Asia Pacific Education Review
2003, Vol. 4, No. 2, 170-180

The Professionalization of Hong Kong Teachers: Dilemma between Technical Rationality and Individual Autonomy

Grace C. L. Mak

The Hong Kong Institute of Education
China

This article studies the dilemma between professionalization and professionalism in the development of teaching into a bureaucratic organization in Hong Kong. Professionalization and bureucractization are simultaneous processes. Teaching as an occupation has grown from a state of idiosyncrasy to a profession with defined boundaries. However, achieving system efficiency and technical rationality, both features of bureaucracy, could undermine or suppress teachers' individual autonomy. Thus, bureaucratization supports professionalization by raising the status of teaching, but undermines professionalism by constraining teachers' autonomy. The article examines the changing pattern of stratification and how it shaped the relationship between the professionalization, bureaucratization and professionalism of teaching in Hong Kong. It argues that teaching cannot be a true profession without realizing professionalism, and that teacher education has a central role in the drive towards it.

Key Words: Hong Kong teachers, teacher education, professionalization, professionalism, stratification

Entry to teaching in most education systems today is based on one's academic qualifications. Despite this common threshold requirement, the teaching force is stratified by social class and gender backgrounds. The pattern of stratification is changing, and teaching has been increasingly open to women and members of the working- or lower-middle classes (Floud & Scott, 1961; Hoyle, 1988, 1995; Lortie, 1975, pp. 34-36; Spencer, 1994). Within teaching there used to be a primary-secondary divide, with secondary teachers being university graduates and primary teachers not. There has been a trend toward greater homogeneity in entry qualifications and common salary scales. With the advent of compulsory education, teaching has grown into one of the largest occupations. To admit and reward its members according to their educational qualifications is an act of technical rationality, which keeps a large public-sector occupation bureaucracy efficient.

Stratification is inherent in a bureaucracy. On the macro level, Karl Marx attributed social stratification to the unequal distribution of economic resources. Max Weber extended the notion to include the dimensions of status and power. On a micro level, stratification within an occupation cuts across different dimensions, typically class, race and gender. The issue is not whether it is desirable, but whether it is rationally defined and contributes to system efficiency. Weber identified the characteristics of an ideal-type bureaucracy as: an organization of offices bound by rules with each office carrying out its specified functions, an office hierarchy with levels of graded authority, office management being reflected by written records (files), and all specialized office management requiring prior expert training. Officials are appointed according to educational qualifications, receive a fixed salary commensurate to them, and are usually tenured after a trial period (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 196). Teaching is a bureaucracy in that it is specialized work with graded positions, requires prior training and pays according to a common scale.

The development of teaching into a bureaucracy

Grace C. L. Mak, Principal Lecturer, Department of Educational Policy and Administration, The Hong Kong Institute of Education. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Department of Educational Policy and Administration, The Hong Kong Institute of Education, 10 Lo Ping Road, Tai Po, N.T., Hong Kong. Electronic mail may be sent to gmak@ied.edu.hk

coincided with the long process of professionalization, which is a process of building specialist knowledge into a monopoly (Macdonald, 1995, p. xii). Teacher education has been an agent of the professionalization of teaching. Subject knowledge alone cannot "professionalize" teaching; knowledge of pedagogy "professionalizes" the teaching of subject knowledge (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Goode, 1969, p. 286). This latter knowledge turns teaching into a monopoly and sets a social closure to those who do not possess it. In developed societies it has been a means of changing teaching from a job with pronounced idiosyncratic characteristics to a profession with well-defined boundaries.

Weber attributed the advance of bureaucratic organization to its purely technical superiority over any other form of organization. It functions with the precision, unity and continuity of a machine, hence it has the hallmarks of technical rationality (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 214). However, the use of technical rationality in teaching is not unproblematic, for, unlike other bureaucracies, teaching is essentially human rather than technical work, characterized by unique micro-level decisions in school settings and the interaction between teachers and learners. These decisions depend on the degree of autonomy and quality of individual teachers. Bureaucratization has rationalized teaching, but too much bureaucratization, in the form of red tape, may suppress teachers' passion and creativity and undermine system efficiency. Here then lies the fundamental dilemma between bureaucratization cum professionalization, i.e., attaining the status of a profession, on the one hand, and professionalism, i.e., realizing its service ideal, on the other. How to restore individual autonomy whilst maintaining technical rationality then becomes crucial if teaching is to optimize its role in cultivating the potential of the young. Just as teacher education has been a vehicle of bureaucratization and professionalization, now it should overcome the ensuing constraints and foster individual autonomy. This distinguishes teacher education as a means of liberating human potential from that of being the mere technical gatekeeper of a bureaucratic organization.

