CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction of thesis

Traditional approaches towards the study of gender and language have aimed at formulating generalizations for gender-based linguistic differences at a universal level. In the last two decades, however, some researchers have turned away from the quest for a universal interpretation for gender-based linguistic differences, and suggested that more attention should be paid to the social constructions of gender which may take different forms across cultures and through time (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Cameron 2003, Romaine 1999, Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros 1998).

The constructionist view rejects the traditional approach which takes gender as a simple binary opposition, and argues that gender is a social construction implicated with other social identities in a complex way that the linguistic differences displayed by gender are not simply differences between “women” and “men”, but are differences emerged from the distinctive and overlapping social identities borne by women and men(Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Romaine 1999).

This thesis aims to provide a thorough examination on the gender differences in codemixing behaviour in Hong Kong. Through this study, I will provide evidence on how gender-based linguistic differences would be better understood by adopting the constructionist approach. The data collected will show that the differences in codemixing behaviour between Hong Kong female and male are not simple oppositional differences between female and male but have complex cultural implications.

1.2 Terminology: codemixing

‘Codemixing’, also called intra-sentential codeswitching or intra-sentential code-alternation, refers to the alternate use of two or more languages below clause level within one social situation (Luke 1984; Sridhar and Sridhar 1980; Treffers-Daller 1994; Chan 2004). It should not be confused with ‘codeswitching’ which refers to the alternate use of two or more languages at or above clause level although both codemixing and codeswitching are products of bilingualism. Furthermore, codemixing should not be
confused with ‘lexical borrowing’ which refers to the adaptation of lexical items from a foreign language to one’s native language, and these borrowed lexical items are usually pronounced and used grammatically as if they were part of the native tongue.

The distinction between codeswitching and codemixing is one of the most puzzling terminological problems in the study of code-alternation. Some scholars find it necessary to draw a distinction between them because of their syntactic difference. Others, however, prefer to use ‘code-switching’, ‘mixing’ or ‘code-alternation’ as a cover term for both types of code-alternation discussed above (e.g., Gumperz 1982; Grosjean 1982; Lederberg and Morales 1985; Clyne 1991; Bhatia 1992; Li 2000). Clyne (1991) argues that codeswitching and codemixing refer to the same phenomenon in which ‘the speaker stops using language A and employs language B’ (p.161). A slightly different line of argument is developed by Romaine (1989) who regards codeswitching phenomenon as a continuum on which exist both inter-sentential and intra-sentential code-alternation.

Another terminological problem in this study area lies in the differentiation between codemixing and lexical borrowing. For instance, Lau (1999) defines lexical borrowing as the adaptation of lexical items from a donor language into a recipient language. This definition of lexical borrowing is parallel to Sridhar and Sridhar’s (1980) definition of codemixing which suggests that codemixing refers to the transition from using linguistic units, such as words and phrases, of one language to using those of another within a single utterance. According to these two views, it is almost impossible to tell whether a word is a codemix or a loan item when it is ‘imported’ from one language to another language by a speaker. As it is difficult to distinguish between codemixing and lexical borrowing, Treffers-Dallers (1994) suggests that codemixing and lexical borrowing should be treated as fundamentally the same. In her study in Brussels, she uses the term ‘borrowing’ for all kinds of single-word switches while longer switches below clause level are termed ‘codemixing’.

However, some other researchers have insisted on maintaining a distinction between codemixing and borrowing. Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) outlines four criteria for the
differentiation between codemixing and lexical borrowing: 1) loan items are often adopted when there are no equivalents in the host language while mixed items are used even when equivalents can be found in the host language; 2) the mixed items are usually longer than single words while loan items are not; 3) loan items are used by all speakers in the speech community, including both bilingual and monolingual speakers while mixed items are only limited to bilingual speakers; 4) loan items have been nativized into the host language by phonological and morphosyntactic processes while mixed items are not assimilated into the host language. Myers-Scotton (1993) suggests that borrowing only occurs in monolingual speech while codemixing is necessarily a product of bilingualism. Li (1996) pointed out that loan items are items of foreign origins which have become a part of the repertoire of the monolingual speech community by integration into the phonology and morphosyntax of the host language.

Despite these attempts at clarifications, the terminological dispute remains far from resolved. For example, Chan (2004) pointed out that borrowing can also occur in cases where an equivalent counterpart exists in the recipient language. Koll-Stobbe (1994) argues that some borrowed items may not have been fully nativized into the host language by phonological process. Li (1996), based on mixed code data collected from Hong Kong newspapers, showed that many cases of codemixing in Hong Kong are due to the lack of equivalents in the host language.

The discussion above highlights the terminological problems related to code-alternation. For the purpose of the present study, I propose that it is necessary to maintain the distinction between codeswitching and codemixing. As shown in many previous studies, intra-sentential code-alternation or codemixing is a prevalent phenomenon in Hong Kong but inter-sentential code-alternation or codeswitching is extremely rare. The same situation can also be seen in the results of the present study. As suggested by Li (1998), this is probably related to the strong norms against the use of English among ethnic Chinese in Hong Kong. This will be discussed later in the study. Due to the big difference in occurrence between codeswitching and codemixing in Hong Kong, I believe that, at least in Hong Kong speech community, they should be regarded as two different
phenomena. I will return to this issue later in the study. Therefore, in the present study, I will use ‘code-alternation’ as a cover term for all types of language mixing: ‘codeswitching’ to refer to intersentential code-alternation and ‘codemixing’ to refer to intrasentential code-alternation.

Furthermore, this present study will consider all transferred English items into Cantonese speech as codemixing rather than lexical borrowing for three reasons. First, all informants who participated in this study were all Cantonese-English bilingual speakers. Thus, they were more likely to use the transferred English items as codemixes rather than loan items. Second, based on my own judgement, the mixed items uttered by the informants during the interviews were obviously not items that had been phonologically nativized into Cantonese. Third, from the language diary test where the informants were asked to report their own use of code types such as ‘Pure Cantonese’, ‘Cantonese mixed with English’, ‘English’, etc, it was apparent that the informants were aware of their use of English items in their Cantonese speech when they reported the code they use as ‘Cantonese mixed with English’ rather than ‘Cantonese’.

1.3 Outline of thesis
The remainder of the thesis consists of 5 chapters. In Chapter 2, I will give a literature review on the two streams of approaches towards the study of gender and language and also some theoretical aspects in the study of code choice in bi/multilingual speech communities. Some sociolinguists have suggested that monolingual speech variation can be considered parallel to bi/multilingual language variation. By applying generalizations of gender and language use in monolingual variation to bi/multilingual variation, I will show how the use of language of women and men requires further investigations.

Chapter 3 is a discussion on the methodology of the present study. I will first start with an introduction of the historical and social background of the Hong Kong speech community which is the context of the present study. This will be followed by a description of the social background of the informants and the data collection methods for the present study.
In Chapter 4, the results obtained by one of the instruments---- the informal interview, will be presented. The results show that there are gender differences in code-alternation behaviour in Hong Kong.

In Chapter 5, the results for another data-collection method--- the language dairy, will be presented. Again, the results show that there are differences in the code-alternation patterns of young women and men in Hong Kong. I will suggest that code-alternation carries dual symbolic meanings for women in Hong Kong.

Chapter 6 is the discussion for the results of the present study. By combining the results of the two methods used in the present study, evidence of the interaction of gender and code-alternation in Hong Kong is shown.

Chapter 7 will conclude the present study and gives suggestions for future study.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction of the chapter
In this chapter, I will first review two main streams of approaches towards the study of gender and language variation in monolingual speech communities. Traditional approaches aim at explaining the relationship of gender and language at global level. However, the new approach which arose in the last decade tends to focus on the local particularities of gender and language. Then, I will go on to review some studies on gender differences in code-alternation behaviour in bi/multilingual speech communities. The findings of these studies suggest there might be no universal essence in the interaction of gender and language.

2.2 Two streams of approaches towards gender and languages
In Western monolingual speech variation, it has been found that women tend to use a higher proportion of standard forms of speech than men of the same class within the same speech style. This gender differentiation pattern is so consistent that it has led many sociolinguists to consider it as the fundamental principle of gender differentiation in language use (e.g. Fasold 1990; Chamber 1992; 1994). The consistency of this pattern has prompted number of attempts at generalizations of gender-based linguistic differences at global level. Since the last decade, however, there has been a growing concern on the effect of local particularities of gender on language use in different speech communities (e.g. Cameron 1988; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Gal 1992). Eckert and McConnel-Ginet (1992), in their landmark essay “Think practically and look locally: Language use and gender as community-based practice”, urged that researches should pay more attention to the interaction of gender and other social constructions of identities in a particular culture rather than focusing on gender as a global category which brings the same influence to every speech community.

