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Abstract

The growing number of immigrants from both Taiwan and Mainland China have brought speakers of different Mandarin varieties into contact in an American context. In the Chinese community in Los Angeles, Mainland Putonghua speakers are found to accommodate their language to the local Taiwan Mandarin speakers. Social network analysis, a model oriented toward the individual, is adapted here for analyzing this linguistic situation. The conversation of 35 informants was recorded within a naturally occurring context and their social network scores were compared with their scores for nine linguistic variables selected for this study.

It was found that the accommodation process among Mainland Mandarin speakers is closely related to their degree of integration into the local networks. Statistical procedures reveal significant correlations between the network scores and linguistic variable scores for the entire sample. The network and language correlation is strongest for subgroups such as women, older speakers, and speakers from Beijing and Shanghai areas. Some individual differences were observed, especially among younger speakers.

This study of relationship between network structure and linguistic accommodation shows a complex process in which individuals' decision based on economic and political considerations has an impact, which affects the kind of
network structure and the subsequent linguistic change. While a speaker who is marginal in the community can choose from a wide range of psychological orientations during verbal interaction with others, such a choice is limited when a speaker is closely tied to a particular group that has a distinctive linguistic norm. In this sense, the long-term accommodation process, using Trudgill (1986)'s term, is actually a process in which speakers from other communities converge under the normative pressure from the local groups with which they are closely associated.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Variation is an inherent characteristic of natural language. A full understanding of language must include an understanding of the nature and the function of variation. The aim of this dissertation is, thus, to analyze some of the linguistic and sociolinguistic variation and change that occur in natural, spontaneous, everyday speech in an urban setting, in order to contribute to the study of language in its social context.

Since the publication of Labov's *Social Stratification of English in New York* (1966), which launched a series of empirical investigations into the sociolinguistic structure of urban speech communities (e.g. Trudgill 1974; Cheshire 1982; Shuy et al 1968; Wolfram 1969; Labov 1972a), great progress has been made in the study of sociolinguistic variation and in methods of quantitative analysis. The significant body of work which emerged from research has been crucial in the development of the sociolinguistic theory which attempts to make a coherent statement about the relationship between language use and social structures of various kinds.

However, as Romaine (1982:1) observed, the great majority of this research on urban social dialects has been based on urban varieties of English and on mainstream English speaking communities. The database limited to these cases has
obviously provided knowledge of the range of sociolinguistic variation in English and allowed sociolinguists to lay a solid methodological foundation for the study of language in its social context. Nevertheless, such restrictedness leads to problems encountered when Labovian methodology is applied to a range of more linguistically diverse, non-English speaking ethnic minority communities.

One such problem is the use of socio-economic class as a social variable in the Labovian correlational model. Although sociolinguists tend to treat social status as a unitary concept, or a single hierarchy for each society, it is actually a loose term that covers a range of different, more or less independent hierarchical structures (De Camp 1971; Hudson 1980:173). In other words, social class is a proxy variable which includes distinctions in life-style, attitude and belief, as well as differential access to wealth, power, and prestige (Milroy 1987:101).

Whether or not the issue of social class as a viable variable for English speaking communities still awaits further specification, the application of the concept of social class is difficult in sociolinguistic research on ethnic minority groups. It is especially so in an American Chinese community, such as the one found in Los Angeles and nearby areas, where the concept of social class is further obscured, and where linguistic distinctiveness is maintained.

In the past three decades, especially the past ten years,
Chinese communities in some Metropolitan areas of the United States have undergone tremendous changes. The old Chinatowns, or old inner-city Chinese neighborhoods, have given way to new, much larger, more prosperous Chinese quarters, such as Monterey Park in Los Angeles and Flushing in New York, which serve as the centers for the extended Chinese communities in those cities. New immigrants from Taiwan, Hong Kong and Mainland China have not only enriched the Chinese culture there, but have brought with them the language they use, namely, Mandarin Chinese, which has been gradually replacing Cantonese as the usual language for communication within these communities.

While the Chinese communities in such cities provide an ideal landing place for new immigrants, they also have brought together the Mandarin speaking people from both sides of the Taiwan Straight for the first time after over 30 years of separation, in a place that is far away from their country of origin. Speakers of different Mandarin varieties have come into contact. One variety of Mandarin, spoken by many from Taiwan, incorporates features borrowed from Taiwanese, a local variety of South Min.1 Such a Mandarin variety is referred to in the literature as "Taiwan Mandarin" (Cheng 1985; Li 1985), as contrasted with other varieties, such as Beijing Mandarin, spoken by people from Beijing and nearby areas.

Several studies have compared and contrasted Taiwan Mandarin and Beijing Mandarin (Cheng 1985), the latter of
which has been designated as the standard variety, after some prescriptive modification, by both the government of PRC and that of Taiwan. However, little is known about the social significance of variation of Mandarin, especially in an American Chinese community where these varieties have come in contact, or about how such dialectal variation is used by speakers to indicate social importance, especially in a Chinese community in which speakers of Taiwan Mandarin on the whole are much more established, have greater access to social, economic and political resources, and outnumber those from the Mainland speaking Beijing Mandarin and other Mandarin varieties.

The language situation in such American Chinese communities, therefore, is unique in the sense that not only have two varieties of Mandarin been brought together in a third place, but the notion of social class as a social variable proves to be inapplicable. In the Chinese community discussed here, there is hardly any way to label people in a hierarchy of social classes. It would be far-fetched to force such a hierarchy on urban Chinese communities. American Chinese are different from other ethnic minority groups in black and Hispanic communities in the United States where much research has been done, because the majority of the Chinese population is of first generation immigrants, with widely different social and economic backgrounds. Moreover, many newly settled immigrants within these Chinese communities now
occupy jobs which are much below the occupations for which they have qualifications, skills and experience.

What is needed, therefore, is not a model based on the notion of discrete groups in a society where group boundaries are hard to define, but one that views society as organized around a number of distinct focal points, each defining a separate norm of behavior, and attracting degrees of allegiance from members of the society (Hudson 1980:174). The more recent use of network theory in sociolinguistic studies, as shown in Lesley Milroy's (1976, 1980) study in Belfast, Northern Ireland, provides an innovative way to study such social clustering of people, which departs sharply from the Labovian tradition, and which provides the analytic tool for my study.

Social network refers to informal social relationships contracted by an individual. This is another way of viewing how an individual relates to other individuals in society, or, in other words, how an individual interacts with other different individuals through a set of links of various sorts. The interest of network analysis in social science lies not in the attributes of the people in the network per se, but rather in the characteristics of the linkages in their relationships with one another. Such characteristics are viewed as a means of predicting and explaining the behavior of the people involved in them (Mitchell 1969, 1973).

By the mid 1970s, Gumperz had already stated that one's
network position is a function of actual communicative experience and also varies with education, occupation, generation cohort, political values and individual aspiration for mobility (Gumperz 1976:13). Suzan Gal (1979)'s study of Hungarian/German bilingualism in the town of Oberwart near the Austrian border utilized the network concept and demonstrated a relationship between network structure and the choice of the language used. Milroy (1980)'s Belfast study first developed a more systematic use of the social network concept. Since then, quite a few studies have been done (e.g. Edwards 1986; Schmidt 1985; Lippi-Green 1989) following the model. One important similarity of these studies is that the communities they investigated, whether urban or rural, all involve network clusters which are relatively closed, long-standing, territorially based, and close-knit.

The American Chinese communities are different from these previously studied in that they have these characteristics: (1) network clusters are not so closed, as the community itself is expanding daily; (2) network clusters may not necessarily be territorially based, and the community is quite extended, but with focal points (e.g. Monterey Park); (3) ethnicity and the distinctive language play major roles in helping to keep the clustering of people closer to each other internally than externally. In such a community, new members, many of whom are from Mainland China, try hard to integrate themselves into the community with the majority of its members
from the more established earlier immigrants from Taiwan. It is the former group, the Mainland Chinese immigrants, that shows the most interesting linguistic change. These Mandarin speakers modify their language in varying degrees so that dialectal differences are minimized. In other words, they tend to accommodate their speech to Taiwan Mandarin speakers. Another goal of the present thesis is, then, to test the social network model in a totally different linguistic environment from those of the previous studies.

The research carried out here is correlational in that the frequency of a few selected linguistic variables in the speech of Mainland Mandarin speakers are examined in the light of their social network strength scores, an index for the individual's relation to local social networks. Field research of the present study was conducted in the larger Los Angeles areas, where the Mandarin speaking population is growing rapidly and where a large Chinese community is found. It is probably the largest in the United States, and is quite representative of similar communities elsewhere.

The working hypothesis is that the more advanced the person is in the process of becoming integrated into the local social networks, the more exposed the person is to the Taiwan Mandarin variety, and the more the person will be under pressure to accommodate to that variety. The individual's social network ties are examined for their density and multiplexity through these six indicators, selected on the
basis of ethnographic observation in the community. They are membership in Taiwan Mandarin speaking networks, work, friendship, participation in social or religious activities, neighborhood and roommates, and kinship. Ten linguistic variables have been selected as indicators of the trend toward integration of the language of the Mainland Chinese to Taiwan Mandarin: de-retroflexion, tonation, auxiliary verbs of yōu, hui, and yào, the intensifier hǎo before adjectives, copying of monosyllabic adjectives, sentence-final particles, and aspects of the lexicon. The selection of these linguistic variables was based on ethnographic observation, on informants' awareness of the variants, and on reports in the literature (cf. Chapter 7).