The Hong Kong teaching force has generally followed a similar process of development. This process, especially in the beginning, has been more complex due to the additional factors of colonialism, especially with the interaction of race and language. Hong Kong was a British colony from 1841 to 1997. The dimensions of stratification of its teaching force included academic qualification, types of school sponsorship, language of instruction, race, gender, and rural-urban distinctions. By the 1950s these dimensions of stratification were gradually reduced to the central one of educational qualification: a university degree for upper secondary teachers and a training college certificate for primary and lower secondary teachers. However, at that time the system was still gender-biased. All things being equal, female teachers were paid less than men. In 1969 the government started to implement the policy of equal pay for equal work for male and female employees in the civil service and aided sectors by seven stages. In 1975 this policy became fully effective (Education and Manpower Branch, 2003). It applied to teaching as well. Thus a bureaucracy that admits members according to academic qualifications and rewards according to a master pay scale, regardless of their background characteristics, in teaching was established. The primary-secondary divide in the Hong Kong teaching force had maintained a sharp distinction until recently. In 1997 the government announced an "all professionally trained, all university graduate" policy for new primary and secondary teachers by 2007, which would demolish the divide. The success of this policy depends on the supply of qualified entrants -- hence expansion of pre-service teacher education -- and the provision of salaries commensurate with such qualifications. Six years on, there has been no firm implementation date yet for the policy. As long as teaching continues to be open to those without the required qualifications, its bureaucratization and professionalization is incomplete and only a partial social closure has been achieved.

This article examines the changing pattern of stratification of the Hong Kong teaching force, how it has shaped the relationship between the bureaucratization, professionalization and professionalism of teaching, and how teacher education has contributed to the relationship. It first discusses each dimension of stratification that contributed to the process between 1841 and 1975. A bureaucracy is impersonal, and dimensions of stratification are hidden. In a pre-bureaucracy, the dimensions are overt or even blatant. The historical element of this discussion therefore illustrates this change in nature. The article then considers how this change has shaped bureaucratization cum professionalization. It argues that bureaucratization is necessary but inadequate. Bureaucratization supports professionalization but contradicts professionalism. It sets the professional boundaries needed to raise the status of teaching (the structural dimension), but discourages teachers' individual autonomy (the intangible dimension). However, teaching cannot be a true profession without realizing professionalism. Teacher education has a central role in the drive toward professionalism by bringing out the personal autonomy of teachers.

From complex stratification to technical rationality

Factors specific to colonial Hong Kong, namely, types of school sponsorship, language and race, and those common to teaching in general, namely, academic qualification, gender and status of school, were interrelated but of varying importance at different times in Hong Kong history. In the course of educational expansion and development of the society as a whole, they have been streamlined. There is now order in what was once a disorganized occupation. This section analyzes how each factor has contributed to the change.

Types of school sponsorship

The quality of teachers in a school was largely determined by the type of school sponsorship. In 1841 Hong Kong was ceded to Britain. The development of the Hong Kong education system mirrored to some extent the English system. In England. state education was introduced relatively late; provision of education in the 19th century relied heavily on private and voluntary efforts (Dunford & Sharp, 1990; Evans, 1985; Green, 1990). This has been a feature of Hong Kong education too. The early attempts at providing education came through local Chinese efforts and Western missionary groups. In 1847, the government announced grants to three Chinese schools and set up a committee to supervise them. This was the beginning of the colony's public support of education (Endacott, 1993, p. 136). In 1853 there were 13 government-aided schools and five mission schools (Education Department, 1952, p. 3).

The government could not afford to provide education for all the children in Hong Kong. Its strategy was to set good standards, with adequate and qualified staff and a suitable curriculum, in a few government schools, while giving assistance in the forms of grants or subsidies to private schools, i.e., all non-government schools, which had reached modest standards. Government schools served as models of quality for all other schools (Hong Kong Government, 1924, Appendix O, p. 04). Mission schools improved with government grants. A grant-in-aid scheme was introduced in 1873, by which it provided aid and supervision to mission schools (Education Department, 1952, pp. 3-4). Aid was provided in the form of a grant paid on the results of students in an annual examination conducted by the government. The principle was similar to that of payment by results of the English education code of that time (Endacott, 1993, pp. 232-233). Grant schools, at first of dubious quality, proved immensely popular (Hong Kong Government, 1883, pp. 1-3). In 1903 the system of giving grants was changed. Instead of payment by results, the grants were based on the general report of the Inspector of Education and whether the schools hired qualified teachers (Endacott & Hinton, 1962, p. 146). Thus teacher quality became an explicit condition of a school's funding. The Grant Code has since been amended several times. Today it covers 22 secondary grant schools and pays for the difference between approved expenditure and income from school fees and other sources. It also pays for a substantial proportion of the costs in providing new buildings and equipment (Education Department, 1973, p. 15).

Another form of government support was subsidy. Under the Subsidy Code, vernacular primary schools run by voluntary organizations received small amounts of government assistance. In 1957 the Subsidy Code was extended to secondary schools and the amount of assistance was increased (Education Department, 1973, p. 15). The two forms of support – grant and subsidy -- became similar over time. As the gap between them closed, the government decided to unify the Grant and Subsidized School Codes under a Unified Code of Aid. This would enable schools to pursue similar standards in education. The Unified Code was brought into force in 1973 (Education Department, 1973, p. 15).

