

Singapore Management University

## Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

---

Research Collection School of Social Sciences

School of Social Sciences

---

4-2022

### Class(ify)ing Christianity in Singapore: Tracing the interlinked spaces of privilege and position

Orlando WOODS

*Singapore Management University*, [orlandowoods@smu.edu.sg](mailto:orlandowoods@smu.edu.sg)

Lily KONG

*Singapore Management University*, [lilykong@smu.edu.sg](mailto:lilykong@smu.edu.sg)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soss\\_research](https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soss_research)



Part of the [Asian Studies Commons](#), [Religion Commons](#), and the [Sociology of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Citation

WOODS, Orlando, & KONG, Lily.(2022). Class(ify)ing Christianity in Singapore: Tracing the interlinked spaces of privilege and position. *City*, 26(2-3), 373-384.

Available at: [https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soss\\_research/3574](https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soss_research/3574)

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Social Sciences at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection School of Social Sciences by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email [cheryl@smu.edu.sg](mailto:cheryl@smu.edu.sg).

# **Class(ify)ing Christianity in Singapore: Tracing the interlinked spaces of privilege and position**

Orlando Woods & Lily Kong

Published in *City*, 2022, 26 (2-3), 373-384. DOI: 10.1080/13604813.2022.2055927

## **Abstract**

This paper considers how two facets of identity—religion and class—are performed, (re)produced and negotiated within the spaces of the Christian school, home and church in Singapore. We show how the social structuring of one space can inform and influence the structuring of another. Spaces of Christianity in Singapore tend to be mutually reinforcing, strengthening the linkages between religion and class, and in particular reifying the position of Christianity as a religion of the privileged classes. However, the ways in which Christian spaces are reified can become problematic when space is in fact shared with less privileged groups, such as Christians from lower socio-economic classes, and foreign domestic workers. In such instances, the interlinked spaces of Christian privilege and position can cause differences within the community to become points of negotiation and compromise. As a result, they can lead to the social (re)positioning of individuals, and the reproduction of both inclusionary and exclusionary forms of religious citizenship.

## **Keywords**

Christianity, class, identity, interlinked spaces, positioning, Singapore

## **Introduction**

The spaces of a city are defined in relation to the people that occupy them. The movement of people between spaces causes spaces to be connected, and the cumulation of these movements over time creates interlinked spaces where the character of the spaces evidence similarities reflecting the character of the people occupying them. Spaces of the city are interlinked entities that are defined in relation to, or in conjunction with, each other. Our argument is that tracing these interlinkages can provide insight into the ways in which the social structuring of one space might influence the structuring of another. Interlinkages enable the causes and effects of relationality to be traced across the city. This can lead to a range of outcomes. On the one hand, interlinked spaces can reveal efforts to produce a ‘completed horizontality’ (Massey 2005) in which the possibilities for space to evolve are reduced in favour of a more totalising and hegemonic view of spatial purity. Interlinked spaces can strengthen the interlocking ties between facets of identity, meaning that to occupy these spaces can reify the social positioning of people, and can reproduce inclusionary and exclusionary community dynamics. On the other hand, interlinked spaces can also create opportunities for these ties to be renegotiated and potentially overcome, thus revealing the *provisional* nature of these spaces and the extent to which they are implicated in processes of ‘continuous becoming’ that reveal a commitment to the ‘genuine openness of the future’ (Massey 2005, 20, 11). Often, processes of identity strengthening and renegotiation occur simultaneously and foreground spatial politics (Kong and Woods 2019; Woods and Kong 2020a). In turn, these politics reveal a continuum of shifting spatial formations that reflect the making, governing and contesting of urban space.