To sum up, this dissertation has as its goals (1) to study the Chinese community which employs Mandarin varieties, to investigate speakers' variable language use, and the changes involved, and (2) to test the model in a community which is totally different from those previously studied. In particular, this research will examine (1) the correlations between linguistic variables and speakers' social network structures, (2) differences among subgroups, e.g. gender and age, and (3) how well the linguistic variables selected at different levels of analysis operate as markers (see Chapter 8).

A brief outline of the content of each chapter follows. Chapter 2 is a description of Chinese communities and the
languages used in the United States in general and in Los Angeles in particular. Chapter 3 is concerned with the Mandarin varieties, the differences between Putonghua (or Guoyu) and Taiwan Mandarin, and some of Taiwan Mandarin features. Chapter 4 provides a review of correlational sociolinguistics that serves as the background for a detailed discussion of social network analysis and different traditions in its application, with reference to accommodation theory, which offers insights to understand the language change observed in this research. In chapter 5, network patterns in Chinese communities in Los Angeles are examined with ethnographic information. Chapter 6 focuses on fieldwork strategies with discussion of sampling and data collection. In Chapter 7, definitions are given for social variables, network strength scores, and linguistic variables used in the research. Chapter 8 presents a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the results. Chapter 9 is concerned with reporting and discussing the problems. Finally, Chapter 10 presents conclusions and suggestions for further studies.

Notes:
1. South Min, also called Amoy, is one of the three best-known sub-dialects of Min, a major dialect spoken in the southern part of Fujian Province, the northeast tip of Guandong Province, and, of course, in Taiwan (cf. Ramsey, 1987)
CHAPTER 2
The Chinese Community and Its Language

2.0 Introduction

This chapter, which is divided into three sections, contains a description of the history and current sociolinguistic situation in the American Chinese community. In the first part, in order to shed light on the present sociolinguistic phenomena, the history and the current characteristics of the Chinese community in the United States are addressed. The second section deals with the Chinese speech community as a whole. The range of linguistic variation is approached from historical and social perspectives at both language and dialect levels. The social attitudes towards the use of Taiwan Mandarin, a major variety of Mandarin spoken in the Chinese community is discussed in Section 3. All these serve the purpose of establishing grounds for a closer understanding of the linguistic accommodation process taking place on the part of the Mainland Chinese, which is the main objective of the investigation.

2.1 The American Chinese Community: Its Past and Present

According to the 1980 U.S. Census, the Chinese, numbering over 812,000, make up the largest of the Asian American groups (Gardner, Robey & Smith 1985:5). Although the results of the 1990 Census are not yet available for ethnic Chinese, the
figure will be considerably higher, because the American Chinese population, like that of other Asian groups, has been rising at an even greater rate each year since 1980, according to an article in Time Magazine.¹

Over the last 140 years, however, there have been many fluctuations in the size and composition of the Chinese American community, as a result of changing attitudes and policies towards the Chinese (Wong 1988:194), which has had a direct impact on the development of the Chinese community in the United States and on the language they use.

2.1.1 Immigration History and the Rise of Chinatown

Chinese presence in the United States dates back to the end of the eighteenth century (Lai, Huang & Wong 1980:12; Chen 1980:3-13; Tsai 1986:1), but the Chinese did not begin emigrating in significant numbers until the mid 19th century. In 1847 contract laborers, commonly known as "coolies", started to be shipped in (Tsai 1986:6), and when gold was discovered in California in 1848 and the news of the "Gold Mountain" reached China (Wong 1988:194), an outpouring of emigrants responded. Guangdong (Kuangtung) Province in southern China, a densely populated and then poverty-stricken area with a long seafaring tradition, became the main source of early Chinese immigrants.

These Cantonese-speaking Chinese were mainly poor, uneducated peasants and workers from Taishan area, Guangdong
Province, who had to struggle to survive in the destitute circumstances of their time. When they went abroad, they frequently left their wives and children behind, hoping to return home wealthy and respected after a few years of hard labor. This situation-centered early Chinese culture in the U.S. is quite different from the individual-centered culture of Americans with European background (Hsu 1970). With strong ties to the homeland, these early Chinese immigrants lived in an abnormal society full of young males, wandering sojourners, whose outlook was deeply-rooted in the Chinese cultural tradition, and in the religious systems of Confucianism and Taoism. This social instability and cultural difference, coupled with an exorbitant, discriminatory tax which drove early immigrants out of the mines, made possible the rise of Chinese quarters, or Chinatowns in American cities.

In these small and often crowded sectors, the Chinese built temples and public halls, and established stores and businesses. They retained their native customs and formed a nation within a nation, a tendency characteristic of many immigrant groups in America. They also retained their national habits in food, reading, and mode of life. Chinese festivals and seasonal celebrations were important social events. Enjoying opera and other forms of Chinese music and playing Chinese chess were important pastime activities.

Although the Burlingame Treaty of 1868 between the United States and China allowed reciprocal immigration (Chen
1980:128-129) and the Chinese population steadily rose to over 105,000 by 1880 (Lai, Huang & Wong 1980:25), when economic conditions took a turn for the worse in the 1870s, Chinese laborers, who had been subject to racism since mining days (Lyman 1974:58-62), easily became the target of public discontent, restrictive legislation regarding the occupations and lifestyles of the Chinese, and most importantly, exclusionary immigration laws (Lyman 1974:54-85; Chen 1980:127-180).

The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which was renewed in 1902 and extended indefinitely in 1904, barred the entry of Chinese laborers and prohibited naturalization of Chinese. When the act was redefined in 1924, entry of Chinese wives of U.S. citizens was prohibited. Although Chinese continued to enter through some fraudulent means,² the community during this period was far from a growing one. It was a "bachelor society" with no family life to speak of (Wong 1988:195).

The attendant effect of the discriminating laws and subsequent population decline was the continued withdrawal of the Chinese from the majority society. As a defense mechanism, the Chinese tended to congregate further within the Chinese quarters of metropolitan cities and avoided work contacts with labor organizations. They engaged in occupations that would not compete with or threaten the white population. A pattern of concentrating in noncompetitive, service occupations began, which lasted for nearly a century
and is still observable today (King & Locke 1980:17). They became small, independent entrepreneurs, such as laundrymen, grocers, and restauranteurs. They socialized primarily with their kinsmen and rarely participated in local and state affairs. They were an invisible minority secluded within their own territorial boundaries, namely, Chinatown (Tsai 1986:66), which, according to Chen (1980:255), was a city, a community within a community, an ethnic neighborhood of a particularly vital kind.

The early immigrants from China, therefore, had a unique experience, quite different from that of other subordinated ethnic minorities in the United States. The early immigrants from China, therefore, had a unique experience, quite different from that of other subordinated ethnic minorities in the United States.³ They were mostly from a small region in Guangdong Province, who were always China-oriented and non-English speaking, and who suffered from persistent inequality, racial conflict, alienation, and subordination. Cantonese, the language they spoke,⁴ played an important role, which served as a strong unifying force among its speakers (Chan & Lee 1981:122).

2.1.2 The present American Chinese community

Although the Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed in 1943, the turning point for the Chinese in their immigration history was the 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Amendments, which permitted up to 20,000 entries per country per year (Chen 1980:216). Thus began an influx of Chinese immigrants of varied backgrounds, mainly from Taiwan and Hong Kong. Since
the end of 1970s, PRC has become another new and important
source of Chinese immigration. In addition, the immigration
reform allowed, between 1950 and 1983, over 60,000 Chinese who
were in the United States on a temporary basis to adjust to
permanent residency status, the majority of whom were so-
called "student immigrants" from Taiwan, who came on a student
visa and eventually obtained immigration status. (Tsai

It is much easier, therefore, to generalize about the
early Chinese American community than the contemporary one.
The old community structure reflected earlier Chinese
immigrants' homogeneity and cohesiveness. As portrayed above,
those old-timers shared a fairly uniform background: they were
from a small rural area in southern Guangdong, with little
formal schooling, and were predominantly males with no family
and children in the United States.

In contrast, the contemporary Chinese American community
defies ready generalization. It is by no means predominantly
Cantonese, rural, male. It may be more useful to think of
succeeding groups of immigrants, although having common
ancestry and embracing the same ideal, as layers of deposits
in a geological formation, discernible in any cross-section,
whether cut by settlement patterns, nativity, occupation,
educational attainment, or language (Tsai 1986:198). Old
dialect loyalties have been undermined by radical changes in
the community's structure.
According to Gardner et al (1985:5), immigration has played a vital role in the formation of the post-1965 Chinese American community: fully 63.3 percent of the Chinese in America are foreign-born. By the 1970s the Chinese-American population included males and females of different ages, professionals, and students who speak diverse Chinese languages and dialects, and merchants and laborers from various parts of Asia.

Like their ancestors, many new Chinese immigrants prefer to congregate in an environment which resembles their place of origin. Increasing numbers of non-English speaking immigrants caused a population explosion in the already congested Chinese urban quarters. For example, there were only 100 people in the New York City Chinatown in the 1850s; by now it has over 150,000. In San Francisco alone, approximately 12,000 Chinese arrive each year. As a result, the ability of the old Chinatown to provide instant employment for new arrivals became increasingly strained and contributed to a collage of economic and social problems (Tsai 1986:188).

The answer to these problems is the rise of so-called new Chinatowns, or, rather, Chinese quarters, which can be found in almost every major cities, such as Flushing in New York, Richmond in San Francisco, Monterey Park in Los Angeles, and Diho Square in Houston. Since the beginning of the 1980s, with the arrival of Chinese immigrants from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and other Southeast Asian countries, also comes the
investments brought in by some of the immigrants, which created new vitality in these new Chinese communities and also provided employment opportunities.