A pecking order of schools by type of sponsorship was emerging in the late 19th century, with government schools at the top, followed by grant schools and subsidized schools (which were private schools that received government aid), and unaided private schools. Unaided private schools taught in the vernacular and offered a rudimentary teaching in Chinese literacy. Most schools then had poor facilities. Of 204 schools in 1887, only 10 to 12 were in appropriate buildings and they were either government schools or grant schools (Endacott & Hinton, 1962, p. 143).

In 1913 an Education Ordinance was passed. Except for government, naval and military schools, which were presumably of a higher quality, all schools had to be registered and were subject to inspection. This Ordinance brought 620 schools under government control. The private schools were supervised for the first time. Unregistered schools became unlawful (Hong Kong Government, 1913, p. 16). To be registered, schools had to meet government requirements, and the Ordinance for the first time ensured a minimum level of quality control for the system. The Ordinance introduced a new classification of schools. The schools to which the Ordinance applied were called Controlled Schools. They included (a) grant schools, (b) subsidized schools, and (c) all other private schools (Hong Kong Government, 1913:

Appendix N, p. N3). In 1929, of 1007 schools under the Education Department, 2% were government schools, 33 % grant or subsidized schools, and 65% private schools (Hong Kong Government, 1929, Appendix O, pp. O1-O2).

The pecking order began to blur in the 1950s. However, government schools continued to recruit more qualified teachers and paid better than other schools. The categories remain the same today, although the number of schools in each category has changed. Many of the subsidized schools, despite their humble origins, have caught up with the good government or grant schools. For private schools, educational expansion has given them an interesting change in status. When education was scarce, government and aided schools were elitist, and private schools were large in number but marginal in status. They were tremendously valuable however, in spreading educational opportunities to children from poor families or rural areas. In 1971 universal compulsory education was introduced; in 1978 it was extended to nine years. Private schools received government support as well and gradually became subsidized schools. Today, the majority of children in Hong Kong attend government or grant/subsidized schools. The private schools' role in filling the unmet needs of the lower strata of society has more or less completed. Paradoxically, the status of private schools today has reversed. They charge exorbitant tuition fees and serve children whose parents are dissatisfied with the mediocrity of mainstream schools. Well-to-do parents who are critical of the standards of mainstream schools tend to send their children to private schools, which are expensive, well-equipped and are models for aspiring government-supported schools.

School Sponsorship and Teacher Status

Teaching generally was - and still is - not an attractive occupation, whether in the 19th or 20th century. Hong Kong being a commercial port, those with options tended to opt for jobs in business or in the colonial service. Within the education system, however, the differential status of the schools was reflected in the teaching force, with government schools having the best teachers. For example, in 1915, of 34 teachers at Queen's College, 15 were certificated or had a British university degree, 10 had had local training as Student Teachers or Passed Student Teachers, and 9 were vernacular teachers. This was an example of the kind of teachers a top school managed to attract (Hong Kong Government, 1916, p. 023).

Teachers in grant schools were a combination of missionaries and locals and were the second highest ranked group. Teachers in the early subsidized schools, i.e., private schools that received a small government aid, which were in the New Territories, then rural areas, were mostly uncompetitive and poorly paid. The following episode may serve to illustrate their situation. In 1913, in anticipation of the passing of the Education Ordinance, the government conducted a survey of schools and teachers in the New Territories in order to find out how many of the latter would qualify for government support. The official who conducted the survey reported thus:

> "that the school-rooms themselves are dark and dirty to a degree is not surprising. They are just ordinary rooms set aside for schools by the villagers, and the idea of making a school a bright clean place would amaze them. As for the teachers, they are usually quack doctors or geomancers, who make education a 'side line'. They make no pretence to a knowledge of modern methods of teaching and when their remuneration is considered, this is hardly surprising.
>
> The teachers' incomes are quite uncertain at the opening of the school. The teacher is expected to teach without having been definitely promised what his annual income would be until the 4th or 5th moon, when the question of teachers' income will be discussed and settled. If there is a large attendance the teacher gets more; otherwise he gets less.
>
> According to the educational census many teachers' annual income amounts to over $100, but the difficulty they have had to face makes one horrified. Most pupils do not pay their fees in full. It was 5 days after Chinese New year at the time of my visit; some teachers complained then that their fees for the past year had not been fully collected. In failing to get fees from his pupils one of the teachers got angry and burnt all his books, swearing at the same time that he will teach no longer. A great number of teachers gave up their profession for the same reason.
>
> From what I gathered from the population it is certain that if a teacher can earn $200 a year, his income would be considered very good." (Hong Kong Government, 1913, Appendix N, pp. N13-N14).

As mentioned earlier, today subsidized schools have caught up with government and grant schools. However, in 1950 teachers in subsidized schools remained inferior in status

and received lower salaries than those in government or grant schools, despite having the same qualifications and experience (Fisher, 1950, p. 19).

