

Research Note

**Language Planning in Multilingual Singapore:  
Concerns, Issues And Problems**

**NG Chin Leong, Patrick**

Language planning policy is often conceived as a political and administrative activity by a governmental authority (Jernudd and Gupta, 1971). According to Ager (2001), the ability to use many languages can represent a major economic resource and thus there is a need for the government to coordinate the planning of language as a resource for societal development. Singapore has frequently been cited as a successful case study of governmental intervention in language planning. The rational, centralized and top-down status planning by governmental authority has resulted in the adoption of English as a medium of communication in a multilingual society and a high level of communicative integration between different ethnic groups (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003; Shepherd, 2003; Goh, 2004). However, beneath the success story of Singapore's language planning policy, there exist a number of problems, issues and concerns. This article will flesh out in greater detail the language ideology, rationale and effects of its language planning implementation. In particular, it will examine some current potentially fractious language planning issues in the official language planning policy.

Key words: Singapore, language planning, issues

**1. Introduction: Singapore's linguistic background**

Singapore is a small island with an area of 712.4 square kilometer (Department of Statistics Singapore) state located at the tip of the Malay Peninsula. It was formerly a British colony founded by the British colonial administrator, Stamford Raffles in 1819. In 1959, Singapore achieved self-government and was led by the Peoples Action Party

---

\* Faculty of International Studies and Regional Development, University of Niigata Prefecture  
(chin@unii.ac.jp)

(PAP) under the leadership of Lee Kuan Yew. Since self-government, Singapore has become a commercial entrepot for commerce and finance and has one of the highest standards of living in Asia (Kaplan and Baldauf, 2003). With a population of approximately 5 million (Census, 2010), Singapore is a young country of many races whose forefathers are from Southeast Asia, China, India and Europe. According to the 2010 census, the four main races in Singapore are the Chinese (74.15%), the Malays (13.4%), the Indians (9.2%) and Others (3.3%) which include Eurasians and guest workers from the region as well as from English-speaking countries. Singapore's racial diversity can be traced to immigration trends that formed as a result of colonial commercial practices. Each ethnic group has been ascribed an official mother tongue by the government. Thus the official mother tongue of the Malays is Malay, the Chinese Mandarin and the Indians Tamil. These three languages are also accorded the status of official languages in Singapore to facilitate intra-ethnic communication (Rappa and Wee, 2007). Students in Singapore are required to study English and one of the ethnic mother tongues. In school, English is the primary medium of instruction of all subjects except the mother tongue which is learnt as a "Second Language". Although Singapore citizens are not native English speakers, the official working language in Singapore is English.

The dominant ethnic group is the Chinese comprising more than 76% of the Singapore resident population (Census, 2010). Although the Chinese in Singapore form a large demographic majority, they are far from being culturally or linguistically homogenous. The ancestors of Singapore's Chinese residents are from various parts of Southern China who spoke various regional dialects. In the context of Singapore, the term 'dialect' refers to a vernacular variety of the Chinese language, and is spoken by various sub-groups of the Chinese community. In Singapore, all Chinese belong to a dialect group which is inscribed on his or her identity card. Many Singaporean Chinese acquire some knowledge of one or more additional dialects, either through their parents, relatives, friends or neighbors. It is the practice in Singapore to refer to Mandarin as a 'language', while other varieties of Chinese such as Cantonese or Hokkien are considered to be 'dialects.' Although politicians in Singapore do not recognize dialect as a language, linguists, on the other hand, view 'dialect' as another variety of language. The major dialects in Singapore include Hokkien, Teochew, Cantonese, Hainanese, Hakka, Hockchew, Henghua and Sam Kiang.

