INTRODUCTION

The proposal of the Education Commission Report No.4 (ECR4) to stream seventy per cent and thirty per cent of Secondary One students into Chinese-medium and English-medium sectors\(^1\) has rekindled the debate concerning the desirability of allowing over 90 per cent of local secondary students to receive their education in Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools which profess to use English as a medium of instruction. This debate can be dated back to the release of a report on the effects of medium of instruction on local students published by Siu et al. in 1979.\(^2\) Since then, the issue has been taken up by the Llewellyn Commission in 1981 (Llewellyn et al., 1982), the Education Commission in 1984 (ECR1), The Report of the Working Group set up to Review Language Improvement Measures in 1989, and, most recently, the Education Commission’s Fourth Report (ECR4).

Although growth in enrolment at Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools continues unabated through the course of this debate, ECR4's Streaming Proposal, first mentioned in the 1989 Working Group report, will probably put a stop to this relentless expansion during the past thirty years, as shown in Table 1.
**TABLE 1: Hong Kong school enrolment at the secondary level (by medium of instruction), 1958-1988**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools (ACSS) Student</th>
<th>Chinese Middle Schools (CMS) School</th>
<th>Total School Student</th>
<th>% student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25,863</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>55,510</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>66,600</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>81,163</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>41,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>94,625</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>44,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>109,123</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>45,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>124,449</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>134,347</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>46,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>149,921</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>50,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>157,881</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>172,569</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>48,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>184,651</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>51,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>208,118</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>55,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>223,254</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>57,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>273,418</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>64,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>303,413</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>331,036</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>63,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>375,470</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>378,570</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>52,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>386,531</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>385,543</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>383,900</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>380,203</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>375,673</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>370,615</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>372,422</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>370,410</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>365,330</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32,973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The figures in this table refer to enrolment at day grammar schools only. 1958 and 1988 are the year when such figures were reported in the *Annual Reviews* for respectively the first, and the last time.


Now that the administration has cast its dice on the medium of instruction issue and turned a new page in its educational language policy, this is an opportune moment to look back in time to explore the question how such a differential selection of the Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools and Chinese Middle Schools came to pass, to use this historical survey to put the current...
situation in perspective, and to assess whether or not the Streaming Proposal is an appropriate model for Hong Kong as she moves into a new phase of development towards 1997 and beyond.

**ONE TERRITORY, TWO SECONDARY EDUCATION SECTORS**

The development of a language-based bifurcation in the local secondary system is a result of largely three sets of historical circumstances. First, the cultural backwardness and foreign encroachment of Modern China, as well as her effort to strengthen herself. Second, the colonization of Hong Kong, and the needs of the local colonial administration to cultivate a class of bilingual brokers to mediate between itself and the governed. And third, the Chinese Nationalist Party's political platforms on modern education and on the Overseas Chinese.

This section deals with the link between the interplay of these three sets of circumstances and the differential growth of Chinese-medium and English-medium secondary education in Hong Kong before 1949.

This language-based bifurcation can be dated back to 1926 with the founding of the Government Vernacular Middle School (renamed Clementi Middle School in 1951). However, at the time of its founding, there were already at least sixteen relatively well-established institutions offering a relatively complete English-medium secondary education by the standards of the times. The dominance of these English-medium institutions in the secondary sector was largely a result of the colonial administration's measures, as shown in the thorough documentation of government language policy during this period by Fu (1975:38-77). From 1902 until the eve of the Second World War, a substantial amount of the resources allocated to education were funneled, via the Grant-in-aid Scheme, to English-medium schools with the manifest purpose of cultivating a Westernized and English-speaking elite among the local population. The consequence of this policy can be seen from a remark in the *Annual Colonial Report--Hong Kong 1946*: "The grant-aided schools mainly use English although one school is entirely taught in Chinese... secondary education in English is to a great extent in the hands of Government and grant-aid schools..." (p.44)

It is unfortunate that most of the polemical literature on the medium of instruction issue chooses to stop at this point and, based on evidence such as those quoted above, hypothesize that the current plight of Chinese-medium secondary education in Hong Kong is basically a consequence
of the colonial administration’s pro-English-medium policy. As a result, people who subscribe to this Colonialist-Policy Hypothesis tend to pay insufficient attention to an interesting as well as crucial period in the development of Chinese-medium secondary education in Hong Kong. This period begins with the founding of the Nationalist Government in Nanjing (Nanking) in 1928, and ends with its retreat from Nanjing to Taipei (Taipei) in 1949.

The importance of this period to local Chinese-medium secondary education can be seen from the following fact. While it took more than eighty years after the founding of the Colony for Chinese-medium secondary education to get started, a mere fifteen years after 1926, upon the eve of the Second World War, at least forty-nine institutions offering an education up to either junior or senior secondary level can be identified (Wong, 1982:270-353). Whereas, during the same period, the number of English-medium institutions with an upper section increased by only five, making their total number to twenty-one. In other words, the Chinese-medium institutions with an upper section out-numbered their English-medium counterparts by more than a two-to-one margin, albeit in terms of enrolment, the two sectors were probably comparable in size before the War.

On the other hand, this period saw the colonial administration largely pursuing a policy of providing respectively an English-medium education up to university level for children from well-to-do families, and a vernacular primary education for children from less well-to-do families (Irving 1914). In other words, the local government did not have much to do with this dramatic expansion of the Chinese-medium secondary sector. Unlike English-medium secondary education whose development was largely determined by local socio-economic dynamics and local government aid, the development of Chinese-medium secondary education in Hong Kong was mostly driven by developments in Mainland China.