2.2.1 Traditional approaches: generalizations of gender pattern of language use
It has long been apparent that women and men are different in their language use. Studies on language variation and change have consistently shown that women report a higher tendency towards the use of standard variants than men. This pattern is considered by
many sociolinguists as a universal principle of gender-based differences. Fasold (1990), for example, refers to it as “the sociolinguistic gender pattern”. Labov (1990) gives it as “the first principle of sexual differentiation”.

Although the sociolinguistic gender pattern might seem like a universal phenomenon, it has received no universalized interpretations. Explanations for the pattern have taken a number of different forms. For example, Labov (1966; 1972) and Trudgill (1972) both suggested that women are conservative linguistically because they are status-conscious. The main reason for this is that women are socially insecure as they cannot derive their identity and self-esteem from paid work like men do so they employ language as their symbolic capital and acquire status through the use of language. Deuchar (1988), considering politeness as parallel to standard forms of speech, argues that women, as powerless members of the society, use a higher proportion of standard forms as a face-saving strategy in interactions. Fasold (1990) claims that women’s preference on standard forms of speech is due to their wish to sound less ‘local’ as sounding local represents the endorsement of traditional values established by men which places women in a subservient positions in the society. Milroy and Milroy (1993) develops a different line of explanation, suggesting that women’s higher use of standard variants is due to the fact that they have looser social networks than men, and therefore conform less to vernacular norms than men do. These are just a few selections from the wide range of the interpretations that have been proposed. As can be seen, all these explanations seem to be plausible account for the sociolinguistic gender pattern. This has led many scholars to suggest that no single interpretation can be possiblle(e.g. Cheshire 2002; Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros 1998; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992).

Moreover, there are, in fact, counterexamples to the consistent pattern of gender linguistic differentiation. In Muslim communities such as Amman and Cairo, men have been found to tend towards the use of standard forms of speech (i.e. Classical Arabic) significant more than women (Haeri 2000). The gender pattern in these societies has been argued to be due to women’s lack of access to the standard variety of language in these communities (Abdel-Jawad 1981; Labov 1990). However, Haeri (2000) pointed out that
educated women do have access to Arabic Classical, yet they still use Classical Arabic less than men. He suggests that more understanding about Muslim society and culture is needed for the interpretation for the gender differences in these communities. In addition, some other studies have shown that women and men may not always differ in their use of language. Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros (1998), equating codeswitching behavior with the use of nonstandard forms, found that no significant gender differences in the codeswitching pattern in Greek-Cypriot communities in Britain.

There is another well-known generalization related to gender-based linguistic differences. Women’s preference on standard variants has said to play an important part in the mechanism of language change because women, as the child bearer, certainly talk to young children more than men do, and therefore, would more likely pass on their use of language to the future generation (Labov, 1972). After reviewing related research in the last thirty years, Labov (1990) proposed a generalized account of women’s role in language change (the formulations below is from Cameron, 2003, p.190):

- Principle I: For stable sociolinguistic variables (i.e., those not involved in change), men use a higher frequency of nonstandard forms than women.
- Principle Ia: In change from above (i.e., where speakers are conscious of the existence and social meaning of competing variants, women favor the incoming prestige form more than men.
- Principle II: In change from below (i.e., where speakers are not conscious that change is occurring), women are most often the innovators.

These generalized principles have raised concerns on the plausibility of trying to account for linguistic behaviour in terms of some essential characteristic common to all members of the group. As pointed out by Cameron (2003) and Eckert (1989), one problem with Labov’s generalization is that it treats the linguistic behaviour of all women as being fundamentally the same. In fact, women’s linguistic behaviour may vary across the population. Women who lead changes from above and those who lead changes from
below may be individuals of different positions in the social hierarchy. Labov’s Philadelphia study found just such a pattern, with women at the lower end of the socioeconomic hierarchy leading the change for a certain vowels while those at the upper end resisting the change.

Another problem with this generalization lies in its underlying principle which is the so-called “sociolinguistic gender pattern” that women tend to use more standard variants than men do. This empirical basis of the generalization relies heavily on the concept of ‘standardness’ and ‘nonstandardness’ which researchers can hardly be objective about (Cheshire 2000; Haeri 2000). In sociolinguistic studies, ‘standard’ and ‘nonstandard’ forms are usually differentiated according to the social status of their frequent users and the degree of formality of the context where they are used. ‘Standard’ forms usually refer to the overtly prestigious forms frequently used by members of the prestigious social class and by all members in the speech community in formal speech style. However, as Cheshire points out (2000), the notion of prestige may have different meanings in different speech communities and even within the same speech community. Therefore, it would be implausible to generalize behaviour of women and men across the world based on the concept of ‘standardness’ and ‘nonstandardness’ which may vary from speech community to speech community.

As we have seen, differences in language use between women and men may not be as simple as the proposed generalizations might suggest. Given the fact that different gender linguistic patterns appear in Western and Muslim cultures and that so many different factors can be so convincingly argued for the same gender linguistic pattern, more detailed and systematic investigations seem to be required for the issue before any accurate generalizations can be provided.

2.2.2 The constructionist approach: looking locally into gender

Traditional approaches which aim at providing a generalized account for the language use of women and men has been challenged by many social constructionists. Social constructionists tend to disagree with the traditional treatment of “women” and “men” as
global binary oppositional categories. It is suggested that the construction of gender involves the interaction of overlapping and non-overlapping identities attached to women and men through their participation in social practices. As social constructions of identities are different in different times and places, it is necessary to “look locally” in order to provide an interpretation for the construction of gender and its effects on language use in a particular community.

Eckert (1989), in her essay “The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation”, pointed out that the treatment of differences shown up in sex groupings as gender differences in variationist studies is inappropriate as the differences may involves differences in orientation to other social variables. By exemplifying her study on “Jocks” and “Burnouts” in a high school in Detroit which found a more significant difference in the use of certain linguistic variants between the Jock and the Burnout girls than between the boys, although both groups of girls were found to be more advanced in the use of variants than their male counterparts, she argued that gender must not be treated as binary oppositional categories as oppositions can also be found with each sex category. As shown in the study, the girls’ cultural identities as “Jocks” and “Burnout” overlapped with their identity as “female”.

A similar view is given by Romaine (1999) who used the differences in the identity of White American women and African American women to argue that gender is a culture-specific construction and sex is a simple biological category. While both White American women and African American share the same sex, their racial culture has created different ways for them to experience the society. Therefore, studies on gender and language must not only rely on the sex differences between women and men for an interpretation on their language use but should also look into other social and cultural aspects which take part in the construction of identities for different individuals.

While the constructionist approach tends to emphasize on the social construction of “women” and “men”, it does not say that sex plays no role in affecting language use of women and men. Constructionists tend to agree that sex is a fundamental basis for a
differentiation of roles, norms and ideologies which play important roles in the social construction of gender (Eckert 1989; Bergvall 1999; Romaine 1999). In the old days, for example, physical differences between women and men assigned different social practices to women and men. For example, women were the gatherer and men were the hunter.

Although conventional gender roles in the past have been called into question as women have been moving self-consciously to the marketplace (Cheshire 2002; Eckert 1989), traditional norms, roles and ideologies governed by sex in a culture are still important for the analysis of gender and language because they are part of the cultural histories of gender(Cheshire 1989).

2.3 Code choice in bi/multilingual speech communities

As more than one language is used by speakers in bi/multilingual speech communities, researchers have been interested in how bi/multilingual speakers switch between two or more languages or mix languages together in their daily life. In monolingual speech communities, sociolinguists study speech variation in relation to various social factors including setting, speech style, age, gender, education, etc. This approach towards language use has been proven fruitful. It has been found that different social aspects work together to shape the social identities of individuals and therefore, affect their use of language. The same approach also applies to the study of bi/multilingual language variation. Like monolingual speech variation, bi/multilingual code choice is also affected by various social factors. This has led many researchers to consider bi/multilingual language variation as parallel to monolingual speech variation. As Coupland (1985) points out, ‘the difference between monolingual and bilingual behavior lies only in the choice of linguistic symbols for socially equivalent processes.’

Fischer (1972) suggests that language or code choice in bi/multilingual speech communities can be analyzed within the domain or the social context of the speech. The domain of language use is determined by three contextual factors: the relationship of the speakers engaged in the talk, the setting where the talk takes place, and the topic being
talked about (Fishman 1971; Hymes 1977; Ervin-Tripp 1964). Fishman (1972) claims that stable bi/multilingual speech communities have their own patterns of how different languages fall into different domains.