## 2. Language Planning in Singapore

According to Chua (1995), language planning in Singapore is closely linked to economic development and nation building. Ho and Alsagoff (1998, p202) observe that in Singapore, forces of the marketplace often dictate language choice although language planning in Singapore is highly centralized. Centralized planning implies a top-down approach in decision-making and implementation. Decisions about language policy, adjustment measures and their application are made in the cabinet, parliament and relevant ministries. The decisions to implement national language policies are articulated by top political leaders without much consultation with specialists on language planning (Kuo and Jernudd, 1994). In Singapore, language planning is taken seriously requiring a delicate balance of competing objectives, interests, and issues. Singapore's language policy develops within the context of a set of deep and far ranging ideological presuppositions (Tan, 2007). The language ideology of Singapore refers to the substantive content and ideational principles that undergird the state discourse, policies and action on language in Singapore. Some key principles in language ideology can be summarized as follows:

- ( i ) Language planning is subsumed as an integral part of national development, serving the needs of nation building, and closely inter-connected with other planning activities (Chua, 1995).
- ( ii ) A policy of multilingualism which emphasizes the respect and equal treatment accorded to each ethnic group (Bokhorst-Heng, 1999).
- ( iii ) The belief that English and the mother tongues play different roles (Bokhorst-Heng, 1999).
- ( iv ) A policy of pragmatism where languages perceived to be obstacles to economic development will have no place in the linguistic ecology of Singapore (Wee, 2002).

## 3. Historical development of language planning in Singapore

As mentioned earlier, Singapore is a multilingual society where a multiplicity of languages is spoken. However, from the perceptions of the government, language

diversity is problematic in Singapore because:

*Linguistic identity is associated with ethnic and cultural identity. Language loyalty could lead to inter-ethnic conflict when the functional status or sentimental values of one's own ethnic language are at stake. Language diversity weakens communicative integration and generally implies inefficiency in the management of economy and polity which hinder the social, economic and political development of the nation. (Kuo and Jernudd 1994, p 87)*

As a result, language planning in Singapore is perceived as fulfilling the pragmatic needs of the nation. A policy of multilingualism was developed, resulting in the Republic of Singapore Independence Act of 1965 which decreed that Malay, Mandarin, Tamil and English would be the four official languages of Singapore. This means that Mandarin, Malay and Tamil are officially designated as the 'mother tongues' of the Chinese, Malay and Indian communities respectively. The mother tongue for an individual Singaporean depends on the child's race, which is determined by the race of the child's natural father. Gopinathan (1998) explains that the strategy of multilingualism has been the adoption of a policy of equal treatment which requires that the languages of the different racial groups be formally given equivalent status. As a result, the entire population is conceptualized officially constituted into four units of equal status: Chinese, Malays, Indians and 'Others' (Eurasians, etc.) Thus intra-group differences among the Chinese, Malay and Indians were radically reduced by the installation of a single language each for the 'Chinese', the 'Malays' and the 'Indians' (Clammer, 1985).

Under the multilingual policy, English was accorded the status of an official language while Mandarin, Malay and Tamil are the respective official mother tongues of the Chinese, Malay and Indian community. The use of English has been defended as a necessity for accessing scientific and technological knowledge (Rappa and Wee 2007) and is essential to economic development from the early years of Singapore's independence. This view was expressed by the then Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew:

*The deliberate stifling of language (English) which gives access to*

*superior technology can be damaging beyond repair. Sometimes this is done to elevate the status of the indigenous language as much as to take away the supposed advantage a minority in society [are] 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).*

On the other hand, the mother tongues are a demarcation and embodiment of culture, each serving to re-ethnicize and consolidate separate ethnic communities and acting as a cultural ballast against undesirable Western influences (Rubdy, 2005). Revamping the education system was one of the first policy actions of the Singapore government since independence in 1965. A policy of bilingualism was implemented in 1966 to unify and nationalize the education system. The policy was succinctly explained by the former Minister for Education, Dr Tony Tan Keng Yam:

*Our policy on bilingualism – that each child should learn English and the mother tongue – I regard as a fundamental feature of our education system. Children must learn English so that they will have a window to the knowledge, technology and expertise of the modern world. They must know their mother tongue to enable them to understand what makes us what we are today (Lee, 1983, p43).*

Chiew (1980) reported that:

*the imposition of the policy was based on two political objectives. Firstly, the English component in bilingualism is seen as a means towards facilitating interethnic interaction in order to break down communal exclusiveness and to foster a Singaporean identity. Secondly, bilingualism is expected to reduce the inequalities of occupational achievement between the English-educated and the disadvantaged vernacular-educated. (Chiew, 1980, p 238)*

The form of bilingualism specific to Singapore is unique where the term ‘English-

knowing bilingualism' means proficiency in English and one other official language: English and Chinese, English and Malay, English and Tamil, and not proficiency in any two other languages as mentioned in most literature (Lo Bianco, 2007). Several measures were undertaken by the government to consolidate the English-knowing bilingual education policy. Chinese, Malay and Indian medium schools were required to study their 'mother tongue' community language (Kaplan and Baldauf 2003). Gopinathan (1998) reports that school bilingualism was implemented by a series of detailed guidelines involving exposure time, subject-language matching, examinations and attainment requirements. Even today, the principle of the bilingual policy is well entrenched. All students in Singapore are required to study English as a 'First Language' and mother tongue language (Mandarin, Malay or Tamil) as a 'Second Language' in schools.

#### **4. Discussion: Issues, concerns and conflicts in Singapore's language planning**

Although most studies on Singapore's language planning have documented successful governmental interventions, there are some current issues, concerns and conflicts as a result of deliberate language planning by the government. These potentially fractious and conflicting issues are related to language planning issues since Singapore gained independence in 1965. Several concerns, issues and conflicts have been identified: the conflict between ethnic and national identity, the widening gap between English and non-English speaking populace, negative attitude towards the vernacular languages and the declining proficiency in English.

##### **4.1. The conflict between ethnic and national identity**

As mentioned earlier, 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. The strategy of multilingualism has been the adoption of a policy of equal treatment which requires that the language of the different racial groups be formally given equivalent status. However, there are a number of problems with the policy of 'equal treatment of languages' in the official language planning policy. In the first place, the sheer

disproportionate size of the Chinese community constantly threatens the balance of equilibrium between the different ethnic communities (Bokhorst-Heng, 1999). As the Chinese in Singapore become unified through a common mother tongue, other minority groups such as the Malay or Indian Singaporean may experience self-perceived insecurity (Tan, 2007), and become more threatened by the increasing domination of the Chinese community. While the Speak Mandarin Campaign serves to insulate the Chinese populace from the influx of 'undesirable Western influences,' the promotion of Mandarin and Chinese culture has also been regarded as 'communal,' 'parochial,' 'potentially divisive' and 'disruptive' (Ho and Alsagoff, 1998, p208). In the long-term, the promotion of the Chinese mother tongue may have the effect of tearing at the multi-ethnic and multi-cultural fabric of Singapore's sociological make-up. Tan (1998) reported that Chinese-related issues often dominate the agenda in Singapore and the non-Chinese communities feel overwhelmed and marginalized. Quah (1990) suggests that the arduous task of establishing a Singaporean national identity will become more difficult when the Chinese ethnic group is made more conscious of their ethnic identity. This will reinforce the cleavages among the various ethnic groups in Singapore. Thus a major challenge of the government is to maintain a balance between strengthening the ethnic identity as well as reinforcing the larger national supra-ethnic Singapore identity (Kuo and Jernudd, 1994, p134).

