak only English. The lack of connection with their grandchildren through a common language has resulted in a sense of desolation and dislocation experienced by elderly Chinese Singaporeans. This problem will eventually pass when young Chinese Singaporeans become grandparents themselves. They will then no longer face the awkward communication rift that their grandparents had encountered. However, this will imply that future generation of young Chinese will have less linguistic competency, and their speech repertoire may merely be confined to English and Mandarin.

7.2   Future Challenge of the SMC

There are still a few challenges in promoting the use of Mandarin within the dialect-speaking Chinese community. A major challenge of the SMC is to ensure that Mandarin is able to hold its own against the encroachment of English in the

local linguistic landscape. Over the years, English has made its way into the homes of a large number of Singaporeans. As reported in a recent article, "English most common home language, bilingualism also up: Government survey" that appeared in *The Straits Times* dated 10 Mar 2016, Mandarin is gradually losing out to English in the homes. About 36.9% of residents aged five and older use English most frequently at home against 34.9% for Mandarin (Lee 2016).

As a result of the low intergenerational transmission of the Chinese language, the Chinese language may be experiencing an endangered situation. Fishman (1991) posits that no language maintenance is possible if there is no intergenerational mother tongue transmission. There is a real fear that the Chinese language is losing its currency in the linguistic landscape of Singapore as data released from the Ministry of Education revealed that 59% of the Primary one cohort in 2009 came from families who speak mainly English compared to 49% five year ago (Oon and Kor 2009). Zhao and Liu (2007) observed that the language shift from Chinese to English in the home environment is due to the fact that English has acquired high values in terms of cultural, social, and symbolic capitals in Singapore over the years. Parents who believe that learning Mandarin is an extra burden for their children will continue to be indifferent to the SMC. Being aware that parents in Singapore have a deliberate intention to cultivate their child's English ability, former Minister Mentor, Lee Kuan Yew had stressed that Singapore parents should instead adopt Mandarin as a language of use and preference at home. To enable Singapore school children to maintain their proficiency in Mandarin, Lee also reminded parents not to enforce the use of English at home since many school children are already speaking English in schools. However Lee's comments may fall on 'deaf ears' as a result of the pragmatic and prestigious value accorded to English in Singapore. Bokhorst-Heng et al. (2010) suggest that as younger Singaporeans grow up as native speakers of English (English being the first language they acquire as a child), they will increasingly claim ownership of English, with the language being core to their identity.

Another challenge of the SMC is to ensure that the quality of Mandarin spoken is compatible with the Mandarin spoken in mainland China. 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. There is a need to improve the quality of spoken Mandarin within the Chinese community. 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 due to the rapid increase of Chinese immigrants in Singapore. Over the years, there are about 100,000 Mandarin-speaking Chinese migrants (Chan 2006) from various parts of China, including Beijing, Northeast China, Sichuan, Shanghai, Shandong, Hubei, Hunan, Jiangsu working in Singapore. The relentless influx of mainland Chinese speakers will result in a naturalistic environment for interactions in Mandarin and thus raise the standard of Chinese in Singapore. However, Chinese nationals in Singapore have been regarded with hostility and suspicion and viewed as distinct and apart by some local

Singapore Chinese (Lim 2010). Singaporeans' negative attitudes toward Chinese nationals have been featured in blogs and web forums postings (Teo 2008). The Singapore government is aware of local sentiments towards the influx of Mandarin-speaking Chinese nationals and speaks of a cautionary discourse of "limits and constraints." Although the presence of large number of mainland Chinese speakers has not changed Chinese dialect speakers' views about the SMC, it has unfortunately resulted in some negative perceptions of Mandarin speakers and the use of Mandarin in Singapore.

In addition, more students from English-speaking homes found the learning of Chinese language in public schools difficult. The issue was first highlighted in 1997 when the former Prime Minister, Mr. Goh Chok Tong flagged the need to study and rectify the learning difficulties of ethnic Chinese from English-speaking homes.

These children have at least average ability. They have no difficulties with their other school subjects but find Chinese (the mother tongue subject) in school very difficult despite extra tuition and supervision from parents (Lee 2011, p. 183).

The trend of children entering pubic schools with little exposure to the Chinese language in the home will continue due to the declining use of the Chinese language among younger students. A survey conducted by the Chinese language curriculum and pedagogical review committee (henceforth CLCPRC) in 2004 revealed that a significant proportion of Chinese students do not like to study Chinese in schools due to an over-emphasis on character memorization. The survey also highlighted several problems in the learning of Chinese: (i) students' disinclination to read in Chinese, especially outside the curriculum (ii) decline in interest in topics taught in Chinese lessons when students progress to the secondary level (iii) teachers' scope for delivering engaging and interesting lessons became limited due to current examination format and (iv) inadequate interest amongst Chinese students to continue learning and using the language after they leave school (CLCPRC 2004, p. 24). Over the years, Chinese teachers have expressed concerns that it is difficult to motivate English-speaking school children to master Mandarin due to their insufficient exposure to Mandarin and the lack of opportunity to use the language in their everyday lives (Goh and Lim 2010). Prime Minister Lee had cautioned that Singaporeans are now learning Mandarin in an English-speaking environment. The persistent lack of a linguistic environment for the use of Mandarin will continue to be a bugbear for many Mandarin speakers. During the past 35 years, a majority of parents have graduated from schools with English as the sole medium of instruction and speak mainly English at home. Thus the Prime Minister explains that in order to sustain Mandarin as a living as well as a thriving language, there is a need to encourage Chinese Singaporeans to practise Mandarin as much as possible in an English-speaking environment.