This claim is supported by Gibbons’s (1987) findings in his study on the code choices of a group of university students in Hong Kong. He found that the use of pure Cantonese, MIX (Cantonese-English codemix), pure English, etc. is each associated with a specific domain. For example, pure Cantonese is usually used in family domain among family members while MIX is usually used by university students to discuss school life. However, Fishman’s model has been criticized for being too general as it assumes that bi/multilingual code choices simply reflect regular patterns. As Holmes (1992) points out, ‘it obviously oversimplifies the complexity of bilingual interaction’.

In fact, code choices of individual speakers may vary according to more specific social factors other than domain of language use. Myers-Scotton (1993) argues that speakers’ social identities and relationship play a major role in affecting their code choices. In her review of data collected in Nigeria and Kenya in 1970s, it was found that most urban Kenyans use their mother tongue to communicate with other speakers from their own ethnic group while Swahili, the indigenous lingua franca, and English, the alien official language, are used to communicate with speakers from other ethnic group. Also, it was found that the use of English is higher among speakers with secondary education or higher than among speakers of lower educational level. It can be seen that each of these languages serves as an identity marker for a specific social category. Speakers may choose to use a particular language or code as a signal of group membership and shared ethnicity with one another. The mother tongue, for instance, symbolizes the ethnic identity shared by people from the same ethnic background while English symbolizes good education and is only among people of a certain educational level.

In addition, code choice can serve as a strategy for self-representation. As mentioned previously, different codes in bi/multilingual speech communities may carry different symbolic values or meanings and the use of a code enables speakers to assert their group
membership in a particular social group. This symbolic power of language is sometimes used by speakers as part of a verbal strategy in order to achieve a certain social status or identity. Gal’s (1978) study on language shift in a Hungary-speaking village in Austria showed that young women in the village lead in the shift from Hungarian to German because they want to dissociate themselves from the traditional peasant way of life and want to adopt the modern urban lifestyle by marrying German speaking workers. The use of German by these women is a verbal strategy to reject their peasant identity and to achieve their desirable identity as a worker’s wife.

2.3.1 Code-alternation as a nonstandard form of speech

Bi/multilingual speakers sometimes switch to different languages as they enter different social situations and sometimes they use different languages alternately within one social situation, producing a mixture of languages. Both of these cases are natural phenomena whose causes are determined by the contextual factors and what speakers intend to express about themselves in the social situation. Unfortunately, while the former case is considered as an appropriate linguistic behavior, the latter is usually considered as a stigmatized form of speech in many bi/multilingual speech communities (Montes-Alcala, 2001; Gardner-Chloros 1991). Language mixing is usually considered a sign of lack of education in many speech communities. Among Mexican Americans, the derogatory term *Tex Mex* is used to refer to the mixing of Spanish and English. In some French-speaking Canadian communities, the put-down label *joual* is used to refer to the mixing of French and English (Holmes 1992). In Hong Kong, *zung1-ying1-gaap3-zaap6* (literal translation: ‘Chinese-English mixing’) is used to describe speakers with poor language skills (Li 1996; Chan 2004).

Due to this negative attitude towards code-alternation, there is a social norm against the use of alternated(mixed) codes in formal and academic settings in many speech communities (Chesire and Gardner-Chloros 1998; Gardner-Chloros 1991). For example, in Hong Kong secondary schools, codemixing is generally negatively viewed by teaching staff and many students are anxious of codemixing during lessons because they are afraid of being punished by their teachers (Tsui, 2005). Gardner-Chloros (1991), in her study
conducted in an insurance office in Strasburg, found that code-alternation occurs frequently in conversation among employees in the office while it occurs much less often between the employees and the clients because the in-group interactions among the employees are much more relaxed and less constrained than those between the employees and the clients. Gibbons (1987) found that codemixing in Hong Kong mostly occurs in informal speech style.

2.4 Code-alternation and Gender.
In monolingual variations, women have been found to use standard forms more than men. Due to the perceived nonstandard nature of code-alternation, some sociolinguists have attempted to examine the relationship of gender and code-alternation by equating code-alternation with nonstandard forms of speech in monolingual speech communities. For example, by assuming a parallel relationship between nonstandard forms of speech in monolingual communities and code-alternation, Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros (1998) reviewed number of the limited studies done on gender and code-alternation and found no consistent gender code-alternation pattern similar to the sociolinguistic gender pattern in monolingual speech variation.

In the Greek-Cypriot communities in Britain Cheshire and Gardner-Chlros (1998) found no significant differences in the code-alternation behaviour between women and men. Cheshire and Gardner-Chlros (1998) did a comparison between their results and the results of Romaine’s (1989) study on Punjabis-English codeswitching. Considering the different gender code-alternation patterns found in the two studies, they suggested that there might be no consistent gender pattern of code-alternation across different communities.

Romaine’s (1989) study of Punjabis-English codeswitching in Birmingham found that women tend to codeswitch more than men. It was argued that the difference was due to the gender-role differentiation in the community. In Birmingham, codeswitching is used mainly for personal communication with in-group members in the community while pure Punjabis and pure English are used for the communication with outsiders. Women as
housewives tended to have fewer contacts with the outside world than men, and therefore, would less likely use Punjabis and English separately than men.

In the ethnic Chinese speech community in Hong Kong, Pennington, Balla, Detaramani, Poon and Tam (1992) found that women in Hong Kong tend to codemix more than men. They considered that women’s higher use of mixed code in Hong Kong as an innovative behaviour. This view is based on Principle II in Labov’s generalization of women’s role in sound change which states that women are innovative in leading changes that have not been stigmatized in the speech community.

One of the few works that have found a gender code-alternation pattern parallel to that in monolingual variations is the study of Mougeon and Beniak (1992) who found that female bilingual speakers in a French-speaking community in Ontario use the English word so in their French speech less than men. Considering code-alternation as a stigmatized form of speech, Moygeon and Beniak (1992) concluded that their finding corresponds to the generalization of gender linguistic differentiation which states that women are more sensitive to nonstandard forms than men that they tend to use it less often than men.

As claimed by Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros(1998), the lack of a consistent pattern of gender differences in code-alternation suggests some social implications about code-alternation and gender. First, code-alternation may carry different connotations in different speech communities. Second, code-alternation may not be considered nonstandard in every speech community. Also, language attitudes towards code-alternation may vary within a speech community. Third, language use of women and men may vary across different speech communities and therefore, rather than examining the link between gender and code-alternation at a global level, more attention should be paid to the local particularities of gender and the use of language in a given speech community.
2.5 Summary of chapter

In this chapter, I have reviewed some significance on gender and language, and on bilingual choices and code-alternation. It can be seen that monolingual speech variation and bilingual language variation can be considered as parallel linguistic phenomena. If the sociolinguistic gender pattern found in monolingual community is a universal principle of gender-based linguistic differences, it would probably be adequate to explain the linguistic differences between women and men in bilingual communities. However, there are no consistent patterns of gender differentiation in bilingual communities, and this suggests that some more detailed and systematic investigations are needed.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview of the chapter
In this chapter, I will introduce the social background of the Hong Kong ethnic Chinese speech community which is the context of the present study. In addition, this chapter will describe the data-collection method for the present study.

3.2 The context of the present study
Hong Kong, located on the southeast coast of the People’s Republic of China, is usually described as a city where East meets West. It became a British colony in 1942 and was returned to China in 1997. Despite its cosmopolitan multiracial appearance, Hong Kong is in fact a far more racially homogenous city than most cities in the world. According to the last population census in 2001, Hong Kong has a population of 6,708,389, more than 94% of which are ethnic Chinese.

It is worth noting that Hong Kong is largely a second or third generation migrant community. Due to the Second World War and the onset of Civil War in China, a large influx of Chinese immigrants came to Hong Kong. During 1945-1981, the population in Hong Kong rose from 600,000 to 5.5 million (Wong, 1999). Due to the large influx of both legal and illegal immigrants, the Hong Kong implemented the ‘One-way Permit System’ in 1980. Under the One-way Permit System, a quota of up to 150 persons per day was given to immigrants from mainland China. In other words, Hong Kong has been receiving 54,000 immigrants from China per year since 1980. In 1996, one-third of the Hong Kong population were born in mainland China and the majority of Hong Kong born Chinese had parents or grandparents who were born in China (Wong, 1999). Later in the study, I will argue that this historical fact has an influential impact on the construction of identities of the Hong Kong young generation and their use of language.

