



**HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL SECTION)**

**HUMANITIES RESEARCH PAPER 2020**

---

Topic: **Analysis on how Singlish is used as a Political Tool in Political Speeches**

Slant: **Lit**

Total Word Count (excluding appendices, footnotes & references): **5500**

Student's (official) Name: **Jeriel Tan Chee Ray**

Class: **3i4**

Name of Teacher-Mentor: **Mr Daniel Siew**

**Declaration**

I declare that this assignment is my own work and does not involve plagiarism or collusion. The sources of other people's work have been appropriately referenced, failing which I am willing to accept the necessary disciplinary action(s) to be taken against me.

Student's Signature :

Date of Submission:

## **Chapter 1: Introductory Chapter**

### **1.1 General Background**

This paper attempts to explain the effects of the usage of Singlish in the political context in Singapore.

### **1.2 Rationale**

The government has been encouraging Singaporeans to utilize Standard English rather than the vernacular Singlish through the Speak Good English Campaign first introduced in 2000. Ironically, Singlish has continued to be used in many political speeches and government advertisements, which is contradictory on first appearance.

### **1.3 Research Questions**

1. How does the concept of diglossia apply to the use of CSE and SSE in Political Speeches?
2. How does the use of Singlish differ in various political speeches and events? (eg. Singapore National Day Rally vs General Election Speeches vs Circuit Breaker Speeches)
3. What are the effects of the use of Singlish in political speeches?

### **1.4 Thesis Statement**

Singlish is used in the political context in an attempt to connect to the masses in order to convince them that they (the politicians) understand their issues and have their best interests at

heart. It is also possibly used to segregate speeches into the formal and more informal domains, where Singlish is used to discredit their opposition's views. However, overuse of the vernacular or incorrect usage could lead them to seem out of touch with the masses.

#### 1.5 Scope of Research / Delimitation(s)

This research will encompass the use of Singlish by the Singapore Government and analysis of the speeches and political advertisements from 2004-present.

#### 1.6 Significance of Research / Usefulness

Singlish is an integral part of our Singaporean identity and this research will allow us to understand the uses of Singlish outside of informal communication, namely in the political context. We will be able to better understand the reasoning behind code switching in political speeches and how the use of Singlish rather than Standard English can be beneficial in certain formal situations.

#### 1.7 Limitation(s)

Speeches will be studied from the view of an analyst and educated guesses are made regarding the possible aims of the speaker as well as the audience's thoughts and reactions, thus this analysis may not accurately pinpoint the intentions of the speakers. Furthermore, the findings will be limited to speeches that this paper has analysed and may not be fully representative of all politicians.

## 1.8 Preliminary Literature Survey

There have been multiple studies regarding the use of Singlish in formal contexts, more specifically in that of politics as well as in the classroom. One study regarding Singlish in the political context (Khoo, 2015) observed that politicians commonly code switched in rally speeches between Standard English (SSE) and Singlish in order to relate to the people but ironically also found that politicians who used too much Singlish came across as not being qualified to lead the country. Another analysis of the National Day Rally Speech (Tan, 2007) found that the language used attempted to inject patriotism into Singaporeans through narratives such as the Singapore Story as well as allowed the PAP to build authority of twin pillars of force and consent, a Machiavellian Principle developed by Gramsci under the Theory of Hegemony.

## 1.9 Methodology (Framework(s))

This research will be using Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 2001) to analyse archives of selected National Day Rally speeches and GE Speeches to attempt to explain the reason why politicians choose to use bits of Singlish in their formal speeches. Fairclough's CDA Structure suggests that the text be looked at from a three-dimensional approach, namely the text itself, discursive practice and lastly social practice. This allows the analysis of the speeches to encompass both the literary and social points of views to provide a better picture.