Compared to the old Chinatown, the new Chinese quarters, no matter how heterogenous, still resemble in a lot of places the older ones. The old Chinatown traditions can be traced in the new ones, which serve as the centers for the Chinese communities, where Chinese can congregate, set up businesses, and more importantly, maintain their traditions and the language.

On the other hand, the new Chinese quarters bear several distinctive characteristics. They do not have clear boundaries, in other words, people from other ethnic groups find their way to live and work in the Chinese majority quarters. The members of the new Chinese quarters are more educated; many are American trained doctors, engineers, and other professionals. Traditional situation-centered social ties, such as kinship, clanship, and huiguăn ('guild') networks are replaced by individual-centered social relationships. People have more contacts with the non-Chinese community. The main functions of new Chinatown are more business oriented than as a defensive device.

2.1.3 Mainland Chinese: The New Members of the Community

At the same time that American Chinese communities are undergoing fundamental changes, Mainland China has opened its
doors to the Western World. Since the beginning of 1980, the
number of immigrants from Mainland China is increasing rapidly
and now it ranks the eighth ever in the number of immigrants
into the United States. In addition to that, students from
Mainland China has been swarming into the United States,
ranking the first in number among overall foreign students in
the United States, most of whom have adjusted or will
eventually adjust to immigrant status, just like those
student-immigrants from Taiwan in the 1960s and 70s.

Many Mainland Chinese, then, have ended up settling down
in Chinese communities, which provide them with a landing
place, where they can find employment, and where they do not
have to battle as directly with the language and cultural
barrier.

2.2 The American Chinese Speech Community

2.2.1 The Chinese Language Family

As American Chinese are no longer a homogeneous group
speaking the same language, or dialects, it will be helpful to
start with a brief introduction to the Chinese language
family.

There are seven major families, or groups, of dialects in
the Chinese language5: (1) Mandarin, which is spoken by 70
percent of the total Chinese-speaking population and has four
sub-varieties (Northern, Northwestern, Southwestern, Lower
Yangzi); (2) Wu (8.4 percent); (3) Xiang (5 percent); (4) Gan
(2.4 percent); (5) Hakka (4 percent); (6) Min, which is spoken by 4.2 percent of the population and is subdivided into Northern and Southern varieties (Taiwanese is one sub-variety of the latter); and finally, (7) Yue, which is commonly called "Cantonese" and is spoken by 5 percent of the total population (Hu 1987:6).

Speakers of all the seven dialects can be found in the American Chinese communities now. However, as mentioned briefly above, Cantonese and Mandarin are the major ones, although many people from Taiwan also speak Taiwanese.

2.2.2 Cantonese, Early Chinese Immigrants, and Chinatown

A Chinese immigrant's language background depends on where he or she comes from. Despite the large number of dialects in the Chinese language family, only a handful have played key roles in the Chinese American communities.

The first of these is Cantonese. The term "Cantonese", as used in the American context, refers both to the immigrant's origin (from Guangdong Province) and to the dialect, which includes several varieties such as Taishan, which is the major sub-variety spoken by early Chinese immigrants, and Guangzhou, which is the more prestigious variety. In early Chinese American communities, almost everybody came originally from Guangdong and few people had close contacts outside Chinatown. Cantonese had an important symbolic meaning. It served a strong unifying force among its
speakers, which represented not only linguistic but territorial and ethnic distinctions. Such distinctions were crucial for survival at the time, and were reinforced by the hardships that the early immigrants had experienced in the new world. With its varieties, Cantonese was the only form of communication within the boundaries of Chinatown. This situation has lasted for almost a century.

Since 1965, although these old dialect loyalties have been undermined by radical changes in the community structure, Cantonese still plays an important role in the life of present-day old Chinatown. The influx of immigrants from Hong Kong and ethnic Chinese from Vietnam, who have been joined by many recent immigrants from Guangdong Province, PRC, have kept and, to some extent, enhanced the importance of Cantonese in Chinatown.

2.2.3 Mandarin, the Lingua Franca

Until 1965, Mandarin was spoken by only a small number of ethnic Chinese in the United States, most of whom were student-immigrants from Mainland China and Taiwan. Since 1965, however, with the arrival of increasing number of immigrants from Taiwan, Mandarin is gaining its importance within American Chinese communities.

The rise of new Chinese quarters in many major metropolitan areas in the United States gives a unique status to Mandarin. Contrary to early Chinese immigrants who spoke
only Cantonese, the majority of recent immigrants are Mandarin speaking Taiwanese, who have been joined, after 1980, by Mandarin speaking Mainlanders. Mandarin speakers have become the majority in American Chinese communities, outnumbering by a large margin those Cantonese speaking "old timers" and those from Hong Kong and Vietnam. Moreover, the present-day ethnic Chinese in the United States are by no means a homogeneous group. They represent almost all dialect groups. Mandarin, therefore, has replaced Cantonese as the much needed lingua franca for communication, as found in Mainland China and Taiwan. This is particularly so in those new Chinese sectors.

On the other hand, Mandarin is also increasingly heard within old Chinatown (Guthrie 1985:43-44). As the language on which writing is based and in which works of literature are composed, it has the advantage of greater prestige and wider currency over Cantonese. As increasing numbers of Mandarin-speaking immigrants who reside in suburbs or other areas come into Chinatown to dine and shop, Cantonese shopkeepers and waiters have to pick up a functional command of Mandarin to deal with their customers (Guthrie 1985:44).

The situation is that, although dialect loyalties in Chinese communities are no longer as strong as they used to be, they continue to play a role in the interactions within the Chinese-speaking communities. Now such loyalties are geared toward Mandarin, which, as Cantonese before, represented not only linguistic but ethnic distinctions.
2.3. **Taiwan Mandarin: the Norm for Communication**

As Mandarin speaking Taiwanese immigrated into the United States in increasing number, they have gradually established themselves in the American Chinese communities, especially in the new Chinese quarters where they exert more and more influence. They have become the majority among Chinese. Since many came with wealth, they are the ones who have the economic and the political power within these communities. Thus, the variety of Mandarin they speak becomes the norm for communication when people talk within American Chinese communities, despite the fact that both the PRC and Taiwan governments have designated a national standard language (to be discussed in detail in the next chapter).

The ethnographic study carried out during the research in the larger Los Angeles area has revealed that such a norm is fully reflected in different aspects of the community. Taiwan Mandarin is not only the language for interpersonal communication among people from Taiwan, it is also used, of all other Mandarin varieties, as THE Mandarin in the public domains. On the other hand, Beijing Mandarin, the more prestigious variety in Mainland China and in Taiwan, is not much appreciated.

Although Taiwan Mandarin is not the universal standard variety, it is tolerated in the Chinese media. In the larger Los Angeles areas, there are about 5 public Chinese television stations on Channel 18 (KSCI), the international channel.
At the news time, except for very few who speak the standard variety, most of the announcers in these stations have, to varying degrees, "Taiwan Mandarin accent". In other programs, Taiwan Mandarin is even more noticeable. The commercials are among the most obvious. In the Chinese papers, such as the Chinese Daily News and the International Daily News, grammatical and lexical features of Taiwan Mandarin are frequent.

When one shops or eats outside in those Mandarin speaking Chinese quarters, such as the City of Monterey Park (which is to the east of City of Los Angeles), one feels as though he/she has emerged in a town somewhere in Taiwan. Thus, Monterey Park is often referred to as "Little Taipei". There, Mandarin with traces of Taiwanese pronunciation and lexical and grammatical features is more than usual, while Beijing Mandarin would be the marked form.

Therefore, when those ethnic Chinese who originally immigrated from Hong Kong, Vietnam, Malaysia and other places have to learn Mandarin to communicate in the Chinese community,¹⁰ they acquire a functional proficiency of the language and Taiwan Mandarin is the model they use. They prefer Taiwan Mandarin and consider it to be the standard.

Since 1980, many Mandarin speaking Mainland Chinese have arrived in the United States. Many of them are immigrants who came under the sponsorship of their relatives from Taiwan, Hong Kong, or old-timer American Chinese, while others are
students, most of whom are self-sponsored. The Mandarin speaking Chinese quarters are ideal for them; not only can they survive the initial stages of their adventures in the United States, but they can find employment. When they come in contact with other Chinese in these communities, they start to learn and use Taiwan Mandarin. In other words, they accommodate their language so that they sound more like Taiwan Mandarin speakers, although they normally speak the more standard Mandarin variety. The tendency is that the more they become integrated into the local Chinese communities, the more the language they speak sounds like Taiwan Mandarin. This dissertation is concerned with this process.

Notes:

1. For details, see two reports in the April 9, 1990 issue of Time Magazine, pages 28-35. According to a report by Mehta et al (pp. 28-31), population increase of Asians in the United States from 1980-1988 is about 55%, two thirds of the increase is due to immigration.

2. Some Chinese entered by resorting to the "paper son" system. Under the system, a Chinese man with American citizenship, after visiting his wife in China, would later claim the birth of a child in China, creating a "slot" for a new U.S. citizen eligible for future entry into the U.S. This "slot" could then be sold to someone who wanted to join his/her family in the U.S. but was barred by law from doing so (Tsai, 1986.)