The most widely used language in Hong Kong is Cantonese which is the “usual” language of 89.2% of the population. English is the usual language of 3.2% of the population while Mandarin is used by only 0.9% population as a usual language. Speakers of other Chinese dialects make up to 5.5% of the population while those of other languages make up to 1.2%(Census and Statistical Department H.K., 2001)
3.2.1 Languages and language attitudes in Hong Kong
During the colonial period, English and Cantonese formed a diglossic situation in which the two languages were used in different domains and for different functions (Fishman, 1967; Gibbons; 1987). English was a prestigious language which had the most instrumental value and social status in the speech community (Lai 2005) that it was used in social domains including government institutions, law, education and business while Cantonese was used by ethnic Hong Kong Chinese as a daily-life language in informal settings(Pierson, 1994).

As a result of the political handover in 1997, the HKSAR government introduced Mandarin (the official language of China) as one of the official languages, along with Cantonese and English, in its language policy known as “Biliteracy and Trilingualism”. Hence, HongKongers of postcolonial generation are expected to be able to write both English and Chinese and speak Cantonese, English and also Mandarin.

One institutional sector which is perhaps most affected by the language policy is education. Before the political handover in 1997, English was used as the medium of instruction (EMI) in more than 90 % of secondary schools in Hong Kong. As a result of the Mother Tongue Education Policy implemented in 1998, more than 70% of the secondary schools were required to switch to using Chinese as the medium of instruction (CMI) for Secondary 1- Secondary 3 (junior secondary levels) while only 20% retained EMI. However, most secondary schools were given liberty to revert to EMI for Secondary 4-7 (senior secondary levels) in order to prepare students for university education which retained using English as medium of instructions. Meanwhile, the importance of Mandarin was also enhanced in schools. Before 1997, Mandarin was not required to be included in the school curriculum compulsorily. Since 1998, however, Mandarin has become a core subject in the curriculum from Secondary 1- Secondary 3(Lai, 2005).

Due to the change in sovereignty, one might expect the status of English in would be replaced by Mandarin. However, many studies on the language attitudes conducted in
recent years have shown that English is still regarded as the most prestigious language in Hong Kong. It is seen as a symbol of modernization, westernization, wealth and good education. Although there are an increasing number of Mandarin learners in Hong Kong, the status of Mandarin is the lowest among the three official languages in Hong Kong. While English is regarded as the most prestigious language, Cantonese is regarded as the language most representative of the Hong Kong ethnic Chinese speech community (Lai 2005).

Despite the prestigious status of English, there are strong social norms against the use of English (except code-mixing) for spoken communication among ethnic Chinese in Hong Kong. Kowk and Chan (1972) found that university students in Hong Kong rarely used English at home and with peers other than to make fun of someone. Fu (1987) comments that Cantonese-English bilinguals in Hong Kong use English in situations where they have no other choices (i.e. in school or work settings). This is mainly due to the fact Hong Kong ethnic Chinese are generally proud of their identity as Chinese and the use of English may seem to be a threat to this identity (Gibbons 1987). In Hong Kong, it is often heard that ethnic Chinese who use English above clause or sentence level to one another are described with insult terms such as “showing off” and “suhng3 yeuhng2” (literal meaning: “nigger lover”).

3.2.2 Code-alternation in Hong Kong

The language contact between English and Cantonese has led to the prevalence of codemixing behavior in Hong Kong. Gibbons (1987), in his study on a group of university students in Hong Kong, distinguished four main types of codes used in the Hong Kong speech community: pure Cantonese, MIX (Cantonese-English codemixing with Cantonese being the dominant base code), English with Cantonese (with English being the dominant base code), and English. Each of these four codes is associated with relevant social situation and purpose. MIX and pure Cantonese are used for daily life communication while English and English with Cantonese are mainly used in situations where they are required (e.g. in school context; to talk to foreigners). Among these four
types of code, the use of MIX was found to be most frequent by the participants in formal settings.

Chan (2004), in her study on a group of secondary students, found mixed code has become the main mode of communication for young people in Hong Kong nowadays. In her one-day-without-English experiment, the students were asked to avoid using English items for one day. The results showed that all students reported incidences of communication breakdown during the day. Some of the students found it uncomfortable to speak pure Cantonese with their peers. One of the students commented, ‘some of the people looked at me as if I were a stranger when I tried to speak “written Chinese” and even “normal” [formal] Cantonese’. Another student noted, ‘when we couldn’t say English words, we needed to replace them with Chinese ones [Cantonese Chinese], but it sounded very strange.”

The language attitudes towards codemixing in Hong Kong are rather contradictory. While codemixing is generally considered as a sign of poor education by some members in the community, it is considered as an identity marker for the educated people by the others. As mentioned in the last chapter, codemixing is generally suppressed in school context in Hong Kong. Many educators in Hong Kong view codemixing behaviour as the culprit for the decline of language standards in both Chinese and English (Li, 1998). A contrasting argument is developed by Cheung (1984) who notes that “while English in Hong Kong divides people who knows the language (the middle class) and those who don’t (the working class), Cantonese unites the general public [as ethnic Chinese], and Mixed-code the middle class” (p.281). In this view, codemixing is seen as a symbol of good education. However, like many bi/multilingual speech communities, there are strong social norms against the use of language mixture in formal contexts in Hong Kong, thus, codemixing only occurs in-group communication in informal contexts.

As mentioned in the terminology section in Chapter 1, there is a need to differentiate between codeswitching and codemixing in the present study. It is because these types of code-alternation carry different social meanings in the speech community in Hong Kong.
While codemixing is accepted as a natural phenomenon which marks the identity of the educated group of people, codeswitching is usually considered as an unnatural and deliberate code choice by which individuals “show off” themselves. According to Li (1998), this is due to the negative attitude towards the use of English among ethnic Chinese. As codeswitching may involve the use of English above sentence level, the use of it is perceived as no different from the use pure English.

3.2.3 Gender relations in Hong Kong
To examine the gender relations in Hong Kong, it is necessary to start from the traditional Chinese cultural values towards gender relations as majority of the Hong Kong population is of Chinese origin. The Chinese culture is a male-dominant one in which women are considered subordinated to men. In the past, the Chinese society has been highly patriarchal. The folk saying, nam chu oi nui chu noi (Mandarin: literal meaning: ‘men take charge of the outside, women the inside’) is often quoted to describe the patriarchal society of Hong Kong past (Tam 2000). Women are seen as mother-wives who belong to the domestic sphere, whereas men are seen as the provider of the family who takes part in the employment activities in the public sphere. In Hong Kong, this situation of gender relations has started to change only since the last few decades. In the 1970s, most Hong Kong women were still expected to “take charge of the inside”. Most husbands would consider it as a disgrace when their wives took up employment in the marketplace. Furthermore, in the past, women were often denied access to tertiary education by their parents. The folk saying, “nui zhi wu cai bian shi de” (Mandarin: literal meaning: “women without wisdom gain merits”) was usually told to women by their parents.

Today’s Hong Kong is a modern, bustling society filled with opportunities. Women’s participation in politics and other social domains has risen. During the handover from Britain to China, the women’s fight for equity has achieved some success, i.e., the establishment of legal institutions like the Equal Opportunity Commission (EOC) to pursue equal opportunity, the repealing of the ban on female inheritance of land in the New Territories, and the enactment of Hong Kong’s first sex discrimination ordinance
The rising educational attainment of women since the 1960s has helped to reduce disparity between men and women. The economic transformation from manufacturing to service industries since the 1980s has provided opportunities for the upward mobility for Hong Kong’s women (Lee 2003).

Women in Hong Kong today hold a different cultural view from women of the past. In 1999, Ng conducted a telephone questionnaire (‘What do I want?’) on 731 female members of staff in one Hong Kong University. 11 references were made by the respondents in wanting a better quality of life for women, and seeing women gain in status and equality. 3 of the references are shown as below:

- To see women performing outstanding in the society
- Equal rights, equal opportunities, and mutual respect for (Asian) women
- A society that treats women equally to men; men should not be regarded as superior, unless they have the ability

Gender is constantly being maneuvered. In this era, attitudes and ideas about gender relations have changed, a male dominant society no longer places a strong hold in Hong Kong. Gender relations in Hong Kong are working towards equality.

3.3 The informants
The informants were 20 Cantonese-English bilingual speakers. 10 of them were female and 10 of them were male. They were all Hong Kong ethnic Chinese who were born and grown up in Hong Kong. All of them had never resided in a foreign country except for one female speaker who had spent one year living in the U.S. for a study exchange program 4 years ago. To test for the gender effect on codemixing, social variables other than gender were carefully controlled. Thus, the informants were selected from the same socioeconomic class, age group and educational level.