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review:**

### **2.1 Political Appeal of Singlish**

Researchers have long argued about how linguistics affect political appeal. In the local context of Singapore, the vernacular Singlish plays a significant role in rally speeches. Khoo (2015) analysed rally speeches in the 2011 General Election and observed that code switching was common and politicians that could not speak SSE were ridiculed by the public, as can be seen by Chan Chun Sing's Mandarin accented English making various users on the HardwareZone forum think that he was not qualified to lead the country. Khoo also observed that Singaporeans consider SSE to be dominating in the range of appropriate language skills for a politician. On the political side, Khoo noticed that Singapore politicians recognize the significance of Singlish as a marker of solidarity for Singaporeans, and try to exploit this by consciously choosing to use Singlish. He concluded that the main factor for politicians using Singlish was to connect with the people, but added that code switching could also be seen as being 'out of touch' with Singaporeans, and a pathetic attempt at trying to connect.

### **2.2 Linguistic Instrumentalism and Use of Singlish**

Ironically, the use of Singlish by politicians contradicts the "Speak Good English Movement" launched in 2000 encouraging Singaporeans to speak Standard English rather than Singlish. This seemingly ironic use of Singlish by the politicians can be explained by the basis of Singapore's policies, which Wee (2010) found to be based mainly on economic gain. In fact, Wee (2003) coined the term "linguistic instrumentalism", which is "a view of language that justifies its existence in a community in terms of its usefulness in achieving specific utilitarian

goals, such as access to economic development or social mobility” (Wee, 2003: 211). . Wee explored the view of a language that justifies its existence in a community in terms of usefulness in attaining economic goals and explained that in Singapore’s context, English was implemented as a first language to allow individuals to compete for social and economic gains while the mother tongues initially aimed to help individuals retain their sense of identity and values. However, in early 2000, the government realised that making cultural education the aim of Mother Tongue was causing it to lose status and thus, started emphasizing the economic significance of Chinese and other mother tongues. Similarly, Wee found that the reason against Singlish was for Singaporeans to ensure global competitiveness as the state believes that constant use of Singlish will cause deterioration of English (SSE) Proficiency and SSE is seen to have a greater value in the global economy. Thus, the Speak Good English movement is merely a guideline set by the Government to guide us towards future economic policy through the mastery of SSE and speaking Singlish is not frowned upon provided that it does not negatively affect our proficiency in SSE. In this case, going by the principle of ‘linguistic instrumentalism’, it is fair to extrapolate that any use of CSE by the government, is meant to result in competitive advantage that can be yielded, with Singlish used as an instrument here

### 2.3 Correlation between Language and Political Appeal

Indeed, the use of the vernacular (ie. Singlish) has shown to affect the political appeal of the politician, however the reason behind that is highly debated on. A study by Ricks (2018) in Thailand, concluded that the type of language used has a direct correlation to the public opinion of a politician. Ricks conducted a survey on 750 Thais to determine whether the language, the

formal or native tongue, has a bearing on people's perception of the politician. The writer found that the formal register generally evoked an impression that the speaker is fit for political office, especially in terms of preparation and education. However, the ethnic tongue resulted in higher positive responses on persuasiveness, as well as increased feelings of kinship and higher electoral support compared to the formal register, as people were drawn to the co-ethnic appeal of the native tongue. On the other hand, Albertson (2014) argues that it is not the language per se, but rather the terminology that affects the political appeal. She found that in the US, people were more willing to vote for a candidate and had a better impression of a candidate when he used terminology specific to their social group (eg. racial or religious signals).

#### 2.4 Linguistic Persuasion in the Singapore National Day Rally

Yet another linguistic factor affecting political appeal is proposed by Tan (2007) in his analysis of the annual Singapore National Day Rally. Tan found that the format of National Day Rallies over the years were of a similar format, beginning with an assertion of national vulnerability, achievements and challenges, followed by the call to Singaporeans to unite. Tan also found the annual rallies to be a platform for announcing and justifying major policy changes and act as a moment of closure on public debates that spring from controversial and unpopular, but "necessary" decisions. In addition, Tan found the speech to be laced with local slang in the various languages as well as peppered with vivid real-life examples made to be the role models of the nation. This attempt by the government to connect with the audience on a very personal and cultural level is clear, and aligns with Khoo's findings.

