Rekindling the *kampong* spirit: Fostering a sense of belonging through community theatre in Singapore

**INTRODUCTION**

In post-World War Two Singapore, housing became the first major aspect of change as the country began to develop into a modern city-state. In order to address the housing shortage, the Singapore government embarked on a major public housing programme in the 1960s, effectively seeking to resettle residents who were living in ‘cramped and environmentally hazardous rural kampongs [villages]’ (Jones and Shaw 2006: 124). By compulsorily acquiring land under the 1967 Land Acquisition Act, the government constructed high-rise public housing estates, thereby moving kampong dwellers into redeveloped ‘new towns’ (Wong 2011: 2). While this shift meant that the majority of citizens were provided with a higher standard of housing, the mass relocation of people seemed to undermine the social fabric of community and the ways in which people interacted (Walter 1978: 236). Singaporeans bemoaned the loss of the ‘kampong spirit’, a colloquial term often used to refer to the sense of community and neighbourliness felt whilst living in villages. Chia (2013: 11) explains the kampong spirit in more detail:

> [It] describes the coming together of the community to help and sustain each other. Multi-racial communities lived in the kampong like an extended family where everyone’s doors were kept open, neighbours kept a look-out for each other, and the children played with one another without any thought of discriminating against the others for being of a different race. This is the kampong spirit at its best.

Walter (1978: 236) acknowledges government’s awareness of the erosion of people’s social foundations and its subsequent efforts at countering it. Similarly, Wong, Ooi and Ponniah (1985) note the how the government sought to encourage community building within housing estates through the provision of common spaces such as void decks and playgrounds. Community-building programs and policies were put in place to ‘develop cohesive neighbourhoods in which social bonds are strong’ (Teo and Kong 1997: 45). More than 50 years since Singapore’s first public housing development project, the emphasis on community-building endures as the country continues to progress economically. Reviving the kampong spirit actively forms part of Singapore’s aims at nation-building (Fu 2017).

Currently more than 80% of Singapore’s population live in public housing, which has ‘become synonymous with comfortable, middle class housing’ (Yuen 2004: 23). Of this figure, approximately 90% of Singaporeans residing in public housing own their homes. For families who are unable to afford home ownership, the Housing Development Board (HDB), Singapore’s sole public housing authority, currently offers the Public Rental Scheme. On its website, the HDB claims that its scheme extends to families with ‘no other housing options’ such as the ability to live with their adult children. According to Phang (2007: 30) rental flats represent the social housing sector in Singapore, which has in recent years faced increasing demand by low-income families (Ng 2013: 41).
This paper considers a community theatre project in Singapore, whose work aims at engaging residents from low-income families living in rental flat communities. Led by theatre facilitator Izzaty Ishak, The Community Theatre (TCT) project consists of drama-based workshops and forum theatre performances that are informed by Augusto Boal’s Theatre of the Oppressed (TO) work. Supported by Beyond Social Services, a voluntary welfare organisation, the TCT began in 2014 partly as a response to a perceived view of social work in Singapore being overly structured and prescriptive, which in turn perpetuates a sense of dependency and passivity amongst those living in rental flat communities. According to a report from the organisation, many of the families living in these communities:

- experience a long history of poverty
- face complex and multiple challenges such as incarceration, substance-dependence and prolonged unemployment
- have little community support and are not always identified by helping agencies
- struggle to support as many as five to eight children (Siriwardane 2010: 2)

Theatre and applied drama strategies were thus seen as a way in which residents living in these neighbourhoods could be brought together to actively engage with issues they faced and to have conversations about such issues (Izzaty, interview, 17 November 2016).

I seek to understand how the project reignited the kampong spirit by creating opportunities for the community to build and maintain connections, thereby deepening the affective dimensions of belonging. Because subjective feelings of belonging and the political dimensions of belonging are impossible to separate, I further investigate the extent to which the TCT project enabled participants to become cultural citizens and agents for change.

My examination begins by situating the TCT project within the context of welfare in Singapore. In doing so, I consider how people living in rental flat communities are a marginalized group in society in light of their exclusion from particular narratives of nationhood, and explain why the need for rekindling the kampong spirit in such communities is crucial. By drawing on frameworks for the study of belonging, I then analyse how the TCT project helped participants gain a sense of groundedness and identifications with others, thereby strengthening the relational ties between those involved. Following that, I examine the impact of the project in terms of creating a space for the participants and the community to become agentic, cultural citizens through grassroots activism.