As pointed out by Eckert (Eckert 1997), individuals’ use of language may change as they go through different life stages. To eliminate the effect of both biological and
chronological age on the results, the informants were chosen from a small age range (24-28 years old) and they were all fresh university graduates who had been in the workforce for no more than 5 years.

The informants belonged to the upper middle class of the Hong Kong society. The determination of class was mainly based on my knowledge on the occupations, incomes and family backgrounds of the informants most of whom I had known and been close friends with for more than 8 years. All of the informants were university graduates with a bachelor’s degree.

Unfortunately, one social variable that could not be controlled was the occupations of the informants. Majority of the informants were engaged in job activities in the commercial field including banking, marketing, management and merchandising. As social practices may affect the use of language of individuals, it is possible that the differences in job nature of the informants may cause some linguistic differences among the informants. Therefore, an examination to the relationship of occupations and codemixing behavior will be also included in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social variables</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24-28</td>
<td>24-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic class</td>
<td>Upper middle class</td>
<td>Upper middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Social variables of informants

3.4 The Instruments
The data were collected through two instruments: an informal interview and a language diary. Both of the data collection methods have their advantages and disadvantages. Interviews allow the researcher to record real life conversations but the informants may not behave naturally as they normally do as they are conscious of the fact that they are
being interviewed. The language diary does not require the researcher to be present as the informants are asked to fill in details of their verbal exchanges in a form with a highly structured format but the collected data can be quite subjective as it is mainly based on the speakers’ own perceptions of their language use. However, by combining the two methods, the researcher would be able to assess the validity of the data as the two methods can serve as an accuracy check for each other.

3.4.1 The informal interview
As it has been found that codemixing in Hong Kong mostly occurs in causal settings (Gibbons 1987), the interviews were carried out in casual settings. As the interviewer had been friends with the informants for some years, the interviews were easily done in a very causal style. Since the interviewer was female, the interviews could only be done in one mixed-sex setting which was male-female and one same-sex setting which was female-female. Four simple and easy-to-answer questions were asked:

Question 1. What is your occupation and what are your duties at work?
Question 2. What do you dislike about your job?
Question 3. What do you do during leisure time?
Question 4. How many members are there in your family and who are they?

Before I chose the questions for the interview, I had done some observation on my friends’ codemixing behaviour and I realized that they usually codemixed a lot when they talked about their work. Most of the jargons at work, such as position titles, names of documents, and names of departments, were said in English. Therefore, the first question “what is your occupation and what are your duties at work” was chosen and it was expected that they would say some workplace jargons in English when they answered this question. The second question was chosen as I intended to see if the informants would also use English words to express their feelings other than to use English to say workplace jargons. Question 3 was chosen because I had observed that, in Hong Kong, many leisure activities would sometimes be said in mixed code, for example:
### Cantonese, Mixed code, Meanings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cantonese</th>
<th>Mixed code</th>
<th>Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“lok5 tsaa2 ba1”</td>
<td>“lok pub”</td>
<td>(go to a pub)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“hui5 haan 3kai1”</td>
<td>“hui shopping”</td>
<td>(go shopping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“da2 gou1 yi3 fu1”</td>
<td>“da golf”</td>
<td>(play golf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“da2 tsuk5 kau3”</td>
<td>“da snooker”</td>
<td>(play snooker)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the first three questions were open-ended ones, it was expected that the informants would give different answers as they had different jobs and different hobbies. Therefore, it was impossible to target on any specific words. Question 4, however, aimed at two target words which were the English words “daddy” and “mammy”. In Hong Kong, it is quite common that speakers would address their parents in English. It is interesting to note that some speakers would use “daddy” and “mammy” to address their parents directly and use the Cantonese equivalent “ah pa” (daddy) and “ah ma” (mammy) when they indirectly address their parents in front of others. Also, some speakers may directly address their parents with the Cantonese equivalents and use the English equivalents when they mention their parents to others. It is also worth noting that other family members such as siblings and grandparents are rarely addressed in English in Hong Kong.

As mentioned before, one social factor which was not controlled was the occupations of the informants. It is possible that the different nature of the informants’ occupation may have an effect on their language use. As suggested by Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992), the social practices individuals engage in would have an effect on their language use. Therefore, I have divided the informants into two groups according to the nature of their jobs. Informants who worked in the commercial areas including business management, marketing, and accounting would be considered as working in “more competitive environments” while informants who worked as salespersons, teachers, and so on, would be considered as working in “less competitive environments”. Table.2 shows a summary of working environments of the informants.
3.4.2 The language diary
The language diary was based on the design devised by Gibbons (1987). The informants were required to fill in details of verbal exchanges they made with their interlocutors in a form with a highly structured format on a two-day basis. The details required to report included age, gender, and educational level of the interlocutor, the code used for the verbal exchange (i.e., Cantonese, Cantonese with English (codemixing), English, Mandarin, etc), the circumstance where the verbal exchange took place, and the topic of the verbal exchange (please see appendix for a sample of the language diary). As most informants had highly busy working schedules, they were only required to report details of as many verbal exchanges as possible.

3.5 The procedure
The informants had been told that the research was about language use. However, to make sure the informants would codemix naturally, they were not told that the research topic was about codemixing. Each informant was interviewed individually in casual settings including restaurants, karaoke bars, and coffee shops. After each interview, the
informant was given instructions on how to fill out the language diary. The completed language diary was returned to the researcher by email.

### 3.6 Summary of chapter

In this chapter, I have described the historical background, linguistic situation and gender relations in Hong Kong. This information is important for the analysis of the study because it will show us how identities of women and men are constructed in Hong Kong. I have also described the process of data collection in this chapter. Despite the limited size of the sample which cannot be considered to be representative of the speech community in Hong Kong, I believe it will give a good picture of the code choices of women and men in Hong Kong.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION FOR THE INTERVIEW

4.1 Overview of the chapter

In this chapter, I will discuss the data-coding method used for processing the results for the informal interview. Then, I will present and discuss the results. The results will show that young women codemix more than young men in Hong Kong.

4.2 Data-coding

The percentage of English items used by the informants during the interviews was calculated out of the total number of English words and Cantonese characters uttered during the interviews. An initial attempt was made to calculate the percentage of the English items out of the total number of words uttered by the informants. However, the morphosyllabic structure of the Cantonese language poses difficulties in drawing boundaries between words. Many Cantonese words are compound words which are made up by more than one character and a character can also stand out as a word alone so it is difficult to define word boundaries. Another method which calculated the percentage of English items out of the total duration (mins) of the interviews was also attempted. However, this method could be problematic as the speaking pace of the individuals could vary. Therefore, the calculation was made out of the total number of Cantonese characters and English items uttered instead. The following is an example of how the data was coded:

Example: ngo5 hau2 soeng1 seon3 ngo5 go3 friend

(I completely trust my friend)

(6 Cantonese characters + 1 English words)
The percentage of codemixing: \( \frac{1}{7} \times 100\% = 14.3\% \)

4.3 The results

The overall results for the Interview showed that the female informants codemixed approximately twice the time as much as the male informants did during the interviews. As can be seen in Figure 1, 6.2% of the speech contributed by the female informants during the interviews was English while only 3.6% of the speech contributed by the male informants was English.

![Figure 1. The percentage of English used by the female and male informants during the interview](image)

4.3.1 Results for Question 1, 2 and 3

I will now turn to the results of each question. A summary of the results of the four questions is shown in Table 3. All informants codemixed during the interviews. Both female and male informants reported a much higher percentage of codemixing in answering Question 1 “what is your occupation and what are your duties at work” than Question 2 and 3. The percentage of use of English items by the female informants in answering Question 1 was about three times higher than that of Question 2 and 3. The male informants reported a six times higher percentage of use of English items in
answering Question 1 than Question 2 and 3. Again, the results of Question 1 showed that female informants employed twice the time as many English items as the male did when answering the question. In the answers for Question 2 “what do you dislike about your job” and Question 3 “what do you do during your leisure time”, the percentage of use of English reported by the female informants was three times higher than that reported by the male informants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Informants</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Informants</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Summary of percentage of use of English by female and male informants in the interviews

As can be seen in Table 3, there is a higher percentage of use of English items in Question 1 than the other questions. This is not surprising as most office jargons and technical terms in the commercial fields are usually said in English in Hong Kong. This may be related to the historical background of Hong Kong. Due to the colonization by the British, English is widely-used in institutional and commercial areas, thus, many technical terms in Hong Kong are usually said in English. The difference between the informants’ use of English items in the answers of Question 1 and Question 2, suggest that emotional feelings are less likely described in English. Question 2 asked the informants to describe their feelings for their jobs. In the answers of Question 2, almost all affective notions are expressed in Cantonese and the use of English by the informants in answering this question was only limited to technical terms related to their work. This shows that English and Cantonese have different connotations in the community. The use of English for technical terms at work signifies the instrumental value of English while the use of Cantonese items for affective notions suggests that Cantonese is used for maintaining solidarity among ethnic Chinese in Hong Kong.

