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Abstract

This thesis examines the language use and social networks of the young South Asian community in Hong Kong and their influence on their proficiency in Chinese. Through surveys, Chinese language assessment and participant observation, it provides a general picture of their linguistic repertoires in various domains (family, school, friendship and after-school activities) and their regular social networks in their daily lives, with a primary focus of the extent of their interaction of Hong Kong Chinese, to determine the role of their social networks on their proficiency in Chinese. The thesis shows that there is a correlation between their social networks with Chinese and higher proficiency in Chinese. In other words, if the young South Asians have more interaction and a dense and multiplex social network with Hong Kong Chinese, their proficiency in Chinese will be higher. Other than their social networks, there are other factors affecting their proficiency in Chinese and these will be further discussed. By studying their daily social interaction, this thesis will enhance our understandings of their social lives and the South Asian cultures in Hong Kong.
Chapter 1  Introduction

1.1  Purposes of Research on South Asians in Hong Kong

The focus of the current study is on the South Asians in Hong Kong. In this paper, the term ‘South Asian’ refers to people of South Asian descendent, including those from India, Pakistan and Nepal. Since the British colonial governance in Hong Kong, South Asian people have been living in Hong Kong and according to the latest population census in 2011 (Census and Statistics Department, 2011), South Asian people accounted for 0.89% (63176) of the total population in Hong Kong and a majority of Pakistanis and Nepalese took up elementary occupations such as security guards, cleaning workers, construction workers, delivery workers, etc., whereas Indians worked as businessmen, traders and some elementary occupations.

Although Hong Kong is acclaimed as an ‘Asia’s World City’ with its rich cultural diversity (Information Services Department, 2010, p. 29), South Asian people’s contribution to Hong Kong was not recognized and the general public considered South Asian people as outsiders and paid little attention to their social needs. As indicated by Law and Lee (2012: 117), ‘there is a lack of multicultural policies to motivate Hong Kong people to respect and interact with other races and provide resources for other non-Chinese people to improve and maintain their social well-being and cultural identities’. In recent years, social issues concerning South Asian people in Hong Kong have long been a topic of discussion among academics, journalists and policy makers, for example, the unemployment among South Asian youngsters, limited access to tertiary education, racial discrimination against South Asian people, (EOC, 2011; Ngo, 2013; Yang 2013) and the linguistic issues, especially their difficulties in learning Cantonese Chinese. Their inability to master the Chinese language is blamed by some government officials for their being lazy and stupid. (Ngo, 2013; Yang, 2013) Failure in language learning cannot be simply attributed to laziness and social stigmas against South Asian people in Hong Kong.

There have been a lot of advocates for Teaching Chinese as a Second Language by non-government organisations and academics and recently, the policy address proposed in 2014 suggested increasing resources in teaching Chinese to ethnic minorities (HKSAR, 2014), but in
fact, little has been known about their ways of living in Hong Kong and how they make use of their linguistic repertoires in different social contexts, including homes, schools, work, religions, community activities, etc. (Detaramani & Lock, 2003). Most of the researches and reports center on the macro social issues, such as language and education policy, racial discrimination, employment policy, welfare policy, etc. (Loper 2004; Ku et al., 2005; Ku et al., 2006; Carmichael, 2009; EOC, 2011; Hong Kong Unison, 2012) In order to address their difficulty in mastering Chinese language, it is also important to examine the micro interactional issues of language use among the South Asian students in Hong Kong, for example, who the South Asian students interact with regularly in their daily lives and how their interaction with different people affects the way they use Chinese.

A latest survey report on the use of language in Hong Kong, which was published by the HKSAR government (Census and Statistics Department, 2013), demonstrated Hong Kong people’s language choice of Cantonese, Mandarin and English by age in linguistic domains such as employment, home, further study, friendship. But it does not reveal a detailed breakdown of how different ethnic groups use their own languages in different social contexts. In other words, there is a pressing need for a general outline on South Asian people’s language choice patterns in different domains. Furthermore, if a society values its future generations living there, education will have to cater to the needs of different types of people, including Chinese learning education for South Asian adolescents and young adults as part of the ethnic minorities. Therefore, the younger generation of the South Asian people in Hong Kong is the main focus in this study. This research paper will take a survey and an ethnographic approach to produce a holistic view of their language choice patterns in various domains and the relationship between these patterns and their proficiency in Cantonese Chinese.

1.2 Research Aims

This study is intended to take a specific look at the linguistic issues of South Asian adolescents and young adults in Hong Kong, as shown in the following:

1. To identify their linguistic repertoires in different domains.
2. To investigate the social networks of South Asian students.
3. To examine how their social network affects their proficiency in Chinese.

In order to achieve these research aims, the following research questions and sub-questions are asked:

1. What are the linguistic repertoires of the South Asian students in different linguistic domains?
   a. What are their language choices in home domain (e.g. grandparents, parents, siblings)?
   b. What are their language choices in education domain (e.g. schoolmates and teachers at schools)?
   c. What are their language choices outside home and school (e.g. friendship, religion, occupation, community activities, etc.)?

2. What are their regular social networks?
   a. Who do they interact with regularly?
   b. Do they interact with Hong Kong Chinese people?
   c. Do they have dense social networks? (In other words, are their ethnically close friends and Hong Kong Chinese friends in touch with each other?)
   d. Do they have multiplex social networks? (In other words, do they have multiple social connections with ethnically close friends and Hong Kong Chinese friends?)
   e. Do their ethnically close friends know their Hong Kong Chinese friends?

3. How do their social networks affect their proficiency in Chinese?
   a. What language(s) do they speak with Hong Kong Chinese?
   b. How is their Chinese language proficiency, in terms of reading, writing, listening and speaking?
   c. Do their social networks with more Hong Kong Chinese correlate with higher proficiency in Cantonese Chinese?
1.3 Outline of thesis

This thesis is divided into five chapters. Following this introduction, Chapter two demonstrates a review of the literature that has informed this research, including the demographic and historical account of South Asian in Hong Kong, sociolinguistic research on South Asians in Hong Kong, the concept of social network and the relationship between social networks and language proficiency. Chapter three details the research design and methodology of the study. It comprises the sampling and locating of research participants, a description of the data collection procedures and a discussion of some obstacles encountered during data collection. Chapter four reports the findings from questionnaires, interviews, language assessment and participant observation to see what language(s) South Asian youngsters speak in different domains and how their social networks affect their language proficiency in Cantonese Chinese. Chapter five discusses the significance and implication of findings and explores correlation between South Asians’ social networks and their proficiency in Chinese. Finally, chapter six concludes the study and considers possible direction for further research.
Chapter 2  Literature Review

2.1  Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present an overview of South Asian community in Hong Kong, explore the concept of ‘social network’ and review the previous sociolinguistic research that has guided this study. This literature review is divided into two sections: (1) the definition of South Asia and the brief history, demographics and previous sociolinguistic research on South Asian in Hong Kong, (2) the origin of the concept ‘social network’ and its application in sociolinguistic research on language maintenance and shift and the relationship between social network and proficiency in a dominant language.

2.2  South Asians in Hong Kong

2.2.1  Defining South Asia

There are various definitions for South Asia. South Asia includes countries such as Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Iran, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka (United Nations Statistics Division, 2013). However, United Nations Statistics Department (2012) indicated that “the assignment of countries or areas to specific groupings is for statistical convenience”. Farmer (1993: 1) noted that there were a lot of discussions on what other countries to include in defining South Asia. In some cases, ‘South Asia’ and ‘Indian subcontinent’ are used interchangeably (McLeod, 2002, p.1), in which Indian subcontinent includes today’s India, Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan only.

In other words, defining the boundary of South Asia depends on the focus of the different research and issues. For the convenience and purpose of this study, this research focused on people from India, Nepal and Pakistan only because Indian, Nepalese and Pakistani account for a majority of the population in Hong Kong and academic research and media report on South Asia cover those who are mainly from India, Nepal and Pakistanis or their descendents.
2.2.2 Brief Historical Backgrounds of South Asian in Hong Kong

The presence of South Asian people in Hong Kong can be traced back to the British colonial period in Hong Kong. Since India used to be a British colony, Indian did business and trading in Hong Kong without restriction (White, 1994, p.15; Weiss, 1991, p.419). Some other Indian people came to Hong Kong to work as seamen (Weiss, 1991), provisioners of Indian foods and products (White, 1994, p.4). The then-British government also recruited Indian people from Punjab area (nowadays in Pakistan) to serve as police officers, militaries and guards. Some Pakistani people migrated to Hong Kong to become watchmen, security guards, bankers and merchants (Weiss, 1991, p. 433).

Nepalese people, as Gurkha soldiers serving the British army, were recruited to become part of the army in the British colonial government of Hong Kong to patrol the border with mainland China after the 1967 riots in Hong Kong and the Cultural Revolution (Bosco, 2004, p.511). The Nepalese Gurkhas and their relatives and descendants were granted permanent residency and citizenship by the British colonial government in the 1980s. More Nepalese Gurkhas’ relatives came to Hong Kong (Yamanaka, 1999). Now the Nepalese population in Hong Kong includes the retired Gurkhas and their relatives (Bosco, 2004, p.511).

Today, South Asian people in Hong Kong find it difficult to live in Hong Kong because of discrimination. As suggested by Bosco (2004: 512), they are often told they cannot apply for jobs because they have low proficiency and fluency in spoken Cantonese and written Chinese, even though some jobs do not require good Chinese language skills. Prior to the linguistic issues, the following section presents the demographic features of the South Asians in Hong Kong to re-think about various social aspects of South Asian in Hong Kong.

2.2.3 Demographics of South Asian in Hong Kong

According to the Population Census 2011 (Census and Statistics Department, 2011, p.18), there were approximately 63,000 South Asians in Hong Kong, making up of about 0.9% of the total population in Hong Kong. The following is the breakdown of the population of Pakistanis, Indians and Nepalese in 2011:
Table 2.1  Population of South Asian (Pakistani, Indian and Nepalese) in Hong Kong, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>18 042</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>28 616</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>16 518</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census and Statistics Department, HKSAR (2011: 18)

In terms of the education of South Asian youngsters, Census and Statistics Department (2011) pointed out that the school attendance rates of ethnic minorities in Hong Kong were 86.9%, 75.7% and 13.8% for the age groups 3-5 (pre-primary), 17-18 (pre-university) and 19-24 (post-secondary), compared with those for the whole population (91.3%, 86.0%, 43.8%), when foreign domestic helpers are excluded (See Table 2.2). However, these figures only reveal the school attendance situation of ethnic minorities as a whole, rather than each individual South Asian group.

Table 2.2  School Attendance Rates of Ethnic Minorities by Age in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>School Attendance Rates (%)</th>
<th>School Attendance Rates (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Including Foreign Domestic Helpers)</td>
<td>(Excluding Foreign Domestic Helpers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Minorities</td>
<td>Whole Population</td>
<td>Ethnic Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census and Statistics Department, HKSAR (2011: 50)

Regarding the highest education levels attained by South Asians in Hong Kong, Census and Statistics Department (2011) demonstrated that compared with the whole population aged 15 and above (27.3%), almost more than a half of the Indians received post-secondary education,
whereas the highest education level of both Pakistanis and Nepalese were nearly 10% lower than that of the whole population (as indicated in Table 2.3). As suggested by Zhang et al. (2012: 35), ethnic minorities in Hong Kong were less likely to attend universities because their Chinese language proficiency and general academic performance were far from satisfactory and they could not meet the entrance requirement of universities in Hong Kong, especially the requirements of Chinese subjects. Zhang et al. (2012: 36) also explained that the Indians in Hong Kong had higher socio-economic status in Hong Kong than other South Asian counterparts, so they tended to have more opportunities to receive higher education.

**Table 2.3**  Education Attainment (Highest Level Attained) of South Asian Aged 15 or Above in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No Schooling / pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Lower Secondary</th>
<th>Upper Secondary / Pre-university</th>
<th>Post-secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Population Aged 15 and Above</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census and Statistics Department, HKSAR (2011, p.54)

### 2.2.4 Sociolinguistic Research on South Asians in Hong Kong

Census and Statistics Department (2013) conducted a survey on language use in Hong Kong. However, it only focuses on speakers of Chinese language as the first language (Cantonese, Mandarin and other Chinese dialects), self-reported proficiency of spoken and written Chinese, English language and their language use at home. It does not reveal a detailed breakdown of the use of various languages in different domains by social factors such as
ethnicity. Also, the survey only measured self-reported Cantonese, Mandarin and English proficiency, without assessing informants’ actual language skills.

Although Ku et al. (2005) also took the self-evaluated language proficiency of the South Asian youngsters (Age: 14 – 24; 50 Indians, 50 Pakistanis, 50 Nepalese) in their data, it presents an in-depth survey on their mother tongues, language proficiency (reading, writing, listening and speaking) of their mother tongues, Chinese and English, the frequency of using Chinese in respondents’ everyday lives and the situation of learning Chinese, with a complete breakdown of each South Asian ethnicity.

Based on their studies, more Indian and Pakistani informants thought they had good or very good speaking and listening skills in Cantonese. In terms of speaking, 42% (21/50) of the Indians think they are good or very good at speaking Cantonese, whereas the respective figures for Pakistanis and Nepalese are 36% (18/50) and 10% (5/50). In terms of listening, more Indians and Pakistanis (both 46%, 23/50) considered their listening skills good or very good than Nepalese (10%, 5/50). When it comes to reading and writing Chinese, more than 80% from each ethnic group thought they had poor reading and writing skills or do not know how to read and write Chinese. The following table summarises the findings from Ku et al. (2005).