At the dawn of the 1928-49 period, modern Chinese-medium education had found itself a political patron, a national structure, and a linguistic medium. 1928 saw a semblance of national unity achieved with the founding of the Nationalist Government in Nanjing. The temporary political unity facilitated the implementation of a national curriculum—which was largely based on the American model and had been adopted earlier in 1922—as well as the popularization of a national language, Guo Yu, in the nation's schools. For example, in 1932, Guo Yu was made the official medium of instruction in all
By 1928, a Chinese model of modern education was finally taking shape, and ready for export.

Understandably, recipients of this export were overseas Chinese communities, including Hong Kong. The scale of this influence can be understood in the light of the ideology of the Chinese Nationalist Party, and the impact of the Second Sino-Japanese War 1937-45. Since its founding by Dr Sun and his associates, the Nationalist Party regarded itself as the leader of all Chinese nationalist movements both at home and abroad. It also treated all Overseas Chinese citizens of the Republic regardless of whether or not they were citizens of their respective host countries. Accordingly, the Nationalist Party found it politically opportune to promote nationalist education for its overseas citizens, and in fact, as early as 1921, when the Nationalist Party consolidated its power in Canton (Guangzhou), agents were sent to Southeast Asia and beyond to assist local Chinese communities in the development of nationalist modern education for their children (Akashi, 1970:1-14).

However, the climax of the expansion of Chinese-medium secondary education in Hong Kong did not come until the out-break of the Second Sino-Japanese War. After the outbreak of this War, many Chinese Middle Schools in China simply moved across the border and re-established themselves in Hong Kong which, for four years, became a haven for escapees from the War in China.

Given the external origin of the development of the local Chinese-medium secondary education, and the centre-and-periphery kind of relationship between China and Hong Kong, it is quite understandable that the former gradually assumed, for the local Chinese-medium sector, the role of a model, a provider of resources and financial support (for some schools); a supplier of personnel, textbooks and other ancillary materials; a regulator; a certifying agent and a place for further studies.

For example, local Chinese-medium schools with an upper section mostly followed China and adopted the American 6-3-3 curriculum structure instead of the local 6-5-1 system (see note 6). Guo Yu was extensively taught in all Chinese-medium schools until the late 1950's even though opportunities for its use locally were minimal.

Moreover, most Chinese-medium schools with an upper section, in addition to their local registration, also had registration with the Overseas Chinese
Affairs Committee of the Nanjing Government, and with the provincial Bureau of Education in Guangzhou. Students from these schools also participated in the public examinations administered by the Guangdong authorities. In fact, after 1935, such examinations were made available locally by the Guangdong authorities for the convenience of Hong Kong students (Wong, 1982: 347-8).

Also, while evidence is not readily available, it is understood that many local Chinese-medium schools were regularly inspected by Nationalist Government officials. Usually such inspections were done covertly because the Nationalist Government was acting ultra vires. However, in 1949, news of such a visit paid by an official from the Overseas Chinese Affairs Committee to local Chinese Middle Schools was leaked to the press, but the colonial administration at that time chose not to create a fuss with an open response (Cheng, 1949:322).

Therefore, by the 1930's, the language-based bifurcation of the local secondary sector was about complete. For a student who had gone through his primary education, he might choose to continue his education in either a Chinese medium or an English medium institution. A student who had done his secondary education in the Chinese medium might continue his education in any of the tertiary institutions on the Mainland, many of which enjoyed higher prestige than Hong Kong University\(^\text{14}\). Measures had in fact been taken by the colonial administration to deal with such a development. In the Annual Report of the Department of Education for 1935, it was reported that a curriculum designed to accommodate this choice was planned in 1929, and had since been adopted by the Department.

THE POST-1949 DECLINE OF THE CHINESE MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Consequently, as Hong Kong started its reconstruction after the Second World War, its secondary education system was rebuilt on a foundation that was marked not only by its bilinguality, but also by its dual tradition. The Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools had their origin in the missionary zeal of the West;\(^\text{15}\) had their orientation in meeting the needs of the colonial administration and the expatriate community for bilingual brokers; and had their constituency among the indigenous elite whose elitist status was in no small measure a result of an English-medium education.
Whereas the Chinese Middle Schools had their origin in the patriotic zeal of the Chinese intelligentsia for national salvation, and the political ideology of the Nationalist Party for extending its influence among the Overseas Chinese, they had their orientation in meeting the needs of China for achieving unification and freedom from imperialist encroachment; and had their constituency among the less well-heeled local families.

Another difference between the two sectors was that the English-medium sector, owing to government aid and resources provided from their patrons in the West, managed to develop an infrastructure that was largely self-sustaining. The entire process of education and certification up to the tertiary level could be conducted locally.

In contrast, the Chinese-medium sector largely saw itself essentially as an appendage to a larger system with which presumably it would soon re-integrate. Its centres were in Nanjing and Guangzhou.