Teachers in unaided private schools were the bottom of the hierarchy. To Frederick Stewart, Inspector of Schools in 1866, the vast majority of teachers in private schools had to be dismissed. He was shocked to find that the master in a school was charged with highway robbery and in another was dismissed for embezzlement of school funds (Endacott, 1993, p. 229). In 1912, several of the private (vernacular) schools for boys inspected

> "appear(ed) to be run by people, who, for the time, are out of employment, and have therefore turned to teaching. In some cases the teachers appeared to have outside employment, and only spent a short time in school; not that this makes much difference, as in many cases the children would have been better off left to themselves… In many schools not the slightest effort is made to advance with the times; the methods employed 100 years ago being considered quite good enough… A very noticeable feature in many cases was the part taken by parents or guardians of pupils; they deicide what books shall be studied by their children. In some schools all sorts of books were in use; the teacher is often unable to explain even a small portion of the reading-matter… In many instances the teacher did not know what work his pupils were doing… Supervision is very badly needed in the majority of the private schools; with even a casual supervision and a workable and useful syllabus many of these schools would improve by 50% in a short time." (Hong Kong Government, 1912, Appendix N, pp. N2-N5).

As long as private school teachers continued to be poorly paid, it was difficult to get rid of inefficient schools (Hong Kong Government, 1918, Appendix O, p. O8). By the 1930s the qualifications of teachers in private schools had improved, but varied considerably. Some had been trained in China or in Hong Kong, but most were untrained (Hong Kong Government, 1938, Appendix O, p. O9).

There was an influx of immigrants from China after the Communist revolution in 1949. This led to a large demand for education, much of which was met by private schools. A report on education recommended that since private schools were an indispensable part of the education system, professional training should be provided for their teachers, who were mostly unqualified (Fisher, 1950, pp. 18-28.).

Rural/Urban Divide

Geography was another dimension in the stratification of teachers. Until about the 1960s, there was a significant urban/rural divide in Hong Kong. Government and grant schools were located in the urban areas, and many subsidized schools and most private schools were in the rural areas. Rural vernacular schools maintained a precarious existence. Their teachers were associated with low qualifications and poor teaching standards. They would have left village poverty were they able to find jobs in the urban areas (Hong Kong Government, 1924, p. O5).

As Hong Kong began to industrialize, its urbanization accelerated and its schools and teachers became more homogeneous. The process supported the claim that an industrializing society is also a professionalizing one (Goode, 1966, p. 46) and that professionalization was a move from an unorganized state to the ideal-type bureaucracy (Vollmer & Mills, 1966, pp. xi, 2).

Language

Throughout the history of Hong Kong, whether to use English or Chinese as the language medium of instruction has been a major issue of contention among educators, decision makers and society at large. It has its roots in the beginning of colonial Hong Kong. Given Hong Kong's defining characteristic as a British colony and a commercial port, English enjoyed the advantage of being the language of choice for politics and commerce. Proficiency in English held the promise of success especially in the period in which few had access to education. For example, in 1931 Hong Kong had a population of 849,751, of which 821,429 (97%) were Chinese. Of the Chinese population 44% reported an ability to read and write Chinese, but only 5% the same ability in English (Hong Kong Government, 1931, Appendix O). Those who had knowledge of English formed an elite group, with access to junior positions in commerce and the colonial service, such as clerks and interpreters, which were enviable destinations for the Chinese in the Colony in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The more successful ones became compradors. However, Chinese was the language of indigenous social life. With the return of Hong Kong to Chinese sovereignty, English has faded as a political language but its economic value continues, and the dilemma of choosing between English and Chinese as

medium of instruction continues to haunt schools.

There is a common view that the language of the colonizer automatically becomes the medium of instruction, and what happened in Hong Kong seemed to lend support to it. The dynamics behind it, however, are far more complex. Hennessy, Governor of Hong Kong from 1877 to 1882, maintained that English should be emphasized in education. Eitel, Inspector of Schools, in his report of 1879, supported this view. However, Irving, who became Inspector of Schools in 1901, was keen to improve and expand vernacular education (Endacott & Hinton, 1962, pp. 141-142, 145). The Education Committee of Enquiry, in its report in 1902, recommended that greater attention should be given by the Chinese to the study of their language. Similarly, the Burney Report of 1936 also recommended that Government should pay more attention to Chinese primary education (Education Department, 1954, pp. 4, 6). Therefore, policy-makers views on the English dominance in education were not always consistent. However, despite the occasional call for attention to vernacular education, the popularity of English medium schools has continued.

Given this context, language was a main dimension in differentiating between schools. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, government schools and grant schools provided English education and village schools vernacular education. Few local teachers were able to teach English, and teachers of English had to be imported from England. They received higher salaries than local teachers and were provided free passage to Hong Kong and passage back (Hong Kong Government, 1879, p. 6; 1883, p. 2). Teachers of Chinese cost less. This difference highlighted the need for a local supply of English language teachers.

There was a common perception that teachers in vernacular private schools were often scholars who had failed in the imperial examinations and denied entry to Chinese officialdom. Others were those who had not been successful in commerce (*Zhonghua shuju*, 1997, p. 110). Thus teaching in vernacular private schools tended to carry this stigma of failure and reinforced the language divide in education. However, this stereotyping was unfair to good and committed Chinese scholar-teachers.