A recent article done by The Straits Times on a study analysing race, religion and language (Mathews, et al., 2020) also finds that “there is wide acceptance that English should be the language used as far as possible in the public space.” The study found that overall, 47% of Singaporeans agree or strongly agree that English Language should be used in the public sphere, while 24% of respondents indicated that they somewhat agree, and 30% disagreeing. Furthermore, regarding the appropriateness of Singlish in various contexts, “approximately two-thirds of respondents indicated it was “never appropriate” or “rarely appropriate” for government officials or Members of Parliament (MPs) to use Singlish in their speeches for public consumption” (p. 91). This aligns with Khoo and Ricks’ findings that the formal variety of English is fit for political office.

### 2.5 Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis

Lastly, the framework this paper utilises to analyse political speeches is the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) by Fairclough (1992). Fairclough argues that text should be analyzed as a social practice through the lens of discourse in both speaking and writing, and suggests that the text be looked at from a three-dimensional approach. The first dimension ‘discourse as text’ aims to study the textual features of discourses, that is ‘how is the text designed, why it is designed in this way, and how else could it have been designed?’ (Fairclough 1995, p. 202). The second dimension is the discursive practice which involves the production, distribution and consumption of texts. The discursive practice is the process through which writers (or journalists) produce texts, and readers or receivers use and understand them (Richardson, 2007). Lastly, the last and third dimension of Fairclough’s model is discourse as social practice which is

embedded and draws on the concepts of ideology, power and hegemony (Hamuddin, 2017). This allows the analysis of the speeches to encompass both the literary and social points of views to provide a better picture.

## 2.6 Research Direction

In summary, Khoo (2015), Ricks (2018) and Mathews, et al. (2020) all agree that the formal variety of English is suitable for political office. However, there are varying opinions on use of the informal variety in the political context, with Khoo suggesting that it fosters connection with the people, while too much may seem out of touch, and Ricks suggesting that the usage of the vernacular may be more persuasive, garnering higher electoral support. On the other hand, Albertson (2014) argues that only local terminology results in connection, and Tan (2007) also suggests that use of CSE results in greater connection with the locals. This gap in the current research presents a need to analyse both the use and the purpose of CSE, and study the effects of the use of CSE in political speeches. As such, this paper will be utilizing Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (1992) to study the effects and purpose of the usage of Singlish in Political Speeches in Singapore.

### **Chapter 3: Methodology**

This paper will be analysing 3 of PM Lee Hsien Loong's speeches, namely one rally speech during the GE 2020, one National Day Rally speech and one of his speeches addressing the nation during the COVID-19 circuit breaker period to view the difference in usage of CSE in different situations. Furthermore, Lee being the Secretary-General, his usage of CSE and intentions behind doing so should accurately reflect the intentions of the rest of the PAP in their usage of CSE, hence the choice to use Lee's speeches for this paper.

To analyse the speeches, this research will be utilizing the Critical Discourse Analysis Framework (Fairclough, 1992). The CDA suggests a three-dimensional approach at looking at the text, and the first dimension 'discourse as text' aims to study the textual features of discourses, that is 'how is the text designed, why is it designed in this way, and how else could it have been designed?' (Fairclough 1995, p. 202). The second dimension is the discursive practice which involves the production, distribution and consumption of texts. The discursive practice is the process through which writers (or journalists) produce texts, and readers or receivers use and understand them (Richardson, 2007). Lastly, the last and third dimension of Fairclough's model is discourse as social practice which is embedded and draws on the concepts of ideology, power and hegemony (Hamuddin, 2017).

Through analysing the various modes of speeches that Lee has done, this paper hopes to gain insight into the differences in intention behind using Singlish in various political circumstances, and through that, be able to better understand how Singlish is used as a Political Tool.