4.3.2 Results for Question 4
As mentioned in the previous chapter, Question 4 aimed at two target items “daddy” and “mammy”. The results turned out to be as expected that the use of English by the informants in answering this question only occurred when they referred to their parents. None of the informants used English to refer to other family members such as brother and sister. As can be seen in Table 4, a significant difference between the female and male informants was observed in the use of English for addressing parents. Six out of the ten female informants addressed their parents as “daddy” and “mammy” to the interviewer while only one out of the ten male informants did so. All other informants referred to their parents in Cantonese during the interviews. No other English terms such as “father”, “mother”, “dad” and “mum” were used by the informants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>Tokens of “Daddy” (%)</th>
<th>Tokens of “Mummy” (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/10 (60%)</td>
<td>6/10 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4/10 (40%)</td>
<td>4/10 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1/10 (10%)</td>
<td>1/10 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9/10 (90%)</td>
<td>9/10 (90%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. The use of the English words “daddy” and “mammy” by the female informants and male informants

4.3.3. Results for informants in different working environments

As mentioned in the methodology, the informants were divided into two categories according to the working environments they work in. The results showed that the female informants in both types of working environments codemixed more than their male counterparts. Differences in the percentages of the female informants and the male informants in each type of working environments are displayed in Figure 2. It can be seen that the difference (0.4%) between the female informants and the male informants is fairly small in the “less competitive working environments”. A more noticeable difference (2.2%) between the female informants and the male informants can be seen in the “more competitive working environments”. When the female and male informants were compared separately, it turned out that the female showed a greater category difference than the male. The difference between the female in the two types of working environments
environment was 4.2% while that between the male was only 2.4%. The differences between sex categories are shown in Figure 3.

**Figure 2.** Percentages of use of English items of the female informants and male informants in the “more competitive working environments” and the “more competitive working environments”

**Figure 3.** Differences in percentage of amount of English used within each sex category
It can be seen that differences in codemixing behaviour in Hong Kong do not only exist between sex groups, but also within sex groups. The differences within sex groups can be caused by the different social practices the members engage in. This confirms Eckert’s (1989) claim that the construction of gender is also co-constructed with other social identities.

4.4 Summary of chapter

In this chapter, I have presented the results for the interview. The results of the interview showed that young educated women in Hong Kong tended to codemix more than their male counterparts. However, a difference between each gender group was also observed. The young women and men who worked in the “more competitive” working environments tend to codemix more than their same-sex counterparts who worked in the “less competitive” working environments and the difference within the female group was significantly higher than the male group. This shows that gender identities are interwoven with other social identities. Therefore, linguistic differences shown in sex groupings should not be regarded as mere differences between “women” and “men”.
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION FOR LANGUAGE DIARY

5.1 Overview of the chapter
This chapter will present the results of the language dairy. Seven types of codes including pure Cantonese, Cantonese-English mixture, pure English, English-Cantonese mixture, Mandarin, Mandarin-Cantonese mixture, and others were reported by the informants. Among these seven types of codes, pure Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture were found to be the most frequently used codes in Hong Kong. While the other five types of codes were found to be only used in specific social situations, a sociolinguistic variation between pure Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture in daily-life communication was found. Young women and men in Hong Kong were found to be different in their choice of the two codes.

5.2 Data-coding
Owing to the large number of verbal exchanges collected, the software SPSS 14.0 was used to process the data. Data collected were first entered in the program by hand. The calculation of frequencies and crosstabulations of variables were done by the program.

5.3 Results for the language diary
A total of 259 verbal exchanges were reported by the informants. 115 of them were contributed by the male informants and 144 were by the female informants. The use of 7 types of code including pure Cantonese, Cantonese-English mixture (codemixing with Cantonese as the base code), pure English, English-Cantonese mixture (codemixing with English as the base code), pure Mandarin, Mandarin-Cantonese mixture (codemixing with Mandarin as the base code), others including Hokkien and Indonesian was reported. The numbers of verbal exchanges and each type of code is shown in Figure 4.

As can be seen in Figure 4, among the 259 verbal exchanges reported, 40.2% was in pure Cantonese and 48.3% was in Cantonese-English mixture. The third most frequent code reported by the informants was English which had a percentage of 5.4%. The percentages of English-Cantonese mixture, pure Mandarin, Mandarin-Cantonese mixture and others were 1.9%, 2.3%, 0.8% and 1.2% respectively. It can be seen that pure Cantonese and
Cantonese-English mixture are the two main types of code used by ethnic Chinese in Hong Kong. This pattern is similar to the pattern found in the language diary study done by Gibbons (1987).

The insignificance of the occurrences of pure English confirmed the claim by Fu’s (1987) that Hong Kong Chinese rarely use English to one another unless in situations where they have no other choices. From the crosstabulations of code with circumstance, topic and relationship of interlocutor to informant shown in Table.5, Table.6, and Table.7, it can be seen that thirteen out of the fourteen verbal exchanges in English reported by the informants took place in workplaces. This suggests that the use of English in Hong Kong is only limited to certain domains where English is required.

Fu’s (1987) claim about the use of English in Hong Kong may also hold true for Mandarin as well. The topics of four of the six verbal exchanges in Mandarin reported by the informants were about relationship. All of these 4 verbal exchanges were made between the same male informant and his girlfriend. There is a high possibility that his girlfriend was a native Mandarin speaker. The topics of other two verbal exchanges in Mandarin were both about work. Both of these verbal exchanges were also contributed by
the same informant. This informant was a salesperson who worked for a high-price cosmetic brand. Since Mainland Chinese are nowadays the major source of tourists in Hong Kong, it is highly likely that the verbal exchanges were made between the informant and a customer who was a native Mandarin speaker. This suggests that ethnic Chinese in Hong Kong may also only speak Mandarin in situations where there are no other choices.

Furthermore, the five verbal exchanges in English-Cantonese mixture were also reported by the one same informant. As shown in the crosstabulation of code and circumstance in Table 5, three of them were made when the informant was at work and the others were made under other circumstances. Among the only two verbal exchanges in Mandarin-Cantonese mixture, one was about the topic “work” and was carried out between the informant and a customer/client.

All these suggest that these five types of code are only used when the interlocutor is not a native Cantonese speaker or in a domain in which the use of one of these code is necessary. Gender, does not have an effect on the use of these five types of code. However, a different picture emerges in the use of pure Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture (codemixing). These two codes can be found in almost every type of circumstance, topic and relationship. There seems to be a sociolinguistic variation between the use of pure Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture in Hong Kong. From now on, the five types of code discussed above will be excluded from the following discussion as I have shown that they are rarely used unless it is necessary.
### Table 5. Crosstabulation of code and circumstance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Doing work</th>
<th>Eating</th>
<th>Leisure</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can+Eng</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng+Can</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man+Can</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing value</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. Crosstabulation of code and topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can+Eng</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng+Can</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man+Can</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. Crosstabulation of code and relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Sibling</th>
<th>Friend/boyfriend/Girlfriend</th>
<th>Boss</th>
<th>Co-worker</th>
<th>Customer/Client</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can+Eng</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng+Can</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man+Can</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing value</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1 The variation of pure Cantonese and Cantonese-English with gender
229 verbal exchanges in pure Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture were reported by the informants. Three types of verbal exchanges in relation to the sex of informants and the sex of interlocutors were obtained: between male and male, between male and female, and between female and female. Table 8. shows the numbers of verbal exchanges in each of these settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Number of verbal exchanges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>229</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Numbers of verbal exchanges in each type of settings in relation to sex of informants and interlocutors

The results suggest that both female and male informants’ choice between pure Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture vary according to gender, educational level of the interlocutors, and relationship with the interlocutors. Although age is usually seen as an important social factor for language variation, it was not found to have an effect on the codemixing behaviour in Hong Kong here.

Gender of interlocutors:
The results suggest that the use of Cantonese-English mixture among female in Hong Kong is higher than same male-sex and mixed-sex settings. With both male and female interlocutors, the male informants reported higher use of Cantonese than Cantonese-English mixture while the female informants reported higher use of Cantonese-English mixture than in Cantonese. However, both of the female and male informants used a higher percentage of Cantonese-English mixture with female interlocutors more than male interlocutors. Nevertheless, the use of Cantonese-English mixture with female interlocutors reported by the female informants was 38% higher than that by the male informants. In addition, the difference in the use of Cantonese-English mixture with
female interlocutors and male interlocutors by the female informants is 24.1% while that by the male informants is only 8.5% (Refer to Figure. 5).