This study is based on researcher observations during the rehearsals for Sayang, the community theatre project’s most recent performance. Sayang is a Malay word that can be a term of endearment, or an expression of regret. I also consider the script, video recordings of the performance event, as well as group discussions and reflections. Additionally, the material informing my research is drawn from interviews and informal conversations with the following research participants:

- Izzaty Ishak, 26-year old theatre facilitator
- Dre, 18-year old volunteer actor from a rental flat community
- Anton, 16-year old volunteer actor from a rental flat community
- Shafie, 17-year old volunteer actor from a rental flat community
Ibu, 45-year old woman from a rental flat community
Faizah, 44-year old woman from a rental flat community

‘WE ARE A NATION OF HOME OWNERS’: LOW-SES COMMUNITIES AND THE INVISIBLE BOUNDARIES OF POLITICAL EXCLUSION

As highlighted earlier, concerted efforts to foster the kampong spirit have become part of Singapore’s nation-building plans. I would then argue that this need becomes even more important for the small percentage of Singaporeans who are considered being of low SES (socioeconomic status). Wong (2011) notes how the lack of home-ownership among low-income groups often results in the deterioration of public housing projects, with accompanying issues such as crime and drugs. Not only does urban poverty seem to be reflected in the physical and social landscape, it also comes into conflict with a political sense of belonging. Itzhaky et al. (2015: 1679) argue that low-SES communities are ‘on the margins of the social power structure’ and claims that those living in these neighbourhoods ‘often feel helpless and alienated from their environment, and are unable to act for themselves’.

In Singapore, low-SES communities residing in rental flats seem to exist on the margins of nationhood. I make this assertion based on particular nation-building narratives related to home ownership. In 2000, the Prime Minister revealed his economic and political goals:

My primary preoccupation was to give every citizen a stake in the country and its future. I wanted a home-owning society. I had seen the contrast between the blocks of low-cost rental flats, badly misused and poorly maintained, and those of house-proud owners, and was convinced that if every family owned its home, the country would be more stable. (cited in Phang 2007: 21)

The views expressed set up an invisible boundary between ‘us’ and ‘them’: those who own their flats and are able to contribute to the stability of the country, and those who live in rental flats and presumably do not take pride in their neighbourhoods. In other narratives of nationhood, the Prime Minister has proclaimed that ‘[w]e are a nation of home-owners’ (Prime Minister’s Office Singapore 2015: para. 37). Additionally, the government has also expressed that ‘[h]ome ownership provides Singaporeans … a tangible stake in the country’ (Ministry of Communications and Information 2013: para. 1). Antonsich’s (2010: 648) argument that economic embeddedness allows people to feel that they have ‘a stake in the future of the place where [they] live’ further reveals the exclusion of low-SES citizens who do not fit into this particular thread of nationhood.

This exclusion is made more challenging when the government’s attitudes towards state welfare are considered. In 2005 budget speech, the Prime Minister shared:

The better-off must help the poor and the disadvantaged … Our social compact is rather different [compared to other developed countries where the state takes on the responsibility]. It is based on personal responsibility, with the family and community playing key roles in
supporting peopled [sic] through difficulties. The state will provide a safety net, but it should be a last resort, not a first resort, and we should focus on the minority who need help the most. We thus avoid state welfare, which will erode our incentive to achieve and sap our will to strive. (cited in Phang 2007: 18)

Teo (2013: 388) identifies that the most important factor in Singapore’s approach to welfare is that of the family as the ‘main party of responsibility’. As such, Teo argues, it is the familial that ‘shapes how welfare is imagined in Singapore’. Rekindling the kampong spirit among rental flat communities – creating an ‘extended family’ – thus becomes crucial not only to strengthen a sense of place-belongingness (defined in the next section), but to engage the community as agentic cultural citizens who themselves become agents of change.

‘YOU ARE NOT ALONE, WE ARE ALL HERE’: FOSTERING THE EMOTIONAL SPACE OF BELONGING THROUGH COMMUNITY THEATRE

Place-belongingness is concerned with the personal, intimate feelings of belonging, or feeling ‘at home’. Drawing on bell hooks, Antonsich (2010: 646) explains that ‘home’ is not merely ‘domestic(ated) space’, but represents ‘a symbolic space of familiarity, comfort, security, and emotional attachment’.