3. Perhaps with the exception of Japanese Americans.

5. It is traditional to refer to different varieties of Chinese as "dialects", even though they may be different from one another to the point of being mutually unintelligible (Li & Thompson, 1989:2). They are called different "dialects" simply because they are spoken in the same country and because they share the same writing system.

6. According to some linguists, Southern Min and Northern Min should be considered as separate dialects, spoken by 3% of the population by the former and 1.2% by the latter.

7. Popularly known as Cantonese, the Yue dialect consists of a group of dialects spoken over wide areas of Guangdong and Guangxi Provinces. The prestigious variety, Guangzhou, is spoken in the provincial capital Guangzhou and also in Hong Kong. Other major varieties include Taishan, Zhongshan, etc. (For details, see Norman, 1988:214; and Li and Thompson, 1981:3.)

8. These students are called "stranded students" by Tsai (1986:120), because they came to the United States after World War II and remained here after the Chinese communists gained control over the Mainland in 1949.

9. These five television stations are: China TV, Chinese World TV U.S.A., Asia Television Ltd. U.S.A., American Chinese TV, and World Report (Shijiè Bāodào).

10. Most ethnic Chinese from Hong Kong and Vietnam speak Cantonese, while those from Malaysia usually are able to speak Northern Min.
CHAPTER 3
The Mandarin Chinese Varieties

3.0 Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to discuss some differences between the standard variety of Mandarin (which is called Putonghua in Mainland China and Guoyu in Taiwan) and Taiwan Mandarin. Many studies that deal with this subject take Beijing Mandarin as the standard variety for comparison, and compare Taiwan Mandarin against it. Some confusion can be caused by such an equation, because there are some differences between Beijing Mandarin and Putonghua/Guoyu, although the latter is developed on the basis of the former. A brief description of the Mandarin varieties is, therefore, provided in the first section of this chapter as a framework of reference for the description of Taiwan Mandarin, which is compared at different linguistic levels of analysis with Putonghua, the Mainland version of the standard variety, in the second section. Such differences will provide a basis for the sociolinguistic study of linguistic accommodation to be discussed in the later chapters. The third section deals with some sociolinguistic factors associated with Taiwan Mandarin speakers, who are usually bidialectal Taiwanese and Mandarin speakers, and with the fact that speakers are aware of differences between the two Mandarin varieties.
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3.1 Putonghua/Guoyu vs. Taiwan Mandarin

3.1.1 Varieties of Mandarin

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Mandarin is the most important of all Chinese dialects. It is spoken by more than 70% of the population in Mainland China as the native tongue (Li & Thompson 1981:3), and by more than 80% of the population in Taiwan as a second dialect (Cheng 1985:352). The figures go even higher if we include those speaking Mandarin as a second dialect in the Mainland and those speaking Mandarin as the mother tongue in Taiwan.

The term "Mandarin", literally meaning "official language" in Chinese, denotes a major dialect family in China, which includes different varieties and sub-varieties. According to Li and Thompson (1981:3) there are four major varieties of Mandarin, which are Northern Mandarin, with its representative locale in Beijing, Northwestern Mandarin, with its representative locale in Taiyuan, Southwestern Mandarin, with its representative locale in Chengdu, and Lower Yangzi Mandarin, as represented in Nanjing. Within each variety, there are sub-varieties; each is represented by a major city as the center. For example, the city of Beijing presents the center of Northern Mandarin; however, the Mandarin found in Shenyang would be somewhat different from that in Beijing, especially when pronunciation is concerned.
3.1.2 The Standard Variety

In popular as well as linguistic usage, the term "Mandarin" usually represents the speech of Beijing, which for centuries has been recognized as the standard language of China because of the political and cultural significance of the city. China did not officially establish a standard language for the nation until 1955 when the PRC government proclaimed a national language embodying the pronunciation of Beijing dialect, the grammar of northern Mandarin, and the vocabulary of modern vernacular literature. This national language has been known as Putonghua (henceforth PTH) or "common language", meaning the style and vocabulary aimed at being close to the language of common people. During the early fifties, Taiwan also adopted a similar policy of promoting a uniform language based on the Beijing dialect. In Taiwan, it is called Guoyu, or "national language". In essence, Putonghua and Guoyu are similar except in certain areas of vocabulary (Li & Thompson 1981:1).

Although PTH/Guoyu is based on Beijing Mandarin, this national language is not "pure" Beijing dialect. Noticeable differences exist between them. One important difference, for example, is the deletion of Beijing Mandarin nonsyllabic word-final -r in PTH and Guoyu (or, drop of retroflex suffix, as referred to in literature), which is maintained in Beijing Mandarin. Moreover, many local jargon words and expressions are not used in the standard variety. Despite the fact that...
Beijing Mandarin is more prestigious than other Mandarin varieties (Kalmar, Zhong & Xiao 1987), it is Putonghua, the standard variety, that is modelled on and used in the Mainland by Mandarin speakers, including many from Beijing, and by those who learned it as a second dialect. However, although efforts have been made in standardizing Mandarin by both governments, both PTH and Guoyu are far from being "uniform" when spoken. China has a large population spreading over a vast geographical area, and consequently numerous other dialects inevitably influence and affect the versions of Putonghua and Guoyu spoken by people from different regions. When PTH/Guoyu is actually spoken by people of varying dialectal background, it exhibits considerable variation. Therefore, when one speaks of Putonghua or of Guoyu, one refers merely to an ideal. There will always be some variation between "the Mandarin language" of one person and "the Mandarin language" of another person (Li & Thompson 1981:1-2). Deviation from the standard is extremely noticeable when a person speaks another Southern Chinese dialect as the mother tongue. Thus, one often hears terms such as Shanghai Mandarin and Hunan Mandarin. In Mainland China as well as in Taiwan (Li 1985:5), however, Beijing Mandarin is the more prestigious variety.

3.1.3 Taiwan Mandarin

During the 1950s, when Guoyu was formally designated in
Taiwan on the basis of Beijing Mandarin, it was the phonology that was codified rigorously while the lexicon and syntax were left largely unspecified. Therefore, although many people from Taiwan claim that they speak Guoyu, the fact is that the language they actually speak is a variety of Mandarin which is not exactly the designated standard. As over 80% of the people in Taiwan speak Mandarin as a second dialect, the kind of Guoyu spoken by many, naturally, incorporates features borrowed from other southern dialects as well as Taiwanese, a local variety of Southern Min spoken mainly in the Xiamen (Amoy) and Quanzhou areas of Fujian Province on the Mainland side of the Taiwan Straight. This variety of Mandarin is referred to in the literature as "Taiwan Mandarin" (Cheng 1985; Li 1985).

According to Cheng (1985:353), since numerous influences in the grammar of Taiwan Mandarin (henceforth TM) are traceable to Taiwanese, if one tries to compare TM and Guoyu, many unshared features can be reasonably described as those that have been carried over from Taiwanese into TM, given that Guoyu is the designated target language. As Chao (1976:75) also indicated, interdialectal loans have resulted in so-called "Taiwan(ese) Mandarin", which is characterized by substituting Taiwanese phonetic and syntactic features for the Mandarin counterparts.

Borrowing from various Southern dialects in Mainland China also has had a great impact on TM (Li 1985:127). Among
the non-Taiwanese speakers of Mandarin in Taiwan, those who were not originally Beijing Mandarin speakers are much more numerous, and are politically and economically more powerful than the Beijing Mandarin speakers. Especially influential are the Wu speakers, who include the political elite from Zhejiang and the financial tycoons and textbook writers from Shanghai. Although essential features of Guoyu in the area of phonology have been codified and taught seriously, the Mandarin of those influential non-Mandarin speakers appears to be the norm (Cheng 1985:354). In daily language contact, non-native Mandarin has been the actual model, especially in syntax and lexicon. Therefore, Southern Chinese dialects are the second most important source in shaping Taiwan Mandarin.

As pointed out by Zhu (1987), due to long separation between Taiwan Mandarin and its base variety Beijing Mandarin, it is an inevitable outcome that Taiwan Mandarin changes, because it has lost the constraining forces to keep it away from change. The development of Taiwan Mandarin, with its de facto linguistic characteristics, has gradually been recognized by all people in Taiwan, including those from the Beijing area. This recognition of the once-substandard variety indicates not only the acceptance of the Taiwanese colored Mandarin, but also of the mentality which accepts Taiwan as a home for re-establishing ethnolinguistic homogeneity and for developing positive linguistic tolerance (Li 1985:125).
3.2 Some Features of Taiwan Mandarin

Characteristics of Taiwanese and other non-Mandarin dialects can be found in Taiwan Mandarin at different levels of linguistic analysis which distinguish it from the standard variety. In this section, some major differences between TM and PTH, the standard variety as found in the Mainland, will be discussed. Such differences are not necessarily always dichotomous because some features may also be found in the other variety. Therefore, while some differences are categorical, others are tendentious. The features discussed here are largely the accepted and widely used forms in Taiwan Mandarin, as opposed to those Taiwanese features which have not gained such status in the variety.

3.2.1 Phonological Features

Taiwan Mandarin is differentiated from Putonghua in not complying with some phonological rules (Li 1985: 127). Some of these rules include unrounding of the rounded vowels or semi-vowels (e.g. chīfàn → cūfàn 'eat meal'), extensive vowel insertion (epenthesis) (e.g chīfàn → cūhuàn), dissimilation of labial-dental sounds (gōngfu → gōnghu 'spare time'), and laxing of the tense vowels (e.g. deletion of /u/ in the diphthong /uo/ as in guójiā → gōjiā 'country'). The most salient and the most common, however, are differences in articulation of retroflexes in consonants (Li 1985:127) and in the realization of the neutral tone (Sanders 1989:4), which
will be discussed here.