Whilst intersectional approaches have helped to unravel the multiple, positioned, and relational nature of identity—and the negotiations that emerge when difference is encountered (Valentine 2008; Wilson 2017)—there has been less consideration of the intersectionality of space, and how the linkages between spaces can serve to reinforce, undermine, or otherwise disrupt pre-existing notions of sameness and difference. Intersectional spaces are ‘throwntogether’ in ways that reveal structural interlocks and (in)consistencies across variegated and heterogeneous categories of meaning and relationally defined socio-spatial difference. These are spaces that might, at first blush, be seen to be structurally sedimented along interlocking axes of social alignment and cohesion, but which, upon closer inspection, are imbued with a sense of contingency that is always at risk of being challenged and undone (Massey 2005; Woods 2018, 2019, 2021). The contingent *potential* of these linkages to (re)position individuals in society is pronounced in cities, where spatial constraints and social diversity create situations that result in the gathering of diverse (id)entities into relationally defined places of contestation and compromise (Vertovec 2007, 2019). Because social distinctions often manifest as spatial distinctions, an interlinked perspective offers new ways in which the ‘contingency of identity and [community] belonging’ (Wilson 2017, 452) can be observed and understood. The ‘contingencies’ we explore in this paper concern the intersections of religion and class, and how they are performed, (re)produced and negotiated within the interlinked spaces of the Christian school, home and church in Singapore. We show how the interlinkages between these spaces reify the position of Christianity as a religion of the privileged classes (Woods and Kong 2020a), and how this position is negotiated when space is shared with less privileged groups.

Recognising the intersectionality of space recognises the fact that social distinctions are repeatedly encountered and negotiated throughout the spaces of everyday life, and can therefore be transposed from one space to another. In Singapore, the intersectionality of space causes Christian spaces to be inscribed with distinct forms of language (‘proper’ English), upbringing, and status, causing them to be established as uniquely ‘middle-class’ and thus ‘privileged’. The hostility that emerges from situations of throwntogetherness can be reinforced, and potentially overcome, in response to the structuring logics of intersecting spaces. If hostility is taken to mean the outcomes that emerge from the exclusionary sense of separation—or distinction—that arises from encounters with difference, then class is a point of differentiation through which hostility can be reproduced—or overcome—within spaces of Christianity. In turn, these spaces can either become hostile environments for those that do not accord with the prescriptions of Christian privilege, or harmonious environments (see Gawlewicz in this Special Feature) in which the inclusive *potential* that is embedded within spaces of religion can manifest. Recognising this continuum of outcomes has important ramifications for the management of superdiversity in cities, as it provides insight into the ‘integration of religious ways of being within a public arena shared by others’ (Gökariksel and Secor 2015, 21). This paper therefore highlights the ways in which religion can serve to connect and structure the pluralistic spaces of everyday life, and the processes of negotiation and social othering that can emerge as a result (see Carta in this Special Feature). The two sections that follow explore, first, the interlinked spaces of community, and then the spatial positioning of privilege in Singapore and its (un)doing through encounters in the church.

### **Throwntogetherness and the interlinked spaces of community**

Communities are volatile phenomena. Whilst they are formalised through specific space–time configurations, they also transcend these configurations. This means that spaces of community are often inflected by the attitudes and exclusions embedded within other spaces of everyday life. Where there is alignment across the spaces of community, these attitudes and exclusions can become more entrenched; where there is misalignment, they can become points of tension and negotiation. Accordingly, if space is the ‘sphere in which distinct trajectories coexist; as the sphere therefore of coexisting heterogeneity’ (Massey 2005, 9), we can begin to see the spatial intersectionality of community formation within the broader framework of ‘throwntogetherness’. The tensions and negotiations embedded within such communities are acutely felt in cities, where spatial constraints increase the likelihood of encountering difference—or the ‘heterogeneity’ of which Massey speaks—which in turn can increase the potential for new forms of division and hostility (see Roy et al. in this Special Feature). Augmenting these

divisions is the presence of migrant communities, which tend to cluster in cities and give rise to ‘super-diverse’ populations that are defined by ‘new conjunctions and interaction of variables’ (Vertovec 2007, 1025; Kong and Woods 2018; Vertovec 2019). Whilst questions of diversity, encounter and community have provided a focus of research for many years now, we contend that the role of spatial intersectionality in structuring communities—especially those in which diversity plays a defining role—remains under theorised (Valentine 2008; Kelly 2012; Wilson 2017).