#### **4.2. The widening gap between the English and the non-English speaking in Singapore**

Although the policy of multilingualism in Singapore's official language planning does serve the government's goal of establishing equality of all languages, in reality not all languages are equal (Kuo and Jernudd, 1994). Tan (2007) points out the Singapore's language policy to accord English as an official language raises the popularity of English at the expense of the mother tongues. Although the importance of English is rationalized in terms of its economic value in promoting trade and technology, its function as a social equalizer is questionable. The prestige accorded to English as the official working language in Singapore has resulted in an asymmetry in power between the English-speaking and non-English speaking (Rubdy, 2005). Silver (2005) observed that despite the government's intention to maintain symbolic and cultural capital in the mother tongues, with English acquisition as merely economic, there has been a gradual but significant shift from a predominant use of Chinese to

English within the Chinese community (Silver, 2005). Tan (2003, p48) observes that Singapore is very close to a situation where “linguistic differentiation is marked by social stratification,” even though the government is aware of the uneven power distribution between English speaking citizens and those who are less proficient in English. Recent trends have also shown that Singapore's officially constructed language ecology articulated in economic utility of English has caused social injustice faced by non-English users in Singapore. As a result of their handicap in English, an estimated 770 000 low-income Chinese-speaking Singaporeans felt marginalized and have suffered for years a combination of ‘economic disadvantage, sociopolitical alienation and cultural dislocation, in communicating with the ruling English-speaking elite (Ho and Alsagoff, 1988, p206). Thus the promotion of English can be seen as a form of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1998) where the non-English speaking Chinese felt there was an “unequal division of power and resources” between them and their English-speaking counterparts.

#### **4.3. Negative attitudes towards the vernacular languages**

Given the ever-increasing trend of globalization and the recognition by the government that English is vital for access to economic knowledge, the vernacular languages such as Malay, Chinese dialects and Tamil have gradually become low status languages and therefore do not command much respect among the local populace. Ho and Alsagoff (1998) report that in the matter of language attitudes, there are signs of linguistic and cultural discrimination against the vernacular languages.

*Because English has a great deal more status and prestige than any of the vernaculars in Singapore, it is not uncommon for members of the English-speaking elite to show a negative attitude towards the vernaculars and their users. (Ho and Alsagoff, 1998, p205)*

An example is the prejudices against the Chinese language among parents within the Chinese community. While the official discourse of language policy repeatedly emphasized the importance of the learning of the mother tongue was an essential cultural ballast to guard against decadent Western values, some Chinese speaking parents, on the other hand, perceive the learning of English as vital to their children's well-being (Chew, 2007). They will prefer their children to excel in English because



the grade for English is taken into account by the gatekeepers at institutions of higher learning in Singapore. More and more parents will demand that the school place less emphasis on the learning of the mother tongue as exemplified by the following letter, A Mum's concern and hope which appeared in The Sunday Times dated May 09, 2010:

*I am a mother of four children in Secondary 2 and Primary 6, 5 and 2. I have tried my best to inspire my children to love the Chinese language - sending them for extra classes and private tuition, and speaking some simple Mandarin at home. However, these methods have not made them love the language. We need to think hard about motivating young learners on the subjects they are learning. I prefer my children to learn less and show more evidence of use of mother tongue in everyday life, and a passion for it. The learning pressures at a young age should not kill love of one's mother tongue. The Ministry of Education (MOE) has realised this, hence the plan to review the weighting of mother tongue in the Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE). Over-emphasising weighting will at best produce learners 'for the test', rather than for love of the culture. I suggest increased exposure to the culture of the language rather than learning words by heart. If the weighting cannot be reduced, reconsider the criteria for entry to secondary school.*

Despite the fact that the government has given the assurance that the Mother Tongue (MT) is the foundation of Singapore's educational system, more and more parents, acting as 'invisible language planners' will continue to pressure the government to change the policy for the reason of climbing the English-wrought social ladder (Xu and Li, 2003).