Race

The native English teachers were mostly from Britain. While better paid than local teachers, they were difficult to recruit. In the 1920s, there was continued difficulty in recruiting them from Britain. It was necessary to appoint local teachers or expatriate women as temporary teachers (Hong Kong Government, 1924, p. O4). Government schools were more attractive to expatriate teachers than grant schools, as the former offered a pension scheme whereas the latter a provident fund, which was a one-off sum paid at the end of service.

At first, the native English teachers were posted in government schools. In 1923, of 198 teachers in government schools, 72 (36%) were British teachers and 126 (64%) non-British teachers (Hong Kong Government, 1923, p. O2). Taking Queen's College as example, the expatriate teachers were reported to be generally efficient, although some of them had insufficient knowledge for teaching or fake qualifications (Stokes & Stokes, 1987, p. 88). Today, the overwhelming majority of teachers in Hong Kong are Chinese. The development of the teaching force in Hong Kong can be viewed as a process of localization.

Similarly, in their early years, many government, grant or subsidized schools were headed by expatriates. The appointment of a local school head was often a landmark event in the history of these schools, which is an interesting feature of colonial education. Such examples are often found in published histories of schools in Hong Kong.

Gender

As in most societies, teaching was one of the occupations that opened up as one of the early opportunities of independent employment for women. How open it was depended upon the prestige of the schools. Private and vernacular schools were more open to women probably because of their low salaries. In comparison, women's admission to government schools was limited. One of the reasons for the reservation about women's suitability concerned not so much women themselves as their students. For example, the women teachers, mostly expatriates, at Queen's College, a boys' school, taught the junior classes. It was only later that they were assigned to teach senior students, boys of 16 to 18 years of age, on a trial basis. The experiment proved successful, as "Chinese boys do not show the wavering attention and so do not suffer from the hardly controllable high spirits" of the youth in Britain (Hong Kong Government, 1918, p. O2). Teaching offered a classic example of the use of women as reserve labor. Expatriate women were recruited as temporary teachers when there was a shortage of male expatriate teachers (Hong Kong Government, 1920, p. O2; 1921, p. O5; 1922, p. O2; 1923, p. O2; 1924, p. O4). Marriage also handicapped women's employment. A European woman teacher would be transferred to a temporary position after marriage (Hong Kong Government, 1930, p. O4). In Belilios Public School, a government girls' school, Chinese women

teachers had to be single or widowed. Once married, they would have to resign (*Zhonghua shuju*, 1997, p. 110). Discrimination against women declined slowly and blatant discrimination in teaching ended when the policy of equal work for equal pay became fully effective in 1975.

However, women always constituted a high proportion of the enrollment in in-service evening teacher training classes, suggesting a higher proportion of Chinese women in non-elite schools where few teachers were qualified. In 1919, of 141 vernacular teachers enrolled in the evening Normal Class at the Technical Institute, the main teacher education programme at that time, 61 were men and 80 women (Hong Kong Government, 1919, p. O8). This pattern was typical of the period.

Teacher Training and the Localization of Teaching

There was no teacher training in early Hong Kong. The expatriate teachers that filled the posts in government schools were usually qualified, but costly. Local teacher training emerged from two considerations: educational and financial. Already in 1858 the Education Committee Report pointed out the low moral and educational qualities of Chinese teachers (Endacott, 1993, p. 139). The government attributed the poor quality of Chinese teachers to the lack of teacher education. In the 1860s, Frederick Stewart, Headmaster of Central School, set up a separate class in the school based on the model of the pupil-teacher system in England of that time (Yiu, 1983, p. 12). In 1880 Eitel, Inspector of Schools, concluded that as long as there was an absence of institutions for teacher training, good results could not be expected of schools in Hong Kong (Hong Kong Government, 1880, p.7). The importance of teacher training in improving education was raised again in later years. However, it was financial considerations that gave teacher education an impetus. The costs of importing teachers from Britain underscored the urgency of a local supply of teachers of English. Governor Hennessy's plan in 1881 to create an English-speaking Chinese community led to the setting up of a normal school for teacher training (Endacott, 1993, p. 236; Stokes & Stokes, 1987, p. 27). However, the normal school lasted two years and was closed in 1883 due to disputes between the officials.

The value of the early teacher education classes in raising teacher quality became recognized. In 1912 the Education Department made it compulsory for local teachers in government schools to attend Teachers' Classes (Hong Kong Government, 1912, p.16). The 1913 Education Ordinance required that all schools had to register with the Education Department, and one of the criteria of registration was teaching qualifications. Thus the Education Ordinance led to a system-wide demand for teacher training. The Technical Institute, which had been providing evening training classes for serving teachers, was recognized for raising standards in school teaching (Hong Kong Government, 1929, p. O5). Like its schools, Hong Kong's teacher training classes were grouped by language. In the early 1920s, there were programmes that trained teachers for English schools, such as those offered at Queen's College, the Technical Institute and the University of Hong Kong. There was also a stream for vernacular teachers which included the vernacular class at the Technical Institute, a normal class for men at Man Mo Vernacular School and one for women at Belilios Public School (Hong Kong Government, 1920, pp. O6-O7; *Jinwentai zhongxue*, 1996, pp. 48-51).