Both religion and class are unstable forms of identification that are constantly being performed and negotiated. When they coalesce, they can become mutually reinforcing (causing religion to become class(ifi)ed), or they can lead to the redefinition of either category. Indeed, as much as religion has the potential to break down boundaries by ‘cultivat[ing] ethnic and national identifications that enable social connection across class and occupational status’ (Johnson 2010, 43; Woods and Kong 2020b), it can enforce them as well. These processes of social repositioning through religious association are often more nuanced amongst migrant groups. For these groups, religion can provide a source of community and belonging (see Carta in this Special Feature). However, because migration is often motivated by socio-economic mobility, it also constitutes ‘a literal and metaphoric space of possibility’ (Johnson 2010, 429). For example, Asor’s (2020, 855) study of Filipino migrants in Seoul, Korea shows how ‘social structures of discrimination, stratification and incivility may be deconstructed through recurring encounters’ that might originate in the church, but which are *renegotiated* through the ad hoc weekend spaces of the clinic, hair salon, café, and more. In this case, whereas ‘purposeful’ encounters between migrants and Koreans serve to reify differences, it is ‘accidental’ encounters that help overcome them. We develop this line of thought further through consideration of the structuring effects of interlinked spaces.

Asor’s (2020) understanding of ‘purposeful’ encounters reflects the fact that communities are often assumed to be distinct socio-spatial entities that are defined in relation to difference. Often, however, this emphasis can obfuscate the connections, tensions and contradictions that have come to define the interlinked nature of urban life. As Dowling (1999, 513) argues, there is a ‘rigidity to class boundaries ... that is lost, and maybe even trivialised, when approached through the language of difference’. This problem is reflected and exacerbated by the ways in which class-based communities are analysed in relation to the spaces they occupy. In this vein, research has shown how class-based identities are often ‘constituted within bounded territorial spaces’ and are therefore understood in terms of ‘geographical containment within a contiguous territory’ (Kelly 2012, 155). Similarly, Fernandes (2004, 2416) has explored the ‘politics of forgetting’ amongst India’s burgeoning middle-classes, which are rooted in ‘attempt[s] to naturalise these processes of exclusion’. In this latter case, we can see how the expression of class-based differences can reflect the imaginary pursuit of an exclusionary ideal. Yet, whilst exclusion may be desired, it is often compromised by the messy socio-spatial inflections of the everyday. Religion exacerbates this complexity; it brings diverse people together, but in doing so it can reproduce exclusion within a framework of inclusion. The idea of socio-spatial distinction that is often assumed to underpin processes of community formation can therefore overlook the interlinkages that cause communities to become either more rigidly defined, or more fluid, constructs as they are mapped across the city. Indeed, embracing these outcomes can reveal the range of spatial formations that define contemporary urban environments.

Interlinked spaces are those in which spatial formations are not treated as static or distinct entities, but are recognised as inflected by the norms and biases of the other spaces that individuals occupy on a day-to-day basis. Seemingly distinct spaces must be recognised as provisional in their formations, and constantly facing the threat of connection and change. Yet, recognising the intersectionality of space is to recognise the sedimented nature of ‘throwntogetherness’, and how some amalgamations of difference might hold together more strongly or coherently than others (after Massey 2005). The strength of these connections depends on the ways in which people engage with, and move between, space. As people move between spaces, they connect them; by connecting them, they structure them, and are simultaneously structured by them. An interlinked perspective thus considers how spaces of community are responsive to the ways in which the social structuring of space can have diffuse outcomes that affect other spaces as well. The ways in which individuals occupy and negotiate these spaces can contribute to

their (re)positioning in society, and the subsequent formation and fracturing of communities. Since ‘interactions between social groups do not always undermine, but often enhance, the boundaries that divide them’ (Lan 2003, 525), there is value in exploring how the boundaries of identity can become more relationally fixed, or fluid, when reproduced across interlinked spaces. For the purposes of this paper, we focus on how the interlinked spaces of the Christian school, home and church can serve to reinforce the privileged position of Christians in Singapore. We also consider how spatial politics of privilege and position manifest when these spaces are shared with other, less privileged people.