**Table 2.4** Chinese Language Proficiency by South Asian Ethnic Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethic Origin</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Origin</strong></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know at all</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know at all</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know at all</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ku et al. (2005: 42)

Other than Chinese language proficiency, Ku et al. (2005) also looked at how frequent the South Asian students use Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin) in their daily life. More Indians and Pakistanis spoke and listened to Chinese all the time or very often in their everyday lives. 80% (40/50) of Indians and 60% (30/50) of Pakistanis spoke Chinese all the time or very often, whereas 84% (42/50) of Indians and 68% (34/50) of Pakistanis listened to Chinese all the time or very often. In contrast, Nepalese rarely or did not speak and listen to Chinese at all. 30% (15/50) and 24% (12/50) of them spoke and listened to Chinese respectively. Ku et al. (2005: 45) suggested that Indians and Pakistanis have longer establishment in Hong Kong, so they used Chinese more often than Nepalese and their Chinese language is more proficient.
**Table 2.5**  Frequency of using Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin) in daily life by South Asian Ethnic Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using Chinese</th>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ku et al. (2005: 47 – 48) explored the reasons why the youngsters like or dislike learning Chinese. Approximately 75% of them liked to learn Chinese because it was useful for further study and/or future employment in Hong Kong and helped them communicate with the Chinese people, whereas the rest of them disliked learning Chinese because they found it difficult.

While the findings from the above two studies may be reflective to a large extent, their research aims focused on larger social and educational issues, rather than on specific linguistic issues. Ku et al. (2005: 11) aimed at improving the education for South Asian youngsters by presenting their data for social and educational policy makers, whereas Census and Statistics Department (2013: 8) stated it was the first time to conduct a survey on language use in Hong Kong.

Furthermore, there are only a few studies of the linguistic aspects of South Asian community in Hong Kong. Pennington and Patri (1998) examined the social identity and language attitudes of Indian students from a Hong Kong international school. They found that Indian students had a strong ethnic identity of traditional cultures and, meanwhile, a positive attitude towards English as a means of upward mobility and acculturation.

Detaramani and Lock (2003) focused on two Indian communities, the Sikhs and the Sindhis, and explored their linguistic repertoires, language use and the language shift in Hong Kong. They noted that there was a language shift in the Sindhi community where they used English more often even in family domain and their language skills of Sindhi, Cantonese and Hindi were all declining, especially the younger generation, whereas Sikhs still preserved the use of Punjabi, Hindi and Cantonese and the shift to English was less prominent. Questionnaire and self-evaluated language proficiency of Sindhi, Punjabi, Hindi, English and Cantonese were adopted and only the home and friendship domains were considered. It may be insufficient to capture the general picture of their language use in Hong Kong. The present study focuses on the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ku et al. (2005: 46)
2.3 Social Network

2.3.1 Its Origin and Concept

The concept of ‘social network’ originated from social anthropology during the 1960s and the 1970s. As indicated by Wiklund (2002: 55), the origin of social network could be traced back to the 19th century. In 1857, a Norwegian sociologist Eilert Sundt adopted an ecological and ethnographic approach to examine Norwegian people’s lives and behaviour sociologically, before the discipline of sociology was developed in Europe. After nearly a century, a British social anthropologist, Alfred Radcliffe-Brown, introduced the concept of social network in 1940 to describe social structure. Later, the concept was developed in various disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, politics, etc.

Social network was developed as an alternative to social class. Wiklund (2002: 55) added that ‘social network is a metaphor for micro-level relations, whereas social class concerns macro-level phenomena’. Furthermore, social class is designed to elucidate large-scale social, political and economic structures and processes, whereas social network looks into the community and interpersonal level of social organisation (Milroy and Milroy, 1992, p.2). Chambers (2009: 75) also commented that the difference between them is that social class imposes less stringent influence on individuals than social networks do. An individual’s social circle of intimates can exert their standards of behaviour more directly and reinforce them more regularly. In general, the difference depends on their proximity to the individual or the immediacy of their influence imposed on the individual’s behaviour. Chambers (2009: 74) added that an individual’s loyalty to his/her social networks lies in his/her conformity to its collective values. In other words, to examine one’s social network is to examine the pattern of informal relationships people are involved in on a regular basis (Holmes, 2008, p. 194), which is in line with the goal of looking into the South Asian youngsters’ language use in Hong Kong and interpersonal relationships to see if their social networks have native Chinese Hong Kong people and it has an influence on their Chinese language proficiency.
There are two major properties of social networks: density and multiplexity. Density is a structural property concerning the shape and pattern of a network. A network is dense if a group of individuals know one another. Meanwhile, multiplexity is an interactional property which examines the observable behaviour of individual and contents of social ties. If an individual is connected to another one in a single capacity only (such as student or workmate only), this relationship is known to be uniplex. In contrast, if more than one capacity (such as student, workmate, neighbour at the same time) connects two people, this relationship is multiplex. When a network is both dense and multiplex, this is a close-knit network (Milroy, 1980, p. 50-51; Milroy and Milroy, 1992, p.51; Milroy and Milroy, 1999, p. 49). Wiklund (2002: 60 - 62) also outlined five more influences on social networks and the interaction: stages of life (the influence of age and change on language and social network from child to adult), education and subculture (the role of education and participation in subgroups on the development of language choice and proficiency), social mobility of an individual (the influence of socio-economic status on social contacts and neighbourhood) and kinship and friendship (the significance of friendship in young people’s language choice).

The present study focuses on the role of social networks of South Asian young generation in Hong Kong and its impact on their language use and proficiency in Chinese. As suggested by the above scholars, it is essential to examine informal relationships in their social lives such as friendship, workmate, community activity participants, and other social factors such as socio-economic status to determine how they affect the structure and interaction within their own social networks and language choice in various domains.

2.3.2 Social Network in Sociolinguistics

Social network, as defined by Milroy and Milroy (1992), is ‘a boundless web of ties that reaches out through a whole society, linking people to one another, however remotely.’ As the concept became popular in different academic disciplines, Milroy (1980) was the first to introduce social network to the sociolinguistic study in three poor communities in Belfast: Ballymacarrell (a Protestant area in East Belfast), Hammer (a Protestant area in West Belfast) and Clonard (a Catholic area in West Belfast), and examined the correlation between the
relationships of individuals in the community and the styles of their spoken English. She determined whether the three community members knew other people in their own communities, workplaces and leisure times and then measured the use of several linguistic variables, for example, (th) as in ‘mother’ and (ai) as in ‘night’, which had both standard and non-standard forms. The general results showed that the more people an individual knew in a community, the more vernacular or non-standard form of English they tended to use and men were found to use more vernacular forms than women because men always interacted with people from their own networks and formed a close-knit social network. There was an exception in the findings as well. For example, in Clonard, because of the fall of traditional linen industry, both men and women worked together to form a close-knit network and then picked up the vernacular speech form associated with men.

A number of studies of social networks have been conducted and social network analysis becomes a tool for language variation and change and language maintenance and shift. For example, Hulsen et al. (2002) studied the process of language maintenance and shift in three generations of Dutch immigrants in New Zealand and their social network with native Dutch speakers in the Netherlands. They found that their proficiency in Dutch decreased across all generations and suggested that informants broke with the home country and experienced language loss and led to limited use of Dutch. Stoessel (2002) examined the role of social networks in language maintenance and shift of ten immigrant women in the US. It also revealed that the stronger the social networks with their native ethnic language speakers, the stronger the language maintenance is, whereas language shift is more prominent when the contact with native ethnic language speakers is weak.

There are also studies on the influence of social networks on ethnic minorities’ proficiency in a dominant language. Raschka et al. (2002) examined the first language (Chinese) maintenance in a second language (English) environment in Tyneside in the northeast of England and determined the bilingual development and social network of younger British-born Chinese. They were found to use Chinese to older family members and relatives if they had higher proficiency in Chinese and prefer English to family members of the same generation (siblings, cousins) if their proficiency in Chinese was low. Irrespective of their Chinese language skills, they preferred either a mixed code or English in peer groups, whereas Cantonese or a mixed code
was adopted in non-peer groups. The researchers also concluded that the youngsters who had more opportunities to use Chinese without code-mixing to older family members or friends were more proficient in Chinese. Wiklund (2002) also looked into the influence of social networks on the bilingual proficiency (Swedish and their ethnic languages) of young immigrants at schools in Sweden. Three types of network orientation were divided: (1) oriented towards students’ own ethnic group; (2) oriented towards Swedes and (3) oriented towards other ethnic groups. The findings demonstrated that a majority of informants with higher proficiency in adjusting various linguistic repertoires belong to a network oriented towards Swedes or towards Swedes and ethnic groups other than their own. In other words, if students interacted with Swedes and other ethnic groups more often, they would be able to accommodate their native ethnic languages and Swedish to people in different domains and their Swedish would be more proficient.

However, there is a lack of research on the social networks of South Asian youngsters in Hong Kong. That is the major research gap this paper is trying to fill. Based on Raschka et al. (2002) and Wiklund (2002), this research also focuses on the sociolinguistic practice of the younger generation of the South Asian community in Hong Kong and determines whether having more Chinese-speaking people in their social networks will lead to higher proficiency in Chinese.

2.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter has reviewed (1) the scope of the term ‘South Asia’ and the relevant historical, social and linguistic backgrounds of South Asians in Hong Kong and (2) significant sociolinguistic studies of the impact of social networks on language maintenance and shift and language proficiency. Generally, no sociolinguistic research has been done on the role of social networks on South Asian youngsters’ language use in Hong Kong and their proficiency in Chinese. In the next chapter, research tools and data collection and analysis procedures to explore these issues will be discussed.
Chapter 3  Methodology

3.1  Introduction

In this chapter, the research methodology and data collection procedures used in this study are described, followed by an outline of data analysis procedures. The first part will review the research aims of this study to make explicit association between the type of data required for examining the specific research purposes and questions, and the purposes of data collection. Then, the sampling methods and data collection procedures in the fieldwork will be discussed. In other words, the methods to find research participants and various research tools adopted for this study will be covered.

3.2  Purpose of the Study

3.2.1  Restatement of Research Aims

The major aims of this sociolinguistic study is to examine the linguistic repertoire of South Asian adolescents in Hong Kong in different domains (home, school, friendship, religion and others), different language variety or varieties they use with different interlocutors, particularly Hong Kong Chinese, and the relationship between their social networks and their Chinese language proficiency. Specifically, this research is intended to answer the following three key questions:

4. What are the linguistic repertoires of the South Asian adolescents in different linguistic domains (i.e. home, school, friendship, religion and others)?
5. What are their regular social networks? Do they interact with Hong Kong Chinese regularly?
6. How do their social networks affect their proficiency in Chinese?

3.2.2  Goals of Data Collection
Consistent with the above three research questions, the main goals of data collection in this study are as follows:

1. To gather information about the language choice and language use patterns from South Asian adolescents.

2. To collect data on their regular social networks with different interlocutors, with a particular focus on Hong Kong Chinese.

3. To obtain their average performance of their Chinese language proficiency.

3.3 Sampling Subjects in the Study

The sampling method chosen for this study is judgmental sampling. In other words, using this approach, researchers identify the types of informants to be studied beforehand. This sampling approach relies on researchers’ judgment in determining the structure of the sample and choosing the subjects (Milroy and Gordon, 2003, p. 30). In the case of this current study, subjects are selected based on their ethnicity and age. That is, target informants are South Asian (Pakistani, Indian and Nepalese) adolescents and young adults (Age: 12 – 24).

Random sampling is not adopted in this study for various reasons. Milroy (1987) pointed out that, first of all, judgment sampling is more appropriate for sociolinguistic studies because it is not important to claim that samples are statistically representative than a well-chosen and systematically selected counterpart, as long as the sample contains the target research community. Secondly, relatively small samples have been shown to be equally sufficient in accounting for language variation and change.

Within the framework of judgment sampling, ‘snowball’ technique is used in social network studies. Researchers rely on the friends of research participants (friend of friend) to recruit more prospective research participants. In other words, investigators make use of informants’ social networks to increase the sample of potential new participants, as if a ‘snowball’ increased its size as it went down along a slope. Therefore, ‘snowball’ sampling is also known as network sampling. This technique can reduce the rate of rejection in participating
In research since researchers meet new subjects as ‘a friend of a friend’, rather than a complete stranger. (Milroy and Gordon, 2003, p. 32)

In order to approach the South Asian community in Hong Kong, I have been participating in City Youth Empowerment Project, a service learning project organised by the Department of Applied Social Studies at the City University of Hong Kong. I have been volunteering for more than a year and tutoring South Asian adolescents in Chinese and other subjects. The year-long volunteering experience and involvement in City Youth Empowerment Project has helped me develop relationships with South Asian youngsters and understand this community in Hong Kong, for example, the influence of Islamic cultures on their lives, the languages they speak, their learning experience in Chinese and other subjects, etc.