As it turned out, History was unkind to the local Chinese Middle Schools. On the one hand, China's victory in the Second World War failed to accelerate the de-colonialization process in Hong Kong, which would benefit the local Chinese Middle Schools. On the other hand, the collapse of the Nanjing regime in 1949 also deprived the local Chinese Middle Schools of their centre of reference, and source of logistic support. As early as 1950, the administration already indicated its concern for the problems faced by the Chinese Middle School graduates as a result of this deprivation (Colonial Office, 1950:61). The irony of history in this case is that the Chinese Middle Schools declined during a period when the administration was expending relatively more effort and resources for Chinese-medium education, and adopted a more and more enlightened approach to its language policy. For example, local certification for Chinese Middle School graduates was made available again by the colonial administration in 1952.

In 1963, the Chinese University of Hong Kong was founded to provide, among other things, local opportunities for tertiary education for Chinese Middle School graduates. In the Preamble of its founding Ordinance, it is clearly written that "the principal language of instruction [in the University] shall be Chinese." Moreover, the four-year norm of its curriculum structure also reflects the intention of the authorities at the time to have the Chinese Middle Schools as the major supplier of students to the University.
In 1974, the Chinese language was accorded official status. Since then, the use of Chinese has increased in the public sector. For example, there has been a growing demand for the provision of simultaneous interpretation in government or quasi-government meetings as more and more legislators, municipal and district councillors and advisory committee members choose to speak in Cantonese. Also, the provision of a Chinese version of all communication from the government to the public has long become a standard practice.

In 1986, a policy of positive discrimination in favour of secondary schools adopting Chinese-medium instruction was promulgated.

In spite of all these efforts, there are few signs indicating that Chinese Middle Schools are going to make a come-back. Such a continual decline might have triggered the latest draconian measures from the government to revamp the system. Whether or not these measures will succeed remains to be see. However, the fact is that proponents of the Colonialist-Policy hypothesis should find it hard to square their thesis with the historical evidence shown above. Indeed, their thesis would create for us the riddle of Chinese Middle Schools flourishing during a period when the colonial administration adopted a manifestly 'pro-English' language policy, and declining during a period when the colonial administration adopted a more enlightened language policy.

Lest it be misunderstood, it is not suggested here that the colonial administration be absolved of its responsibilities concerning the decline of the local Chinese Middle Schools. Rather, what is submitted here is that this decline is a function of forces that are much more powerful than government language policy. The collapse of the Nanjing regime, and the ascendancy of the anti-intellectual, totalitarian Beijing regime created an extremely negative environment for the local Chinese Middle Schools which, short of switching to the English-medium sector, have so far proved themselves not very adaptable to the Post-1949 developments.

Meanwhile, after 1949, the Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools found themselves in an increasingly favourable environment as a result of three sets of developments. These are the development of Hong Kong into an international manufacturing and financial centre in relative isolation from the Mainland until the 1980's; the emergence of English as the predominant medium in trade and in academic discourse(Fishman, Cooper & Conrad
and the tremendous advance made in science and technology after the War, all of which have intensified the demand for an educated and English-speaking labour force at the work-place.

The Popularity of the Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools

What is significant here about the three aforementioned developments is that their interaction produces an effect that further accentuates the historical role of the Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools as a major vehicle of upward mobility. The rapid growth in the local economy after 1949 has dramatically expanded opportunities of such mobility. For example, the number of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical &amp; related workers</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative &amp; managerial workers</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; related workers</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural workers &amp; fisherfolk</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production &amp; related workers, transport</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment operators &amp; labourers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces &amp; unclassifiable</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labour Force (Million)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (Million)</td>
<td>3.130</td>
<td>3.937</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>5.396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

traditionally more desirable and/or more prestigious jobs has been on the increase in the past thirty years. As shown in Table 2, a shift towards skilled-cum-white collar jobs in the occupational structure is very much in evidence in the past thirty years. Between 1961 and 1986, it is estimated that the number of professional, technical and related workers increased 3.6 times; the number of administrative and managerial workers 2.6 times; the number of clerical and related workers 5.6 times; the number of sales workers 3.8 times; the number of servicing workers 4.8 times.

Whereas, during the same period, the size of the entire labour force increased by only 2.17 times. The size of the local population by only 1.72 times.

Given the fact that English has become the language of wider communication especially in the domain of commerce and finance, these traditionally more desirable occupations invariably demand varying degrees of proficiency in English. Furthermore, the more prestigious among them often require tertiary education qualifications. To the local people, there is no question about what gives one the best access to these occupations. After all, most of the local and foreign tertiary institutions offer their education in the English medium. Children from the well-established elite usually get a head-start in one of the few local, exclusive English-medium primary schools. Young people from ordinary families try to get into Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools, places where traditionally 'good' English was learnt.

In Hong Kong, given the transient nature of its population especially before 1949, the refugee character of the population especially after 1949, and the laissez-faire ethos of the society at large, there are no entrenched class structure, divisive religious affiliations, nor dogmatic ideological subscription to put stops in people's path to upward mobility. In the past, especially during the last thirty years of rapid economic growth, anybody who possesses English skills and secondary education qualifications will avail himself of a career in the white-collar profession. For somebody who possesses tertiary education qualifications or more, he will be assured of either a passage upward, and become a member of the local, expanding bourgeoisie; and/or a passage outward, and become a member of the Overseas Chinese communities in one the advanced, English-speaking nations of the world.