#### **4.4. Declining proficiency in English**

The most current language issue in Singapore is the fear of deteriorating standards of English given the universalization of the language and its variety of use among a larger population. This problem was first introduced as a concerned issue in 1999 when the former Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr Lee Kuan Yew observed that the standard of spoken English among Singaporeans was a growing cause of concern as more and more young children were speaking Colloquial Standard English or 'Singlish.' Singlish is perceived as the basilectal variety and usually associated with uneducated Singaporeans with a low proficiency of English. It draws its roots from several Chinese

dialects, Malay, Tamil and English (Chew, 2007). There is a strong perception by the Singapore government that Singlish a sub-standard form of English and unintelligible to foreigners. In his National Day Rally message in 1999, the former Prime Minister, Mr Goh Chok Tong warned that if Singlish were allowed to flourish, it would spell Singapore's economic downfall. In an attempt to eradicate Singlish, the Singapore government launched the Speak Good English Movement (SGEM) in 2000. The slogan of SGEM was 'Speak well, Be understood' and the mass media (television, radio and the Internet) was harnessed to encourage Singaporeans to discard the use of Singlish and speak a brand of English language such as Received Pronunciation (RP) or Standard American English which is perceived as the door to wealth, power, prestige and a form of economic capital (The Straits Times, March 31, 2000, p42). However, the government's strong stand against Singlish has become an issue of some concern among local Singaporeans. Proponents of Singlish frowned upon the attempt by the government to destroy Singlish, but instead affirm that Singlish is authentic and is a manifestation of the Singaporean identity (Chng, 2003). In various public platforms, there have been various messages posted by Singaporeans to defend the use of Singlish. As a reader, Danesh Daryanani wrote in an online forum page, In defence of my national language: SINGLISH, dated August 22, 2006:

*First of all, we must view Singlish as a language or at worst, patios in its own right and not English gone wrong. Singlish has evolved out of our multi-racialism and it's probably the one true thing that has organically developed rather than been manufactured by a campaign. It's our identity and one element that we all identify with whether we are Chinese, Indian, Malay or Eurasian. We must also remember that languages evolve. What is considered "good" English today would probably be considered very poor English a number of years ago. Why kill the only thing that our nation has created that truly is a result of our unique brand of multi-racialism rather than brand it bad and try and kill the language. Yes, I believe Singlish is a language.*

But as Singapore cements its position as a financial services hub and a top regional tourist destination, the government will insist that local Singaporeans discard the use of Singlish and switch to speaking standard English. However, supporters of Singlish view Singlish as a reflection of their Singapore identity (Chew, 2007) and something that is authentic and homegrown (The Straits Times, September 7, 1999,

p. H3). Thus the pragmatic linguistic policy of the authority has given birth to a new breed of Singaporeans who see English as their language, but not the kind of English envisaged by the policy makers. The discrepancy between the official plans and the sociolinguistic reality has been cast as a national concern and the dispute about the authenticity of Singlish will continue unabated as Singlish becomes increasingly foregrounded in the consciousness of most Singaporeans and its gradual acceptance as a crucial marker of the Singaporean identity (Rubdy, 2005).

## 5. Conclusion

This article attempts to provide an overview of language planning in Singapore and, in particular, it focuses on problems and issues related to deliberate language planning intervention by the Singapore government. We have seen that under the policy of multilingualism in Singapore's language planning policy, English has been designated the official working and administrative language in Singapore. The use of English in Singapore is mainly influenced by world economic trends. Since English is an international language, it would allow Singaporeans to plug into the world economy. As a result, English has become the dominant language in Singapore. However, over the years, the Singaporean government began to perceive the dominance of English as problematic. English has been accused of leading Chinese Singaporeans to undesirable Western influences such as drug abuse and moral decay. In order to counteract these undesirable Western influences, the mother tongue was given more emphasis in schools to curb the erosion of Chinese cultural values as a result of the dominance of English. Thus the government implemented the English-knowing bilingual educational policy in schools. Under the bilingual policy, it was mandatory for all students to study English as a 'first language' and one ethnic mother tongue as a 'second language'. The English-knowing bilingual policy adopted by the Singapore government is to allow Singapore to remain modern and competitive in the world through English but, at the same time, ensure that Singapore remains a cohesive nation with three homogenous ethnic communities coexisting in equilibrating relation to each other (Bokhorst-Heng, 1999). Even today, the English-knowing bilingualism remains an imperative for current Singapore (Pang, 2009) as English is justified on economic grounds as Singapore comes to grips head-on linguistically with globalization (Chew & Quek, 2002).