3.2.1.1 De-retroflexion

Retroflexed consonants contrast with their non-retroflexed counterparts (i.e. there are minimal pairs) in PTH/Guoyu. Figure 3.1 is the phonetic value of these sounds (adapted from Li & Thompson 1981:5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of articulation</th>
<th>Manner of Articulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unaspirated Affricate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental-alveolars</td>
<td>Pinyin IPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retroflexes</td>
<td>z ts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 The retroflexed sounds in Putonghua.

Note that Pinyin is the Romanized phonetic alphabet system adopted in PTH.

In TM, however, the retroflexion is simply not realized, possibly due to absence of equivalent consonants in Taiwanese. Therefore, [zh] > [z]; [ch] > [c]; and [sh] > [s]. Thus a merger takes place in Taiwan Mandarin. This de-retroflexion in TM coincides with other Southern Mandarin varieties. For example, in TM:

- zhīdào → zīdào 'know'
- chīfàn → cīfàn 'eat meal'
- zuòshì → zuōsi 'do work'
3.2.1.2 Insertion of Tones

One important phonological distinction between TM and PTH regards the frequency and distribution of the neutral tone. In PTH, neutral tone is normally realized in either of the two environments: in boundary-free or inter-morphemic position and in constituent-final position directly preceding a boundary. Only one, the boundary-free or inter-morphemic position is productive in exhibiting neutral tone in Taiwan Mandarin. The occurrence of neutral tone is very infrequent in TM in constituent-final position directly preceding a boundary (Sanders 1989). For example, in PTH the second syllable in many bisyllabic words (such as nouns and verbs) in constituent-final position is a weak one in which neutral tone is realized. However, in TM, the weak syllable becomes strong, or, toned. The tone it carries usually resembles the one for the syllable when it is a separate word and is fully pronounced. For example:

PTH               TM
dongxi  →  dōngxī 'thing'
xièxie  →  xièxiè 'thank you'
xiāngsheng →  xiānshēng 'Mister'
yīsi    →  yísi 'meaning'
piaçãoliang →  piàoliàng 'beautiful'
shūfu    →  shūfū 'comfort'

Bisyllabic kinship terms are another example where tones change in TM. Two patterns seem to be involved. (1) In PTH
when the second syllable of a bisyllabic kinship term is a duplicate of the preceding one, this second syllable usually carries a neutral tone. But the same syllable typically becomes strong, or, toned, in Taiwan Mandarin, e.g.:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{PTH} & \quad \text{TM} \\
\text{bàbà} & \rightarrow \text{bàbà} \ '\text{papa, father}' \\
\text{māmā} & \rightarrow \text{māmā} \ '\text{mama, mother}'
\end{align*}\]

(2) In the second pattern, a complete change of tones is involved, due to direct transfer of tones from Taiwanese. The two syllables of a bisyllabic kinship term, usually with a tone in the first syllable and a neutral one in the second in PTH, become toned in the tone sandhi of a neutral in the first syllable followed by a rising tone, e.g.:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{PTH} & \quad \text{TM} \\
\text{māmā} & \rightarrow \text{māmā} \ '\text{mama, mother}' \\
\text{shūshū} & \rightarrow \text{shūshū} \ '\text{uncle}'
\end{align*}\]

3.2.2 Morphological Features

In TM the intensification of an adjective involves, among other things, two ways which are not as frequently used in PTH. These are the use of hǎo and the copying of the adjective with -de added at the end. It should be noticed that both constructions are more often used as a stative verb rather than as an attribute.
3.2.2.1 The Adjective Intensifier hǎo "very": hào+adjective

Although discussed in this section, hǎo is actually a lexical item that is typically TM when used as an adverb. Hǎo, meaning 'very, extremely, awfully', is quite typical in TM when emphasis on intensity is intended. It can precede both monosyllabic adjectives as well bisyllabic ones:

e.g. hǎo lèi 'very tired'
    hǎo kě'ài 'very lovely, cute'

It is very strongly marked as TM when it precedes a bisyllabic adjective which starts with the morpheme hǎo- ('good'), e.g.:

hǎo hǎochī 'very delicious' (hǎochī 'good to eat')
    hǎo hǎokàn 'very good-looking' (hǎokàn 'good-looking')

Other adverbs (intensifiers) are more common in Mainland Putonghua, such as hěn, zhēn, tīng, mán, and tè (all meaning 'very', 'quite', 'awfully'), although there is some slight semantic difference as far as intensity is concerned. Therefore, for hǎo hǎochī 'very delicious', the PTH equivalent would be: hěn hǎochī, or zhēn hǎochī, etc.

Although hǎo as an adverb modifying an adjective can be found in PTH, it is relatively low in frequency. The few exceptions include hǎo-duō 'quite a lot', which is quite fossilized and common in PTH. Thus, basically hǎo is more of a TM adverb.
3.2.2.2. Copying of the Adjective: \( A_i + A_i - de \)

In TM a monosyllabic adjective is frequently copied with an optional \(-de\) added at the end (i.e. \( A_i A_i - de \)) to mean "quite ...". The construction is often used as the predicate (subject complement) or as an adverbial when spoken. It is also quite common in literary works from Taiwan. One often reads similar constructions, such as xiūxiū 'shy', ruānshūshū 'soft and comfortable', jiānkūbābā 'arduous, tough', and xiāoxiāoyāuyāo 'free and unfettered' (Zhu & Zhou, 1990). In Mainland PTH, the same meaning is signaled by using other words, rather than the copying process, e.g.:

(1) TM: Zhèige rén guàiquài-de.
    'This person is quite strange.'
    PTH: Zhèige rén zhēn guài.

(2) TM: Nèige rén yànjīn dàdà-de.
    'That person's eyes are quite big.'
    PTH: Nèige rén yànjīn tǐng dà.

3.2.3 Morpho-syntactic Features

In Taiwanese, irrealis mood is obligatorily marked by auxiliary verbs. The deletion of the irrealis elements always yields an expression either ungrammatical or different in meaning. Realis mode in Taiwanese is optionally marked, which denotes an emphatic affirmation of the existence or occurrence of an event in the past or present, and occur in both stative and active predicates.
However, realis vs. irrealis distinction in Putonghua is blurred in that the marking of the semantic difference between present habitual and immediate future action is neutralized in PTH, except for immediate future of a stative predicate, but the marking is optional and very often not used at all.

Three auxiliary verbs, yǒu 'have', yào 'will' and hui 'likely' are used in TM to denote realis/irrealis distinction. The first is not found at all in PTH and the other two are used less frequently. The frequent use of these in TM is caused by influence from Taiwanese.

3.2.3.1 Yǒu 'have'

In Taiwanese, the perfective and experiential aspects are clearly marked by the auxiliary verb y 'have, do, did', which is borrowed into TM and takes the form of yǒu. This yǒu denotes the realis side of the polarity and becomes merged with the standard use of yǒu ('possess','have'). It is also used for habitual action, as well as in forming A-not-A (alternative) questions.

However, there is no such counterpart in PTH for a habitual action. Such a distinction is neutralized in PTH. Marking on a perfective or an experiential verb in PTH is expressed by the post-verbal markers le and guo respectively. But such markers are never used for a present action, e.g.:

TM: Wǒ yǒu kànjiàn guo. vs. PTH: Wǒ kànjian guo.

'I have seen (it).'
Only in the negative does PTH overtly use the marking méiyōu, as in TM, for the perfective and experiential. However, this negative form in TM also appears frequently in those otherwise negated by another negation word bū in PTH, as often used for an irrealis action or for a stative verb.

3.2.3.2 Yào 'want, will'

Yào 'want, will' suggests volition and immediate future. It represents the irrealis side of the polarity. Yào is used obligatorily in TM, corresponding to its Taiwanese counterpart beh. It is also used in A-not-A construction to present questions.

But yào is infrequent in PTH, particularly in questions. In PTH the marking of the semantic difference between present habitual and immediate future actions is often neutralized. In PTH, volition or intention is not often overly marked by an auxiliary. With the exception of immediate future of a stative predicate, it is very often not used at all, or it is expressed through other verbs. For example:

TM: Nǐ yào chī zhège ma? vs. PTH: Nǐ chī zhège ma?
'Do you want to eat this?'

3.2.3.3 Huí 'likely'

Huí 'likely' is used in TM as the Mandarin counterpart of Taiwanese e to denote likelihood, i.e. irrealis events. This is often neutralized, as in the case of yào, in PTH. In other
words, it is relatively lower in frequency. PTH does not mark it with an overt auxiliary. Following is a TM example:

A: Tā hěn pàng. 'He is very fat.'
B: Tā bú hui. 'He is not.' (vs. Tā bú pàng.)

A striking difference between Taiwan Mandarin and PTH is the obligatory use of the auxiliary verbs yǒu, yào and huì as operators in TM. They are needed (1) when a verb is negated, (2) when they form an A-not-A (alternative) question, or (3) when a yes-no question needs a short response. For example:

A: (TM) Tā yǒu-méi-yǒu zài jiā? 'Is he home?'
   vs. (PTH) Tā zài-bú-zài jiā?
B: (TM) Méiyǒu (zài). 'No, he's not.' vs. (PTH) Bú zài.

Another example would be:

TM: Nǐ míngtiān yào-bú-yào qù? 'Are you going tomorrow?'
PTH: Nǐ míngtiān qù-bú-qù?