Furthermore, during the fieldwork, I made use of the ‘snowball technique’ and asked the first few research participants recruited from City Youth Empowerment Project and social workers to recommend other people, for example, their friends, siblings, etc. who may be interested in participating in my study. And all of them were willing to participate, which is in line with the low rejection rate of new research participants through a participant’s social network. (Milroy and Gordon, 2003, p. 32)

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

3.4.1 Consent Form

First and foremost, a consent form (Appendix 1) was given to each research subject prior to the data collection to gain permission from informants for their voluntary participation in the current studies. Meanwhile, the data collection procedures in the study were described to research participants. If they were aged below 18, another consent form (Appendix 2) would be given to their parents or guardians to gain their permission.

3.4.2 Questionnaires and Interviews
The questionnaire (Appendix 3) was designed to gather information about South Asian youngsters’ and young adults’ linguistic repertoire in different domains (home, school, friendship, religion, other activities), the linguistic variety or varieties they use with different interlocutors, their regular social networks, attitudes towards learning Chinese and making friends with Hong Kong Chinese and their personal backgrounds, such as age, gender, type of housing residence, etc. Each research participant was accompanied to complete the questionnaire in case they have any inquiry about the questionnaire.

After the completion of the questionnaire, an interview was conducted. The interview questions were based on responses from the questionnaires, in order to gain further insights into the density and plexity of their regular social networks. For example, if they have some regular extra-curricular activities, where do they have these activities? Who do they have these activities? What language(s) do they speak with them? Why do they have these activities with them? Do their ethnically close friends know their Hong Kong Chinese friends? If so, what do they do together? Do they hang out with their schoolmates outside the school? These are some examples of questions for the interview.

3.4.3 Chinese Language Assessment

Following the questionnaire and the interview, the subjects were given a test on their Chinese language proficiency. The Chinese language assessment (Appendix 4) was designed based on Shum et al. (2012), which outlined some common errors in reading, writing, listening and speaking South Asian students commit when they learn Chinese.

The assessment is divided into three parts: listening, reading and writing. The listening section has five multiple-choice questions. They needed to listen to five different audio recordings in Cantonese Chinese about daily activities, public transportation, Hong Kong museums and objects and choose a correct answer. Then the reading section required informants to identify some Chinese words to objects found in kitchen. Also, some syntactic and semantic structures in Chinese were tested in forms of multiple choices, such as classifiers, copular verbs, questions, etc. and subjects needed to read a short passage and answer questions to show their
understanding of a larger Chinese text. Finally, the writing section tested their ability to write correct Chinese characters and a large Chinese text about themselves.

Speaking is not included in this assessment because according to Shum et al. (2012: 57-58), they did not include speaking test in their study since listening abilities and speaking skills are interrelated and it is the foundation for speaking and listening skills to master a large inventory of Chinese vocabulary, grammar and common syntactic expressions and stock phrases. Shum et al. also added that South Asian youngsters rarely have linguistic contexts to practice their spoken Cantonese but mostly mingled with their ethnic close friends. In other words, listening, writing and reading abilities are essential skills for oral communication skills and it is sufficient to test subjects’ listening, writing and reading abilities and the results of the three tests can reveal their skills in speaking as well.

3.4.4 Participant Observation

In order to further understand and observe their actual language use in daily life, participant observation was conducted. Four subjects aged above 18 were selected as case studies to examine their regular social networks and their language use in different domains.

Participant observation is a primary research tool in ethnography (description of culture). As indicated by Schilling (2013: 113), participant observation is achieved by research goals of simultaneously developing an insider perspective while preserving an outsider detachment through long-term development in the community of study, both as a researcher and as a participant in community activities. The following are some main issues participant observers will examine (Duranti, 1997, p. 90; Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 92 – 95):

1) Background information about the community, such as history of the community, settlement history, current demographics of the community (See Chapter 2 for details)

2) Material artifacts, such as physical objects community members make and use
3) Social organisation, such as what people community members interact with, what activities they participate in, how they are organised, in what role-relationship.

4) Common knowledge, such as the assumptions about their language use, attitudes towards the way they communicate.

As mentioned by Li (1992: 81-82), participant observation provides an insider’s view for investigators to observe subjects’ language use in different domains, their linguistic repertoire (common knowledge) and their social networks (social organization) when research communities in question are different from the eye of the general public and there are differences between the views of insiders (research community) and outsiders (the general public). In other words, participant observation is a useful research tool to investigate less publicly known speech community, such as Chinese community in Britain in Li’s (1992) study and the South Asian youth in Hong Kong in this research.

Another reason for conducting participant observation is the issue of reliability of data. Lee (2008: 141-143) illustrated with her experience as a participant observer that self-report language use in questionnaire and interview and observed actual language use may be different to a certain extent in different domains. In order to maintain a high degree of reliability of data, participant observation seeks to reduce the discrepancy between self-reported and actual language use, as supplementary data along with questionnaire and interview.

Prior to conducting participant observation, I have been serving as a volunteer for City Youth Empowerment Project, as mentioned in section 3.3. My involvement as a tutor and mentor for the South Asian youth community has helped me gain an understanding of their daily language use in Hong Kong. For example, I was curious about what language(s) they spoke in different domains because they often switched their language(s) with friends and other volunteers, either their ethnic language(s) in Pakistan such as Punjabi or Urdu or English. I also asked the South Asian teenagers to teach me Urdu. I have learnt little Urdu only to date, but my elementary Urdu can serve as a means of developing rapport and starting small talks to leave a good impression on other potential South Asian research subjects, before we move onto the core business of participant observation.
3.5 Data Analysis

In this study, qualitative analysis was conducted on the data from questionnaire, interview and participant observation in order to describe South Asian youngsters’ linguistic repertoire, language use in different domains and the density and plexity of their regular social networks with Hong Kong Chinese.

Quantitative analysis was done on the data from questionnaire and Chinese language assessment to measure the informants’ social backgrounds and their performance in the Chinese language assessment. Correlation between factors such as family backgrounds, religions, density and plexity of their social network with ethnically close people and Hong Kong Chinese, etc. and their Chinese language proficiency was examined to determine if there is an effect of their social network with Hong Kong Chinese on their Chinese language.

3.6 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, research aims were reviewed, followed by the purposes of data collection. The judgmental sampling method and ‘snowball’ technique for research subjects were put forward and justified over random sampling. Details and overviews of various stages of data collection procedures were also described, together with my own volunteering experience with South Asian teenage community through City Youth Empowerment Project. Methods of data analysis were also mentioned briefly.
Chapter 4  Findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a picture of young South Asian community by examining their language use and looking into how frequent they use Chinese in their various social networks. Data analysis was conducted on the questionnaires, short interviews and participant observation with regard to the following three research questions:

1. What are the linguistic repertoires of the South Asian students in different domains?
2. What are their regular social networks?
3. How do their social networks affect their proficiency in Chinese?

To address these questions, this chapter first presents a general trend of the linguistic repertoires of South Asian youngsters in Hong Kong, their social networks where they interact with people of different ethnicity in different languages and the influence of the regular networks on their Chinese language proficiency. Subsequently, some informants are chosen for case studies to further illustrate their language use in their daily lives and activities to determine the degree of influence of their social networks on their Chinese language.

4.2 General Overview of the Young South Asians’ Linguistic Repertoires and Social Networks

A total of 17 informants aged from 12 to 24 participated in the study. All of them are studying in secondary schools and universities. The number of subjects participating in the research activities was as follows:

1. Questionnaire: 17 participants
2. Interviews: 9 participants
3. Chinese Language assessment: 17 participants
4. Participant observation: 3 Pakistani informants

For some reasons, not all informants could participate in all research activities. One reason is that participation is voluntary. Another issue is the time constraint. On one occasion, I was invited to a Chinese learning class and allowed to collect data of questionnaires and Chinese language assessment from the students after class. But after completing the research activities, all of them were unavailable for a short interview. In the end, seven subjects in total could participate in the interviews. The details of this research activity will be described in 4.3.

Furthermore, participant observation is meant to be a research tool for case studies. In other words, only voluntary and available informants were chosen for further investigation into their language use in various domains in their lives. Therefore, participant observation was conducted on a few research subjects only. The relevant details will also be discussed in 4.3.

The following section (4.2.1) reveals the general backgrounds of all informants in this study with regard to the informants’ age and gender, place of birth, religion, place of living and the education level of their parents, by their ethnicity (Indian, Pakistani and Nepalese). The language use in their regular social network and their performance of Chinese language assessment will also be delineated in the later sections (4.2.2 and 4.2.3).

4.2.1 Profile of the Young South Asian Informants

4.2.1.1 Age

A majority of the research participants are above 18 (70.6%) and they are studying at university or other post-secondary institutions. Only five of them are below (29.4%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 – 17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1.2 Gender and Ethnic Origin

Of the 17 respondents, 58.8% of the respondents are female and 41.2% are male. There are six Indians, eight Pakistani and three Nepalese in total.

Table 4.2 Gender and Ethnicity (Percentage in Bracket)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Indian (%)</th>
<th>Pakistani (%)</th>
<th>Nepalese (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Female</td>
<td>5 (83.3)</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
<td>2 (66.7)</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (100.0)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>3 (100.0)</td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1.3 Place of Birth

In general, almost a half (47.0%) of the research participants were born in Hong Kong. The remaining (53.0%) were born elsewhere. A relatively higher proportion of the Indians (66.6%) were born in Hong Kong, whereas most of the Pakistanis (62.5%) born in Pakistan.

Table 4.3 Place of Birth and Ethnicity (Percentage in Bracket)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Indian (%)</th>
<th>Pakistani (%)</th>
<th>Nepalese (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>4 (66.6)</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>8 (47.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (100.0)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>3 (100.0)</td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1.4 Religion

Of the 17 respondents, nearly a half of the informants (47.0%) are Muslim, all of whom are Pakistani. Half of the Indian subjects (50%) believe in Sikhism, which accounts for 17.6% among all of the informants. A few Nepalese and Indian respondents also have faith in Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity and Catholicism.

Table 4.4 Religion and Ethnicity (Percentage in Bracket)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Nepalese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>8 (47.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhism</td>
<td>3 (50.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholicism</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (100.0)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>3 (100.0)</td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1.5 Place of Living

In general, South Asian informants evenly spread around most of the districts in Hong Kong. Almost a quarter of the informants (23.3%) live in Kwai Tsing District and a half of the Pakistani informants (50%) live in that district. The remaining live in Central and Western District, Kowloon City District, Tuen Mun District, Yau Tsim Mong District, etc.

Table 4.5 Place of Living and Ethnicity (Percentage in Bracket)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Nepalese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Western</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1.6  Type of Housing

Of all 17 respondents, over three quarters of them (76.5%) live in public housing. Almost all of the Pakistani research participants (87.5%) and the same proportion of Indian and Nepalese informants (66.7%) live in public housing. A few of them reside in private housing.

Table 4.6  Type of Housing and Ethnicity (Percentage in Bracket)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Nepalese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Housing</td>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>4 (66.7)</td>
<td>7 (87.5)</td>
<td>2 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>2 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>3 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (100.0)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>3 (100.0)</td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1.7  Number of Siblings

Of the 17 respondents, 35.3% reported to have one sibling, followed by 29.4% having three siblings. Those who have four and five siblings constitute 5.9% and 17.6% respectively.
Table 4.7  Number of Siblings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Siblings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1.8  Parents’ Education Attainment

Generally, the education levels of South Asian mothers are lower than those of the fathers. A higher proportion of mothers’ educational attainment (64.7%) is of primary school or below, compared with only 11.8% for fathers. Similarly, the fathers who received secondary school education or above account for 88.2%, whereas the corresponding figure for the mothers is 35.3%.

Judging from each ethnic origin, it is noticed that the parents of Indian informants have the highest education attainment, followed by Nepalese. 66.7% of the mothers and all of the fathers received secondary school or university education, whereas the corresponding figures for Nepalese are 33.3% and 100%. Only 12.5% of Pakistani mothers and 75% of Pakistani fathers attended secondary schools or universities.

Meanwhile, the education level of 87.5% of Pakistani mothers and 25.5% of Pakistani father are of primary or no schooling, whereas the respective figures for Nepalese are 66.7% and 0%. It is also noted that the proportions for Indian parents who have only primary school education or no education are comparatively much lower than those for Pakistani and Nepalese counterparts. Only 33.3% of Indian mothers and none of the Indian fathers have primary school education or no education.
Table 4.8  Mother’s Education Attainment and Ethnicity (Percentage in Bracket)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Nepalese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s No Schooling</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (50.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>2 (33.3)</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
<td>2 (66.7)</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Attainment</td>
<td>3 (50.0)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (100.0)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>3 (100.0)</td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9  Father’s Education Attainment and Ethnicity (Percentage in Bracket)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Nepalese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father’s No Schooling</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (25.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Attainment</td>
<td>5 (83.3)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
<td>2 (66.7)</td>
<td>12 (70.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (100.0)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>3 (100.0)</td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1.9  Parents’ Occupation

Among all of the informants’ mothers, a large proportion of them (88.2) are housewives and all of the eight Pakistani mothers are engaged in homemaking work. Those who are employed full time are Indian and Nepalese (5.9%) and work as professionals such as businesspeople or service workers, for example, tourism officers.
### Table 4.10  Mother’s Occupation and Ethnicity (Percentage in Bracket)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Nepalese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Occupation</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>5 (83.3)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>2 (66.7)</td>
<td>15 (88.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (100.0)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>3 (100.0)</td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all of the informants’ fathers, the same proportion of them (35.3%) has professional work such as financial controller, businessman, manager and elementary occupation such as security guard, construction worker, factory worker. Judging from the ethnic origin, a half of the Indian fathers (49.9%) has professional work, whereas most Pakistani (37.5%) and Nepalese (66.7%) have elementary jobs. The remaining works as a clerk and a service worker.