However, as the encroachment of English in the Singapore society continues to expand, the containment of English within the ethnic community becomes a current salient issue. As the motivation for language planning policy in Singapore arose from the overriding goal to promote the economic interests and welfare, the governmental authority now faces the challenge of how to maintain the balance between English and the ethnic mother tongue language in the linguistic ecology. Thus, as a result of its competing objectives, deliberate governmental interventions in language planning by the Singapore government have not produced the convergence of goals much sought after (Tan, 2007). Perhaps, language planning by government should take into consideration the perception of the planned product by recipients (Zhou and Liu, 2007), and must ultimately satisfy the interests of the community or it will not meet the conditions just enunciated for that language plan to survive (Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997).

---

## References

- Ager, D. (2001). Motivations in language planning and language policy. *Itilingual Matters*. Cromwell Press Ltd. Great Britain.
- Bokhorst-Heng, W. (1998). 'Language Planning and Management' Pp.287-309 in *English in New Cultural Contexts*. In. J.A. Foley (Eds). Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1999). 'Singapore's Speak Mandarin Campaign: Language Ideological Debates in the Imagining of the Nation' in Pp.235-266 *Language Ideological Debates*, In Jan Blommaert (Es.). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Census of Population 2010. Retrieved 1 September 2010. <http://www.singstat.gov.sg>
- Chew, P.G.L. (2007). 'Remaking Singapore: Language, Culture and Identity in a Globalized World' Pp. 73-93 in *Language Policy, Culture, and Identity in Asian Contexts*, In Amy B.M. Tsui and James W. Tollefson (Eds.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chew, P.G.L. & Quek, S. H. (2002). Globalisation. Singapore: The national University of Singapore Society. *Globalisation Commentary*, Vol 18:1-5
- Chiew, S.K. (1980). 'Bilingualism and National Identity: A Singapore Case Study'. Pp. 233-253 in *Language and Society in Singapore*, ed. A. Afendras and E. Kuo (eds). Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Chng, H. H. (2003). 'You see me no up.' Is Singlish a problem? *Language, Problems and Language Planning* 27 (1),47-62,
- 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 Singapore. Retrieved 7 March 2011. <http://www.singstat.gov.sg>
- Danesh, D. (2006, Dec20). In Defence of Singlish. *Message posted by Danesh Daryanani*. Retrieved November 12, 2010 from <http://danesh.wordpress.com/>
- Goh, N.W. (2004). *Huayuwen Zai Xinjiaopo De Xianzhuang Yu Qianjing* [The Current Practice and Prospect