### **Tracing the interlinked spaces of privilege and position in Singapore**

Singapore is a religiously pluralistic country that in recent decades has experienced high levels of economic growth. Economic growth has led to the expansion of Singapore’s middle class, which has occurred alongside the growth in the Christian population since the 1980s. As a result, the Christian community now tends to be over-represented amongst the middle and upper middle classes (Woods and Kong 2020a). There is, however, an important degree of diversity within this overall picture of privilege. Privilege is most coherently associated with ‘cradle’ Christians—that is, those born into multi-generational Christian families that tend to be associated with mainline denominations. They represent what Chong (2015, 224) defines as the ‘established’ middle class that has ‘better education, parents from more privileged socio-economic and English-speaking backgrounds, and to have lived in private property’. The idea of privilege becomes more diluted and nuanced amongst Christian ‘converts’ who tend to be relatively new to Christianity, and are associated with evangelical megachurches. These Christians comprise what Chong (ibid.) defines as the ‘emergent’ middle class that ‘come[s] from less privileged socio-economic and non-English-speaking backgrounds, and ... live[s] in public housing’. Importantly, Christian converts are ‘likely to have been economically marginalised during the country’s industrialising years *in light of* their linguistic and educational background’ (Chong ibid., emphasis added). Altogether, this has brought about a situation in which Singapore’s Christian community is fractured along at least two lines of difference. One is the established/cradle and emergent/convert distinction outlined above, which is primarily associated with the Singaporean Christian community. Another more clearly observable distinction is between Singaporean Christians and their migrant counterparts, especially domestic helpers.

The empirical subsections that follow draw on 106 in-depth interviews with various Christian stakeholders in Singapore. The interviews were conducted between August 2017 and February 2018 and were part of a project exploring the role of Christianity in (dis)enabling the integration of migrant communities. The project was guided by the question of how spaces of Christianity could open up or close down the possibility for cosmopolitan dialogue between Christians that might otherwise be understood as ‘different’. Whilst this led to a primary focus on the church, it soon became apparent that informal spaces of Christianity—such as the school and home—played an equally important role. This more expansive scope led us to explore the method, extent, and outcomes of spatial interconnection. Of relevance to this paper are 28 interviews conducted with Singaporean Christians, 23 interviews with Singapore-based Christian clergy, eight interviews with Filipino migrants (domestic helpers and working professionals), and nine interviews with Burmese domestic helpers. The recruitment of lay interviewees followed a snowball sampling methodology, whilst for clergy it involved compiling a database of all registered Christian churches in Singapore and then contacting churches representing different denominations. All interviews were transcribed upon completion, coded and analysed for themes. Whilst our sample represented a range of Christian denominations, the ideas presented below resonated most strongly amongst Catholics and mainline Christian denominations (mostly Anglican, Methodist, and Presbyterian). Collectively, these encapsulate the cradle Christians that represent the established middle-class, and which manifest their privileged social status through the spaces they occupy (Kong and Woods 2019; cf. Chong 2015). These manifestations are, however, problematised by the presence and practices of Christian communities that do not fit the same privileged mould. We now explore these ideas further.