### Table 4.11  Father’s Occupation and Ethnicity (Percentage in Bracket)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Nepalese</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3 (49.9)</td>
<td>2 (25.0)</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>6 (35.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Occupation</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
<td>2 (66.7)</td>
<td>6 (35.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Language Use and Social Networks

This section describes the language use of the young South Asians and their social networks in various domains: home, school, friendship and after-school activities. Informants are kept anonymous and are assigned a name based on their ethnicity, gender and age, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Order Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Indian</td>
<td>F: Female</td>
<td>A: Aged above 18</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: Pakistani</td>
<td>M: Male</td>
<td>B: Aged below 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N: Nepalese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If an informant is an ethnically Pakistani male aged below 18, he will be assigned a name as PMB1, based on the initials of the words above. The order number is randomly assigned. Throughout this paper, informants will be named in this way to maintain anonymity and there are totally 17 informants as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Informants’ Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>IFA1, IFA2, IFA3, IFA4, IFA5, IMA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>PFA1, PFA2, PFB1, PMA1, PMA2, PMA3, PMB1, PMB2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>NFB1, NFB2, NMA1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2.1 Home

In general, most of the informants exhibit a high degree of multilingual abilities at home domain. A majority of them speak at least two languages at home. They can not only speak their ethnic languages, but also English and, to some extent, Cantonese.

**Indian Informants**

In terms of the six Indian informants, the ethnic languages they speak frequently at home are Hindi, Punjabi and Malayalam, along with English and, less frequently, Cantonese. There is one informant, IFA2, who speaks Tagalog, a language commonly spoken in the Philippines, with her mother, grandparents and siblings except her father, because she is a mixed Indian and Filipino and her father is of Pakistani descent. IFA2 told me that her father never spoke Urdu, an official language in Pakistan, at home but only with his friends. She only speaks English with him. The following diagram illustrates IFA2’s language choice for different family members at home. (The idea of diagramming code choice is based on Holmes (2008: 24)).

**Diagram 4.1** IFA2’s Code Choice at Home Domain

IFA2 speaks Tagalog for some the conversational topics, for example, talking about the school life, arguing and gossiping with her siblings and preparing dinner. IFA2 uses both Tagalog and English as well in certain situations such as talking about the school life and arguing.
with parents, discussing current issues, watching TV together. In general, IFA2 never speaks and practices Chinese at home.

Conversely, another informant, IFA3, speaks Cantonese as the major language of communication at home, along with some English and Punjabi, for most of the topics of conversation, such as having a party with relatives, talking about the school life with parents and siblings. She only speaks Cantonese for some situations, such as arguing with parents and siblings, discussing current issues, watching TV with family members. She speaks Cantonese and, less frequently English and Punjabi, to her father, mother, grandparents and siblings.

**Diagram 4.2**  
IFA3’s Code Choice at Home Domain

```
DOMAIN  | FAMILY MEMBERS | LANGUAGE
---------|----------------|----------
Home     | Father         | Cantonese, Punjabi
         | Grandparents   |          
         | YES +          |          
         | NO -           |          
         | Siblings       | Cantonese  
         | YES +          |          
         | NO -           |          
         | Mother         |          
         | YES +          |          
         |                | Cantonese   
```

Overall, most Indian informants speak the ethnic languages, English and to some degree, Cantonese. IFA3 is the exceptional case and speaks Cantonese most frequently in most cases.

**Pakistani Informants**
A majority of the Pakistani informants use the ethnic languages and English more frequently than the Chinese language. Some of them do not even use Chinese at home. The common ethnic languages are Urdu, Hindko and Punjabi.

There is only one Pakistani informant, PFB1, who use Cantonese as the second most common language of communication at home, along with Urdu as the most common one and
English as the least, because PFB1 was born in Pakistan and is a mixed Pakistani and Chinese. She speaks Cantonese with her father and Urdu with her mother, grandparents and siblings. She mostly uses Urdu for most of the conversation topics, together with some extent of Cantonese and English, for example, having a party with relatives, watching TV, singing songs with siblings. But when it comes to topics concerning ethnic cultures, she speaks Urdu only, such as discussing Quran with parents and siblings, talking about ethnic and religious holiday events like Eid al-Fitr (an Islamic holiday to mark the end of Ramadan, the Islamic holy month of fasting).

Diagram 4.3    PFB1’s Code Choice at Home Domain

Nepalese Informants
All of the three Nepalese research participants use Nepali and English as the languages of communication at home. An informant, NFB1, uses Nepali only at home for all the topics of conversation. Even though another subject, NMA1, uses Chinese as the third common language, preceded by Nepali and English, he did not indicate in which situations he uses Chinese for communication with family members. It implies that his use of Chinese is still very limited.

4.2.2.2    School
The languages for communication at school domain switch to English, Cantonese and to some extent, the ethnic languages, when compared with the languages used at home domain. The language use for schoolmates and teachers, the ethnicity of the people informants interact with and the frequency that they interact with Chinese schoolmates and teachers will be described.

**Indian Informants**

All of the six Indian research participants use English as the major and most common language of communication with schoolmates in secondary schools and universities. The ethnicity of their schoolmates includes Chinese, Indian, Pakistani, Filipino and Korean.

There are two research participants, IFA2 and IFA4, who speak English only with Chinese people, even though they often interact with Chinese schoolmates. IFA4 also speaks Hindi with schoolmates of other ethnicities. The relationships with Chinese schoolmates are uniplex. Also, they have teachers of various ethnicities but both IFA2 and IFA4 have loose contact with their teachers because they talk about homework and current issues only.

But those who use Chinese regularly in schools prefer English and Chinese with people at school. For example, a research participant, IMA1, interacts with Chinese schoolmates all the time and speaks both English and Chinese with them. The topics of conversation include discussing school homework and current issues, gossiping about boys or girls, playing football together, talking about family and teachers. IMA1 is a student from English Department, which requires students to speak English only. But it is noted that IMA1 has a multiplex relationship with Chinese schoolmates because IMA1’s relationship with Chinese schoolmates also involve playing football together, as indicated by IMA1. Furthermore, he is responsible for organising activities at school with school teachers and schoolmates. This helps IMA1 develop a dense and multiplex network. (Diagrams of social networks are based on Chambers (2009: 79 – 81))

**Diagram 4.4**  
IMA1’s Social Network with Chinese Schoolmates and Teachers

[Diagram of IMA1’s Social Network with Chinese Schoolmates and Teachers]
However, another subject, IFA3, speaks Cantonese most frequently with her schoolmates, along with some English, and she always interacts with Chinese people. She also has a lot of conversations with Chinese schoolmates on a number of topics and activities as well, such as doing voluntary work, discussing school homework, talking about teachers. But IFA3 mostly speaks English with teachers and has a loose contact with teachers. As shown in the following diagram, IFA3 has a multiplex relationship with Chinese schoolmates because she does voluntary work with them and has a uniplex one with teachers.

**Diagram 4.5**  
IFA3’s Social Network with Schoolmates and Teachers

![Diagram of IFA3's social network]

**Pakistani Informants**

Among all of the eight Pakistani research participants, PFA2, PMA1 and PMA3 can communicate with Chinese schoolmates and teachers in English only. But PFA2 told me that some of her Chinese schoolmates were also workmates because she worked as a henna artist in Ocean Park and they worked together for four months. At work, even though she spoke English, she was able to pick up some Cantonese from the Chinese schoolmates. In this way, PFA2 developed a multiplex relationship with some Chinese schoolmates. Also PMA1 also said that it is hard for him to develop social networks with Chinese at school because he attended a non-Chinese class at Vocational Training Council.

Even though some of research participants speak Cantonese with their Chinese schoolmates and teachers, they do not have a close-knit social network with Chinese schoolmates and teachers, even though PFB1, PMB1 and PMB2 engage in activities with the Chinese such as
discussion of school homework and current issues, having school party, doing voluntary work, they interact with their Chinese schoolmates from time to time.

However, PFA1 and PMA2 have a regular contact with their Chinese schoolmates and teachers. PFA1 is a social work student. She always interacts with her schoolmates to discuss school homework and current issues, talk about teachers, have lunch together and do voluntary work. She and her schoolmates have little contact outside school because they have different school schedule and do not have time to meet. But they always have gatherings after each semester to have karaoke party and still get along well with schoolmates. This can help maintain the dense network with her schoolmates.

Meanwhile, PMA2 is a chemistry student. Even though he has Pakistani and Indian schoolmates and communicates with them in English, he always interacted with Chinese schoolmates in Cantonese, not only for school homework, but also some informal talk such as gossiping about boys and girls, talking about favourite idols. Furthermore, he is a core committee member of the magic society at school and always organises a number of activities for his school with Chinese schoolmates. PMA2 also interacted with Chinese teachers outside academic work such as voluntary work. This helps PMA2 develop a multiplex and dense social network with Chinese schoolmates and teachers.

Diagram 4.6 PMA2’s Social Network with Schoolmates and Teachers
Nepalese Informants

The three Nepalese informants use English mainly and rarely speak Cantonese to interact with Chinese schoolmates and teachers, even though they reported that they always interact with the Chinese. In addition, the three Nepalese subjects (NFB1, NFB2 and NMA1) use their ethnic languages (Nepali, Hindi) with their schoolmates and English with school teachers more frequently than Indian and Pakistani counterparts. On the whole, the Nepalese informants have a loose and uniplex relationship with Chinese schoolmates and teachers.

4.2.2.3 Friendship

Overall, South Asian informants sometimes or rarely meet their Chinese friends. Most of them prefer English as the languages of communication with Chinese friends. Some of them even do not have any Chinese friends. But there are a few cases where informants have regular contacts with Hong Kong Chinese.

Indian Informants

All of the research subjects prefer English and their ethnic languages to communicate with friends. Cantonese is the least preferred and common language among them. Even so, most of the informants have a regular interaction with their Chinese friends.

Two informants, IMA1 and IFA3, not only often interact with their Chinese friends, but also speak Chinese and English with them. Even though they can speak Hindi, they speaks English and Chinese for most of the activities and conversations, for example, gossiping about boys and girls, talking about family and friends, playing sports and going for a drink at bars and seaside with friends.

Pakistani Informants

Similarly, Pakistani research participants prefer English and their ethnic languages (Hindko, Punjabi, Urdu and sometimes Hindi) to communicate with their friends. But compared with the Indian informants, Pakistani subjects sometimes or rarely interact with Chinese friends. But two informants, PMA1 and PMA2, maintain a regular social network with Chinese friends.

PMA1 moved to Hong Kong about six years ago. Even though he does not speak Chinese very well, he often interacts with many Chinese friends in English because he has regular hockey
trainings in Hong Kong. He told me that he used to be a player in a hockey team where there were a lot of Chinese people and he interacted with them regularly. Now he still keeps in touch with the Chinese team members.

**Diagram 4.7** PMA1’s Social Network with His Friends

Meanwhile, PMA2 studied in a secondary school with a number of local Hong Kong Chinese. He used to study Chinese at secondary school and chose science stream in senior form. When he started learning magic at secondary school, he interacted with Hong Kong Chinese. Now he always meets Chinese friends and speaks Chinese and sometimes English with them.

**Nepalese Informants**

All Nepalese informants use English mainly and ethnic languages (Nepali and Hindi) to communicate with their Nepalese, Indian and Filipino friends. They rarely interacted with Chinese friends in Chinese but English only. One of the informants (NFB2) does not speak Chinese in this domain. Furthermore, even though two of the informants (NMA1, NFB1) stated that they rarely use Chinese for communication with friends, they did not indicate which topics of conversation they will use Chinese. It implies that the use of Chinese in the conversation is limited.

### 4.2.2.4 After-school Activities

This part describes the informants’ daily activities they regularly get involved in, for example, religious activities, voluntary work, sports, part-time work, etc. Their language use and the people they interacted with in these activities are also to be delineated.
**Indian Informants**

A majority of the research participants have regular activities for different religions, for example, Sikhism, Hinduism, Christianity and Catholicism. They mainly use their ethnic languages for communication in the religious domain.

Both IMA1 and IFA4 are Sikhs. They reported that they regularly go to a Sikh temple in Wan Chai, where there are mainly Indians and they speak Punjabi, Hindi and to some extent, English. IMA1 told me that sometimes there are some homeless Hong Kong people in the temple because the temple always provides free food for everyone in the temple, even though those homeless Hong Kong people are not Sikhs. Another informant, IFA5, always goes to a Hindu temple in Happy Valley, where there are Indian people and she speaks Hindi and English with them, whereas IFA1 goes to a Christian church where she speaks English only with the white people and IFA2 goes to a Catholic church where there are a lot of Filipinos, Hong Kong people, Indians and Americans and she speaks Tagalog with Filipinos and English with other people.

Other than religious activities, informants also engage in other regular activities. IFA1, IFA2 and IMA1 have part-time jobs. But IFA1 work as a secret customer and only speaks English with Hong Kong people, Singaporeans and Thais, whereas IFA2 teaches French at a secondary school and has her Filipino friends as her workmates, so English is the language of communication for teaching and interacting with students and workmates. However, some IFA2’s friends are also her workmates. In other words, IFA2’s interaction with her Filipino friends involves several dimensions and maintains a multiplex social network. Furthermore, IMA1 teaches English to Chinese children at a tutorial centre in Chai Wan and Mong Kok, so he can only speak English.