- of Chinese Language Education in Singapore]. Singapore: Chuangyiquan Chubanshe.
- Gopinathan, S. (1998). 'Language Policy Changes 1979-1997: Politics and Pedagogy.' Pp.19-44 in *Language, Society and Education in Singapore: Issues and Trends*, In Gopinathan et al (eds.). Singapore: Times Academic Press.
- Gupta, A. 1994. 'A Framework for the Analysis of Singapore English'. Pp.119-132 in *Language, Society and Education in Singapore*, eds. Gopinathan et al.. Singapore: Times Academic Press.
- Ho, C.L. and L. Alsagoff. (1998). 'English as the Common Language in Multicultural Singapore.' Pp. 201-217 in *English in New Cultural Contexts*, In J. Foley. (Eds). Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Jernudd, B. H., and J. Das Gupta. (1971) "Towards a Theory of Language Planning, Can Language be Planned? *Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for developing countries*. In Joan Rubin, and B. Jernudd (Eds). University Press of Hawaii: Honolulu, p195-215.
- Kaplan, R. and Baldauf, R. (1997). *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Kaplan, R. and Baldauf, R. (2003). *Language and Language in Education Planning in the Pacific Basin*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kuo, C. Y. (1985) *A Quantity Approach to the Study of Sociolinguistic Situation in Multi-linguistic Society*. Singapore: Regional English Language Centre.
- Kuo, C.Y. and Jernudd, B.H. (1994). 'Balancing Macro and Micro-Sociolinguistic Perspectives in Language Management: The Case of Singapore'. Pp.70-89 In T. Kandiah and J. Kwan-Terry (Eds.) *English and Language Planning: A South East Asian Contribution*. Singapore: Times Academic Press.
- Lee, K.C. (1983). *Language and Education in Singapore*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Lo Bianco. (2007). Advantage and identity: Neat discourse but troubled union: Singapore's medium of instruction policy. In V. Vaish, S. Gopinathan & Y.B. Liu (Eds.), *Language, capital, culture: Critical studies of language in education in Singapore (pp5-24)*. Amsterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Phillipson, R. (1998). Globalising English: Are linguistic human rights an alternative to linguistic imperialism? *Language Sciences*, 19(1), 101-112.
- Rappa, Antonio L. and L. Wee. 2007. 'Language Policy and Modernity in South East Asia'. Pp.77-104, Chapter 4: The Republic of Singapore. Springer.
- Rubdy, R. (2005). 'Creative Destruction: Singapore's Speak Good English Movement', *World Englishes*, 20(3): 341-356.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005). Remaking Singapore for the New Age: Ideologies and Practice. In Angel M. Y. Lin and Peter W. Martin (Eds): *Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in-Education Policy and Practice*. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon. 55-73.
- Shepherd, J. (2003). *Striking a Balance: The Management of Language in Singapore*. Germany: Peter Lang.
- Silver, R.E. (2005). The discourse of linguistic capital: Language and economic policy planning in Singapore. *Language Policy*, 4(1), 47-66. Department of Statistics. 2010. Census of Population 2010. Advanced data released. Singapore: Government Printing Press.
- Tan, K.B. (2007). The Multilingual State in Search of the Nation: The Language Discourse in Singapore's Nation-Building. Edited by Lee Hock Guan and Leo Suryadinata. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies publication. Singapore. pp74-117.
- Tan, S.H. (1998). 'Theoretical Ideals and Ideological Reality in Language Planning'. pp.45-62 In *Language, Society and Education in Singapore: Issues and Trends*, eds. Gopinathan et al. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Tan Y.Y. (2003). 'Reading the Census: Language Use in Asia'. Pp.175-210 in *Babel or Behemoth: Language Trends in Asia*, In J. Lindsay and T.Y. Ying (Eds.). Singapore: Asia Research Institute.
- Teo, W. (2007). 'Mandarinising Singapore: A Critical Analysis of Slogans in the Speak Mandarin Campaign.' *Critical Discourse Studies* 2(2): 121-142.
- Wee, L. (2002). 'Linguistic Instrumentalism in Singapore.' *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 23(4): 282-295.
- Weinstein, B. (1980). Language planning in Francophone Africa, *Language Problems and language Planning*, vol 4, no.1. pp55-77.

## Language Planning in Multilingual Singapore: Concerns, Issues And Problems

- Xu, D. M. & Li, W. (2003). Linguistic dirigisme and language management in Singapore. In P. M. Ryan & R. Terborg (Eds.), *Language: Issues of Inequality* (pp.121-154). Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico.
- Zhao, S. H. & Liu, Y.B. (2007). The generation of Mandarin oral corpus of Singaporean preschoolers [Xinjiapo huazu ertong kouyu yuliao ku de shengcheng]. *Journal of Teaching Chinese in the World*, 80(2)98-105. *Matters*. Great Britain: Cromwell Press Ltd.