3.2.4 Particles:
3.2.4.1 Sentence Level: Sentence-Final Particles:

Traditional Chinese grammar refers to the sentence-final particles as yǔqǐ ci 'mood words', which suggests that the function of these particles is to relate the utterance to which they are attached to the conversational context in various ways, and to indicate how this utterance is to be taken by the hearer (Li & Thompson 1981:317).

In Taiwan Mandarin, one marked characteristic is that many sentence-final particles are used, many than found in
Mainland PTH, due to transfer from Taiwanese. Although different particles differ slightly in meaning, when looked at on the whole at the discourse level, the speaker sounds less assertive, less abrupt, and more indirect when the particles are used. On the other hand, in PTH, most sentences will end without those particles. PTH speakers would consider the particles meaninglessly redundant and pretentious, and if used by men, they may sound effeminate. TM speakers, however, feel that the PTH speakers always stop sentences too abruptly, that they are too assertive. Phonetically, these particles would carry a high level tone when spoken by a TM speaker, rather than a neutral, weak tone they would bear in PTH. With the tone insertion, these bisyllabic words mark a different "accent", even if the TM speaker does not have strong Taiwanese phonological transfer in vowels and consonants.

Some examples of the TM sentence-final particles are:

TM: Tā bù zài jiā ai. vs. PTH: Tā bù zài jiā.
'He is not home.'

TM: Bù shì la. vs. PTH: Bù shì. 'That is not so.'

The most commonly used particles are:
la, ma, a, ai; me, ba, ya, le, ou, ao, lao, na, ne

The meaning of the particles depends on the sentences they are used with. Four sentence-final particles which appear to be quite frequent in TM but marked in PTH are the first four above: la, ai, ma, a. To PTH speakers, these sentence-final particles are extremely marked. As commented
on by one female informant from the Mainland, they are only used by PTH speaking girls when they want to sound coquettish or coy.

In some cases, the particles can be the result of particle fusion, e.g. la=le+a (Chao 1968:769), and ma=me+a (which is contrasted with ma used for yes-no questions). However, Zhu and Zhou (1990) contended that particles that are considered as fusions in PTH may carry totally different semantic meaning in TM. La may not necessarily be the result of fusion of le and a. It can be something equivalent to de a as in zheyang zuo shi bu tai hao la "it is not good to do so", or equivalent to jiu shi la as in juedui baoshen la "absolutely guaranteed", or used to mean Verb+Verb eryi 'only (verb)' as in xiang la "only think". In PTH, sentence-ending particles like la, luo, na, lie are rarely used after le.4

Some sentence final particles are also used to make questions, both yes-no and wh-questions.

3.2.4.2 Discourse Level: Discourse Pause-Fillers

By discourse pause-fillers, I mean those linguistic items that serve to fill the pauses in a conversation, as discussed by Schiffrin (1987). They can be both intra-sentential as well as inter-sentential. TM speakers and PTH speakers seem to employ some different pause-fillers within and between sentences during conversation, although they also share others. Basically, the fillers can be of two kinds, those
used by speakers, or those used by listeners.

The following are some of the discourse markers that are often used by the listener in a conversation. Among these, some are used more by TM speakers, others by PTH speakers (they may also be used for starting a turn in the conversation):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM</th>
<th>PTH</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zhèyàngzi(a/ao)</td>
<td>shi-ma/ba</td>
<td>'is that so'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dui-a</td>
<td>dui; dui-dui-dui</td>
<td>'right'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shì-a</td>
<td>zhēn-de-a?</td>
<td>'really'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some pause fillers are used usually by the speaker within the turn during a conversation:

hào  me/ma  a  ya  ne  ao
shì-bù-shì  "Am I right?"
dui-bù-dui  "Am I right?"
jiù-shì-shuō  "that is"

Of these, hào is obviously more TM, owing to borrowing from a similar Taiwanese counterpart; while jiù-shì-shuō is more Mainland PTH. The rest falls within the two polarity.

3.2.5 Lexion

Owing to the long separation between Mainland China and Taiwan and to the different political and social backgrounds, many lexical items are not shared between TM and PTH, or not used in the same way. For many of those which are shared by both TM and PTH, the lexical items spoken in TM sound more
like formal written Chinese than colloquial. This is because
many terms from old Chinese are now only used as written forms
in PTH but still used in spoken TM.

According to Zhu and Zhou (1990) the major differences
between Taiwan Mandarin and Putonghua in lexicon can be
summarized into three kinds. First, there are new words in TM
that are not found in PTH, such as fùmiàn 'the weak side',
juànchūn 'dependants' village', jiāshìkè 'class for family
affairs'. Such words are comparatively fewer.

Second, most lexical items have counterparts for the same
meaning in TM and PTH, but they are different at three
different levels: (1) in morphology, e.g. zhūmín 'resident',
lièjǐ 'accumulate', and zhōngzhàn 'bus terminal' in TM, are
respectively jūmín, jílěi, and zhōngdiānzhàn in PTH; (2) in
semantics, e.g. chéngzhǎng refers to 'becoming mature' in PTH
while in TM it means 'increase'; many words originally have
several meanings, but TM and PTH concentrate on different
uses: e.g. pǐnzhì 'quality' in PTH is used for moral but in TM
it is for material; (3) in syntactic function, e.g. yìtū
'intention' is a noun in PTH but is used as a verb in TM,
while juéyì 'determine' is used as a verb in PTH but it is a
noun in TM.

Third, the same lexical item means different things in
PTH and TM. Guǎndào in PTH means 'pipes' while in TM it
refers to some abstract concept of 'channel', as in wàijiāo
guǎndào 'diplomatic channels'.
The differences found in TM lexicon are contributed by the retention of the old forms that are not used in PTH, by words newly created out of necessity, by words from translation, by forms borrowed from Taiwanese and other Southern dialects, and by forms also from foreign languages, the most important of which is Japanese.

The following are some examples of differences which include frequently heard words which are contrastive between TM and PTH (for more examples, see Appendix I):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM</th>
<th>PTH</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xiānsheng</td>
<td>āirén/zhāngfu</td>
<td>husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lèngqìjī</td>
<td>kōngtiáo</td>
<td>air-conditioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yóuzhìyuán</td>
<td>yòu-èr-yuán</td>
<td>kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lèsè</td>
<td>làjī</td>
<td>garbage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zuòshì</td>
<td>gōngzhuò</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pǐnzhì</td>
<td>zhíliàng</td>
<td>quality of a product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhúfàn</td>
<td>zuòfàn</td>
<td>cook food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lǐyù</td>
<td>lǐjiē</td>
<td>understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nánshèng</td>
<td>nánde</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shūzhūn</td>
<td>shūpíng</td>
<td>standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Sociolinguistic Factors Associated with Taiwan Mandarin

3.3.1 Speakers of Taiwan Mandarin: Native Taiwanese vs. Mainlanders in Taiwan

Not all people from Taiwan speak the same form of Taiwan Mandarin. As mentioned above, Taiwan is a linguistically
heterogenous area, which deserves some discussion here.

Although the official language in Taiwan is Mandarin, the majority, about 80% of the Taiwanese population, speaks Taiwanese as the first dialect. They call themselves native Taiwanese, while referring to those who came to Taiwan in 1949 as "people from other provinces" (wàishēngrén).

The native Taiwanese always use Taiwanese when talking among themselves. Mandarin, learned as a second dialect, is the lingua franca when talking to those from other provinces. The Taiwanese-colored, or non-standard, features in their Mandarin are the result of imperfect learning and improper modeling.

On the other hand, those who moved to Taiwan from the Mainland and their off-spring still use their own original dialects, whether it be a variety of Mandarin or a Southern dialect. However, many of them, especially the second and younger generations, have also acquired Taiwanese, which can be used when necessary, for example, to show friendliness, or to serve other social or political purposes.

In Taiwan, those originally from the Mainland have been the political or economic elite for a long period of time. They have the power. Many possess high-level positions in the government and in the armed forces. When they came to Taiwan, they tended to move to the same area to live, for example, in an area in Taipei, or in a village near an air-force base or naval base. Because of this, it is possible for them to use
their non-Taiwanese tongue within the area, within the circle of people from the same area in Mainland, and also at home. The whole picture, therefore, depicts a complex diglossic situation, with Mandarin superseding Taiwanese for all of Taiwan as the lingua franca, and different dialects and varieties for speakers within groups and at home.

Such a complex linguistic situation would certainly have effects on the language used among Chinese Americans within American Chinese communities, where the majority of people are first generation immigrants from Taiwan. Therefore, it is wrong to claim that all people from Taiwan should, uniformly, speak Mandarin with Taiwanese color. Many Taiwanese people who originally came to the United States as students, especially those who came during the 60s, were second generation non-native Taiwanese. Their Mandarin ranges from varieties with no Taiwan Mandarin features to heavily Taiwan Mandarin.

With the development of the economy in Taiwan, the native Taiwanese who own land, have become wealthy quickly, due to the rapid rise of the real estate value there. When they immigrated to the United States, they brought over investments as well as the variety of Mandarin, which shows borrowing from Taiwanese.

Geographically, the newcomers, mostly native Taiwanese, prefer to go to areas with a large congregation of ethnic Chinese such as Los Angeles and New York to invest their
money. For this reason, there is a high concentration of Chinese speakers with strong Taiwanese-colored Mandarin in those areas. On the other hand, many non-native Taiwanese came to the United States to gain further education and later to find a job. Consequently, they now have spread throughout the country, where they have been employed in positions related to their field of study.