The factors described by Antonsich reflect the essence of the kampong spirit. In order to begin to build a sense of belonging among residents of rental flat communities, it was deemed necessary for the TCT project to (re)create this symbolic space of familiarity in the first instance. The spaces used for the performances were often within the communal spaces of the neighbourhood such as void decks, outdoor badminton courts, or community centres.

The presence of the TCT project became a way to physically bring people together and create opportunities for people in the community to connect with one another. As proposed by Crisp (2010) making connections can be a precursor to belonging, and the responses from the research participants support this. When reflecting on the time when he was a spectator in one of the TCT performances, Anton recalled:

When I first went to the show, I wasn’t really interested. I just went because my friends convinced me to go … [but] just before the performance, I was really looking forward to it, like, everybody was excited … The neighbours gathered all around those areas, making friends. I could sense that kampong spirit.

(Interview, 24 November 2016)

Similarly, the two women from the community spoke about the joy of bringing people together by encouraging their community to attend the performances:

Faizah: We had to spread the word before the day itself, and then on the day, we were like, ‘Don’t forget, it’s 6 o’clock – we will see you down there!’ We emphasize that we want parents to come along … so I will do the invites. I say, ‘Please come along with your kids, watch
together. Even you just listen, if it benefits you, then it’s good. If not, just the bonding time your kids and the community’. I would say that.

[...]

Ibu: In fact, we both enjoy ah, being involved.

Faizah: Ya, because we feel enjoy because we bring all of our community together. And then—

Ibu: We get to pull them … to participate.

Faizah: So when we see these people turn up, and they participate, it’s like, you know that they got the message … It’s like bringing all together, and after we tell them, ‘You are not alone, we are all here. If you need anybody, you can always turn to any of us you see here’.

(Interview, 15 November 2016)

The women’s responses in particular indicate how the act of bringing people together can begin to build a sense of trust, security, and familiarity necessary for creating an affective feeling of belonging to the community. By encouraging the community to ‘turn to any of us you see here’, members of the community become framed as surrogate kin, where the possibility of establishing more dense relations can happen. These dense relations can then further generate a sense of belonging (Antonsich 2010: 647).

It is likely that Faizah and Ibu’s active involvement and attempts to rally their community stem from their own existing sense of belonging. Ibu spoke of how she was ‘very close to [her] neighbours, the community, the children’, and Faizah commented on the commitment she felt towards her community and how she simply ‘cannot sit down [be passive]’ (interview, 15 November 2016). By contrast, a possible reason that some of the youth felt a strong emotional attachment to the TCT group was that they did not feel a sense of belonging in their own homes. When asked about what life in his community felt like, one of the youth revealed:

I don’t feel ‘fresh’ when I’m in my neighbourhood. It feels very abandoned … the area is quite small and I hear there’s a lot of stuff going on, like a lot of police cases, family problems, family fights and stuff. So I don’t feel good there. I don’t usually make friends with my neighbours, or people in my area.

(Anton, interview, 24 November 2016)

In one of the Sayang workshops (17 November 2016) Anton also shared with the group how he had witnessed his step-father hitting his mother, and often felt that there were ‘negative feelings’ in his home even though there weren’t any fights or quarrels. By contrast, Anton said that in the TCT group:

I treat them like really close friends, because we always meet twice a week, and each session we really enjoy it and I think we somehow understand each other … Previously, I don’t like making friends, but
after I joined this community, I feel like, just be kind to one another, just make friends … I’m always looking forward to seeing them. Like, I only meet them twice a week, and after a few days when I’m at work I feel like I miss them … We always meet [only] because of practice, but I wish what could happen maybe we could plan to hang out somewhere else.

(Interview, 24 November 2016)

Shafie, another youth from the TCT project, expressed similar sentiments as Anton. He shared how he felt that ‘home is like hell’, and that due to conflicts at home, he often ‘feel[s] safe with friends’ (personal communication, 17 November 2016). After his performance in Sayang, however, he expressed a strong emotional attachment to the group:

No words can describe how special you guys are to me … you’ve made my life meaningful and helped me a lot in gaining myself back to be a better person. This community theatre means a lot to me. You guys are more than friends, you guys are like my family. Thanks for making my Wednesdays and Thursdays meaningful.