![Figure 5. Percentage of codes used by informants in relation to the gender of interlocutors](image)

**Education of interlocutors:**
A strong correlation of the informants’ code choice with the interlocutors’s educational level was found. Both female and male informants’ use of Cantonese-English mixture increased with educational levels of interlocutors. With interlocutors who had received university education, both female and male informants chose to use Cantonese-English mixture more than Cantonese. Figure 6 shows that the use of Cantonese-English mixture with interlocutors with university education by the female informants is 76.3% while that by the male informants is 54.8%. Both female and male informants’ use of Cantonese-English mixture is approximately 16 % lower with interlocutors with secondary education than interlocutors with university education. With interlocutors with primary education, the male informants’ use of Cantonese-English mixture was only 11.1%. Unfortunately, the sample size of such category reported by the female informants was small, with only 5 interlocutors, thus, it will be excluded from the discussion.
Although both female and male informants’ use of the language mixture increased with the educational level of interlocutors, there are some noticeable differences between them. While the female informants used Cantonese-English mixture more than Cantonese with interlocutors of all educational levels, the male informants used pure Cantonese more than Cantonese-English mixture except with the interlocutors with university education. (Refer to Figure 6).

**Figure 6.** Percentage of codes used by informants in relation to the educational level of interlocutors

**Gender and education of interlocutors**

A clearer picture can be seen when the gender and education of interlocutors are crosstabulated. Figure 7 shows the variation between the use of pure Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture with female and male interlocutors of each educational level by the male informants while Figure 8 shows the variation between the use of pure Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture with female and male interlocutors by the female informants.
Both male and female informants reported significantly higher use of Cantonese than Cantonese-English mixture with primary-educated interlocutors. This is not surprising because most primary schools in Hong Kong adopt Chinese as medium of instruction. As with speakers who would have some understanding of English (e.g. secondary-educated and university-educated people), at least a certain amount of Cantonese-English mixture is used. With both interlocutors of secondary educational level and male interlocutors of university educational level, the male informants still reported higher percentages of verbal exchanges in Cantonese but the verbal exchanges in Cantonese-English mixture with these interlocutors were at least 20% higher than those with primary-educated interlocutors. The percentages of verbal exchanges in Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture with male interlocutors of secondary educational level and of university educational level by female informants were also approximately the same as those reported by the male informants.

The results also suggest that there is a high tendency to use Cantonese-English within the female sex group. With female interlocutors of both secondary and university educational levels, the female informants reported significantly high percentages in verbal exchanges in Cantonese-English mixture. The reported percentages of verbal exchanges in Cantonese-English mixture with secondary-educated female interlocutors and university-educated female interlocutors by female informants were 67.9% and 90.7% respectively. While these figures suggest that Hong Kong females tend to use Cantonese-English mixture among their same sex, these figures also suggest that the use of Cantonese-English mixture by Hong Kong females is associated with educational factors. As the informants were all university graduates, their high percentage of use of Cantonese-English mixture with university-educated interlocutors shows that Cantonese-English mixture is a code for in-group communication of female university graduates in Hong Kong. This is also reflected in the percentage of verbal exchanges in Cantonese-English mixture with university-educated female interlocutors reported by the male informants. While most of the male informants’ verbal exchanges with other interlocutors were in Cantonese, most of their verbal exchanges with the university-educated female
interlocutors were in Cantonese-English mixture. This shows that the male informants, who were also university graduates, could be accommodating to the speech of the female interlocutors.

**Figure 7.** Percentage of use of codes by male informants in relation to the education and gender of the interlocutors

**Figure 8.** Percentage of use of codes by female informants in relation to the education and gender of the interlocutors
Age of interlocutors:
The age of interlocutors does not seem to have an effect on the code choice of the informants. As can be seen in Figure 9, there were no significant differences in the female informants’ use of Cantonese-English with interlocutors in different age groups. The same observation was found in the male informants’ use of Cantonese with interlocutors in age groups 20-35 and 36-50. However, the male informants’ use of Cantonese was significantly higher with the oldest age group (above 50) than the other age groups. This can be explained with an examination to the average education level of interlocutors in each age group.

The higher percentage of use of pure Cantonese with the age group above 50 than other age groups by the male informants was due to the high percentage of primary-educated interlocutors within this age group. As shown in Figure 10, 61.5% of these interlocutors were primary-educated. The similar figures of percentage of Cantonese-English verbal exchanges with interlocutors in the age groups 20-25, 26-50 and above 50 reported by the female informants were because there were similar percentages of secondary educated and university educated interlocutors in these age groups (refer to Figure 11). This suggests that education is one of the most important social factors in governing the variation between Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture in Hong Kong.

![Figure 9. Percentage of use of codes by informants in relation to the age of interlocutors](image-url)
Figure 10. Looking at male informants: Percentage of interlocutors of each age group within each educational level

Figure 11. Looking at female informants: Percentage of interlocutors of each age group within each educational level

Relationship between the informants and the interlocutors
The informants’ code choices were also found to vary with their relationship with the interlocutors. Again, the female informants reported higher percentages of verbal exchanges in Cantonese-English mixture than the male informants. The female informants’ verbal exchanges with friends/boyfriends/girlfriends and co-workers reported
percentages of 76.5% and 83.3% (refer to Figure 12) respectively while the male informants’ verbal exchanges in Cantonese-English with these two categories were 52.3% and 40% respectively (refer to Figure 13).

The high percentage of use of Cantonese-English mixture with friends/boyfriends/girlfriends by the female informants once again shows that the code holds some iconic value in the communication among educated female in Hong Kong. As the female informants were well-educated, it is highly possible that most of their peers were also among well-educated individuals. In addition, it is common that females would usually have more female friends, thus, the high percentage of use of Cantonese-English mixture with peers by the female informants confirmed the results found in the crosstabulation of gender and education discussed previously. Codemixing marks the in-group communication of educated young women in Hong Kong.

Furthermore, the female informants’ preference of use of Cantonese-English mixture with their co-workers correlate with the results found in the comparison between informants who worked in the “more competitive environments” and those who worked in the “less competitive environments. It was found that female informants from both types of working environments codemixed more than their male counterparts and that the female in the “more competitive environments” employed a high percentage of use of English items during the interviews. Therefore, it is not surprising that the female informants tend to use significant more Cantonese-English mixture with their co-workers.

Both female and male informants reported lower use of Cantonese-English mixture with family members than with their friends and co-workers. Most of their verbal exchanges with parents were made in Cantonese. This may be due to the fact that most of their parents were born in China. As mentioned before, majority of Hong Kong population have parents or grandparents who were born in China(Wong, 1999).
Figure 12. Looking at female informants: Percentage of use of codes in relation to the interlocutors’ relationship with informants

Figure 13. Looking at male informants: Percentage of use of codes in relation to interlocutors relationship with informants
5.4 Summary of the chapter
In this chapter, I have shown that there is a sociolinguistic variation between pure Cantonese and Cantonese-English mixture in Hong Kong. While the male informants reported more verbal exchanges in pure Cantonese with interlocutors of different gender and education levels, the female informants reported more verbal exchanges with interlocutors of different gender and education levels. In addition, both female and male informants reported higher use of Cantonese-English mixture with interlocutors with secondary and university education than those with only primary education. This shows that Cantonese-English codemixing is associated with education and is an identity marker for educated people. Apart from being an identity marker for the educated group, Cantonese-English mixture seems to carry some special meaning or value for young women in Hong Kong as the female informants reported a remarkably high use of language mixture with female interlocutors of the same age. In the next chapter, this will be discussed with the social and cultural background in Hong Kong.
6.1 Discussion
In the results of the last two chapters, it was shown that young educated women in Hong Kong tended to codemix more than young educated men. This pattern would probably be interpreted by the traditional variationists as showing that the linguistic behaviour of young women in Hong Kong as either conservative or innovative. In fact, as mentioned in Chapter 2, such a gender codemixing pattern in Hong Kong has been found by Pennington, Balla, Detaramani, Poon and Tam (1992) before. By adopting Principle II of Labov’s generalizations, Pennington, Balla, Detaramani, Poon and Tam (1992) concluded that men’s lower use of mixed code as a conservative linguistic behaviour and women’s higher use of mixed code as an innovative behaviour. I will argue that this gender codemixing pattern in Hong Kong is, by no means, associated with linguistic conservatism or innovativeness of women and men and this pattern must not be interpreted simply upon the differences between women and men shown in the sex groupings. In order to provide a detailed and accurate interpretation for this pattern, it is necessary to look into the cultural and historical background and changing gender roles in Hong Kong.