The varieties of Mandarin spoken by American Chinese from Taiwan is roughly schematized in Figure 3.2 (based on Li 1985:126). The middle and the right-hand boxes constitute two polarities of a scale into which the Mandarin of over 95% of new immigrants from Taiwan falls.

![Figure 3.2 Major varieties of Mandarin spoken by people from Taiwan.](image)

### 3.3.2 Mandarin Speakers' Awareness of Taiwan Mandarin

In a study investigating Mandarin speakers' awareness of features described in the literature as either Taiwan Mandarin or Beijing Mandarin (Chi 1989), I found that Mandarin speakers...
in an American Chinese community, who are from Beijing, other areas of the Mainland, and Taiwan, all are aware of most of the syntactic and morphological features and lexical items under study as either characteristic of Beijing Mandarin or of Taiwan Mandarin.

Given the fact that in both Taiwan and Mainland China, Beijing Mandarin is the most prestigious variety, and the fact that immigrants from Mainland China are fully aware of the specific differences in TM, a variety which would be less prestigious in the Mainland, the interesting question that arises is, why would many immigrants from Mainland China who reside in those American Chinese communities try to modify their language to sound more like Taiwan Mandarin, while some others would prefer not to follow the suit? The remainder of the thesis will try to answer this question.

Notes:

1. It is generally accepted in Chinese linguistics that Chinese does mark tenses, but aspects.

2. Yao used as an auxiliary verb to denote volition is also common in Southern Chinese dialects.

3. An A-not-A question is one that is formed by the rule of putting the affirmative and then the negative version of the sentence together with deletion of repeated material (see Li & Thompson 1981 for details).

4. This le is called Current Relevant State le by Li and Thompson, for further reference, see Li & Thompson, 1981.
5. This geographic separation also separates TM from the base dialect, namely, Beijing Mandarin, which has undergone tremendous change since then. Now with more and more interflow between the two sides of the Taiwan Straight, which has been witnessed during the past 5 years, the differences in lexicon are becoming minimized.

6. Many of my informants reminded me of this.
CHAPTER 4

Sociolinguistic Models for Analysis

4.0 Introduction

In the previous chapters, the history and present state of American Chinese communities were considered in conjunction with the sociolinguistic situation in these communities. Taiwan Mandarin, a Mandarin variety, has been discussed in detail and has been compared with Putonghua, Mainland China's version of the standard variety, both of which are found in the current American Chinese communities. It has been noted that in these linguistically dynamic American Chinese communities, language change has been observed among ethnic Chinese from Mainland China. What is needed is a theoretical framework which adequately accounts for the nature of such sociolinguistic phenomena. Various approaches to this issue will be considered in this chapter in order to provide background and to justify the sociolinguistic model of description adopted for the present study, namely, social network analysis.

4.1 Approaches to Sociolinguistic Studies

Sociolinguistics is the study of language in relation to society, or, the study of the various functions of language in society. Society here refers to any group of people who are drawn together for a certain purpose or purposes, while
language, or a language, refers to what the members of a particular society speak.

Sociolinguists believe that language and society are not independent from each other, because the definition of language includes in it a reference to society: speech is a kind of social behavior, which, in almost any society, can take many very different forms. The kind of grammar sociolinguists are trying to present can be constructed only when speech is investigated socially. This is not a universal, but a collective grammar. Language variation at the individual and societal level, therefore, is the very subject matter of sociolinguistics, and different approaches have been developed to resolve this issue.

4.1.1 Dialect Geography Studies

The study of social variation of language has its roots in nineteenth century dialect studies. Although both regional and social variations are the concern of sociolinguists today, an understanding of the various procedures developed in studies of social variation requires a look at previous work in regional dialectology. Actually it was in order to widen the limits and repair the flaws that were perceived to exist in the latter that investigators turned their attention to social class variation in language (Wardhaugh 1986:127).

The mapping of dialects on a regional basis has had a long history in linguistics (Chambers & Trudgill 1980; Francis
Traditionally, as a part of the study of how languages change over time, this area of study, known as "dialect geography", employs the assumptions and methods of diachronic linguistics: languages differentiate internally as speakers distance themselves from one another over time and space; the changes result in the creation of dialects of the languages. Over sufficient time the resulting dialects become new languages as speakers of the resulting varieties become unintelligible to one another. In such a model, any variation found in a language is related to the factors of time and space.

In dialect geography studies, "dialect atlases" are made to show the geographical boundaries of the distribution of a particular linguistic feature ("a linguistic variable"), by drawing a line on a map, which is called an "isogloss". This distribution of a linguistic feature is also related to the historical development of the language, both internally, i.e. linguistically, and externally, i.e. politically, socially, and culturally.

Dialect studies have focused almost exclusively on rural areas, because such areas are considered to be more "conservative", preserving "older" forms of the language. Their linguistic data are usually from a small sample, from one to five people, preferably elderly and untraveled. Interview questionnaires are administered and pronunciation and/or usage of particular words is recorded.
There are some serious limitations in such studies. They tend to ignore densely populated areas, especially large urban areas, because of the complexities of both sampling and data evaluation. Also, the selection of informants tends to be not very well controlled, often reflecting no more than the judgement of the person collecting the data toward whether a particular individual is "representative" of the area being sampled. While attempting to relate variation to settlement history, the dialect-atlas studies tend to ignore social class factors, as well as individual variation in addition to social variation, and the influence of large urban areas on other varieties of the language.

It is the issues raised by dialect studies, such as the kind of variation to account for in language, sampling the population where variation exists, the collection, analysis, and treatment of data, and implications for theoretical matters concerning the nature of language and language variation, that have paved the way for the rise of sociolinguistic studies, which require the development of an array of techniques quite different from those used in dialect studies (Wardhaugh 1986; Labov 1966; Weinreich, Labov & Herzog 1968).

4.1.2 Correlational Studies

Many of the techniques used in sociolinguistic studies today are derived from the pioneering work of William Labov,
who, along with other sociolinguists, attempted to identify how language varies in the community, and to draw conclusions from that variation not only for linguistic theory but for the conduct of everyday life as well, e.g. suggestions as to how educators should view linguistic variation, particularly in racially mixed settings.

Labov's early research (Labov 1963, 1966) is deeply rooted in the background provided by the dialectologists. Among these is Weinreich, whose approach to structural dialectology and to languages in contact (Weinreich 1953; Weinreich et al 1968) helped to shape Labov's ideas and is clearly mirrored in his earlier works. But Labov's work is all strongly slanted to the direct observation of linguistic change in the community, to working out its social mechanisms and isolating those social groups which are most directly responsible for introducing and spreading linguistic innovations (Labov 1972a; cf. Milroy 1987b).

The most important contribution of Labov's pioneering work is the development of the notion of the "linguistic variable", which is a linguistic item with identifiable variants, or, alternate realizations (Labov 1966). One important factor concerning the linguistic variable is that one speaker can produce it one way and another speaker a different way, or the same speaker can pronounce it differently on different occasions. What is interesting to sociolinguists is any relationship between these habits and
either the social class to which each speaker belongs or the social circumstances which bring about one pronunciation rather than the other (or both).

Labov (1972b) has also distinguished among "indicators", "markers" and "stereotypes". An indicator is a linguistic variable to which little or no social import is attached; only a linguistically trained observer is aware of indicators. A marker, however, does carry with it social significance. In fact, markers can be potent carriers of social information. People are aware of markers, and the distribution of markers is clearly related to social groupings and to styles of speaking. A stereotype is a popular and, therefore, conscious characterization of the speech of a particular group. In sociolinguistic works, linguistic variables which are markers tend to be focused on.

Once a linguistic variable has been identified, the next issue becomes that of collecting data concerning its variants in such a way that certain conclusions can be drawn about the social distribution of those variants. Data to be used are drawn from a random sample, which truly represents the speech of all the community studied. A range of speech styles (i.e. from least formal, or causal style, to most formal, or minimal pair style) is sampled since speakers vary their speech in accordance with the social situation in which they find themselves. When drawing conclusions about the social distribution of the linguistic variants, the sociolinguist
tries to relate the variants in some way to quantifiable factors in society, such as social class membership and sex.

Such an approach to the study of linguistic variants, i.e. first examining variants of linguistic variables and their distribution and then relating them to measurable social variables, has been called "correlational socio-linguistics" (Gumperz 1972, 1982a). In correlational studies (see also Trudgill 1974), the linguistic variable is a dependent variable, the one sociolinguists are interested in. The independent variable is some social factor that can be manipulated, e.g. social class, sex, age, ethnicity, and so on. What happens to language is closely related to such independent variables: if social factors change, what happens to language? Since correlational studies are statistical in nature, statistical techniques are followed, and reliability and objectivity are sought.

This approach provides the opportunity to study the interrelationship of variables at different levels of grammatical structure with the linguistic environment in which they occur and the social factors that constrain their use (Gumperz 1982a). What it actually tries to find is the general, highly abstracted patterning of language variation in a hierarchical society (Milroy 1987b). The approach has been claimed to give a better idea of the system as a whole. Although correlational studies have become the major theoretical approach in sociolinguistic studies, in recent
years they have come under increasing criticism. Romaine (1980) argued that the Labovian model illustrates only one way in which social and linguistic structure are interrelated in a particular urban community. Time would be wasted if one tries to account for "deviation" of individuals from group patterns when actually the problem is that one is dealing with different levels of abstraction in linguistic analysis. Certain levels of analysis may prove to be more telling in particular situations than others.