## **Chapter 4: Results and Analysis**

In this Section, this paper will be analysing 3 speeches namely the speeches during the Circuit Breaker, the National Day Rally Speech delivered by PM Lee and lastly, a rally speech delivered by PM Lee during GE2015.

### **4.1 Circuit Breaker Speeches**

#### **4.1.1 Textual Features (Micro)**

One notable feature of the speech is the use of words to signify closeness and unity, such as “fellow”, “our”, or “we”, which is a pronoun that appears countless times in the speech.

In addition, the tone of the speech is very firm and confident. Lee uses anaphora in “Do not fear. Do not lose heart. Singapore will not falter in its onward march”. This has an authoritative tone to it instructing Singaporeans to stay strong, and the repetition of “do not” evokes a sense of hope, that after this season is over, Singapore will return to the bustling city it once was. Furthermore, the word “falter” suggests that COVID-19 is merely a small problem in the big picture, and Singapore will easily recover from it, without much repercussions.

#### **4.1.2 Discursive Practice (Meso)**

The form of this speech is in a video released to the public by the Government, due to the circumstances that Singapore is undergoing the Circuit Breaker, therefore live audiences are not allowed. In addition, the target audience is Singaporeans as well as foreign press and potentially people from all around the world.

The speech starts off with the economic impact of the pandemic, followed by reasons for Singapore to remain confident and is ended by a rhetoric on why Singaporeans have a part to play, using the Singapore Story to evoke a sense of patriotism and reassure Singaporeans that Singapore has been through tougher times than this, and we will be able to ride out the storm. He also cites examples of Singaporeans who have stepped up during the crisis to help those in need, using them as role models for all Singaporeans to follow.

In addition, the language used in this speech mainly consists of SSE, in contrast to the style of the GE2015 speeches, with occasional dialect phrases or CSE thrown into the speech, with the tone of the speech being firm and unyielding.

#### 4.1.3 Social Practice (Macro)

This speech is one spoken by PM Lee (2020) at the end of Singapore's circuit breaker lasting from 7 Apr to 1 Jun 2020. The context of this speech lies in the period of the COVID-19 pandemic where as of 9 Aug, there are 724K deaths and 19.5M confirmed cases, hence the severity of this issue, which also explains the economic impact due to many countries coming under lock down in order to keep imported cases to a minimum.

As the circuit breaker is coming to an end and people can soon go out freely again, the government is reminding Singaporeans of the severity of the pandemic and thus, encourage them to continue carrying out safe distancing measures, wear masks and maintain personal hygiene. The lack of CSE can be explained by the fact that COVID-19 is a serious topic that cannot be taken lightly as it concerns the safety of Singaporeans, and the government urgently needs

Singaporeans cooperation in order to keep community cases to a minimum even after the circuit breaker measures are lifted.

Furthermore, COVID-19 not only causes physical health concerns but also results in a number of psychological disorders, and can impact the mental health of people in different communities (Salari, N., et al., 2020). Many people are anxious and worried about the virus, hence Lee uses a firm but reassuring tone to convince Singaporeans that Singapore is still doing okay and that we have sufficient resources to combat the virus, and cites various data to show that Singapore is not doing too badly economically, and is able to rebound. He also addresses worries such as food shortage, and reassures Singaporeans that we are still able to import food from alternative sources.

Next, for the GE2015 rally speech.

## 4.2 GE2015 Speech

### 4.2.1 Textual Features (Micro):

Firstly, he mixes in other languages such as Malay and Chinese into his speech, as well uses informal phrasing in his speech, as compared to the formal SSE in the above speech. One example is when he is talking about Medisafe Life, which in 2015, was an upcoming project by the government for basic life insurance for all Singaporeans. He uses the phrase “akan datang, coming very soon” to describe this initiative. The malay phrase “akan datang” is a commonly used phrase to describe movies that are coming soon, hence, by using this, Lee is telling everyone that there is much to look forward to in this initiative.