The requirement of professional training of teachers as a quality assurance measure started with government schools and was later applied to grant schools. The Grant Code of 1914 stated that all teachers in grant schools must be either Certified Teachers or students (past or present) from the Normal Classes of the Technical Institute (Hong Kong Government, 1914, p. O21). In 1935, the government for the first time defined the notion of 'trained teachers." These fell into four groups: (1) those possessing a certificate recognized by the English Board of Education or its equivalent, (2) graduates of the University of Hong Kong, (3) those who had been trained at one of the Government Vernacular Normal Schools, and (4) those who had satisfactorily attended either English or Vernacular Normal Classes at the Evening Institute (Hong Kong Government, 1935, p. O11). The first group concerned the expatriate teachers, whereas the last three local teachers. The definition of "trained teacher" has changed over the years, but its function as a gatekeeper in entry to teaching has remained.

The recent government definition of "trained and graduate" teacher made its first appearance in the four-year course, including a degree and a teacher's course, offered at the University of Hong Kong from 1919. The course ended with the suspension of university education during World War II. It prepared teachers for secondary schools. Teacher education at the University of Hong Kong re-emerged in 1952 as a Diploma of Education course for degree holders who wished to become teachers. In 1925, a rural teacher training school was founded to serve the rural areas. In 1939 the Northcote Training College opened, and was followed by the Grantham Training College in 1951 and Sir Robert Black Training College in 1960. These training colleges prepared teachers for primary and lower secondary schools. With them the primary-secondary divide was established.

Teacher Pay

As mentioned earlier, local teachers in Hong Kong were poorly paid, but expatriate teachers were costly. However, this pay divide was relative. Sometimes even expatriate teachers found the pay modest. The following is an example.

> "Most of the expatriate masters were bachelors; for a time there was not one married man in the Senior Common Room of Queen's (College). Indeed, marriage was 'more or less impossible' for though the cost of living was low salaries were even lower. And it was not until after the First World War that Government paid for leave passages" (Stokes & Stokes, 1987, p. 82).

There was a general pattern of pay differentiation by type of school, qualifications, language, race and gender. The salaries were in the descending order of government, grant, subsidized, and private schools. In each type of school qualified teachers were better paid than less qualified ones. Schools that taught in English paid better than those in Chinese. At each rank expatriate teachers were better paid than local ones, and men than women. The salary scales (in Hong Kong dollars per month) of 1951-52 provided an example (Education Department, 1952, p. 136).

Government Schools

Principals	$2,025 - $2,250
Women Principals	$1,620 - $1,800
Senior Masters	$1,950
Senior Mistresses	$1,560
Masters	$950 – 1,875
Mistresses	$750 –1,500

Government and Grant Schools

Overseas Qualified Teachers (Male)	$650 - $1,025
Overseas Qualified Teachers (Female)	$580 -$840
Assistant Masters	$550 - $950
Assistant Mistresses	$450 - $750
Certificated & Primary Teachers (M)	$380 - $550
Certificated & Primary Teachers (F)	$300 - $450
Unqualified European Teachers (M)	$325 - $525
Unqualified European Teachers (F)	$295 - $475
Unqualified Teachers (M)	$200
Unqualified Teachers (F)	$180

Subsidized Schools

Qualified Teachers (M)	$200 - $275
Qualified Teachers (F)	$160 - $235
Unqualified Teachers (M)	$100
Unqualified Teachers (F)	$80

In addition to salaries, government school teachers enjoyed better fringe benefits such as pension, health care and, for senior staff, housing provision. Expatriate staff enjoyed paid leave passage as well. At one time the duration was nine months every four years.

Teachers in subsidized schools received lower salaries than those in grant schools despite their having the same qualifications and experience (Fisher, 1950, p. 19). This became unreasonable when the differences between grant and subsidized schools were diminishing. The salary structure did not attract teachers to schools other than in government and grant ones. From 1953, qualified teachers in subsidized schools received the same salaries as those in government and grant schools, although pensions continued to be a privilege of government schools. This was an important step toward teaching as a bureaucracy with a more rational pay structure than before. It also had a positive effect on enticing young people to enroll in teacher training colleges and in turn had an impact upon educational improvement (Education Department, 1954, pp. 80-81).

At the bottom stratum were teachers in unaided private schools. In 1958, when secondary school teachers with university and professional qualifications received a monthly salary in the range of $710-$1,330 and trained primary school teachers in the range of $430-$825, that for their counterparts in private schools was in the ranges of $200-$700 and $150-$350 respectively (Education Department, 1955-58, pp. 36, 111-112). It became evident that for private schools to be of acceptable quality, the salaries of their teachers had to increase. In 1960, the government paid private secondary school teachers an extra 50% of their salaries. Although this was a considerable increase in proportion, the absolute amount remained low (Pui Ying, 1999, p. 437). Despite this bold move, the tight finance of private schools continued to deter educational development. It was the full subsidy for the remaining private secondary schools since the mid-1970s that advanced significantly the formation of education as a bureaucratic organization further.