## Positioning Christian privilege in space

The privileged position of Singaporean Christians is primarily reproduced through the home, the school, and the church. Importantly, these privileges tend to be reproduced over time, with cradle Christians typically expressing the characteristics below more clearly than Christian converts. The interlinked nature of these spaces serves to structure and enforce such positions of privilege. Patterns of movement between the home, school and church become sedimented over time, creating a structural interlock through which difference is defined. Specifically, Christian schools tend to be environments in which ‘proper’ English is spoken, and contrast with schools in which Singlish is more common. Singlish is the English-based patois that is spoken colloquially in Singapore, and incorporates elements of Chinese, Malay and Tamil into its vocabulary and syntax. This linguistically distinguishes Christian schools from other schools and reflects and reproduces deep-rooted social divisions between Christian and other communities. These divisions manifest when students from non-Christian, or non-*cradle*-Christian households’ study at Christian schools. In these cases, the linguistic inscriptions of the home would contrast with those of the school. For example, a Singaporean female in her early 20s explained how her non-Christian parents sent her to a Christian primary school because it was believed to be ‘a bit more elite ... My parents sent me to that primary school with the intention that they [Christians] have better values and upbringing’. She went on to recall the language-related judgement she encountered:

If I spoke Singlish, it’s very weird ... I remember where there was one incident where I kept saying ‘lame *sia!*’ ... So, they [her classmates] said ‘why did that person keep saying *sia*? It’s like, so Singlish’, I was like ‘OK!’ and I will be more conscious, so I will purposely speak more fluent English. Language can be a point of division that, within the context of the Christian school, is used to position ‘fluent’ English-speakers as *above* those that speak Singlish. A Singaporean female in her mid-20s who was brought up in a Catholic family and went to Catholic schools (up until university) recalled how:

In primary and secondary school, I did not choose my friends based on religion, I think it just so happened. Like, the way we speak, the backgrounds, and we subconsciously came together. Because my friends are more Westernised, we don’t speak Chinese. And then, you know, [we have a] very English-speaking background ... we click.

In Singapore, the Christian identity is often a point of convergence that draws on a range of other factors to do with language, upbringing and worldview. This convergence brings about a situation which the same interviewee described as ‘for Catholics, right, I feel that we’re very Westernised’. Beyond being a point of commonality, however, it also became a point of division: ‘because everyone is very Westernised, we don’t really like Chinese [laughs], OK, in Catholic JC [Junior College], I still remember, the whole school, we just really didn’t like Chinese’. Whilst the interviewee describes here the aversion to Chinese *language*, this aversion is symptomatic of a far more deep-rooted fissure within Singaporean society, which was described by a pastor as both a ‘cultural gap’ and a ‘gulf’ between Christians and non-Christians (Woods and Kong 2020b). The same interviewee experienced this ‘cultural gap’ when she transitioned from her Catholic school to the less distinctly Christian space of the university:

I had a culture shock, I just felt so different [from the others] and I thought the [university] culture will be similar to CJ [Catholic Junior College] culture ... But we all come from different backgrounds. Some of them come from a bit more local, a bit more Singaporean, more local, speak Chinese, and they know dialects. For me, my vocabulary of Singlish words is quite limited, so sometimes I feel like I am not a Singaporean. So ... I had a culture shock, like a fish out of water.

This example reveals the isolating nature of Christian privilege, and how the interlinked nature of Christian churches, schools and homes can serve to distance Christians from their non-Christian counterparts. Taking this idea further, they can be defined in opposition to their ‘more local, more Singaporean ... speak Chinese’ counterparts. Another Singaporean female, who converted to Christianity in her mid-30s, revealed how she only realised how distinct the Christian community was in hindsight, explaining how ‘it’s only when you’re older that you start to think back, like, ‘oh, they are

different’’. Echoing this sentiment, Goh (2015, 137) recently analysed the educational backgrounds of Singapore’s elected parliamentarians in 2011, showing how out of a total of 83, 14 were from Catholic schools, 15 from Protestant mission schools, and 12 alone were from the Methodist-affiliated Anglo-Chinese School (ACS). Altogether, 41 out of 83—just under 50% of *all* parliamentarians—were educated at elite schools of Christian/Catholic heritage. Indeed, the linguistic divisions that manifest through school spaces are often a reflection of the home environment, meaning the privileged position of cradle Christians can be strengthened and reproduced through the interlinked nature of home and school spaces. The same convert quoted above recalled how the cradle Christians at the church she first attended were ‘quite hostile, they don’t really welcome newcomers’ because ‘we are new strangers to them’. As we can begin to see, the privileged position of Singaporean Christians becomes more problematic when space is shared with other, less-privileged Christians. In such cases, hostility can manifest as ‘unwelcomeness’.