**Diagram 4.8**  IFA2’s Social Network for After-school Activities
However, IMA1 regularly participates in football games outside the school and English drama at school with Hong Kong Chinese. He speaks both English and Cantonese in these activities. Since his schoolmates are also the members of the drama team, he develops a multiplex relationship with the schoolmates.

Diagram 4.9  IMA1’s Social Network for After-school Activities (Based on Diagram 4.4)

**Diagram 4.9**

![Diagram showing IMA1's social network for after-school activities.](image)

**Pakistani Informants**

A majority of the informants participates in Islamic activities regularly. The languages for communication are mainly Urdu and sometimes Hindko with other Pakistanis and English with Indians, Bangladeshis, Chinese, Indonesians and people from Middle East and Africa.

Other than religious activities, all of the informants have regular non-academic activities. There are three major types of activities they get involved in: sports activities, voluntary work and part-time jobs.

PMA1, PMB1 and PMB2 have regular hockey training together every week in the Pakistan Recreation Club in Jordan, near Princess Margaret Road, Kowloon. They speak Urdu and English during the training session. PMA1 also has hockey trainings with one of his Pakistani schoolmate. I went to the Pakistan Recreation Club for the participant observation on the informant PMA1. The details will be described in section 4.3. PFB1 also joins a badminton club activity regularly with her Pakistani and Indian friends and she speaks Urdu and English with them.
Both PFA1 and PFA2 engage in volunteering on a regular basis. PFA1 does voluntary work for Caritas and UN-Habitat, where she interacts with Pakistani, Indian, Nepali, Filipino and Chinese friends and volunteer groups in English, Urdu, Hindko, Hindi and Cantonese. PFA1 also maintains contacts with her secondary school friends, who are Chinese, Pakistanis and Indians. Meanwhile, PFA2 participates in community activities organised by Unison Hong Kong, such as talks, site visits and hiking, with other Pakistani, Chinese, Indians, Nepalese and Filipinos. She interacted with them in English only.

Other than sports and voluntary work, PMA2 has a part-time job as a tutor for a magic class every week for Hong Kong Chinese children in Shatin YMCA and he conducts his class in Cantonese.

**Nepalese Informants**
One Nepalese informant, NFB2, goes to Christian church regularly, where she interacted with Nepalese only in Nepali. The other two informants do not have regular religious activities but also non-academic activities. NMA1 participates in a football club with Nepalese and Chinese friends and interacted with them in Nepali and English, whereas NFB1 has summer programmes and some school-related activities with her Nepalese friends only.

### 4.2.3 Attitudes towards Expanding Social Networks with Chinese People

This section is based on the results of the 17 questionnaires in Part 2, regarding the informants’ motivations to learn Chinese and know Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong people.

Overall, most of the South Asian informants have a strong desire to improve their written Chinese and spoken Cantonese and agree that it is important for them to have Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong people around to improve their Chinese. In other words, in order to improve their Chinese, it is important for them to expand their social networks with Hong Kong Chinese.

It is also noteworthy that informants do not have a consensus on statements 3 and 6. Regarding statement 3, three of the informants (17.6%) do not agree that it is difficult to improve their Chinese and they are all Pakistani informants (PMA2, PFB1, PMB1). As mentioned in
4.2.2, PMA2 studied in a secondary school with local Hong Kong Chinese and becomes a committee member of the magic society at school to hold activities for his school with Chinese schoolmates, whereas PFB1 is a mixed Pakistani and Chinese and always speaks Cantonese with her father. PFB1 also takes an Advanced Chinese learning lesson at Caritas and I conducted participant observation there (See Section 4.3).

Furthermore, with regard to statement 6, although almost a half of the informants (47%) disagree that it is difficult to make friends with Hong Kong Chinese, another half of them agree with or are neutral about this statement. One Indian informant, IMA1, is neutral about the statement and told me that it depends on some Hong Kong Chinese’s attitudes because it is not just about the languages we use, but more about the stereotypes Hong Kong Chinese have on South Asian communities.

Finally, in response to statement 4, even though a majority of the informants have Hong Kong Chinese friends in their social networks, the frequency of interaction between South Asian informants and Hong Kong Chinese is not very high (between sometimes and rarely) and the language of communication with Chinese is English and to some extent, English, according to sections 4.2.2.2, 4.2.2.3 and 4.2.2.4.

**Table 4.14** Informants' Desire to improve Chinese and know Hong Kong people (17 Respondents for Each Statement) (Percentage in Bracket)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I want to improve my written Chinese.</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I want to improve my Cantonese.</td>
<td>12 (70.6)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) It is hard to improve my Chinese.</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I have Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong friends.</td>
<td>8 (47.1)</td>
<td>7 (41.1)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) It is important to have Cantonese speaking friends in Hong Kong.  
6) It is hard to make friends with Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong people.  
7) Having Cantonese-speaking friends can improve my Chinese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) It is important to have Cantonese speaking friends in Hong Kong.</td>
<td>9 (52.9)</td>
<td>8 (47.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) It is hard to make friends with Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong people.</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
<td>7 (41.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Having Cantonese-speaking friends can improve my Chinese.</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>6 (35.3)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.4 Performance in Chinese Language Assessment

Other than the results from questionnaires and interviews, informants’ Chinese language abilities were also tested by a Chinese language assessment, which includes listening, reading and writing sections. In order to explore their proficiency in Chinese, this section is devoted to describing their performance in the three language tests. (See Appendix 4 for the Chinese Language Assessment)

The total marks for this assessment is 40, with 5 marks for the listening section, 15 marks for the reading section and 20 marks for the writing test.

The mean score of all the informants is 21.2 / 40 (53%), whereas the mean scores for Indian, Pakistani and Nepalese informants are 20.0 (50%), 26.1 (65.3%) and 10.8 (27%) respectively, as shown in the Table 4.15, 4.16, 4.17 and 4.18. (For the entire process of calculation, see Appendix 6). Pakistani informants had a better performance than Indian and Nepalese counterparts.

#### Table 4.15  Mean Score of All Informants in the Chinese Language Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Language Assessment</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>3.8 / 5</td>
<td>8.6 / 15</td>
<td>8.8 / 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.16  Mean Score of Indian Informants in the Chinese Language Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indian Subjects</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFA1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFA2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFA3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFA4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFA5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMA1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Score**  
4.2 / 5 7.5 / 15 8.3 / 20 20.0 / 40 (50%)

### Table 4.17  Mean Score of Pakistani Informants in the Chinese Language Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pakistani Subjects</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PFA1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFA2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFB1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMA1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMA2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMA3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMB1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMB2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Score**  
4.2 / 5 10.8 / 15 11.1 / 20 26.1 / 40 (65.3%)
Table 4.18  Mean Score of Nepalese Informants in the Chinese Language Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nepalese Subjects</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NFB1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFB2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMA1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 / 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.3 / 15</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5 / 20</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.8 / 40 (27%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4.1  Listening

In this section, informants were required to listen to five Cantonese audio clips, all of which last less than 30 seconds, and choose one answer out of four choices. (See Appendix 5 for the scripts of the five Cantonese audio clips)

Based on the Table 4.15, the mean score of all the informants for listening is 3.8 / 5 (76%). Table 4.16 and Table 4.17 also demonstrated that both Indian and Pakistani research participants have the same mean score (4.2 / 5, 84.0%) in the listening test, whereas the mean score in this test of the three Nepalese subjects is twofold lower than their Indian and Pakistani counterparts, only 2 / 5 (40%).

Overall, South Asian informants’ performance here refutes the findings from Shum *et al.* (2012: 55 - 57), which states that most of the non-Chinese students were confused with the tourist spots and landmarks in Hong Kong and did not know enough about Hong Kong cultures. But the listening script of question 4 in the Chinese language assessment involves two museums: Hong Kong Museum of Art and Hong Kong Heritage Museum. Most of the research participants could differentiate four different museums in Hong Kong and choose C (Hong Kong Heritage Museum) and here is the answer from one of the informants, IFA3.
Furthermore, Shum et al. (2012: 55 – 57) also shows that their informants were confused with Chinese vocabulary with 「電」, for example, 「電視」 and 「電話」. However, a majority of the informants in this study could correctly choose the answer 「電子琴」 from 「電話」, 「電腦」 and 「電視」. Here is the example from the informant NFB1 and the results here disapprove the previous findings.

**Figure 4.2** Informant NFB1’s Answer to Question 5 from the Listening Test

### 4.2.4.2 Reading

The reading section is divided into three parts with five questions each. The first part is about matching several kitchen utensils and facilities to their corresponding Chinese words, whereas the second section requires informants to choose a Chinese word to complete a phrase and the last one is a reading passage.
Compared with the general performance for listening, the mean score for reading is lower - 8.6 / 15 (57.3%) and the average scores for Indian, Pakistani and Nepalese informants are 7.5 / 15 (50.0%), 10.8 / 15 (72.0%) and 5.3 /15 (35.3%), according to Table 4.15 to Table 4.18.

In the first reading section, most of the informants were not able to match all the items correctly to the corresponding Chinese words. Here are the answers from IFA2 and PMA1.

**Figure 4.3** Informants IFA2’s and PMA1’s Answer to Part 1 of the Reading Test
Similarly, some of the informants found it difficult to choose certain Chinese words to complete a phrase in the given sentences. For example, there are questions testing the informants’ ability to form a simple relative clause with a character 「的」 and identify a correct classifier for an object. Here are examples from the informants IFA4 and PMA1.

**Figure 4.4** Informant IFA4’s Answer to Question 5 in Part 2 of the Reading Test

![Figure 4.4](image)

**Figure 4.5** Informant PMA1’s Answer to Question 2 in Part 2 of the Reading Test

![Figure 4.5](image)

With regard to the reading passage, a majority of the informants might not fully understand the whole passage and therefore made some mistakes. For example, question 1 tests the subjects’ ability to recognise the answer from a complex sentence 「在一起說話很高興，在一起玩耍也很高興」 (Answer D) in the reading passage.

**Figure 4.6** Informant IFA5’s Answers to the Reading Passage

![Figure 4.6](image)

In general, based on the mean score of the reading tasks by ethnic origins in Table 4.15 to 4.18, Pakistani subjects had a better performance over Indian and Nepalese counterparts.
4.2.4.3 Writing

The overall performance of all informants in the writing section is 8.8 / 20 (44 %), the lowest mean scores among all of the three language tasks. Indian, Pakistani and Nepalese research participants had the mean scores of 8.3 / 20 (42.0%), 11.1 / 20 (56.0%) and 3.5 / 20 (17.5%) respectively. Pakistani subjects had a better performance in writing than their Indian and Nepalese counterparts. (See Appendix 5 for the marking schemes of all of the three writing tasks)

The writing section involves three tasks. The first part requires informants to write the Chinese words based on the given pictures, whereas the subjects were asked to provide Chinese vocabulary based on a given Chinese character in the second part and finally write a short passage about them.

In the first part, a majority of the informants had difficulty writing the Chinese characters completely, even though they could pronounce the characters. Some of them replaced the characters with romanised characters for most of the cases, or characters with extra components.

Figure 4.7 Extra Components and Romanisation for 「香蕉」 from Informant PFA1

Figure 4.8 Romanisation for 「沙灘」 from Informant PMA2
In the second writing task, most of the informants could not complete all of the questions and give romanised characters, characters with missing components, irrelevant vocabulary.

**Figure 4.9** Romanisation for 「醫生」 from Informant PMB1

**Figure 4.10** Missing Component for 「星期」 from Informant PMA3

**Figure 4.11** Irrelevant Answer from Informant NMA1

Regarding the last short passage writing, a number of informants wrote the essay in Cantonese Chinese with romanised Chinese characters, with problems in syntactic expression and discourse organisation, for example, a lack of paragraph organisation, signposting, repetition of simple sentences and some Chinese vocabulary, for example 「鍾意」 (like) and 「我」 (I), and also the use of Cantonese Chinese characters, rather than formal written Chinese.
Some informants only wrote down some basic information about themselves and could not enrich their essay and confused the use of 「是」 to introduce their ages.
But there are also informants who were able to write a coherent essay with a variety of Chinese words and complex structures, such as if-clause, sentence adverbial 「將來」, metaphor.

Figure 4.16 Essay from Informant IFA3 (with if-clause)
4.2.5 Summary

After a general description and analysis of the data ranging from South Asian informants’ background information to their language use in different social domains, from their attitudes towards expanding social networks with Hong Kong Chinese to their proficiency in Chinese, it is
discovered that informants’ South Asian or non-Chinese friends do not know informants’ Chinese friends. In other words, the South Asian friends and Hong Kong Chinese friends in most informants’ social networks are separated and only connected to the informants (See Diagram 4.11 and 4.12) Their social networks are less ethnically diverse and less ethnically dense and multiplex, regardless of the research participants’ family background, and therefore they have less chances to expand the use of Chinese in different domains, where they are required to speak Chinese.