Achieving Professionalism

The development of the Hong Kong teaching force into a bureaucracy has taken a century and a half. This article has examined the forces of change shaping teaching as an occupation. It has argued that bureaucratization has brought rationality and efficiency to teaching. However, whereas bureaucratization is a necessary move to achieve efficiency, it is not sufficient in achieving effectiveness in teaching. Bureaucratization is a two-edged sword. It has raised the status of teaching by setting the professional boundaries, but organizational rules tend to hamper individual potential. Weber aptly identified this dilemma. The dilemma is also captured in the change in the literature on professionalization from a focus upon the behavior of independent, autonomous professionals to one upon the control of salaried professionals by an administrative hierarchy (Vollmer & Mills, 1966, p. 264). The change has highlighted "the tension between the professionals' principles and the organizational ones, arising from the fact that the authority of knowledge and the authority of administrative hierarchy are basically incompatible" (Etzioni, 1969, p. viii).

Teaching is caught in the same dilemma. Many teachers, as private individuals, have multiple talents, interests and personal views, but as "organization men/women" are subject to organizational evaluation and control which tends to depersonalize them. The teaching of norms -- a social function of schooling – set the boundaries for safe, conventional behavior and reinforces teachers' collective identity as being largely a conservative one. Their rich personal resources are only partially used in school; and this limits their job satisfaction. In this way the bureaucratization of teaching stifles individuality and consequently reduces system efficiency. Paradoxically, teaching is all about optimizing the potential of the young, and the full bloom of teachers' diversity and talents is essential to it. One of the reasons for this unfortunate situation is that the equality made possible by the bureaucracy is seen to equate to conformity in organizational life (Lortie, 1969, p. 7). While individual differences among students are increasingly addressed, those of teachers have been blurred by bureaucratic structure and culture. What Weber pointed out about the danger of the bureaucratic machine applies to teaching as well:

> "Rational calculation … reduces every worker to a cog in this bureaucratic machine and, seeing himself in this light, he will merely ask how to transform himself into a somewhat bigger cog… The passion for bureaucratization drives us to despair." (Weber, 1968, p. viii).

This suppression of teacher autonomy is especially dangerous at a time when educational reform in Hong Kong, and the rest of Asia, is being refocused on fostering students' creativity, the primary condition for which is making room for individuality. Can there be room for students to grow if there is little of it for teachers? Now more than ever before, there is a need for the teacher to stand up to the impact of bureaucracies. Teacher education can make a difference here. It is capable of two opposing functions. On the one hand, as the historical analysis of Hong Kong has illustrated, it has contributed to the bureaucratic formation of teaching; on the other hand, as a process of teacher formation it has the potential of liberating prospective teachers' minds. With the implementation of the all-graduate, all-trained policy, bureaucratization will have completed its historical mission in achieving structural professionalization. (The implementation is long overdue, for without it there is no guarantee of the minimum quality of teachers.) The next goal is to achieve professionalism. Only with it will professionalization be complete. It is intangible and beyond the reach of bureaucratic definitions. Teacher education may be able to liberate the individual and offset the danger of bureaucratization. However, it may have itself become a victim of bureaucratization. To increase their aura of "respectability", the curricula of teacher education, like those of other university professional schools, have been dictated by technical rationality (Schon, 1983). Although Schon was referring to the dichotomy between theoretical and practical knowledge, his point about the origins of professional knowledge in the public and its close ties to its clientele is relevant to our discussion. Teacher knowledge involves complex, continuous abilities. Teacher education has been successful in defining the boundaries of specialist knowledge. It is even more important in meeting the next challenge which is liberating teachers' individual potential. This involves the interaction of individuals – both teacher educators and students of teaching -- with the structure. Therefore, although it is messy and cannot be defined technically, fostering teacher autonomy and individuality is a pressing next step in the professionalization of teaching. It is essential for the design of teacher education curriculum to address in order that teachers and their students can face the challenge of the new century.

References

Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, R. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based

research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher*, *31*(9), 13-25.

Dunford, J., & Sharp, P. (1990). *The education system in England and Wales*. London and New York: Longman.

Education Department. (1952). *Annual departmental reports 1951-52*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Education Department . (1954). *Annual departmental reports 1953-54*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Education Department. (1958). *Triennial survey 1955-58*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Education Department. (1973). *Triennial survey 1970-73*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Education and Manpower Bureau (2003). Reply to author's enquiry.

Endacott, G.. B. (1993). *A history of Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Endacott, G.. B., & Hinton, A. (1962). *Fragrant habour*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Etzioni, A. (Ed.). (1969). *The semi-professions and their organization.* New York: The Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan.