### (Un)doing privilege in the church

Sharing space in which people are united by their Christian beliefs, but divided by their positions of relative privilege, can lead to politics that stem from the interlinking of space. Employing foreign domestic helpers to support the needs of a household is a common practice amongst the privileged classes in Singapore, meaning Christian homes can be seen as privileged spaces in which people of different nationalities and classes must coexist. Domestic helpers live and work in close physical, social and cultural proximity to their more privileged employers, with proximity foregrounding the need to negotiate ethno-national, linguistic, and socio-economic differences on a regular basis. Of the Singaporean Christians that we interviewed, it was common for those that employed foreign domestic helpers to employ Christian helpers, often from Burma or the Philippines. Spatial politics emerge when the juxtaposition of different positions of privilege revealed more deep-rooted divisions in attitudes and behaviours (Kong and Woods 2019). A Burmese domestic helper, for example, spoke of how her Christian employer’s bible study session in their home made her feel ‘that I am very low’ as ‘I can feel who wants to talk to me and who don’t want to talk to me’. The home, then, can become a space in which the class-based divisions between different Christian communities in Singapore are established and entrenched. Subsequently, such divisions would often be reproduced within the church, causing the church to become an interlinked, and class(ifi)ed space. A Singaporean church worker explained how:

Singaporeans want people to do work [for them], but Singaporeans will not welcome them among, let’s say, my children—I mean not me *lah*—but my daughter, my wife do not want to come so close to them ... That’s why they are in different groups, we separate them because of this.

The separation explained here is to prevent each group antagonising the other through close contact and interaction. In this sense, distance *from* the other can be seen to be reproduced through disdain *for* the other. This sentiment was echoed by a Filipino domestic helper in her 30s, who claimed that Singaporean churchgoers will ‘look down on you because this is what you do’, which in turn caused her to ‘keep my distance from being in the community, in church activities’. Church leaders used this sentiment to justify the division of their congregations along the lines of the privileged and the less-privileged, professionals and domestic helpers, employers and employees (Woods and Kong 2020). For example, the Filipino pastor of a Catholic church explained how domestic helpers ‘don’t feel comfortable because they feel that they are inferior, they are only helpers’, whilst the Singaporean pastor of a Protestant church reiterated this sentiment, stating how ‘most of them have this inferiority complex, they feel a bit different in class ... they are like the servants’. As a result, many churches have now established dedicated domestic helper ministries that operate independently of the main, Singaporean-dominated congregation. Through these examples, we can begin to see how ‘bordered’ or ‘marginated’ existence can be transformed into spaces of presence’ (Cruz 2006, 15) within the shared space of the church. As a shared space, the church becomes an ‘ever-shifting constellation of trajectories’ (Massey 2005, 151) that are brought together through shared belief. And yet, as Massey

(2005, 151) goes on to assert, the *potential* that emerges from such situations of throwntogetherness is rooted in the fact that

the multiplicity and the chance of space here in the constitution of place provide (an element of) that inevitable contingency which underlies the necessity for the institution of the social and which, at a moment of antagonism, is revealed in particular fractures which pose the question of the political. The question of the political reveals itself through situations of throwntogetherness, in which interlocked spaces start to unravel, and spatial intersectionality starts to become more contingent. For many domestic helpers, their dedicated church spaces can be construed as their home within Singapore, which in turn can cause them to become spaces of empowerment through which they can reposition themselves in Singapore. Repositioning the self in such a way is a strategy through which marginal communities are able to (un)do positions of Christian privilege. One Filipino domestic helper took this idea to the extreme, when she attempted to join a young adult worship community organised by her church; a community that was exclusively comprised of Singaporeans before her joining. A Singaporean in her mid-20s spoke of the struggles she faced in coming to terms with such an overt act of social repositioning:

I remember I felt a bit uncomfortable because, I mean, this is weird. I am not trying to be judgemental or stereotypical, but I have to see her as a friend ... not just [as] a helper ... When she joined us, to be honest, I was also questioning, 'why don't you join a Filipino community? Why did you join us?' The questioning at the end reveals some of the confusion experienced by the Singaporean when the divisions between communities are overcome. The domestic helper did not work for the interviewee's family, but there remained a barrier to 'see[ing] her as a friend' because of her position. This experience also encouraged her to reflect on her relationship with her family's own domestic helper, with her admitting that 'I don't see my helper as, like ... I don't really love her in a sense, you know?'. In this case, as much as the Filipino domestic helper felt empowered enough to reposition herself within the church by joining a group of non-Filipino (and non-domestic helper) Catholics, the fact that she did so on her own terms proved problematic. In other words, this is not a case of the privileged reaching out to the less privileged, but the opposite. Nonconformist practices served to challenge previously held assumptions by overcoming the socio-spatial demarcations of Singaporean and Filipino Catholics, and thus provided a first step towards pursuing integration on her own terms. Yet, as much as examples like this reveal the contingent potential of throwntogetherness, so too do they reveal the sedimented nature of attitudes and prejudices and its enduring capacity to see space as 'thrownapart' (see Abuzaid and Yiftachel in this Special Feature). As the Singaporean Catholic went on to admit, 'I guess we have to practice that, you know, we're not judgemental. I guess, subconsciously, you know that she is a helper and that will affect how you perceive her'. Unexpected triggers like this provide a point from which not only the less privileged can be repositioned in Christian spaces, but the more privileged as well.

## Conclusions

This paper has explored some of the ways in which the interlinked spaces of privilege and position can create problems within the Christian community in Singapore. In doing so, it has shown how the inter-relationship between religion and class—two modalities of identification—is not singular and fixed, but contingent upon a range of factors. As a result, the interlinked nature of Christian spaces can cause the structuring of one space to inform the structuring of other spaces, which in turn can cause exclusions in one domain to be reproduced in another domain as well. In more applied terms, this means that the exclusive nature of Christian schools in Singapore can reflect the privileged statuses of many Christian families, which in turn can fuel more broad-based understandings of Singaporean Christians as 'elites'. This privileged social positioning also informs the demarcation of church space according to 'high' and 'low' status, or employers and employees. Attempts to reconcile these divisions reveal the enduring potential of space to both reproduce, and overcome, difference (see Gawlewicz in this Special Feature). The structuring effects that emerge from interlinked spaces reveal how space can work to (re)position people in society. In Singapore, Christian privilege structures class-based social divisions, which in turn foregrounds the emergence of exclusion and hostility within spaces that are meant to be defined by



acceptance and belonging. The fact that these formations are constantly evolving in response to the social interactions that occur within them reveals the need for attention to be paid to the enduring potential of urban spaces to become interlinked, and thus ‘thrownapart’ as much they are ‘throwntogether’.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Shee Siew Ying for fieldwork assistance, and the editors and anonymous reviewers for helpful feedback on earlier drafts of this paper.

### **Disclosure statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding: This work was supported by the Singapore Ministry of Education, Grant/Award Numbers: 17-C242-SMU-005 and MOE2018-T2-2-102, ‘New Religious Pluralisms in Singapore: Migration, Integration and Difference’.

### **Notes**

1 *Sia* is a suffix usually used to emphasise negative sentiment.