(Personal communication, 8 January 2017)

By examining Anton’s and Shafie’s responses within Antonsich’s framework (2010), it can be understood that the youth felt a sense of rootedness being part of the TCT group: it provided them with comfort and stability where perhaps their homes did not. Even though the two participants had been in the group for less than a year, the developing kinship that is observed in their accounts of the group connects with how ‘[c]onstructions of belonging … reflect emotional investments and desire for attachment’ (Yuval-Davis 2006: 202).

‘I WANT TO GIVE THEM THE SLIGHTEST PIECE OF HOPE’: BECOMING AGENTIC CULTURAL CITIZENS THROUGH COMMUNITY THEATRE

The interviews with the research participants reveal how involvement in the TCT project (whether as volunteer actor or spectator) generated an emotional feeling of belonging where affective care and concern was felt and shown. However, as raised earlier in my discussion, residents of low-SES neighbourhoods tend to be categorized as being ‘on the margins of the social power structure’, ‘unable to act for themselves’ (Itzhaky 2015: 1679) and in the case of Singapore, excluded from particular narrative threads of nationhood. The complex processes of belonging thus need to acknowledge not only emotional dimensions but also the level of agency that people have. Agency, as explained by Giddens (cited in Wille 2011) is the capacity to actually carry out what one intends to do. Wille’s (2011: 92) study finds that ‘a wish to participate [in society] reveals a need to exercise agency, to feel needed as well as a need to feel a sense of self’. The capacity to act thereby enhances one’s sense of belonging. Similarly, if one feels like they belong and are valued, there is an increased tendency to want to engage in meaningful participation.

I am interested here in how the TCT project created a platform for the community to gain more agency and engage them as cultural citizens. The idea of cultural citizenship ‘refers to the right to be different and to belong in a participatory democratic sense’ (Rosaldo
Thus it is not only about the legal elements of citizenship, but takes into account how ‘citizenship is socially and culturally constructed’ and focuses on ‘societal inclusion and belonging’ (Beaman 2015). Building on Jan Pakulski’s work, Beaman (2015: 853) proposes that cultural citizenship involves ‘the right to symbolic presence and visibility’.

If low-SES communities in Singapore experience exclusion from first-class citizenship, perhaps ‘allowing for voice and civic participation would strengthen a sense of ownership and belongingness’ (Tan 2012: 203). One barrier to this however is that the ‘strict control on civic activism [means that] “alternative” local community bonding and grassroots activities are circumscribed to a considerable extent’ (Tan and Neo 2009: 531-532). This control of activism is brought into more focus considering the TCT’s use of forum theatre and the shaky history of forum theatre in Singapore. In 1994, a ten-year proscription was placed on forum theatre following the government’s disapproval as it had ‘no script and encourage[d] spontaneous audience participation [posing] dangers to public order, security and decency’ (cited in Tan 2013: 201). Even though the ‘ban’ has since been removed, Tan (2013: 213) argues that the ‘radicalness of forum theatre is constantly under threat of authoritarian capitalist sanitization, absorption, and repackaging’. He acknowledges however that this ‘respectable [and] attractive packaging’ ensures that forum theatre can ‘survive the coercion of the state’. Despite these contentions, the TCT project through the use of forum theatre strategies revealed possibilities for experimenting with individual and group problem-solving, thereby enabling change in social interactions and well as on a more personal emotional level (Österlind 2008). According to Siriwardane (2010: 6), such grassroots efforts can be considered as complementing support systems currently offered by the state. I extend this line of reasoning however by proposing that the community was able to draw on strategies and assert themselves through acts of cultural citizenship, which considers ‘community activism as the main signifier of belonging’ (Yuval-Davis 2006: 27).

For the young volunteer-actors in the TCT group, they felt that the project provided a space to reflect on their own experiences in relation to the issues explored. During one of the workshops for Sayang, the group explored the tensions between Jamal the young protagonist and his father, Ali. In pairs, the actors improvised a conversation between the two characters on the issue of Ali dating shortly after his wife’s death. When it came to Anton and Shafie’s turn, Anton decided instead, despite his initial hesitation, to share with the group his own experiences of seeing his mother with another man and going through the loss of his father (researcher notes, 17 November 2016). Later he explained to me how he had connected immediately with the issue at hand:

I immediately remembered about my own issues and that’s why I felt I should bring them up to give you guys more idea … This kind of stuff I don’t really like to share with people. I mean, it’s too personal. But what made me want to say it is the fact that we’re performing these issues and … I just want to help you guys get more idea. And that’s why I tell about my story.