Evans, K. (1985). *The development and structure of the English school system*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Fisher, N. G. (1950). *Report on government expenditure on education 1950*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Floud, J., & Scott, W. (1961). Recruitment to teaching in England and Wales. In A.H. Halsey, J. Floud & C.A. Anderson (Eds.), *Education, economy, and society* (pp. 527-544). New York: The Free Press; London: Collier-Macmillan.

Gerth, H. H., & Wright Mills, C. (Eds.). (1958). *From Max Weber*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Goode, W. (1966). "Professions" and "non-professions". In H.M. Vollmer & D.L. Mills (Eds.), *Professionalization* (pp. 33-45). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goode, W. J. (1969). The theoretical limits of professionalization. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), The semi-professions and their organization (pp. 266-313). New York and London: The Free Press.

Green, A. (1990). *Education and state formation*. London: Macmillan.

Hoyle, E. (1988). Teachers' social backgrounds. In M. J. Dunkin (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education* (pp. 612-624). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Hoyle, E. (1995). Social status of teaching. In L.W. Anderson (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education (2nd ed)* (pp. 58-61). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Hong Kong Government. (1879). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1879 – Education Department.* Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1880). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1880 – Education Department.* Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1883). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1883 – Education Department.* Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1912). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1912 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1913). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1913 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1914). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1914 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1916). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1916 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1918). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1918 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1919). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1919 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1920). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1920 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1921). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1921 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1922). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1922 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1923). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1923 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1924). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1924 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1929). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1929 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government . (1930). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1930 – Education Department*. Hong Kong:

Government Printer.
Hong Kong Government . (1931). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1931 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.
Hong Kong Government . (1935). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1935 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.
Hong Kong Government . (1938). *Hong Kong administrative reports 1938 – Education Department*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.
Hong Kong Government . (1952). *Report on the committee on higher education in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.
Hong Kong Government . (1974). *Hong Kong 1974*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.
Jinwentai zhongxue (Clementi Middle School) (1996). *Jinwentai zhongxue qishi zhounian xiaoqing jinian tekan, 1926-1996* (Special volume on the 70th anniversary of Clementi Middle School, 1926-1996). Hong Kong: Jinwentai zhongxue.
Lai, L. B. (1970). The motives and attitudes of Northcote College of Education students to taking up teaching as a profession. *N.C.E. Bulletin, 13*, 26-37.
Lortie, D.C. (1969). The balance of control and autonomy in elementary school teaching. In Etzioni (Ed.), *The semi-professions and their organization* (pp. 1-53). New York: The Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan.
Lortie, D.C. (1975) *Schoolteacher*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Macdonald, K. M. (1995). *The sociology of the professions*. London, Thousand Oaks; Dehli: SAGE.
Pui Ying Secondary School (1999). *Pui Ying shi hua 1879-1999* (History of Pui Ying, 1879-1999). Hong Kong: Haixin wenjiao yongpin youxian gongxi.
Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
Spencer, D. A. (1994). Sociology of teaching. In T. Husen & T.N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of education* (pp. 5607-5614). Oxford: Pergamon Press, 2nd ed.
Stokes, G., & Stokes, J. (1987). *Queen's College: Its history 1862-1987*. Hong Kong: The Standard Press, Ltd.
Vollmer, H. M., & Mills, D.`L. (Eds.) (1966). *Professionalization*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society*. New Jersey: Bedminster Press.
Yiu, W. V. (1983). *An evaluation of teacher education policy in Hong Kong*. Unpublished master thesis, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
Zhonghua shuju. (1997). *Xianggang chuan jilu* (Illustrated chronicle of Hong Kong), Vol. 1. Hong Kong: Zhonghua shuju.

Notes

[i] Race as a dimension of stratification is no less significant but has received less research attention, reflecting the majority perspective of researchers.

[ii] This change is an outcome of other factors as well, such as increased access to higher education for women and members of the lower classes and the degree of attraction of teaching relative to other occupations.

[iii] There has been much discussion on the nature of teaching as a semi-profession. The term "profession" is adopted here in the broad sense that teaching requires specialized tertiary level training.

[iv] The relationship between the government and mission groups swung between cooperation and tension at different times over whether or not to allow religious teaching in school. As mission schools become more secular, this tension has much reduced.

[v] In 1973, there were 131 government schools, 22 grant schools, 737 subsidized schools, and 1,941 private schools (Hong Kong Government, 1974, p. 235). Many of the private schools received varying amounts of government assistance.

[vi] A report on higher education in 1952 showed that teaching was among the least attractive university course to students in Matriculation classes (Hong Kong Government, 1952, p. 6). Students at a college of education ranked "economic desirability" as top factor that attracted them to teaching, but "social status of the profession" as the 16th and 26th factor for men and women students respectively (Lai, 1970, p. 33).

[vii] Schools that taught in English were called "Anglo-Chinese schools," as different from "vernacular schools". In 1951 there was a re-organization of primary and secondary schools. The nomenclature of "vernacular" was eliminated and was replaced by that of "Chinese schools".

[viii] The terms of the leave passages varied over time. This fringe benefit stopped in the mid 1990s, with the near complete localization of senior government officials.

Received August 25, 2003
Revision received December 3, 2003
Accepted December 17, 2003