In another instance, Lee criticizes the opposition for only criticizing the PAP in rally speeches and not in Parliament, using the phrase “初一十五不一样” to describe them. This phrase suggests that they are two-faced, and they only raise up issues in rally speeches to appeal to emotion while staying silent in parliament, and elaborates using an example of Pritam Singh opposing the Budget in his rally speeches, while on the contrary, he fully supported it in Parliament.

He continues by saying “PAP MPs also can do...the tiger comes out (election rallies)” and criticizing the opposition’s policies quoting them: “I have no master plan. If I win, I will take your master plan. Your master plan becomes my master plan. I also can!”. In these two lines, we can see the use of epistrophe in the repetition of the phrase “I also can”.

In addition, he also uses grammatically incorrect English, considered to be CSE in this phrase. This is in contrast to the grammatically correct SSE he uses in the majority of the speech. This use of CSE allows the sentence to be short and catchy, leaving a lasting impact on the audience. This allows the main point of the sentence to be clearer, which is that the PAP is able to achieve whatever the WP claims they are bringing to the table. Furthermore, this kind of grammatically incorrect English is what Singaporeans are used to hearing in the daily context, be it in the hawker centers or in daily conversations with the people around us. As such, it gives the sense that Lee is one with the people, and has a good understanding of the mannerisms of the ground.

Another interpretation would be that he is making a joke out of it, using the juxtaposition between the CSE and SSE. SSE is considered to be the formal language to discuss policies, whereas CSE is largely used for simple conversation and is rarely used in educated discussions. As such, by using this phrase to answer to the policies of the opposition, Lee is belittling the

opposition by giving such an informal answer, using a form of English that is uncharacteristic of a formal discussion regarding policies and the manifesto of the opposition.

#### 4.2.2 Discursive Practice (Meso)

This speech was presented in front of a live audience at a live Rally in Jalan Besar GRC. As such, this allows for a greater connection between Lee and the audience, as it is more engaging compared to the online Circuit Breaker speeches where he was just interacting with the camera. The target audience of this is Singaporeans, as it influences their voting decisions and the policies that are released by the new elected government will also directly affect them.

#### 4.2.3 Social Practice (Macro)

The GE Speeches during the Campaigning period are speeches made by the political candidates to garner support for their party in the upcoming elections (ie. the 2015 GE). As such, the tone of the speech is more informal, as the political parties tend to want to build a connection with the residents, and find common ground with them. In the case of the PAP in this speech, Lee is using a mix of different languages to illustrate various points that the PAP has done, and also uses it to poke fun at the opposition. The use of this is to convey his points in a succinct manner such that the audience will easily remember various points in his speech.

Lastly, the National Day Rally speech from 2006.

### 4.3 National Day Rally Speech

#### 4.3.1 Textual Features (Micro):

Similar to the Circuit Breaker Speeches, this speech, along with the other years one, does not utilize much CSE and uses mostly SSE. Lee starts off with the phrase “friends and fellow Singaporeans”, which connotes a sense of unity and closeness among Singaporeans. He also uses the phrase “respond as a nation”, which suggests that all Singaporeans have a part to play in Singapore’s success and decision making.

In addition, in the speech, Lee mentions “who is going to be here in Singapore, jaga rumah, looking after the home, keeping Singapore dynamic, vibrant, beating?”. This phrase was used in the context of many Singaporeans going overseas to pursue their careers, which causes the worry that there will be a lack of “talented and skilled Singaporeans to keep this place going”. In that excerpt, he code-switches from Malay back to SSE, and the interchangeability of phrases from different languages demonstrates that Singapore is a melting pot of cultures coexisting together

Another interesting phrase that was used in this speech was “You put out a funny podcast. You talk about bak chor mee. I will say mee siam mai hum!” This phrase “mee siam mai hum” became the brunt of many memes and jokes that year, due to the fact that mee siam in fact does not contain any hum (blood cockles). He used this as an example for the downsides of unregulated free speech on the new media, and mentioned that if people were allowed to speak freely, this would result in the “tone of the debate...down eventually, you race to the bottom”, due to the high possibility of personal attacks, fake news and other arguments prevailing over the main issue itself from people who want to prove themselves right, preventing an effective discussion of national issues.