In recent years, the Ministry of education in Singapore has lowered its expectations in the oral Mandarin proficiency of students, especially those handicapped in the language. For students who face exceptional difficulties in Chinese, an alternative Chinese Language "B" Syllabus was introduced to help them cope with learning the language. However, the Chinese Language "B" Syllabus has been vigorously criticized as a retreat from a commitment to the school bilingual policy

that mandates that students should receive a minimum stint of Chinese instruction throughout their school years (Huang 2009). It is also uncertain whether the latest Chinese education reforms implemented by the Ministry of Education will nurture a healthy environment in sustaining students' interest in learning Mandarin beyond the formal school-going years.

A final 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). If more Chinese choose to identify their ethnic identity through speaking Mandarin, there is a possibility that Singapore will be divided into two blocs: Mandarin-speaking and non-Mandarin-speaking. This may have the effect of tearing at the multicultural fabric of Singapore's sociological make-up. In Singapore, nation-building has long been understood as a process of de-ethicizing 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'. However, the promotion of Mandarin as an economic language has raised the specter of competition between Mandarin and the mother tongue languages. It has been reported that there were some unhappiness within the Malay community regarding young Malays learning Mandarin at the expense of learning the Malay language (Wee 2008). Thus, the creeping Chineseness in Singapore's non-Chinese communities may lead to inter-ethnic friction and threaten national unity.

7.3 Future Research on the SMC

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 previously, 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 has been 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. Some questions remain: 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 its expectations to fall in line with the new changes in the learning of the mother tongue? 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?"

"Will younger generations of English-speaking Chinese be convinced that speaking Mandarin will enable them to cultivate their Chinese identity, and speaking no/less Mandarin will cause them to lose their Chinese identity?"

A consideration of these questions will enable the SMC organizers to implement more effective strategies to persuade dialect speakers to embrace Mandarin as a language of use and preference.

(c) There is also a need to consider the use of the campaign as a strategy to promote Mandarin. 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). However, the prevalence and frequency of campaigns in recent years may have led to an "overkill" effect on the target population. Since 1979, dialect speakers have been bombarded with various "messianic" SMC messages that there may come a time where they will become indifferent towards the campaign. There is a need for SMC organizers to consider whether the campaign is an effective strategy to persuade dialect speakers to adopt Mandarin as a language of use and preference.

7.4 Limitations of Study

One of the main limitations of this study is that it is conducted as a one-off case study. A major critique against the use of a one-off case study is that it fails to meet the criteria of generalisability and external validity (Mcdonough and Mcdonough 1997). The one-off case study also fails to incorporate features such as sampling or experimental treatment that would allow extrapolation to a wider population.

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. In addition, data collected from the SSI may not reflect the honest views of informants due to self-imposed censorship. In Singapore, language is a sensitive issue and ordinary citizens may sometimes find it difficult to articulate information related to language and race in a multicultural society. The opinions of individual dialect speakers are also questionable, particularly when the SMC is a government-directed policy. 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. 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. 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). In addition, the study also did not consider code-switching, the practice of moving back and forth between two languages. 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 behavior. For instance, language use and language attitudes could be influenced by several conditions or other 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. The data from the SAS provide valuable information for an overall picture of the sociolinguistic situation of the researched community. This will serve as an entry point for future research on other dialect-speaking communities in Singapore.

References

Bokhorst-Heng, W. (1998). Language planning and management. In J. A. Foley (Ed.), *English in new cultural contexts* (pp. 287–309). Singapore: Oxford University Press.

Bokhorst-Heng, W., Rubdy, R., McKay, S., & Alsagoff, L. (2010). Whose English? Language ownership in Singapore's English language debates. In L. Lim, A. Pakir, & L. Wee (Eds.), *English in Singapore* (pp. 57–90). Hongkong: Hongkong University Press.

Cavallaro, F., & Ng B. C. (2014). Language in Singapore: From multilingualism to English plus. In Y. Slaughter & J. Hajek (Eds.), *Challenging the monolingual mindset. A book in memory of Michael Clyne* (pp. 33–48). Bristol (UK): Multilingual Matters.

Chan, B. (2006). Virtual communities and Chinese national identity. *Journal of Chinese Overseas, 2*(1), 1–32.