### **References**

- Asor, B. 2020. “‘Strangers Amongst Us’: Migrant-Local Encounters, Religious Spaces and Urban Diversity in Seoul Capital Area.” *City* 24 (5-6): 842–857.
- Chong, T. 2015. “Megachurches in Singapore: The Faith of an Emergent Middle Class.” *Pacific Affairs* 88 (2): 215–235.
- Cruz, G. T. 2006. “Faith on the Edge: Religion and Women in the Context of Migration.” *Feminist Theology* 15 (1): 9–25.
- Dowling, R. 1999. “Classing the Body.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 17: 511–514.
- Fernandes, L. 2004. “The Politics of Forgetting: Class Politics, State Power and the Restructuring of Urban Space in India.” *Urban Studies* 41 (12): 2415–2430.
- Goh, D. P. S. 2015. “Elite Schools, Postcolonial Chineseness and Hegemonic Masculinities in Singapore.” *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 36 (1): 137–155.
- Gökarıksel, B., and A. J. Secor. 2015. “Post-secular Geographies and the Problem of Pluralism: Religion and Everyday Life in Istanbul, Turkey.” *Political Geography* 46: 21–30.
- Johnson, M. 2010. “Diasporic Dreams, Middle - Moralities and Migrant Domestic Workers Among Muslim Filipinos in Saudi Arabia.” *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 11 (3-4): 428–448.
- Kelly, P. F. 2012. “Migration, Transnationalism, and the Spaces of Class Identity.” *PSHEV* 60 (2): 153–186.
- Kong, L., and O. Woods. 2018. “Mobile Bodies, (Im)mobile Beliefs? Religious Accord and Discord as Migratory Outcomes.” *Social Compass* 65 (2): 149–167.

- Kong, L., and O. Woods. 2019. "Disjunctures of Belonging and Belief: Christian Migrants and the Bordering of Identity in Singapore." *Population, Space and Place* 25 (6): 1–10.
- Lan, P.-C. 2003. "Negotiating Social Boundaries and Private Zones: The Micropolitics of Employing Migrant Domestic Workers." *Social Problems* 50 (4): 525–549. Massey, D. 2005. *For Space*. London: Sage.
- Sowgat, T., and S. Roy. 2022. "Throtogetherness in Dhaka: Rethinking Urban Planning: A Visual Essay." *City* 26 (2-3): 421–431. doi:10.1080/13604813.2022.2057070.
- Valentine, G. 2008. "Living with Difference: Reflections on Geographies of Encounter." *Progress in Human Geography* 32 (3): 323–337.
- Vertovec, S. 2007. "Super-Diversity and Its Implications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (6): 1024–1054.
- Vertovec, S. 2019. "Talking Around Super-Diversity." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42 (1): 125–139.
- Wilson, H. F. 2017. "On Geography and Encounter: Bodies, Borders, and Difference." *Progress in Human Geography* 41 (4): 451–471.
- Woods, O. 2018. "Spaces of the Religious Economy: Negotiating the Regulation of Religious Space in Singapore." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 57 (3): 531–546.
- Woods, O. 2019. "Religious Urbanism in Singapore: Competition, Commercialism and Compromise in the Search for Space." *Social Compass* 66 (1): 24–34.
- Woods, O. 2021. "Forging Alternatively Sacred Spaces in Singapore's Integrated Religious Marketplace." *Cultural Geographies* 28 (1): 109–122.
- Woods, O., and L. Kong. 2020a. "Parallel Spaces of Migrant Non-Integration in Singapore: Latent Politics of Distance and Difference within a Diverse Christian Community." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 41 (3): 339–354.
- Woods, O., and L. Kong. 2020b. "Fractured Lives, Newfound Freedoms? The Dialectics of Religious Seekership among Chinese Migrants in Singapore." *Asian Studies Review* 44 (4): 652–670.

### **About the Authors**

Orlando Woods is Associate Professor of Humanities and Lee Kong Chian Fellow at Singapore Management University. Email: [orlandowoods@smu.edu.sg](mailto:orlandowoods@smu.edu.sg)

Lily Kong is President and Lee Kong Chian Chair Professor of Social Sciences at Singapore Management University. Email: [lilykong@smu.edu.sg](mailto:lilykong@smu.edu.sg)