#### 4.3.2 Discursive Practice (Meso)

The form of this is a speech, in front of a live audience, which consists mainly of Parliament Members and Government Officials. For the rest of the nation, the speech is streamed online via media channels. The target audience of this speech would be all Singaporeans, including ones overseas. The event would also be covered by foreign press, as the speech encompasses Singapore's achievements in the previous year and its goals for the next couple of years.

In his speech, one recurring theme is that he uses a lot of concrete examples and numbers to illustrate Singapore's success in the various fields, and to emphasize Singapore's respectable standing in the world stage. Quoting his speech, "our reputation is on the line...the IMF and World Bank are having their annual meetings in Singapore. There will be 16,000 delegates and visitors here". In this example, using the large number of 16,000 and the names of large international organizations such as IMF, he conveys the message that Singapore has a name on the world stage, so much so that large corporations are willing to host their meetings in Singapore. This further solidifies Singaporean's impression of their country as a country that is respected on the world stage, and their government as a capable one that can continue to bring Singapore to greater heights.

#### 4.3.3 Social Practice (Macro)

The National Day Rally speech is an annual address that the Prime Minister of Singapore makes to the entire nation. A yearly event since 1966, the Prime Minister uses the rally to address the nation on its key challenges and announce major policy changes. ("Singapore

National Day Rally”, n.d.). Compared to the election speeches, this is more formal and the use of it is more to lay out the plans for the following year and announce changes. This is shown by the large amount of numbers and data used in the speech, as it is meant to be an informative speech rather than a rhetoric. As such, it calls for a more formal tone, hence the use of more SSE rather than CSE.

For the comment on “mee siam mai hum”, as mentioned earlier, it was meant to draw a connection between the government and the ground and to demonstrate understanding of the people, but this is one instance that it backfired. 14 years after, it has continued to be remembered as a meme, and has been compared to the likes of Chan Chun Sing’s comment on cotton coming from sheeps during the Circuit Breaker period. One recent comment on the Hardwarezone forums commented that “In From Lee’s incorrect statement on such a common Singaporean food, many drew the conclusion that he was extremely out of touch with the ground, contrary to the original intention of finding common ground with the people through mention of popular hawker fare. There is even a book called “Mee Siam Mai Hum: Some of the Darnedest Things Our Politicians Say”, that contains anecdotes of factually or socially incorrect things that our politicians say.

## **Chapter 5: Discussion and Interpretation**

### **5.1 Diglossia in usage of CSE and SSE**

In Singapore, the 2 commonly spoken forms are SSE and CSE. The vernacular CSE is known as the low variety, whereas SSE, the more formal of the two, is known as the high variety. The distinction between the two lies in the fact that the high variety is used in formal contexts, whereas the low variety is more commonly seen in everyday conversations among the community.

This clear demarcation is clear when we look at the target audience of the speeches, as in two speeches that have little CSE, namely the National Day Rally speech and the Circuit Breaker speeches, the target audience of these not only include Singaporeans, but also include foreign press and attract international viewership. Furthermore, these two speeches tend to carry a more formal tone, as the issues addressed by these two speeches are more serious and content heavy.