In short, a successful English-medium secondary education has become the principal determinant of either upward or/and outward mobility for the people of Hong Kong. Many, if not most, aspire to both.
The socio-economic transformation of Hong Kong described above and the pathetic post-1949 situation in China have led many local people to perceive the Chinese Middle Schools as some sort of an anachronism, and led to an over-selection of the Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools.19

THE OVER-SELECTION OF THE ANGLO-CHINESE SECONDARY SCHOOLS: FALSE & REAL ISSUES

By the 1980's when ninety per cent of secondary students were receiving their education at Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools, most, if not all, educators agree that the use of the English-medium at these Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools poses problems for students and teachers. After all, Hong Kong is essentially a monolingual, Cantonese-speaking society where English is used in only a restricted number of domains.20 Given the fact that subsidized junior and senior secondary education are now offered respectively to close to 100 per cent and over seventy per cent of the appropriate age group, it is simply unrealistic to expect that quality English-medium instruction can be provided in all subjects, and at all levels, to such large number of students most of whom are brought up in Cantonese-speaking environments.

What educators fail to agree is what constitute the best possible alternative to the present situation. And many educators do find the Streaming Proposal leaves a lot to be desired. Before we proceed to examine the Streaming Proposal from the perspective provided by the previous historical survey, and look forward to the future, it is necessary to put the current situation in perspective and expose the fallacy of a number of suppositions many people, including the architects of the Streaming Proposal, subscribe to in this debate.

The Mother-tongue hypothesis

It is regrettable that the current debate on the medium of instruction issue has made such a heavy use of the Mother-tongue hypothesis.21 In a sense this is unfair to the parents in Hong Kong because they do not send their children to Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools because they do not know Chinese-medium education is easier for them. They prefer English-medium schools for the reasons discussed in the previous section, and not because they are not in favour of teaching in Chinese. In fact, all the experimental studies
on the effect of English-medium instruction on educational outcomes among local students have been churning out findings proving the obvious: when students are instructed entirely in Chinese, they tend to perform better than when they receive instruction entirely in English.\textsuperscript{22} The problem is that the constraints of the design of these studies preclude them from taking into account of the mediating effect of the use of Cantonese under naturalistic conditions, and of the fact that in Hong Kong, learning at Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools seldom takes place exclusively in Chinese or in English. Indeed, if the findings of these experimental studies were taken at their face value, it would mean that year after year the Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools are producing graduates with 'brain damage'!

The fact is most parents somehow know that on the one hand, the educational consequences of English-medium secondary education are not as catastrophic as some pundits would have them believe. On the other hand, the education offered at Chinese Middle Schools is not as easy and effective as their advocates claim it to be. They could sense that it is tricky to equate Chinese-medium education to mother-tongue education. After all, they know a local Cantonese student will not be able to make his grade in a Chinese Middle School with his Cantonese alone. In fact, traditional Chinese teachers would tell him Cantonese cannot be written, should not be used in written academic discourse, and is merely a 'dialect'. To these educators, the label 'language' should be reserved for the standard variety alone.

Whether a local student is having his education in an Anglo-Chinese Secondary School or a Chinese Middle School, the chance is that he will find himself in a relatively unfamiliar linguistic environment, and his success will partly depend on to what extent he manages to achieve proficiency in the respective standard languages. The local trilingual situation in education (Lord & T'sou, 1985) is a nettle that most mother-tongue hypothesis subscribers have yet to learn how to grapple with.\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{Parents=Lemmings hypothesis}

Another misguided assumption made about the parents is that they have been portrayed as lemmings rushing their children towards an English-medium cliff, and therefore have to be stopped, even at great cost if necessary.\textsuperscript{24} However, findings from two surveys conducted respectively in 1983 and in 1986 offer a somewhat different picture.
### TABLE 3
MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION PREFERENCES OF H.K. PARENTS
1983 & 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N.O. *</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM ONLY</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(58)**</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM ONLY</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM &amp; EM</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No Opinion

**Figures in brackets are percentages

Source: So, 1984; So, 1986

### TABLE 4A
H.K. PARENTS' MEAN RATING OF CRITERIA FOR AN IDEAL SCHOOL 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching Staff</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standards</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Campus</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Standards</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of School</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in Public Exams</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether English Textbooks are used</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Chinese Textbooks are used</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The rating scale is from 1 to 5 with 1 meaning the criterion is of no importance at all, and 5 meaning the criterion is very important.
### TABLE 4B:
H.K. PARENTS' MEAN RATING OF CRITERIA FOR AN IDEAL SCHOOL 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching Staff</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Campus &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standards</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether English Textbooks are used</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Instruction is in English</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in Public Exams</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Standards</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Instruction is in Chinese</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Chinese Textbooks are used</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The rating scale is between -2 and 2 with -2 meaning the criterion is of no importance at all, and 2 meaning the criterion is very important.

Source: So, 1984; So, 1986.

Tables 3 and 4 clearly show that there is no evidence of a rejection of the use of Chinese in secondary schools among the parents, and that their primary concern is English standards rather than an exclusive use of English. Nor is it accurate to allege that local parents' choice of secondary schools is predominantly medium-based.

Also, it is interesting to note that among the parent respondents of the 1986 survey, who were from the industrial township of Tsuen Wan, Kwai Chung & Tsing Yi Island, and were of working class background, there was an overwhelming preference for a combined use of the two mediums in the schools. Whereas among the parent respondents of the 1983 survey, who were sampled territory-wide, and approximated a cross section of the local community, the preference was not as overwhelming, albeit it was still relatively strong.