Even though there are some informants who have dense and multiplex networks with Hong Kong Chinese, the rest of them have infrequent interaction with them and they usually speak English and only to some extent, Cantonese when they interact with Hong Kong Chinese. When I first asked some of the informants whether their South Asian or non-Chinese friends know your Hong Kong Chinese friends, the informants did not realize it was the case for them until I asked them this question. Here is a general comparison of the code choices and social networks between with a dense and multiplex social network with Hong Kong Chinese and those who do not.

**Diagram 4.10** Code Choice for Informants with close-knit networks with Chinese

- **DOMAIN**: School, After-school Activities
- **PEOPLE**: South Asian
- **LANGUAGE**: Ethnic Languages, English

**Diagram 4.11** Code Choice for Informants with loose-knit networks with Chinese

- **DOMAIN**: School, After-school Activities
- **PEOPLE**: South Asian
- **LANGUAGE**: English
Diagram 4.12  Informants with Close-knit Social Networks with Chinese

Diagram 4.13  Informants with Loose-knit Social Networks with Chinese
4.3 Case Studies of the South Asian’s Linguistic Repertoires and Social Networks

Participant observation was conducted between March 2014 and April 2014 on some informants in two site visits in order to have an in-depth look into their after-school activities and the real interaction and language use with the others, especially the use of Chinese with Hong Kong Chinese in those activities.

4.3.1 Kowloon Mosque and the Pakistan Club

First of all, I was introduced to PMA1 by another research participant PFA2 because they are brother and sister. The first day I met PMA1 was on 1st March 2014. We went to the Kowloon Mosque in Tsim Sha Tsui. He told me that he rarely went to this mosque because he lived in a public housing estate in Kwai Chung with his parents and siblings and he usually went to a small mosque near Kwai Chung, where there are a number of South Asian people residing in this area. Even so, PMA1 also introduced to me the Islamic culture such as the praying practice, the people they meet and the language he speaks with them. He mainly speaks Urdu to the other Muslims in the mosque.

Other than Islamic cultures, he also mentioned his life in Hong Kong. His sisters and he moved to Hong Kong six years ago in pursuit of a better future in Hong Kong. When I asked him how he could learn Chinese in Hong Kong and whether it was difficult to live in Hong Kong, he told me that he could barely speak and write any Chinese but only speak English with most of the people in Hong Kong. Meanwhile, now he studied business in a non-Chinese class at Vocational Training Council, where he could interact with other non-Chinese students in English or his ethnic languages. Therefore, he rarely has a chance to interact with Hong Kong Chinese at school.

But when it came to his leisure activities in Hong Kong, he told me he played hockey and cricket regularly in Hong Kong since hockey and cricket are national sports in Pakistan. He used to have regular hockey trainings in Shaheen Team in King’s Park, where he knew a lot of Hong Kong Chinese and had regular trainings and matches with them. It was there when PMA1 picked up some Cantonese from the Hong Kong Chinese. Later, there was a change in the manager in
Shaheen Team, so now he plays hockey in another team at Pakistan Recreation Club in Jordan. But he still keeps in touch with some of the Hong Kong Chinese team members. (See Diagram 4.6 for his social networks with Hong Kong Chinese).

After the site visit at Kowloon Mosque, we went to the Pakistan Club near Wiley Road, Jordan. In the club, there were Pakistani teenagers only and they were having hockey trainings. PMA1 told me that all of them spoke Urdu or Hindko with one another. As a newcomer, I felt I was an odd one out in this club because neither can I speak fluent Urdu or Hindko nor am I a Pakistani. The only Urdu phrases I could speak is ‘assalamu alaikum’, which means ‘may peace be on you’ (hello), and ‘allah hafiz’, which means ‘may God (Allah) protect you’ (Goodbye). They were all very impressed with my Urdu greetings and I got welcomed by them. They were very keen on teaching me the basics of hockey and talking to me in English and little Cantonese. During the second site visit on 5 April 2014, I conducted data collection from two more informants PMB1 and PMB2. They are all studying at secondary schools and learning Chinese from their schools. Therefore, their performance in the Chinese language assessment is better than PMA1’s.

4.3.2 Chinese Learning Class at Caritas

Furthermore, I was invited by a social worker to a Chinese learning class in the Caritas Kowloon Community Centre on 13th April 2014 for further data collection of this project. In this Chinese class, I met informants IFA3, PFB1, PMA3, three Nepalese (NFB1, NFB2, and NMA1). Except for PFB1 and IFA3, the rest of them attended a basic level Chinese class. Mr. Chan, the instructor of the class, designed the teaching materials for these students to learn the basics of components of Chinese characters and increase their Chinese vocabulary size and improve their Cantonese pronunciation.

PFB1 attended an advanced Chinese learning class. She was active in answering the teacher’s question in Cantonese. Even though she is a mixed Pakistani and Chinese, she still has to attend this kind of Chinese learning class regularly because Mr. Chan knows her a lot and told me that she used to study in a mainstream local primary school in Hong Kong and was able to increase her Chinese language ability, but later after she switched to a secondary school for non-
Chinese, her Chinese was lagging behind and did not improve a lot. However, her score in the Chinese language assessment is the highest (38 / 40, 95%) among all of the 17 South Asian informants, probably due to her constant use of Chinese in home domain and her identity as a mixed Pakistani and Chinese.

The instructor of both classes is a teaching consultant from the Centre for Advancement of Chinese Language Education and Research, The University of Hong Kong. He shared his experience in teaching Chinese to non-Chinese and ethnic minority students and one of the major obstacles in enhancing their Chinese proficiency is the huge difference in the students’ language ability in the same classroom, especially a large-class teaching. A teacher cannot deal with the difference in the students’ abilities in a large class. Worse still, most Chinese teachers are not equipped with the ability to teach Chinese as a second or foreign language, which involves an entirely different pedagogy from teaching Chinese as a first language.

Another Pakistani girl, who did not participate in my research activities, also shared her struggle in studying Chinese at a low-rank secondary school. She was bullied by Hong Kong Chinese students at school and was used by the school teachers to promote the school to other South Asian children in order to recruit more South Asian students and avoid the shut-down of the school because of the low admission rate of new students to the school. However, the school did not allocate resources for South Asian students to learn Chinese and made them much less motivated to learn it. Meanwhile, she is from a conservative family and her parents did not want her to pursue higher education but have an arranged marriage back in Pakistan. This type of marriage in Pakistani community in Hong Kong is so common that it lowered the Pakistani girls’ motivation to study. However, she was still strongly motivated to study hard and learn Chinese. Fortunately, she received help from Mr. Chan and her parents were persuaded by him in pursuit of their permission of her to study at university. Now she works in a non-governmental organisation to fight for the improvement of teaching and learning Chinese as a second language in Hong Kong.
4.3.3 Summary

Although their sharing and the fieldwork in the Kowloon Mosque and the Pakistan Club may not be directly related to this research project, the implication of their teaching and learning experience is that these Chinese language learners need a stronger motivation and desire to improve their language abilities by knowing more native speakers and expanding their social networks with them in order to expand the use of Chinese in different domains. As suggested by the Pakistani girl mentioned above, it is strongly affected by social factors such as family background. With regard to the Pakistani girl in the Chinese language class, the Pakistani community in Hong Kong is religious and most parents discourage their daughters from pursuing higher education and higher social status through arranged marriage in Pakistan, and even stop them from other social activities outside school, such as interacting with friends, not to mention Chinese people. It demotivates South Asian girls in Hong Kong to learn and use Chinese in more domains and therefore lowers their proficiency in Chinese.

Compared with the Pakistani girl, PMA1’s regular social network is mainly Pakistani or other South Asian people. Even though he has some interactions with his Chinese hockey teammates, he also told me that he did not have free time to learn Chinese. But his family does not discourage him from studying and playing hockey. Therefore, a gender difference in Chinese learning motivation within Pakistani community arises from the family and religious backgrounds, which may prevent Pakistani youngsters from interacting with Hong Kong Chinese and expanding their use of Chinese in more domains.

4.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter described the findings from 17 questionnaires, interviews, Chinese language assessment and participant observation on a few informants. In response to the three research questions, it is concluded that (1) in home domain, most of the informants speak their ethnic languages and English. Cantonese is less preferred. (2) Research participants use more English and some Cantonese and their ethnic languages in school domain. (3) For religious activities, informants use their ethnic languages in most cases and some English, whereas in other activities outside school, they mostly prefer English and their ethnic languages. (4) In terms of subjects’
social networks with Chinese, most of the subjects have infrequent interaction and loose and
uniplex social networks with Hong Kong Chinese and research participants’ South Asian friends
do not know their Chinese friends. (5) Although there is individual variation in the performance
of Chinese language assessment within each ethnicity, the Pakistani subjects’ overall mean score
is higher than the Indian counterparts’, followed by the Nepalese informants’.
Chapter 5  Discussion

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, the South Asian adolescents’ social backgrounds, linguistic repertoires in various domains, social networks and their performance in the Chinese language assessment have been reported. So, what new understanding can this research bring to the study of the younger generation of the South Asian community in Hong Kong? How can one understand this community from the perspective of their regular language use, social networks and their proficiency in Chinese? What other factors can play a role in influencing their language proficiency? This chapter will discuss the implication of social networks and other possible factors on their proficiency in Chinese.

5.2 Correlation between social networks and proficiency in Chinese

A similar sociolinguistic study was done to explore the role of social networks and its influence on the development of second language proficiency. Wiklund (2002) explore the three different types of social network orientations (towards the own immigrant group; towards Swedes and towards immigrant groups other than the own group) to determine the development of different young immigrants’ Swedish language proficiency and showed that they could adjust their native ethnic languages and Swedish to people in different domains and their Swedish would be more proficient if students have a social networks oriented towards Swedes and other ethnic groups more often.

In this study, the primary focus is on the degree of the South Asian youngsters’ social network orientation towards Chinese and its influence on their Chinese language proficiency. Based on the findings in Chapter 3, almost all of the informants have a wide range of linguistic repertoires in most of the domains (family, school, friendship and after-school activities). They can speak their ethnic languages, English and Cantonese. But the priority and the frequency of the use of these languages depend on the people of different ethnicity they interact with in
different domains and thus, social network orientation towards Chinese and people from informants’ ethnic origins can play a role in their proficiency in Chinese, as shown in the following.

First of all, according to the findings in the section 4.2.2, informants who have a dense and multiplex social network with Chinese are IFA3, IMA2 and PMA2, since they frequently use Cantonese as one of the major languages of communication with Hong Kong Chinese in most of the domains, together with English and their ethnic languages. Furthermore, they have very high scores (above 30 marks) in the Chinese language assessment. IFA3 has 35.5 / 40, whereas IMA2 received 31.5 / 40 and PMA2 35 / 50. Therefore, their social network orientation towards more Chinese people expands their use of Chinese in more domains and therefore has a higher proficiency in Chinese. However, there are some informants who also have a high score (above 30 marks) in the Chinese language assessment. They are PFA1 (33.5 / 40), PFB1 (38 / 40) and PMB2 (30 / 40). There is one feature in common in PFA1 and PFB1. Both PFA1 and PFB1 also use Cantonese as one of the languages for communication in the family domain. In addition, PFA1 is studying social work with Hong Kong Chinese students and frequently uses Cantonese to communicate with her schoolmates and teachers, whereas PFB1 is a mixed Pakistani and Chinese and in her home domain, she frequently uses Cantonese to communicate with her father. Also, as indicated in section 4.3.2, PFB1 attends a regular advanced Chinese language class to improve her written Chinese, whereas PMB2 is studying at a secondary school and taking a Chinese subject. He needs to use Chinese to communicate with schoolmates and teachers.

Conversely, those who do not have a close-knit social network with Hong Kong Chinese have low scores in the Chinese language assessment. For example, the mean score for all the three Nepalese informants is only 10.8 / 40. Based on the findings in the section 4.2.2, the Nepalese informants rarely use Chinese in most of their domains and their interaction with Hong Kong Chinese is weak. They mostly use their ethnic languages (Nepali, English, and Hindi) in their domains. Furthermore, the remaining Pakistani and Indian informants generally have their scores lower than 20 in their Chinese language assessment. Therefore, there is an influence of their social networks with Chinese on their proficiency in Chinese.

In summary, it is concluded that the South Asian informants’ social network orientation towards Chinese can play a role in their Chinese language proficiency. This result is similar to
the findings from Wiklund (2002), Raschka et al. (2002), Hulsen et al. (2002) and Stoessel (2002), all of which found that if research subjects (immigrants) have a stronger social network orientation with the local language speakers, they will also have a higher proficiency in the local languages.

5.3 Influences of Other Factors on the Informants’ Proficiency in Chinese

There is a difference in the mean scores of the Chinese language assessment among the three ethnic groups in Hong Kong. According to the section 4.2.4, the mean scores for Indians, Pakistanis and Nepalese are 20 / 40 (50%), 26.1 / 40 (65.3%) and 10.8 / 40 (27%). Pakistanis have a better performance than Indians and then Nepalese. This result is not the same as in Ku et al. (2005: 42), which showed that Indians were more proficient than Pakistanis in the self-reported proficiency in Chinese. Since Ku et al. (2002) conducted a self-evaluated proficiency in Chinese on South Asian informants by survey without testing their actual Chinese language ability. This discrepancy may arise from the use of different research methodology and therefore lead to a different research findings.