In addition, the medium of these two speeches are of a more formal context, with less room of communication between the audience and the speaker. Another factor is that these speeches are informative rather than in the form of a rhetoric as can be seen in the GE2015 speech. For example, in the Circuit Breaker speech, it is using the video medium and thus, there is little communication and connection between the speaker and the audience, and the main purpose is to alert Singaporeans about the current economic state and reassure them that we are able to ride out the storm. In the case of the National Day Rally, it is presented to a small live audience consisting of elected MPs and Ministers. For the rest of the public, the National Day Rally is televised live over television, while the purpose is to inform Singaporeans of the upcoming plans as well as achievements over the past year. This medium is similar to the Circuit

Breaker Speech, excluding the small live audience, as it is also televised live over various media platforms.

These have an effect on the usage of CSE, as CSE is targeted towards the masses and to create a connection with the audience. In the form of the National Day Rally and the Circuit Breaker speeches, there is no live audience consisting of the masses and only fellow members of Parliament, thus there is no use for CSE to forge a connection. Furthermore, CSE is more frequently used in rhetoric rather than informative speeches.

In comparison, the GE2015 speech utilizes more of CSE, also known as the low variety, which can be explained by the target audience being only Singaporeans, and the presence of a live audience consisting of the masses. The speech is also less content heavy and more focused on the rhetoric swaying voters toward the PAP as well as poking fun at the opposition's manifestos, as mentioned in the earlier section.

## 5.2 Purpose of Singlish in various speeches

One of the common reasons behind the code-switching from SSE to CSE is to create a connection between the ground and the politician through relatable subjects. In the GE2015 speech, he instead uses CSE in the phrase "I also can!", which is reflective of the way the ground speaks, and is used to ridicule the opposition's manifesto and reasons given on why the people should vote for them over the ruling party.

Another usage of CSE is to poke fun at the opposition, as well as to make the points memorable and succinct. In the GE2015 speech, the phrase "I also can!" was emphasized and the use of CSE allowed the sentence to be straight to the point, making it more memorable for the

audience. One of the features of CSE is that the sentences are shortened until only keywords are kept. As such, it is used to argue against the opposition's manifesto and promises.

The usage of CSE also allows Lee to create a positive connotation around a certain point or policy that they are going to roll out. For example, in the GE2015 speech, he uses the Malay phrase "akan datang" to describe the upcoming Medisafe Life project. As akan datang is a common phrase used to describe upcoming movies, it gives the connotation that it is exciting and something to look forward to.

However, the "mee siam mai hum" phrase used in the National Day Rally speech is one example of where usage of CSE to establish connection with the matters can backfire, and give the opposite effect. As mentioned above, mee siam in fact does not contain any hum, and many people saw his comment as being out of touch with the masses instead.

## **Chapter 6: Conclusion**

### **6.1 General Conclusion**

Singapore is indeed a society where 2 forms of English can coexist together, spoken by the same people but with different objectives. The concept of diglossia is present in the political context, with more CSE used with a live audience consisting of the masses in order to forge connections with the ground, whereas SSE is used where the target audience includes foreign viewers and the speech is informative rather than rhetoric. The use of CSE mainly depends on the target audience, medium of speech and the intended outcome being informative or persuasive, with informative speeches typically using primarily SSE and rhetorics consisting of more CSE.

### **6.2 Limitations**

Although using the CDA allows for a well-rounded analysis, all the analysis presented in this paper are from a view of an analyst and might not be representative of the intentions of Lee in utilizing CSE in his speeches. In addition, only the speeches of one politician are analysed, which may make the findings not completely representative of all politicians.

### **6.3 Future Research**

One area of future research would be to do analysis on the speeches of other politicians. This would allow for comparison between use of CSE of different politicians, and provide a more well rounded conclusion that would be representative of a larger demographic of

politicians. For example, research could be done on political figures such as Low Thia Kiang, who was known for his teochew speeches and his ability to connect with the people.