One might surmise from this difference that the working class parents in Hong Kong, seeking upward mobility for their children, may well approach the medium of instruction issue in a practical, common-sense way. They realize that it is impractical to expect the schools to educate their children entirely in...
English. However, they would like their children to have access to English-medium, and may, as a result attain a level of English proficiency that would enable them to progress in the local society. In fact, what the parents are shunning are Chinese Middle Schools, not instruction in Chinese. These parents might have very high expectations of their children, but they are not lemmings.\textsuperscript{25}

\textbf{‘Schools have to be forced to switch to Chinese Medium’ hypothesis}

Before we move to the future, there is one more fallacy that needs to be exposed. In 1987, the council of Carmel English School opted to switch the medium of instruction in lower forms to Chinese. The media was informed of the move, and they in turn heralded it as a historic move, and Carmel was portrayed as taking a lead in the promotion of Mother Tongue education. However, in 1990, the teachers of the school voted to switch the teaching medium at the lower forms back to English, and their decision was endorsed by the council. The saga of Carmel has been taken by the media and subscribers to the Streaming Proposal as a prime example showing the conservatism of school authorities regarding the greater use of Chinese at secondary level, and that they would not make ‘the right move’ unless forced to do so.

This sort of allegation is very unfair to many Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools which have been struggling to do a good job in a very difficult situation. Ho (in this volume) details the experience of one school in a \textit{self-motivated} implementation of greater use of Chinese in lower forms, a practice sustained to this day, in the early 1980's, years before the Carmel saga. Moreover, as a result of the policy of positive discrimination announced in 1986, by 1990, similar moves have been taking place in 126 schools, some of which have made a more extensive switch than Carmel, as reported in ECR4(p.89).

In addition, there is also the much lamented use of Cantonese and the mixed code (see Luke, this volume) in the Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools, which, in varying degree of effectiveness, helps the students adapt to the English-medium environment.

Actually, the force of parents’ preference and the inadequacy of students’ English proficiency have engendered a process of convergence in the secondary sector. While, as mentioned above, many Anglo-Chinese
Secondary Schools are making greater use of Chinese, many of the thirty-odd Chinese Middle Schools are adopting English textbooks, and opening Form Seven classes to better align themselves with the three-year norm of the curriculum structure at tertiary level.

In other words, the schools have been doing a lot to cope with the linguistic pressure, and as a result the differences between the Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools and the Chinese Middle Schools are getting smaller and smaller. Many Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools have been making greater use of Chinese, although they stop short of making a total switch. After all, many Chinese Middle Schools themselves do not adhere to the dogma of making an exclusive use of Chinese in their instruction.

In fact, in recent years, the government has made a number of positive moves that help promote this process of convergence. For example, after 1978, partly to enhance the image that the two sectors were on equal footing, the language-based separate administration of the Certificate of Education Examinations was abolished, and candidates from the Chinese-medium and English-medium sectors were given the same examination papers, albeit in different languages. In 1985, ECR1 recommends to 'put an end to the distinction between Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools and Chinese Middle Schools by encouraging the removal of such references from the names of schools'(p.45). In 1986, in order to encourage employers to focus on students' achievements rather than on the teaching medium, the medium indicator on the certificate of education was removed. From 1988, enrolment figures at secondary level were no longer reported on the basis of medium of instruction. In 1994, in order to fully align the Chinese Middle Schools with the local tertiary sector, the Advanced Level examinations will be made available in Chinese, and students taking the examination in Chinese will not be discriminated against by any UPGC institutions, according to a recent joint announcement made by the heads of these institutions.

If such a process of convergence is allowed to take its course, over time, parents will learn to focus their choice more and more on the school, rather than on its teaching medium.

Unfortunately, the Streaming Proposal will put a spoke in this development by re-highlighting the medium of instruction differences among the schools, and lead to a trifurcation of the secondary sector.
THE STREAMING PROPOSAL: A GOOD MODEL FOR OUR FUTURE?

It is submitted here that the answer to the question is 'no,' because of the adoption of the fallacious hypotheses by the architects of the Proposal afore-mentioned, and because of their anachronistic vision of our future. In fact, their Proposal have raised at least two important questions: Will the proposed scheme be able to meet our future language needs? Do we really want to have linguistic segregation in our schools?

What are our future language needs?

What we have in Hong Kong is an increasingly service-oriented international economy which demands the provision of a large number of personnel proficient in at least two international languages--Putonghua Chinese and English--in the context of a largely monolingual, dialect-speaking environment. Under the sociolinguistic conditions of Hong Kong, schools are the only places where our children have a chance to actually use these languages under quasi-naturalistic conditions before they do so in their respective work domains. Our future language needs render the dichotomous Chinese-medium vs English-medium orientation of the current debate out-dated, and point to a need to simulate a linguistic environment within the schools that approximate the linguistic dynamics in Post-1997 Hong Kong. This environment will be characterized by a shift from a need for bilingual brokers to mediate between the colonial administration and the governed to a need for trilingual brokers to mediate among Beijing, the local government and the international community. Indeed, what is the point of having thirty per cent of our best secondary students receive an education exclusively in English, and reproducing to-day's role models many of whom have a predominant western outlook, and are functionally literate only in English? Isn't it another form of anachronism?