Chiew, S. K. (1980). Bilingualism and national identity: A Singapore case study. In A. Afendras & E. Kuo (Eds.), *Language and society in Singapore* (pp. 233–253). Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Chinese Language Curriculum and Pedagogy Review Committee. (2004). *Report of the Chinese language curriculum and pedagogy review committee*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Chua, B.-H. (1995). *Communitarian ideology and democracy in Singapore*. London: Routledge.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift. Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Goh, Y. S., & Lim, S. K. (2010). Global Mandarin. In V. Vaish (Ed.), *Globalisation of language and culture* (pp. 14–33). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Huang, Y. (2009). Dilemma and anguish of the Chinese-educated. In B. Welsh, J. Chin, A. Mahizhnan, & T. T. How (Eds.), *Impressions of the Goh Chok Tong years in Singapore* (pp. 336–349). Singapore: NUS Press.

Kuo, C. Y., & Jernudd, B. H. (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* (pp. 70–89). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Lee, K. Y. (2011). *My lifelong challenge: Singapore's bilingual journey*. Singapore: Straits Times Press.

Lee, P. (2016, March 10). English most common home language, bilingualism also up: Government survey. http://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/. Accessed 3 April 2016.

Lim, L. (2009). Beyond fear and loathing in SG: The real mother tongues and language policies in multilingual Singapore. In L. Lim & E. Low. (Eds.), *Multilingual, globalizing Asia. AILA review 22* (pp. 52–71). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Lim, L. (2010). Migrants and 'mother tongues': Extralinguistic forces in the ecology of Singapore. In L. Lim, A. Pakir, & L. Wee (Eds.), *English in Singapore*. Hongkong: Hongkong University Press.

Mcdonough, J., & Mcdonough, S. (1997). *Research methods for English language teachers*. London: Arnold.

Oon, C., & Kor, K. B. (2009). Was Chinese wrongly taught for thirty years? The Straits Times. http://www.news.asiaone.com/News/. Accessed 29 November 2009.

Pakir, A. (1994). The role of language planning in education in Singapore. In A Hassan (Ed.), *Language planning in SEA* (pp. 148–178). Malaysia: Perpustakaan.

Platt, J. (1980). Multilingualism, polyglossia, and code selection in Singapore. In E. A. Afendras & E. C. Y. Kuo (Eds.), *Language and Society in Singapore* (pp. 63–83). Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Rubdy, R. (2005). Creative destruction: Singapore's speak good English movement. *World Englishes, 20*(3), 341–356.

Shepherd, J. (2003). *Striking a balance: The management of language in Singapore*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Speak Mandarin Campaign. (2015). *A Mandarin anchor in a changing world*. http://mandarin.org.sg/en/content/anchor. Retrieved 30 September 2016.

Teo, E. Speaking up for minorities. Asiaone. com. http://news.asiaone.com/News/Education/Story/A1Story20081124-102921.html. Accessed 24 November 2008.

Trudgill, P. (1974). *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wee, L. (2008). Linguistic instrumentalism in Singapore. In R. Rubdy & P. Tan (Eds.), *Language as commodity: Global Structure, local marketplace* (pp. 31–43). London: Continuum International Publishing.

Zhao, S., & Liu, Y. (2007). Home language shift and its implications for language planning in Singapore: From the perspective of prestige planning. *The Asia Pacific-Education Researcher, 16*(2), 111–126.

Erratum to: A Study of Attitudes of Dialect Speakers Towards the Speak Mandarin Campaign in Singapore

Patrick Chin Leong Ng

Erratum to:
P.C.L. Ng, *A Study of Attitudes of Dialect Speakers Towards the Speak Mandarin Campaign in Singapore*, SpringerBriefs in Linguistics, DOI 10.1007/978-981-10-3443-5

The original version of the book was inadvertently published without the following updated corrections:

Chapter 1
In p. 4, Fig. 1.1: The Speak Mandarin Campaign poster has been enlarged.

In p. 4, Line 5: "2016 marks the 37th anniversary" should be changed to read as "2017 marks the 38th anniversary" of the launch.

Chapter 5
In p. 33, Line 8: "Table 5.3 is a summary of the five questions" should be changed to read as "Table 5.3 summarises the language use of respondents in the five domains".

In p. 34, Table 5.4: Each column in the table should have the following scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.

In p. 35, Table 5.5: "Neither agree disagree" should be changed to "Neither agree nor disagree".

In p. 35, Table 5.6: Each column in the table should have the following scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.

In p. 36, Table 5.7: "Neither agree disagree" should be changed to "Neither agree nor disagree".

E1

In p. 36, Line 30: "The responses for Q21 are shown in Table 5.9" should be changed to "The responses for Q21 are shown in Table 5.8".

In p. 37, Table 5.9: Each column in the table should have the following scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.

In p. 39, Tables 5.10 and 5.11: Each column in the table should have the following scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.

In p. 40, Table 5.12: Each column in the table should have the following scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.

In p. 41, Table 5.13: Each column in the table should have the following scale: Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree.

Appendix A
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 B
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 does 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?