## **Bibliography**

1. Khoo, V (2015). Term paper - Singlish in the political environment: an indexical look at the ideologies behind language in Singapore. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/6064365/Term\\_paper\\_-\\_Singlish\\_in\\_the\\_political\\_environment\\_an\\_indexical\\_look\\_at\\_the\\_ideologies\\_behind\\_language\\_in\\_Singapore](https://www.academia.edu/6064365/Term_paper_-_Singlish_in_the_political_environment_an_indexical_look_at_the_ideologies_behind_language_in_Singapore)
2. Wee, L (2010). Linguistic Instrumentalism in Singapore. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/d972/f451e7bd6ecd98d02502555c364d3a7a2b20.pdf>.
3. Tan, K (2007). Singapore's National Day Rally Speech: A Site of Ideological Negotiation. *Journal of Contemporary Asia* \ Routledge Vol. 37, No. 3 (pp. 292-308). Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232968552\\_Singapore's\\_National\\_Day\\_Rally\\_speech\\_A\\_site\\_of\\_ideological\\_negotiation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232968552_Singapore's_National_Day_Rally_speech_A_site_of_ideological_negotiation)
4. Ricks, J (2018). The effect of language on voter opinion: Results from a survey experiment in Thailand. Retrieved from [https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3785&context=soas\\_research](https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3785&context=soas_research).
5. Albertson (2014). Dog-Whistle Politics: Multivocal Communication and Religious Appeals. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271919673\\_Dog-Whistle\\_Politics\\_Multivocal\\_Communication\\_and\\_Religious\\_Appeals](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271919673_Dog-Whistle_Politics_Multivocal_Communication_and_Religious_Appeals).
6. Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281506450\\_Critical\\_Discourse\\_Analysis](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281506450_Critical_Discourse_Analysis).

7. <https://forums.hardwarezone.com.sg/current-affairs-lounge-17/chan-chun-sing-3200304-2.html>
8. Ang, J. (2020, June 16). Majority feel public interaction should be in English: Study. *The Straits Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/majority-feel-public-interaction-should-be-in-english-study>
9. Mathews, M., Tay, M., Selvarajan, S. & Tan, Z. H. (2020). Language Proficiency, Identity & Management: Results from the IPS Survey on Race, Religion & Language. Retrieved from <https://lkyspp.nus.edu.sg/docs/default-source/ips/ips-exchange-series-15.pdf>
10. Hamuddin, B. (2017). DISCOURSE ON MEDIA: Bringing Hot News into ELT's Classroom Discussion. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326123711\\_DISCOURSE\\_ON\\_MEDIA\\_Bringing\\_Hot\\_News\\_into\\_ELT's\\_Classroom\\_Discussion](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326123711_DISCOURSE_ON_MEDIA_Bringing_Hot_News_into_ELT's_Classroom_Discussion)
11. Richardson, J. (2007). Analysing Newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315685383\\_Analysing\\_Newspapers\\_An\\_approach\\_from\\_critical\\_discourse\\_analysis](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315685383_Analysing_Newspapers_An_approach_from_critical_discourse_analysis)
12. Lee, H. L. (2020). PM Lee Hsien Loong: Overcoming the crisis of a generation. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.sg/article/pm-lee-hsien-loong-overcoming-the-crisis-of-a-generation>

13. <https://www.straitstimes.com/politics/singapolitics/mr-lees-death-sg50-helped-sway-vote-rs-dr-ng>
14. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tqo25bqcBnU&t=211s>
15. Ngerng, R. (2020). What Does Data Tell Us About Singapore's General Elections? [Photograph]. Retrieved from <https://international.thenewslens.com/article/137665>
16. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ReEHqy6ZARU>
17. <https://forums.hardwarezone.com.sg/eat-drink-man-woman-16/mystery-resolved-mee-siam-mai-hum-cotton-sheep-6305765.html>
18. Salari, N., Hosseinian-Far, A., Jalali, R., Vaisi-Raygani, A., Rasoulpoor, S., Mohammadi, M., Rasoulpoor, S. & Khaledi-Paveh, B. Prevalence of stress, anxiety, depression among the general population during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Retrieved from <https://globalizationandhealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12992-020-00589-w>