If there is anything to be learnt from the decline of the Chinese Middle Schools, it is that educational development cannot evolve in isolation from socio-economic developments. Now that the wheel of change is again moving at a fast pace, we had better take heed of the lesson of history and move with the times, or reaping the consequences of being left behind by a backward-looking instead of forward-looking orientation.
And if one does look forward, what he sees is that the inevitable shift in language demands and political orientation require that our students be given opportunities to perform tasks of various nature in Cantonese, Putonghua and English, rather than in any one of these languages, and also be given a good measure of biculturalism that is grounded in the culture of China. Our next generation will have to be well-versed in the rhetoric of Cantonese, Putonghua and English, and be brought up with a better understanding of their cultural identity in a post-colonial metropolis.

**Do we really want linguistic segregation in our schools?**

According to ECR4, the Streaming Proposal is based on three premises. The first is the mother-tongue hypothesis; the second is the preference that it is "better if one clear medium of instruction for teaching, textbooks and examinations are (*sic.*) used" (p.101); the third is the conviction that "students should be grouped by reference to a medium in which they could learn effectively" (p.101). However, the mixed-code is not regarded as an acceptable option.

The information based on which the grouping will be carried out is to be produced by the two test batteries administered by the Examinations Authority respectively at the end of primary six and at the end of secondary three. It is claimed that by 1994, these tests will have given schools sufficient information concerning who can benefit from English-medium instruction (p.112). Indeed, a time-table has been proposed for all schools to adopt a clear language policy (p.105).

The fact is many Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools have already been administering an in-house screening test to their new admittees each year to assess their abilities in Chinese, English and Maths. This information is then used to make medium of instruction decisions within the school. However, at present, these decisions seldom involve an total segregation of students on the basis of the teaching medium within the school. Students who initially are given instruction in Chinese are not precluded from receiving instruction in English later on. There are no official labels attached to them. In other words, what the Proposal will do to the schools is not so much provide them with new information, but put a medium of instruction label on them, as well as on their students; and in so doing, effect linguistic segregation in our secondary sector. The Streaming Model is our linguistic 'Berlin Wall' of the 1990's.
It is also alleged that after the implementation of the Streaming Model "criticism which has been levelled at existing secondary schools that they claim to teach through English whilst actually using mixed-code, would fall away. The medium of instruction offered by schools would come to reflect the reality of students' needs." (p. 113) This claim is misplaced, and indicates a lack of understanding of the language dynamics in local classrooms, and of the development of bilinguality under local conditions on the part of the architects of the Streaming Proposal. The fact is the use of the mixed-code is itself a reflection of the reality of students' needs. This issue is dealt with in depth by Luke in this volume. Suffice it to briefly mention three aspects of this issue here.

First, code-mixing is a mark of bilingual behaviour. In other words, if more and more bilinguals are produced in Hong Kong, code-mixing will get more and more common, and it appears that it is exactly what is happening now, with the mixed code becoming the native tongue of the local educated community.  

Second, the antagonistic attitude towards the mixed-code as a form of corrupted speech is more a case of either a monolingual, inward-looking society unaccustomed to such a language variety, and/or an inappropriate application of monolingual norms, on the part of language purists, to bilingual behaviour. Numerous recent studies have shown that, far from being a form of corrupted speech, code-mixing behaviour has enhanced bilinguals' communicative efficacy, and enriched his linguistic repertoire.

Third, lest it be misunderstood, it is not suggested here that the mixed-code be treated as a standard variety. The case made here is that it is a functional variety the use of which is not random, and very often serves useful purposes. It is submitted here that so long as English-medium and/or Putonghua instruction is given to a large number of students, the mixed-code will serve a useful function of providing students with a means to negotiate meaning in the classroom. Actually, implicit in the rejection of the mixed-code is the belief that somehow it stands in the way of developing rhetorical skills in Chinese and English among the students. The causal relationship between the two can only be minimal as all parties concerned are aware that the norms used in the evaluation of proficiency in the respective languages remain monolingual. If local students' rhetorical skills in the languages are found wanting, the cause probably lies in the fact that, in addition to Cantonese, they are required to master another two unfamiliar languages rather than the assumed problem of mistaking the
mixed-code as a model. For most students, the mixed-code is a building block rather than a stumbling block of their bilingual proficiency.

Therefore, the so-called "clear policy concerning medium of instruction" that all school are required to adopt by the middle of the 1990's will only stigmatize the spontaneous use of the mixed-code, limit the medium of instruction options available to schools (including the Chinese Middle Schools), engender divisiveness among as well as within schools, and among students, and necessitate additional expenditure in the recruitment of 'language police' to regulate classroom language behaviour.

The recruitment of such regulators is a must if the government is really serious about students being taught in either English or Chinese. After all, anybody who knows the local situation will wonder: Where are we going to find that thirty per cent secondary students who will be able to have their education **exclusively** in English (See Lee; Tung; this volume)? And what are we going to do with those Chinese Middle Schools that make use of English textbooks?

**LOOKING FORWARD**

By force of tradition, there will always be English-only and Chinese-only schools in the local secondary sector. No matter how popular is the former, or how unpopular is the latter, the fact remains that the times that produced the dynamics that selected these schools are moving fast behind us. The dynamics in the future will probably select neither Chinese Middle Schools nor English-medium Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools, but schools that are able to make a flexible and sensible use of Cantonese, Putonghua and English as medium of instruction, as well as provide our young people with an exposure to the cultures of China and of the West.