The results of the interview showed that all informants, who were university graduates, codemixed during the interviews. This can be explained with the results of the language dairy which showed that Hong Kong speakers of secondary education or above use a reasonable amount of Cantonese-English mixed code when they talk to one another. This suggests that codemixing is adopted mainly by individuals who have certain degree of exposure to English through education. This is consonant with the view of Cheung (1984) who states that “English in Hong Kong divides people into those who know the language (the middle class) and those who don’t (the working class)” (p.281). This shows that Cantonese-English mixture is an identity marker for educated people in Hong Kong.

If codemixing serves as the identity marker for educated people in Hong Kong, why would there be such a big difference between the use of mixed code by the female and male informants who were equally educated? This can be answered with an investigation
to the historical and cultural background of Hong Kong. Eckert (1989) concluded that the Jock and Burnout girls’ higher uses of the vernacular variants, which are specific to their identities as Jocks and Burnouts, than the boys were due to the girls’ lack of access to real power that they had to rely on the use of symbols of social membership to claim status. This argument, I suggest, would not apply to the case here. The female informants in the present study were all engaged in employment activities which provided them with equal economic power with men. These educated young women do have their access to some real power from which they could claim status from. I will suggest that these educated young women in Hong Kong codemix simply to “show” their identity as the “new women” who are different from women in the older generations rather than to claim power by symbolic asset.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the Hong Kong society in the past tended to see that women should not have “too much” education and they were expected only to become mother-wives rather than a career women. Nowadays, the social situation has changed. Rarely, there are cases where women are stopped from pursuing university education and scorned over for taking up employment in the public sphere. The women in the new generation nowadays do not want to be seen as women of the past who are subordinated to men.

This attitude of the “new women” in Hong Kong has recently been used as the themes in a number of Hong Kong TV dramas. One of the recent TV dramas broadcasted on the TVB Channel in Hong Kong, “Maiden’s vow”, described the changing women’s status in the past 100 years in Hong Kong. Although the characters were fictional, the story background gave a detailed description of Hong Kong history and culture. The drama suggests that Hong Kong young women nowadays want to disassociate themselves from the traditional gender role assigned to them by the Chinese tradition. They seek to show that they are different from women in the past by establishing successful careers and refusing to get married.

To show that they are not traditional Chinese women, some symbolic capital is required.
As mentioned in Chapter 3, majority of the Hong Kong population have parents or grandparents who were born in China. In other words, most mothers and grandmothers of young women in Hong Kong nowadays were born in China and they are illiterate in English. Therefore, the use of Cantonese-English mixed code has a good iconic value that represents Hong Kong young women nowadays. As Cantonese-English mixture has a touch of English, which is associated with modernization, westernization and good education, young women can rely on it to disassociate them from the roles of traditional Chinese women without denying their membership in the ethnic Chinese community at the same time.

The results have confirmed Eckert’s (1989) view that interpretation of gender and language must not rely only on the differences shown in the sex groupings. The larger difference shown between the women in the two types of working environment than the men has shown that linguistic variations do not only exist between categories but also within a category. The difference between the women who worked in the “more competitive environment” and the “less competitive environment” shows that Cantonese-English mixed code are meaningful to the educated young women in Hong Kong in many ways: first, it represents their identity as educated people; second, it represents their identity as “new women” who are not subordinated to men. For the young women who are employed in the commercial field which was traditionally a male-dominant sphere, there is another identity that contributes to their preference on Cantonese-English mixed code--that is their identity as female competitors in this sphere. In the traditional Chinese culture, women have been oppressed as the weaker sex. In the competitive commercial field, Hong Kong young women have to seek symbolic power through their use of language to compete with men.

Codemixing behaviour of women and men in Hong Kong is neither conservative nor innovative. It is a reflection of the history and social practices of women and men in the speech community. The traditional generalizations of gender-based linguistic pattern rely heavily on the notions of “standardness” or “nonstandardness” to interpret the linguistic behaviour of women and men. In fact, individuals may not use a form of language only
because it is standard or nonstandard. Rather, they use a form of language to suit their needs for self-representation.

6.2 Conclusion

In this study, I have shown that the differences in codemixing behaviour between women and men in Hong Kong are not simply linguistic differences between women and men, but also involve differences in orientation with other social identities (e.g. women in the new generation versus women in the old generation; individuals who work in “more competitive environments versus individuals who work in “less competitive environments).

Without having looked into the cultural and social background in Hong Kong, the above analysis could not have been achieved. Gender is an ongoing complex construction interwoven with other social constructions of identities. As it is obvious that there is no “universal culture” in the world, the constructions of gender can hardly be the same for all speech communities. Therefore, it is important to “look locally” into gender in order to interpret the language use of women and men in a particular community.

For future studies, I propose that the validity of my hypothesis, that educated young women in Hong Kong use Cantonese-English mixed code to disassociate themselves from the traditional role of women in the Chinese culture of Hong Kong, can be tested with a comparison between the linguistic behaviour of young women and older women in Hong Kong.
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APPENDIX: LANGUAGE DIARY SAMPLE

Name: 
Gender: 
Education level: 
Occupation: 
Language(s): ____________________________________________________________ 

Most fluent ←------------------------------------------------------→ least fluent

Day 1: Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Time Duration</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education (if known)</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Non-Cantonese words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M F</td>
<td>19 20-35 36-50 Above50</td>
<td>a) Primary b) Secondary c) University d) Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a) Cantonese b) Can. with Eng c) English d) Eng with Can. e) Mandarin f) Man. with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship Food Activities Others:</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a) doing work b) eating c) leisure d) others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M F</td>
<td>19 20-35 36-50 Above50</td>
<td>a) Primary b) Secondary c) University d) Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a) Cantonese b) Can. with Eng c) English d) Eng with Can. e) Mandarin f) Man. with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship Food Activities Others:</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a) doing work b) eating c) leisure d) others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M F</td>
<td>19 20-35 36-50 Above50</td>
<td>a) Primary b) Secondary c) University d) Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a) Cantonese b) Can. with Eng c) English d) Eng with Can. e) Mandarin f) Man. with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship Food Activities Others:</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a) doing work b) eating c) leisure d) others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M F</td>
<td>19 20-35 36-50 Above50</td>
<td>a) Primary b) Secondary c) University d) Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a) Cantonese b) Can. with Eng c) English d) Eng with Can. e) Mandarin f) Man. with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship Food Activities Others:</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a) doing work b) eating c) leisure d) others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>a)Primary</td>
<td>a)Cantonese</td>
<td>a)Cantonese</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>b)Secondary</td>
<td>b)Can.with</td>
<td>b)Can.with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>c)University</td>
<td>Engl</td>
<td>Engl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above50</td>
<td>d)Other</td>
<td>d)Eng with</td>
<td>d)Eng with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f)Man. with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>a)Primary</td>
<td>a)Cantonese</td>
<td>a)Cantonese</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>b)Secondary</td>
<td>b)Can.with</td>
<td>b)Can.with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>c)University</td>
<td>Engl</td>
<td>Engl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above50</td>
<td>d)Other</td>
<td>d)Eng with</td>
<td>d)Eng with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f)Man. with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>a)Primary</td>
<td>a)Cantonese</td>
<td>a)Cantonese</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>b)Secondary</td>
<td>b)Can.with</td>
<td>b)Can.with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>c)University</td>
<td>Engl</td>
<td>Engl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above50</td>
<td>d)Other</td>
<td>d)Eng with</td>
<td>d)Eng with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f)Man. with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>a)Primary</td>
<td>a)Cantonese</td>
<td>a)Cantonese</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>b)Secondary</td>
<td>b)Can.with</td>
<td>b)Can.with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>c)University</td>
<td>Engl</td>
<td>Engl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above50</td>
<td>d)Other</td>
<td>d)Eng with</td>
<td>d)Eng with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f)Man. with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Duration</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Education (if known)</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Circumstance</td>
<td>Non-Cantonese words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2:</strong> Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-19 20-35 36-50 Above50</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>a)Primary b)Secondary c)University d)Other tertiary education</td>
<td>a)Cantonese b)Can.with Eng c)English d)Eng with Can. e)Mandarin f)Man.with Can</td>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>Where: Activity: a)doing work b) eating c)leisure d)others:</td>
<td>Number: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I agree to participate in this study. I understand that by signing on space provided below I am giving consent on the use of my speech data by the researcher.

Signature:____________________