However, the mean score of the Chinese language performance of the Nepalese informants is among the lowest. This result is in line with the findings in Ku et al. (2002: 45), which also explained that Indians and Pakistanis have a longer history in Hong Kong than their Nepalese counterparts. In other words, they have developed a long-standing and stronger social network with Hong Kong society and therefore developed a relatively higher proficiency in Chinese. In contrast, Nepalese came to Hong Kong in the 1960s to serve the then-British colonial government in Hong Kong (Bosco, 2004, p.511). However, Indians and Pakistanis appeared in Hong Kong much earlier than Nepalese because they were from India which was under the colonial rule of the British Empire as well (today’s India and Pakistan) and they could go to Hong Kong without restriction. (White, 1994, p.15; Weiss, 1991, p.419). Therefore, the historical backgrounds of the South Asian people in Hong Kong can indirectly affect their use and also the proficiency in Chinese.

As mentioned in the sections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3, family backgrounds can also play an indirect role in influencing their language use of the South Asian informants’ social networks.
and therefore their proficiency in Chinese. Based on my fieldwork through City Youth Empowerment Project with other South Asian youngsters in Hong Kong and the Chinese language classes at Caritas Kowloon Community Centre, some South Asian’s youngsters have similar experience. Their parents exert their control on their daily lives, especially young girls. They will not allow the girls to have other social activities such as hanging out with friends, playing sports but only allow them to go to school and restrict their daily lives to school and home only. This kind of restriction inhibits their interaction with other South Asian people, let alone Chinese, and therefore some South Asian youngsters have much less opportunities to interact and expand their social networks and language use with Hong Kong Chinese. But there may not be such a restriction for young boys because of the gender difference imposed by their parents. However, informants’ family backgrounds can also help develop their proficiency in Chinese. Take the informant PFB1 as an example. Since she is a mixed Pakistani and Chinese and her father a Chinese, she can frequently use Chinese to communicate with her father in the home domain.

5.4 Summary

In conclusion, the third research question was reviewed and there is a correlation between the South Asian informants’ social network orientation with Chinese and their proficiency in Chinese and this result is in line with other similar research studies. Furthermore, the role of other factors on the informants’ proficiency in Chinese was also discussed, for example, the historical backgrounds of South Asian groups in Hong Kong and the positive and negative side of South Asian family backgrounds.
Chapter 6  Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to explore the linguistic issues concerning the young generation of the South Asian community in Hong Kong, in terms of their linguistic repertoires in various domains, their social networks with Chinese and South Asian people and the relationship between their social networks and their proficiency in Chinese, and to bridge the research gap between the South Asian community in Hong Kong and Hong Kong society. This study attempts to delineate a general picture of their language use and their social lives in Hong Kong.

The following sections present a summary of the main findings, limitations of this study and areas for further research.

6.2 Summary of Main Findings

6.2.1 Informants’ Linguistic Repertoires in Various Domains and Social Networks

In general, informants exhibit a high degree of multilingual abilities in the family domain. A majority of them speak at least two languages at home. They can not only speak their ethnic languages, but also English and, to some extent, Cantonese. In most cases, informants prefer their ethnic languages and English, regardless of their ethnicity.

The languages use in the school domain switches to English, Cantonese and to some extent, the ethnic languages, compared with the languages used in the home domain. When informants have a close-knit social network with Chinese, they use Cantonese as a major language of communication along with English.

In terms of the friendship domain, South Asian informants sometimes or rarely meet their Chinese friends. Most of them prefer English as the languages of communication with Chinese
friends. But there are some informants who have regular interaction with Hong Kong Chinese, such as sports training.

Finally, the informants get involved in some after-school activities. In religious domain, all of the informants use their ethnic languages only and Hong Kong Chinese rarely participate in their religious activities. But the research participants have sports activities, voluntary work and part-time jobs with other Hong Kong Chinese. In these activities, the subjects use both Cantonese and English to interact with Hong Kong Chinese.

The South Asian friends and Hong Kong Chinese friends in most informants’ social networks are separated and only connected to the informants. In other words, their social networks are less ethnically diverse and less ethnically dense and multiplex and therefore they have fewer chances to expand the use of Chinese in different domains, where they are required to speak Chinese.

6.2.2 Relationship between Informants’ Social Networks and Their Proficiency in Chinese

In general, among all of the three tasks in the Chinese language assessment, most of the informants performed well in the listening tasks, followed by the reading tasks and the writing tasks. Some grammatical items and syntactically complex structures were difficult for informants and romanisation was commonly found in their writing tasks. Furthermore, Pakistanis had a better performance in the Chinese language assessment than Indians and then Nepalese.

When their results in the Chinese language assessment were linked to their social networks orientation towards Chinese, it was found that the South Asian informants’ social network orientation towards Chinese can play a role in their Chinese language proficiency. In other words, those informants who have a dense and multiplex social network with Chinese have higher scores in the Chinese language assessment than those who do not.
6.3 Limitations of This Study

The number of South Asian research participants was expected to be above 20, but due to the time constraints, it was difficult to conduct a number of surveys (questionnaires and interviews) and complete Chinese language assessment and took almost an hour for informants to finish the research activities. And some of the potential informants were too busy with their school work to participate in my research and therefore there were only 17 research participants in total.

The time constraints also affected the breadth of the participant observation at the Pakistan Club and Kowloon Caritas Centre. I was invited to these places in March and April by a ‘friend of friend’ approach and a social worker’s recommendation. It took time to develop relationships with the potential participants in these two places and I was still new to conducting participant observation. Furthermore, I, as a Chinese, entered a place where there were only South Asian people. They treated me as a stranger and might not be willing to disclose information about their lives. Therefore, the results here may not be comprehensive enough.

6.4 Areas for Further Research

This research is of an exploratory nature. Even though it attempts to capture a general overview of the language use of the young South Asian community in Hong Kong, there are some subtle and specific linguistic issues worthy of further investigation. For example, as most of the South Asian informants are multilingual in many domains, it is worthwhile to conduct more studies of the phenomena of code switching to determine in what contexts they will code-mix or code-switch.

As there are more South Asian people being more proficient in Chinese and English, it is also interesting to examine the language maintenance and shift in the larger South Asian community in Hong Kong and determine if they will shift to Chinese and English or maintain their ethnic languages.
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Consent Form for Research Participant

I am invited to participate in this research project which is being carried out by a student investigator CHIU Ka Chun, Gary. My participation is voluntary. Even if I agree to participate now, I can withdraw at any time without any consequences of any kind.

A. Research Purposes

The aim of this research is to investigate issues of language use within the community of South Asian ethnic minorities in Hong Kong by means of participant observation, questionnaires and interviews and look into the my social networks and how they affect their language choice.

B. Activities Involved

If I agree to participate, I will have a questionnaire, a short interview and a Chinese language assessment. There will be questions about my daily language use and the people I interact with in my daily life. The assessment is about my Chinese language ability in listening, reading and writing. If I have time, there will be an optional participant-observation session. In other words, the student investigator follows my daily life for several days and observes who I interact with and how I change my language use accordingly.

It is possible that the interview, questionnaire and participant-observation may cause disturbance to my privacy and daily lives, in order to understand my social networks and my corresponding language use. So I can bring along my friends or parents in company with me to conduct interview and participant observation. I can also reject to answer some questions I may find hard to answer.

C. Benefits of My Participation

My contribution to this research is beneficial. Linguistic issues of South Asian adolescents in Hong Kong have been ignored. My participation can help people understand who South Asians interact with in their daily lives and how South Asians in Hong Kong use their languages. These in turn help understand their relationship.
D. Research Data Privacy

The interview and the participant-observation session will be audio-recorded. Any part of the recording will not be played under any circumstances unless authorisation and written transcriptions are for linguistic research only. Data from this research project may be published in future. The original recording and all copies will be available only to the present investigators and his project supervisor.

All information or data which is obtained from me during the research and can be identified with me will be treated confidentially. This will be done by storing them in the present investigator’s computer and flash drive with password protection.

E. Enquiry

If I have any questions about this research any time, I can ask the present investigator CHIU Ka Chun, Gary at 9603 0490. I am also free, however, to contact any of the other people involved in the research to seek further clarification and information as follows:

The research project supervisor: Dr. LUN Suen, Caesar (3442 8791)

Signature of Participant

I understand what is involved in this research and agree to participate in the study. (I have been given a copy of a copy of this consent form to keep.)

___________________________  ___________________________
Signature of participant   Date

Signature of researcher

I believe the participant is giving informed consent to participate in this study.

___________________________  ___________________________
Signature of researcher   Date
Appendix 2

City University of Hong Kong, Department of Chinese, Translation and Linguistics
B7704, 7/F, Blue Zone, Academic Building 1, 83 Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon Hong Kong

Parental Consent Form for Research Participants Aged below 18

Title of Research: The Influence of Language Use and Social Networks of South Asian Adolescents in Hong Kong on their Chinese Language Proficiency

Name and Phone Number of Student Researcher: CHIU Ka Chun, Gary (9603 0490)

Name and Phone Number of Research Supervisor: Dr. LUN Suen, Caesar (3442 8791)

A. Purpose and Background

Under the supervision of Dr. LUN Suen, Caesar, Assistant Professor of Linguistics at City University of Hong Kong, CHIU Ka Chun, Gary, a final year student of linguistics, is conducting research on the South Asian teenagers’ language use in Hong Kong. The purpose of this research is to investigate their language use by means of questionnaires, interviews, Chinese language assessment and an optional participant observation in order to look into their social networks and see how they affect their Chinese language proficiency.

B. Procedures

If I agree for my child to participate in this research study, he/she will have a questionnaire and a short interview. There will be questions about the daily language use and the people he/she interact with in the daily life. Then a Chinese language assessment will be given to listen, read and write Chinese. If he/she has time with your permission, there will also be an optional participant-observation session. The student investigator follows the daily life for several days, under the company of you or his/her friends, and observes who he/she interact with and how he/she changes my language use accordingly.

C. Risks

It is possible that the interview, questionnaire and participant-observation may cause disturbance to his/her privacy and daily lives, in order to understand my social networks and my corresponding language use. If necessary, he/she can bring along you or his/her friends in company with him/her to conduct interview and participant observation. He/She can also reject to answer some questions he/she may find hard to answer.
The information gathered from this study will be kept as confidential as possible. Your child’s real name will not be used in the report and all files, transcripts and data will be stored in a password-protected flash drive and a password-locked folder in the student researcher’s computer in the researcher’s home, and no one except the researcher will have access to them. Your child’s name will not be used and any identifying personal information will be avoided.

D. Direct Benefits

Even though there are no guaranteed benefits to your child, the contribution to this research is beneficial. Linguistic issues of South Asian adolescents in Hong Kong have been largely ignored. My participation can help people understand who South Asians interact with in their daily lives and how South Asians in Hong Kong use their languages. These in turn help the government policy makers, teachers and other linguists understand their relationship.

E. Costs

There will be no cost to your child or you as a result of taking part in this research study.

F. Questions

If I have any questions about this research any time, I can ask the present investigator CHIU Ka Chun, Gary at 9603 0490. I am also free to contact any of the other people involved in the research to seek further clarification and information as follows:

The research project supervisor: Dr. LUN Suen, Caesar (3442 8791)

G. Consent

I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH STUDY IS VOLUNTARY. My child is free to decline to participate in this research study, or I may withdraw their participation at any point.

My child _________________________has my consent to participate in this research study.

Student is a minor ______________ (age)

Parent/Guardian: _______________________ (signature)             Date: ___________________
Appendix 3

Questionnaire

As part of the fieldwork for my final year project in linguistics at City University of Hong Kong, I am conducting a research project to investigate South Asian adolescents’ language use and social networks in Hong Kong. It would be grateful if you can complete this questionnaire. Any information obtained with regard to this study that can be identified with you will remain strictly confidential. Thank you!

Part 1:

In this part, questions are concerned with your corresponding language use in several daily life situations: HOME (P.1 – P.3), SCHOOL (P.4 – P.8), FRIENDS (P.9 – P.11) and AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES (P.12 – P.13)

HOME (P.1 – P.3)

1. What language(s) do you speak at home? (Please indicate in descending order of frequency)

Language 1: __________________________
Language 2: __________________________
Language 3: __________________________
Language 4: __________________________

Other languages: ______________________

2. I speak the following language(s) with my father.

☐ Language 1  ☐ Language 2  ☐ Language 3  ☐ Language 4

☐ Other Languages
3. I speak the following language(s) with my mother.