Having an English-medium cocoon at the top of the secondary sector with a large Cantonese segment at the bottom, which apparently is where the Streaming Proposal is leading us, is a form of anachronism that replicates the pre-1926 situation, and will not last for long even if the departing administration imposes it upon us.

Indeed, it is intriguing to find that the Streaming Proposal opts to intensify the monolingualism of the current model that most people find wanting and
out-of-date. As argued elsewhere (So, 1987:266-67), for the majority of the local students, bilingual education in Hong Kong at present is characterized by its sequential use/monolingual tracking of two different mediums of instruction respectively at two different--primary and post primary--phases. In other words, currently, students who have gone through a monolingual education in the Chinese-medium are then expected to continue their education in a monolingual English-medium environment. Most people today accept that this model is not working. In fact, the popular use of the mixed-code and/or Cantonese in the Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools can be seen as a way of getting round the problems created by the inadequacy of the model.

Our future language needs require that ways should be sought to eliminate the monolingual tracking approach, and to replace it with a concurrent, multilingual approach through a combined use of Cantonese, Putonghua Chinese and English. In other words, instead of having two monilingual phases, a viable model should have provisions to offer a combined use of the relevant languages in all phases (including the tertiary phase). During the course of their education, students should first be given a good grounding in Cantonese, and then with Putonghua as well as English gradually being phased in at varying degree of exposure and pace depending on the respective circumstances of the schools.

Being a vernacular-speaking minority, it would be unrealistic for the people of Hong Kong to be led to believe that Cantonese should remain the major medium of instruction in our system indefinitely. The best protection of the status of our mother tongue in education is not to wave the magic wand of the mother tongue hypothesis, but to promote a multilingual approach to education which will offer the best means to accommodate the linguistic demands of China and to meet the sociolinguistic needs of Hong Kong. In so doing, the planning involved will be able to accord a clear role to Cantonese in our educational system.

Such an approach will also entail efforts of codifying and standardizing Cantonese, formulating the teaching of Putonghua Chinese as a second language to local students, and re-focusing the teaching of English for academic and special purposes.

These are by no means easy tasks, and the pointers mentioned here may not lead to a model whose structural elegance matches that of the one proposed by ECR4. However, a model based on the concurrent, multilingual approach
can be pedagogically sound, administratively viable, socially relevant and politically popular. It will be an arrangement that will offer to people things that they want, and will not impose on people things only the government finds desirable.

NOTES

1 The following is an outline of the proposal: Before Secondary School Places Allocation (SSPA), criterion referenced tests of Chinese and English will be administered to all primary six students in the public sector to determine their ability to learn in Chinese or English. Based on their performance in these tests, students will be classified into three groups: 'C' for those who would learn best through the Chinese medium; 'B' for those who would probably learn better through the Chinese medium but who are possibly able also to learn in English; 'E' for those who are able to learn effectively in English many of whom could equally well learn in Chinese should they so wish.

Similarly, based on the performance of their intakes in the aforementioned tests, all secondary schools will be divided into three groups: Chinese-medium schools, English-medium schools and Two-medium(TM) schools where classes will be conducted exclusively either in Chinese or English.

Such information will then be given to parents and schools. Parents of children in Groups 'B' and 'C' will be advised to select places in Chinese-medium or Two-medium schools. Based on researches done under the auspices of the Education Department, it is estimated that students from Groups 'B' and 'C' constitute seventy per cent of their cohort.

There are three other important elements in this proposal: First, an intensive English programme (termed bridging course) will be provided to secondary one students at English-medium schools.

Second, at the end of secondary three, all students will sit another batteries of criterion referenced language tests. Their performance in these tests will provide grounds for English-medium schools to transfer their weak students to either Chinese-medium or Two-medium schools. On the other hand, if their performance in English is found to be up to par, students at Chinese-medium or Two-medium schools can be transferred to English-medium schools if they so wish.

Third, an intensive English programme will be provided by all UPGC tertiary institutions to their admittees from Chinese Middle Schools.

2 In 1973, Cheng et al. put out a tract titled *At What Cost?--Instruction through the English Medium in Hong Kong Schools* and managed to attract some attention to the medium of instruction issue within the educational community. However, sustained debate on the issue both inside and outside the educational community was not in evidence until the 1980's.

3 This paper takes the Opium War of 1839-42 as the event that marks the birth of Modern China.

4 The Government Vernacular Middle School was not the first Chinese Middle School in Hong Kong. The honour probably belongs to Lingnam Middle School which was founded in 1922. Between 1922 and 1926, according to Wong, 1982, at least thirteen institutions that offered some form of secondary education in the Chinese-medium were founded. In addition to Lingnam, four of these institutions--Sung Lan Middle School, Tack Ching Girls' Middle School, Sung Tsun Middle School, and Munsang College--are still in operation today, although Sung Lan and Munsang are now Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools. Among these thirteen institutions, only Munsang College benefited from the Grant-in-aid Scheme.
The rationale of selecting the founding of the Government Vernacular Middle School, instead of that of any of these thirteen institutions, as the occasion marking the birth of the local Chinese-medium secondary sector is largely based on the scale of operation. For example, unlike the thirteen institutions most of which were in fact primary schools with a secondary extension, it was the other way round for the School which started right away as a middle school with a Normal division, albeit with a 'prep school' attachment. The School was well-endowed at its founding, and had long been regarded as the equivalent of the Queen's College in the Chinese-medium sector.