(Interview, 24 November 2016).
Anton also admitted that he felt a strong connection to the character of Jamil as he recognized his own story within Jamil’s story (Izzaty, interview, 4 January 2017). This was a similar reflection from Shafie, who shared about his own engagement in at-risk, delinquent behaviour (Izzaty, interview, 16 May 2017).

Nicholson (2005: 66) contends that fictional narratives can illuminate lived experience. Not only did the youth feel a strong sense of connection to the stories told, they found purpose in wanting to perform these stories:

Whatever message I send to them [my community], I hope they will take it and I hope it will make a change – be it in their family or themselves.

(Anton, interview, 24 November 2016)

I saw [the project] as a platform for me, not just to share my story, but do something bigger than that, which is to connect to other people in society, in the community, with my story … I’m from the community coming to do this for my own community.

(Dre, interview, 27 November 2016)

When these stories get shared with the community, they can thus work towards rekindling the kampong spirit. It was important that the stories themselves connected with people who came to attend the performances. As Prentki and Selman (2000: 8) argue, ‘[w]hen a play is directly relevant to audience members’ lives and concerns, a process begins which can lead to deeper understanding and change’. When asked if the TCT performance created any sort of change in her community, Dre responded in the following way:

We grew up in that community where there are drug addicts around … the kids see their parents doing drugs and they think it’s a norm … and if they don’t go to school, the parents don’t do anything. It’s a vicious cycle … I still believe that maybe [with] this project, they see that—I mean, there’s still hope. I want to give them the slightest piece of hope, you don’t have to be in this cycle forever … I was afraid of them thinking, Our life is already like that, that’s it lah, don’t have to do this what, why are you putting so much effort to produce a show and talk about these things? That’s your life, this is our life, and that’s meant to be.

(Interview, 27 November 2016)

While Dre’s response does not clearly identify that a change occurred, the hope that she speaks of indicates the possibility for change. She did however reflect on a change in her relationship to the community and a change in her attitudes towards her father:

They [the audience] were supposed to write a note for Zizi [the character]. There was this letter from a father, and I felt like the letter was a personal letter for me, rather than Zizi. And the letter was like a poem about a dad loving his daughter … it was emotional, I broke
down and after the show it changed everything – it changed my relationship with them [the community].

The parents [later] said, ‘Oh I didn’t know you were going through this. I hope you stay strong. Be nice to your father. Don’t give up on him’. I mean, to be honest, I’d already given up on my father. But when he [the audience member] said that, coming from a father himself, I felt that maybe there’s some truth in it. I mean, if I as a daughter cannot accept my own dad, how are people around him going to accept him?

(Interview, 27 November 2016)

This process of facilitating better understanding and change also emerged strongly through the forum theatre interventions made by the children in the audience. GG explained that when the children stepped in and took over from the actors in the forum theatre pieces, this created more awareness of their real needs:

From [the interventions in the drama], I know that the boy actually need to be perhatian [given attention] … I get to know the kids from this drama … they reveal themselves, who they are, what they want … Probably they can’t say it [their problems], but they will react in [the drama]. But they take it as fun at the same time, but without [the children] realising it, you already know.

(Interview, 15 November 2016)

The deeper insight gained through the forum theatre pieces strengthened the existing relationship between Ibu and the children in her neighbourhood. She explained how the drama allowed her to ‘give them extra’ because she better understood what their needs were. The children, by intervening in the forum theatre pieces, were not only able to voice their needs but also gained a sense of agency by becoming active participants. As Saltmarsh (2016: 251) observes, children are not only affected by political and social forces, but are at the same time ‘active, agentive participants in social life’. Izzaty recalled a significant incident from a previous forum theatre performance that dealt with family violence. Per forum theatre conventions, the piece was played through once uninterrupted. When it was played to the audience a second time, a young boy called out to stop the scene in which the Father character slapped the Mother, and asked to replace one of the younger characters. During the replay of the scene however, the boy found himself unable to act. Upon asking what his intentions were, the boy explained to Izzaty that he had wanted to prevent the slap from happening but became afraid of what the Father would do to him. Izzaty then asked if he would like another turn and he accepted. One his second attempt, the young boy found the courage not only to stop the Father’s actions, but even tried to get the Father to stay and talk about the issue. Izzaty shared her memory of the event with me:

He took over the [actor] to stop the Father from slapping the Mother. At first he felt he couldn’t say ‘Stop’ to the Father at all. He was so scared. So I asked him, ‘Do you want to try one more time?’ So he
tried, and he finally could say ‘Stop’. But something interesting happened. The Father began to walk away and the boy turned to him and said, ‘Stop. Don’t go away.’ Nobody saw that coming. He wanted stop the Father from slapping the Mother, but he also wanted him to be part of the conversation.

(Izzaty, interview, 17 November 2016)

The boy’s actions initiated more sharing from the community. After the scene, one of the women in the audience raised her hand, stood up and moved to the front of the audience where she could address all the children. Drawing from her own personal experience, she advised:

You can say no to your parents when something like this happens … I went through the same thing, where my husband was being very [aggressive]. And [my son] had to come and stop the whole thing. That was when I felt very protected by my own children, and you can protect your parents also.

(Izzaty, interview, 17 November 2016)

Another similar moment occurred during the performance of Sayang, with particular reference to the following scene where Ali threatens his son Jamil:

Ali: Kau jangan biadap dengan aku [Don’t be rude to me]. (To the social worker) You see? I’m so tired.
Jamil: Tired of finding girlfriends.
Ali: What did you say? Don’t make me send you to the Boys’ Home! See if they sayang [care for] you over there! Menyusahkan orang [Such a burden].

(Excerpt from script)

When Izzaty asked if the audience had further feedback to offer, a woman from the community came forward and encouraged the parents in attendance to listen to their children and to communicate more openly with them. This woman had herself said similar words to her daughter, who ended up being sent to live in a home for girls (Izzaty, personal communication, 21 December 2016).

From moments such as those I have mentioned, it can be understood that because the issues and stories explored in the performances were relevant to the lives of the community, it gave participants a greater sense of purpose in contributing to the discussion, either by offering advice drawn from their own experiences, or attempting to intervene in the forum theatre pieces. These moments need to be viewed as acts of grassroots activism and cultural citizenship, where the community could exercise greater agency and gain recognition as valuable members of society. As highlighted earlier the ‘right to symbolic presence and visibility’ (Beaman 2015: 853) is a key tenet of cultural citizenship, and it is worth noting
that the work of the TCT has recently been acknowledged by the national newspaper (see Sin 2017).

**CONCLUSION**

The ideologies underpinning Boal’s Theatre of the Oppressed are that ‘values, power structures and the oppression of society are embedded in the smallest social units, like the family, and in the ordinary events of daily life’ (Österlind 2008: 75). The TCT project, which is informed by Boal’s work, can thus be considered an alternative form of resistance in a country known for its political stability, one that has long had an authoritarian regime (Slater 2012). In a sense, this resistance by the TCT project can be thought of as an attempt to challenge the perception that social work creates cycles of dependency amongst those living in rental flat communities. More importantly, I believe that TCT project is a ‘symbolic weapon that facilitates articulation and social activism within marginalized groups’ (Lev-Aladgem 2010: 369).

Yuval-Davis (2006: 201) emphasizes the ‘crucial emancipatory importance’ of making visible the various social divisions created by social power axes. The need to understand how belonging is constructed and performed by the group of people in my paper is important for two main reasons: (1) the youth members of the TCT project are considered ‘vulnerable’ in terms of the distribution of power afforded to them (Lähdesmäki et al. 2016: 240) and (2) as outlined previously, those who come from low SES backgrounds and who live in rental flats are written out of particular strands in the nation-building narrative.

Rekindling the kampong spirit ignites both the affective and political dimensions of belonging. By creating opportunities for the community to gather, share their stories, and actively participate in examining social issues, a process of becoming an extended family is set into motion. This kinship, a critical feature of the kampong spirit, is a legitimate and culturally-informed way for the community to stake a claim in the nation’s ideal.
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