☐ Language 1  ☐ Language 2  ☐ Language 3  ☐ Language 4

☐ Other Languages

4. I speak the following language(s) with my grandparents.

☐ Language 1  ☐ Language 2  ☐ Language 3  ☐ Language 4

☐ Other Languages

5. I speak the following language(s) with my sibling(s).

☐ Language 1  ☐ Language 2  ☐ Language 3  ☐ Language 4

☐ Other Languages

6. Here is a list of topics. Please put a ✔ in the topics you will discuss with your parents and siblings and the languages spoken for the topics. You can choose more than one language for each topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
<th>Language 4</th>
<th>Other Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having a party with relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about school life with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Date 1</td>
<td>Date 2</td>
<td>Date 3</td>
<td>Date 4</td>
<td>Date 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about school life with siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about Quran with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about Quran with siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing current issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about ethnic cultures (e.g. Eid, Diwali)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching TV together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguing with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguing with siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing songs with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing songs with siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOL (P.4 – P.8)

Schoolmates:

7. What language(s) do you speak with your classmates? (Please indicate in **descending order of frequency**)

Language 1: __________________________
Language 2: __________________________
Language 3: __________________________
Language 4: __________________________
Other languages: ______________________

8. What is the ethnicity of your classmates? (Please indicate in **descending order of quantity**)

Ethnicity 1: __________________________
Ethnicity 2: __________________________
Ethnicity 3: __________________________
Ethnicity 4: __________________________
Other ethnicity: _____________________

9. What languages do you speak with your classmates of different ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I speak with my classmates of …</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
<th>Language 4</th>
<th>Other Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. How often do you communicate with your schoolmates of different ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I communicate with my schoolmates of …</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Here is a list of topics. Please put a ✔ in the topics you will discuss with your schoolmates and the languages spoken for the topics. You can choose more than one language for each topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
<th>Language 4</th>
<th>Other Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussing school homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossiping about boys or girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about favourite idols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing current issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about ethnic cultures (e.g. Eid, Diwali)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having lunch together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing sports together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having school party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguing with schoolmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing songs with schoolmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing voluntary work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Teachers:**

10. What language(s) do you speak with your school teachers? (Please indicate in descending order of frequency)

Language 1: _______________________

Language 2: _______________________

Language 3: _______________________

Language 4: _______________________

Other languages: ___________________
11. What is the ethnicity of your school teachers? (Please indicate in descending order of quantity)

Ethnicity 1: ________________________
Ethnicity 2: ________________________
Ethnicity 3: ________________________
Ethnicity 4: ________________________
Other ethnicity: _____________________

12. What languages do you speak with your school teachers of different ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I speak with my school teachers of …</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
<th>Language 4</th>
<th>Other Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How often do you communicate with your school teachers of different ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I communicate with my school teachers of …</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Here is a list of topics. Please put a ✔ in the topics you will discuss with your school teachers and the languages spoken for the topics. You can choose more than one language for each topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
<th>Language 4</th>
<th>Other Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Discussing school homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Discussing current issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Talking about family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Talking about ethnic cultures (e.g. Eid, Diwali)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Having lunch together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Singing songs with school teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Doing voluntary work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FRIENDS (P.9 – P.11)

15. What language(s) do you speak with your friends? (Please indicate in descending order of frequency)

Language 1: __________________________
Language 2: __________________________
Language 3: __________________________
Language 4: __________________________
Other languages: ______________________

16. What is the ethnicity of your friends? (Please indicate in descending order of quantity)

Ethnicity 1: __________________________
Ethnicity 2: __________________________
Ethnicity 3: __________________________
Ethnicity 4: __________________________
Other ethnicity: ______________________

17. What languages do you speak with your friends of different ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I speak with my friends of …</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
<th>Language 4</th>
<th>Other Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. How often do you hang out with your friends of different ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I communicate with my friends of …</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Here is a list of topics. Please put a ✔ in the topics you will discuss with your schoolmates and the languages spoken for the topics. You can choose more than one language for each topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
<th>Language 4</th>
<th>Other Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Discussing school homework outside school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Gossiping about boys or girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Talking about favourite idols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing current issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about ethnic cultures (e.g. Eid, Diwali)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having lunch together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing sports together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing voluntary work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mosque / Church / Temple:

20. Do you attend religious activities at mosque / church / temple?

☐ Yes (Please go to Question 21)  ☐ No (Please go to Question 24)

21. What language(s) do you speak at mosque / church / temple? (Please indicate in descending order of frequency)

Language 1: __________________________
Language 2: __________________________
Language 3: __________________________
Language 4: __________________________
Other languages: ______________________

22. What is the ethnicity of religious believers at mosque / church / temple? (Please indicate in descending order of quantity)

Ethnicity 1: __________________________
Ethnicity 2: __________________________
Ethnicity 3: __________________________
Ethnicity 4: __________________________
Other ethnicity: ______________________
23. What languages do you speak with religious believers of different ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I speak with religious believers of ...</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
<th>Language 4</th>
<th>Other Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other after-school activities:**

24. What activities do you join regularly? (You can fill in more than one activity)

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

25. Who do you join this activity / these activities with? What is their ethnicity?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

26. What language(s) do you speak with them?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
**Part 2:**

In this part, questions are concerned with learning Chinese and knowing Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want to improve my written Chinese.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to improve my Cantonese.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hard to improve my Chinese.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to have Cantonese speaking friends in Hong Kong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hard to make friends with Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Cantonese-speaking friends can improve my Chinese.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3:

In this part, questions are concerned with details about your family and you.

1. Your birthplace:

______________________________________________________________

2. Age Group

☐ 12 – 17 ☐ 18 - 24

3. Gender

☐ Female ☐ Male

4. Ethnicity:

______________________________________________________________

5. Religion:

☐ Islam ☐ Sikhism ☐ Buddhism ☐ Taoism

☐ Christian ☐ Catholicism ☐ Hinduism

☐ Other, please specify: _________________________________________
6. Which district do you live in?

**Hong Kong Island:**
- [ ] Southern District
- [ ] Eastern District
- [ ] Wan Chai District
- [ ] Central and Western District

**Kowloon:**
- [ ] Sham Shui Po District
- [ ] Kowloon City
- [ ] Kwun Tong
- [ ] Wong Tai Sin
- [ ] Yau Tsim Mong

**New Territories:**
- [ ] Islands District
- [ ] Kwai Tsing District
- [ ] Sai Kung
- [ ] Sha Tin
- [ ] Tai Po
- [ ] Tsuen Wan
- [ ] Tuen Mun
- [ ] Yuen Long

7. What kind of housing do you live in?
- [ ] Public Housing
- [ ] Private Housing
- [ ] Dormitory
- [ ] Other

8. How many sibling(s) live with you?

________________

9. What is the education level of your father?
- [ ] No Schooling
- [ ] Primary School
- [ ] Secondary School
- [ ] University
10. What is the education level of your mother?

☐ No Schooling  ☐ Primary School  ☐ Secondary School  ☐ University

11. What is the occupation of your father? ________________________________

12. What is the occupation of your mother? ________________________________

End – Thank you for your participation!
Appendix 4

Chinese Language Assessment

As part of the fieldwork for my final year project in linguistics at City University of Hong Kong, I am conducting a research project to investigate South Asian youngsters’ language use and social networks in Hong Kong. Any information obtained with regard to this study that can be identified with you will remain strictly confidential. Thank you!

Part 1: Listening

Two speakers, Henry and Hugo, talked about their daily lives. Listen to five Cantonese audio clips and put one ✔ to each question.

1. What does Hugo like doing at weekend? (Hugo 喜歡在週末做什麼?)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What means of public transport will Henry take? (Henry 會乘搭什麼公共交通工具?)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✔
3. What birthday gifts does Joanne want? (Joanne 想要什麼生日禮物?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Phone" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Birthday Cake" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Shoes" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Teddy Bear" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Which museum will Henry and Hugo visit? (Henry 和 Hugo 會去哪一個博物館?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Museum 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Museum 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Museum 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Museum 4" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Which one does Henry’s friend sell? (Henry 的朋友賣什麼?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Remote Control" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Computer Monitor" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Keyboard and Music Instrument" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Television" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 2: Reading

a) Here are pictures of kitchen. Fill in the boxes with the right letters.

1. 冰箱
2. 抽油煙機
3. 櫃
4. 爐
5. 鑊
b) Choose the correct character for each sentence.

1. 我很喜歡 C 電視。
   A. 做    B. 住    C. 看    D. 去

2. 那 A 貓很可愛。
   A. 隻    B. 張    C. 碗    D. 份

3. 你的朋友 C 筆嗎?
   A. 在    B. 如何    C. 有    D. 的

4. 明天 D 聖誕節。
   A. 打    B. 讀    C. 見    D. 是

5. 小明是我在學校認識 C 朋友。
   A. 小    B. 好    C. 的    D. 我
c) Here is a short reading passage. Answer the questions regarding the passage.

小明是我最好的朋友，我們每天都見面，在一起說話很高興，在一起玩耍也很高興。每次見面說「再見」的時候，都覺得一起的時間太短了。

但是，小明和我很不一樣。他很愛說話，愛開玩笑，比我更開心。第一次和他見面的人，就可以和他像老朋友那樣說話。

小明又高又瘦，一年也不感冒一次。我呢？我有點兒矮有點兒胖。我們都是短髮。

他很喜歡幫助別人，他看到我不喜歡運動，就想辦法讓我愛上運動，我在學習上也會幫助他。我希望我們總是好朋友，一直到很老很老的時候。

1. 小明和我做什麼時候很高興？
   A. 開玩笑       B. 說「再見」       C. 幫助別人       D. 說話和玩耍

2. 小明和我每次見面做什麼的時候，覺得時間太短？
   A. 開玩笑       B. 說「再見」       C. 幫助別人       D. 說話和玩耍

3. 小明還是我高？
   A. 小明       B. 我       C. 小明和我一樣高

4. 小明比我更:
   A. 有趣       B. 老       C. 開心       D. 好

5. 小明喜歡做什麼？
   A. 幫助別人       B. 聽音樂       C. 打籃球       D. 爬山
Part 3: Writing

a) Fill in the blank based on the pictures given.

1. 我很喜歡吃 ________________

2. 小明家中有 ___和 ___

3. 這是我的 ____________

4. 我喜歡到 ________________ 玩耍

5. 我想有一對 ________________
b) Provide Chinese characters based on the given character. Examples have been done for you.

e.g. 學校 校 OR 做功課 做

1. _______ 天
2. _______ 生
3. _______ 加
4. _______ 明
5. _______ 城
c) Short Passage Writing: Write a short passage about yourself within 100 Chinese characters.

End – Thank you for your participation!
Appendix 5

Script for Listening Tasks

Question 1

Henry: 嘿！Hugo，好耐無見啦。你最近點呀？

Hugo: Ok 啦！最近好忙。好多功課，同埋要夾 band 練結他，有時間休息呀。咁你呢，Henry？

Henry: 我都好忙呀，日日都要返 part time，冇時間做功課。不過我逢週末會去打羽毛球呀。

Hugo: 都好呀！我每個週末會去戲院睇戲呀。

Question 2

Hugo: Henry，你而家去邊呀？

Henry: 無呀, Hugo. 我去搭地鐵返 part time。

Hugo: 雖然地鐵又快又方便，但係地鐵成日壞喎。我都係鍾意搭巴士多啲。

Question 3

Hugo: 喂﹗你記唔記得 Joanne 就嚟生日呀？

Henry: 緊係記得啦。咁重要嘅日子。

Hugo: 咁你打算買咩禮物俾佢呀？

Henry: 無呀。可能 iPhone 掛。不過我又記得佢想要生日蛋糕就夠啦。

Hugo: 咁好啦。我哋聽日快啲去買啦，過兩日就係佢生日啦。
Question 4

Henry: 死啦，有份功課未做呀，你做咗未呀？要做咩架？

Hugo: 未呀。不過好似要去唔知咩博物館呀。

Henry: 呀……好似要去藝術館呀。

Hugo: 唔係呀，係文化博物館，喺沙田呀。

Henry: 咁你幾時去呀？不如一齊去呀。

Hugo: 就星期六啦。星期一係 deadline 喔。

Henry: 好呀！

Question 5

Hugo: 點算呀，Henry！我想搵份 part-time，但係唔想做補習呀。你有冇好工介紹呀？

Henry: 唔洗擔心，Hugo。我有個朋友賣樂器，結他呀，bass 呀，電子琴呀，音樂你最熟啦。

Hugo: 好呀，幾錢人工呀？返邊度呀？

Henry: 3000 蚊一個月，返旺角，都 ok 呀。

Hugo: 好呀，啫我就試試啦。
Appendix 6

Marking Schemes for Writing Tasks

1) Marking Scheme for Part 1 and Part 2 of the Writing Tasks

The question would have 1 mark if informants could write down the characters correctly.

The question would have 0.5 mark if informants write down romanised characters.

The question would have 0 mark if informants did not attempt the question.

2) Marking Criteria for the Writing Test in Chinese Language Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntax, Grammar, Word Choice and Organisation of Discourse</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly any mistakes, with a wide range of appropriate and advanced vocabulary (modifiers, aspect markers, synonyms, etc.) and complex sentence structures. Almost no romanised characters. Highly coherent with very clear signposting and paragraph division.</td>
<td>9 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very accurate with only a few minor mistakes when more advanced structures and words are used, with a range of words written correctly and a few romanised characters. Very coherent with signposting and paragraph division.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely accurate with some minor mistakes when more complex structures are used, with a wide range of vocabulary and structures and most characters written correctly with some romanised characters. Coherent with some signposting and paragraph division.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Limited range of vocabulary and structures. Some persistent errors of simple vocabulary and structures. Use of more romanised characters or a lot of mistakes in characters, but still understandable and do not obscure the meaning. Relatively clear organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 5</td>
<td>Many basic errors which may affect comprehension. Narrow range of vocabulary. Repetition of grammatical structures. Evident mistakes in writing characters or a number of romanisation characters. Limited use of signposting and organised sentence by sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>Shows little grasp of grammatical structures. The number of errors may make comprehension difficult. Inadequate range of structures and vocabulary. There are many omissions and mistakes in writing characters or frequent use of romanised characters. Incoherent without signposting and organised sentence by sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Essentially nothing of value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>