5 These institutions were, in the order of the time of their founding, St. Joseph College, Queen's College, St. Paul's Convent School, St. Mary's (Canossian) College, Belilios Public School, Ying Wa Girls' School, Diocesan Boys' School, St. Stephen's College, St. Stephen Girls' College, St Paul's College, Diocesan Girls' School, Wah Yan College (Hong Kong), Wah Yan College (Kowloon), and Maryknoll Convent School.

6 It would not be appropriate to label these institutions Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools during this period because most of them had three sections: a four-year lower section, followed by a two-year 'prep school' (Classes VIII and VII), and topped with an upper section (Classes VI - I) that offered a curriculum that approximated modern secondary education. Even though their upper sections all became self-contained secondary institutions after the Second World War, many of them still maintain their tradition of keeping 'feeder primary schools' to this day.

7 It should be interesting to explore the apparent lack of interest among most of the Christian missionaries in the Colony, who operated these grant-aid schools, to provide secondary education in Chinese during this period.

8 For example, in discussions on the plight of the Chinese Middle Schools conducted in the media, the catch phrase, *Zhong Ying Qing Zhong* (high priority to English, low priority to Chinese), will invariably be used to label government educational language policy for the past 150 years.

9 This figure can be regarded as a minimum of the actual number of schools in operation at that time because it was a common practice among school administrators of small operations not to register with the Colonial Administration so as to avoid control and regulation, notwithstanding the fact that such acts contravened the stipulations of the Education Ordinance of 1913.

10 They were: Holy Spirit School (Predecessor of today's Marymount Secondary School), St. Clare's Girls' School, King's College, La Salle College and Sacred hear Canossian College.

11 Figures of enrolment at secondary level in the two sectors during this period are not readily available. However, because of government assistance and a longer history, enrollment in the upper sections of the English-medium institutions were usually much larger than that of their Chinese-medium counterparts. Therefore, the English-medium institutions, though much fewer in number, probably had as many secondary students as their Chinese-medium counterparts.

12 Local tertiary education in English was made available with the founding of Hong Kong University in 1912.

13 Before the adoption of this new curriculum, the common practice, largely based on the Japanese model, was to have seven years for primary education and four years for secondary education. According to the new curriculum, primary education took six years, junior and senior secondary education each took three years.

14 On the top of this list is probably Bei-Dai. Others include Tsing Hua, Yenching (both at Beijing),
St. John's (at Shanghai), Fu-jen (at Beijing), Lingnan (at Guangzhou), just to name a few.

Even to this day, eight out of the Top Ten sponsoring bodies in education are Christian organizations. They are: The Church Body of the Chinese Anglican Church in Hong Kong, The Roman Catholic Church in Hong Kong Inc., Hong Kong Council of the Church of Christ in China, Daughters of Charity of the Canossian Institute Inc., Society of St. Francis of Sales, Lutheran Church--Hong Kong Synod, The Methodist Church Hong Kong Tsun To district, and The Methodist Church Hong Kong Wei Li District. The other two are the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals, and The Hong Kong Buddhist Association.

After the war, the colonial administration implemented a recommendation for greater government spending in vernacular education made in a report written by HMI Burney in 1935, and launched a large scale Chinese-medium primary school building programme that culminated in the provision of free primary education for close to all students of the appropriate age group in 1971.

To-day, medium of instruction practices and student intakes at the Chinese University have digressed from these intentions. For example, English textbooks are extensively used; the main bulk of its students come from the Anglo-Chinese Secondary Schools.

For example, all local UPGC tertiary institutions use English text-books extensively, conduct their examinations mostly in English, and have varying levels of requirements of English proficiency in their various courses. For professional degrees such as accounting and engineering, with few exceptions, the external examinations were conducted in English. In the case of local students' favourable overseas destinations of tertiary education, they are all English-speaking countries: Australia, Canada, Great Britain and The U.S.A..

For a more in-depth and theoretical treatment of the dynamics of differential social selection of these two institutions, see So (1984).


Cheng et al. (1973); Siu et al. (1979); Llewellyn et al. (1982); ECRs 1 & 4; as well as writers of polemical literature on this topic in the media all invoke this hypothesis, and appeal to the government to educate parents about this hypothesis.

For example, see Cheung (1974); Poon (1978); Siu et al. (1979).

For an examination of this issue, see So (1989).

This is not an exaggeration. Cheung (1990) characterizes the situation as follows: "As far as possible, Ah Mou, Ah Sau, Ah Chu--the Chinese expression for every Tom, Dick and Harry--all rush to English grammar schools, resulting in endless problems in learning motivation, attitude and school discipline."

For an eloquent expression of these sentiments, see Tsim (1978). For an examination of the validity of parents' belief that there is a link between English-medium instruction and English proficiency, and the effects of English-medium instruction on local students' educational development, see So (1987).

Solid studies on code-mixing behaviour among local people are still few in number. One such study is given by Gibbons (1987) which focuses mostly on students at Hong Kong University.
For example, see Appel & Muysken (1987:117-128).

Few mother-tongue education advocates note the fact that standard Chinese and Putonghua, in the context of Modern China, are, by definition, nobody's mother-tongue. As for the idea of Teaching Standard Chinese as a Second Language in Hong Kong, see Liu (1970).
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