The early correlational sociolinguistics faces some inherent methodological problems associated with the theoretical claims. One of the most serious problems is "the observer's paradox" (Labov 1970). Basically this paradox refers to the effects of observation on linguistic behavior: the aim of linguistic research in the community is to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed, but these data can only be obtained by systematic observation (Gumperz 1971; Sankoff 1974; Wolfson 1976).

The paradox is embedded in the axioms found in sociolinguistic studies, which can be roughly summarized like this: every speaker shows stylistic change in accordance with the social context and topic; and this change ranges along a single dimension and can be measured by the amount of attention paid to speech. Sociolinguists are most interested in the vernacular -- the every day language of the speaker -- but the formal context in which quality data can be elicited
(usually through interview) for later comparison compels the speaker to pay the maximum amount of attention to his or her speech in which no vernacular can be expected (Labov 1972b).

Techniques have been designed to overcome the effects of the paradox, which include use of questions and topics that create strong emotions to divert speaker attention (Labov 1972b), use of intervals and breaks in the interview such that informants unconsciously assume that they are not at the time being interviewed, and use of self-selected peer groups (e.g. Labov 1972a; Cheshire 1982; Edwards 1986). However, as Milroy (1980) contends, despite all the efforts made to modify the approach, interviews are still interviews; the effects of a formal interview are always there.

Sampling is another constant source of problem in the correlational studies. In order to do such studies, representativeness in the data has to be achieved, which requires a random sample based on the entire population of the community. However, while a random sample enables quantification of correlation between linguistic and social variables, such a sampling method tends to exacerbate the central problem of the Observer's Paradox. Usually the population to be studied is sampled for isolated individuals, or households, who are then recorded out of social context. Since a single meeting with a stranger is not a particularly auspicious occasion on which to observe a large proportion of that speaker's linguistic repertoire, the data obtained are
often very sharply limited in their capacity to represent a wide range of speech styles (Milroy 1980).

Representativeness of the sample is further questioned by Romaine (1980), who points out that samples for sociolinguistic studies can never be random, but at the best, quasi-random. There are always problems associated with appropriate sample size, and substitution of vacancies left in the sample for various reasons. Furthermore, the spatial distribution of social groups is not necessarily coherent with the sample; distortions can be built in.

Some sociolinguists have questioned the abstract nature of social class as the social variable. DeCamp (1971) and Hudson (1980) suggest that although social status tends to be treated as a unitary concept, or a single hierarchy for each society, it is actually a loose term for a range of different, more or less independent hierarchical structures. Factors such as occupation and education ought to be recorded separately but allowed to interact with one another. Societies can hardly be allocated neatly into separate groups defined on the basis of social status. Since the different possible bases for defining the classes are likely to conflict, with each criterion in effect defining a different set of classes, it is unlikely that this is how societies are organized.

Romaine (1980) and Milroy (1987a) point out that status-based social variables are usually subjectively determined.
Since there are no clear-cut boundaries between groups, it is difficult to match the cut-off points for social class memberships and the relevant social groups.

Milroy (1987a) further points out that social class as it is used as a social variable is actually a proxy one which covers distinctions in life-style, attitude and belief, as well as differential access to wealth, power, and prestige. She argues that unless some attempt is made by sociolinguists to unpack the pertinent variables for which social class stands proxy, progress in formulating a satisfying explanation of the relationships between linguistic and social structure is likely to be slow.

While social status may be just one level of abstraction in linguistic analysis, the whole range of levels may include individual network relations, social grouping, speech community, and language as a whole. Therefore, some language varieties would be more amenable to an approach which starts with the individual and examines the patterning of social and linguistic structure within the confines of the individual's network (Romaine 1980). As Hudson (1980) has suggested, there is increasing evidence that the notion of discrete groups in society is generally less illuminating than the view that society is organized round a number of distinct focal points, each defining a separate norm for behavior, and attracting allegiance of varying degrees from members of the society.
4.1.3 Interactional Studies

Gumperz (1972) has noticed that studies of correlations between linguistic and social variables would not solve problems such as language maintenance and language shift, and language conflict between competing intergroup aspirations and inter-ethnic stereotypes, because there is hardly any correlation between the linguistic distinctness of relevant variables and the social information they carry. More importantly, if variable selection does communicate social information, mere description of linguistic variables cannot answer the questions of how and in what way this information is communicated, what speakers have to know to speak appropriately, and what gives rise to linguistic stigmatization and why stigmatized practices persist.

What is needed, therefore, is a more basic enquiry into the nature of communication processes, an enquiry which extends the notion of linguistic competence and the sociolinguistic rules which enable speakers to use and produce appropriate speech. This kind of study is referred to as "interactional sociolinguistics".

Gumperz (1982a) has discussed interactional sociolinguistics in terms of a more general account of the relationship between data and theory. He has argued that a sociolinguistic theory should account for communicative functions of linguistic variability and for its relations to speakers' goals without reference to untestable functionalist
assumptions about conformity or non-conformity to closed systems of norms.

An interactional study begins typically not by identifying variable elements in a linguistic system, but by looking directly at interactions between speakers. Using a post hoc interpretative method (sometimes asking the participants themselves for interpretations), Gumperz (1982b) examines the use to which speakers put the various available linguistic resources, and the inference which their conversational partners are able to draw from these "discourse strategies". Conversational code-switching is just one of these strategies. Unsatisfactory conversational exchanges, which are held to contribute to general problems of inter-ethnic conflict, are analyzed under such headings as different cultural assumptions underlying communicative acts, different ways of structuring information, and different ways of speaking.

Gumperz's focus is, therefore, on the speaker's use of linguistic resources, rather than on patterns in a postulated abstract linguistic system, which are then related to patterns in an equally abstract social system, as shown in Labov's models of sociolinguistic structure, despite their empirical basis. This orientation towards speakers rather than linguistic forms constitutes an attempt among sociolinguists to escape from the indirect relationship between theory and data (Milroy 1987a).
A similar approach to language and speech, which is in line with what Gumperz has proposed, is the ethnography of communication, as first designated by Dell Hymes (1964). Ethnography of communication is a particular anthropological approach to language and speech, which involves both theory and method (Baugh & Sherzer 1984:165). Like studies by Labov (1966) and Trudgill (1974), which have demonstrated regular and predictable statistical patterns in linguistic behavior considered irregular or in "free variation" by earlier linguists, the ethnography of communication is also concerned with discovering regularities in language use. However, the difference is that ethnographers are concerned with how communicative units are organized and how they pattern in a much broader sense of "way of speaking", as well as with how these patterns interrelate in a systematic way with and derive meaning from other aspects of culture (Saville-Troike 1982).

The aim of ethnography of communication is to elucidate the native point of view of an event, an institution, or an entire community or society. It deals with the cultural organization of language use, in terms of both underlying conceptions and shared understandings about the role of language in social and cultural life and the structuring of actual speaking practices. Methodologically, it combines several approaches, all aspects of the basic anthropological practice of participant observation in natural setting (Baugh & Sherzer 1984:165).
This approach believes speech, or communication, to be rule-governed. All societies, everywhere in the world, have rules about the way in which language should be used in social interaction. However, these rules may vary widely between one society and another. Speech difference arises just because every group has its own norms of linguistic behavior (Trudgill 1983).

Central to ethnography of communication has been a focus on the variety of speech events that are found in a community, and their analysis in cultural, social, and linguistic terms. An ethnography of communicative event is a description of all the factors that are relevant in understanding how that particular communicative speech event achieves. Various components of such a description have been discussed by Hymes (1962, 1964, 1972), which, as Wardhaugh (1986) has commented, are a very necessary reminder that talk is a complex activity, and that any particular bit of talk is actually a piece of "skilled work". Speakers must reveal a sensitivity to and awareness of these components and they must work to see that nothing goes wrong. Such knowledge, or "communicative competence", includes not only rules for communication (both linguistic and sociolinguistic) and shared rules for interaction, but also the cultural rules and knowledge that are the basis for the context and content of communicative events and interaction processes (Saville-Troike 1982).

What sociolinguists need to show, according to this
approach, is that there are social constraints on speech over and above those which are reflected in the linguistic items that people know (Hudson, 1980). Leaning on the work of Leach (1954), Barth (1966) and Goffman (1964), Blom and Gumperz (1972) have emphasized the importance of an understanding of social constraints and linguistic rules as parts of a single communicative system. Sociolinguists need to understand the general norms and values of the community before they interpret linguistic behavior. They need to understand the strong association of the local variety with localism and the disapproval shown towards locals.

Compared with correlational studies, the ethnography of communication model is more open-ended. The advantages are its greater inclusiveness, which puts language into perspective, and its focus on observation, which leaves open new avenues for the discovery of non-linguistic factors in linguistic variation.

However, this approach is still at its anecdotal state: what is not used in speech is more difficult to find than what is used (Trudgill, lecture-notes, 1987 LSA Summer Institute). It is nearly impossible to go beyond a superficial description, or beyond mere observation. The few existing ethnographies of communication are striking in their lack of details about all but a few of the components and functions. They also fail to specify the inter-relationships among the components and functions they describe.
Despite its weaknesses, the ethnography of communication approach has provided valuable insights for the later development of sociolinguistics. One such contribution has been contributed by the study by Blom and Gumperz (1972). This study has demonstrated that community interactional patterns cannot always be understood without a long period of observation to establish the general norms and values of the community, which may be quite different from more publicly accepted, institutionalized norms and values. Also, the situation in which specific codes are used is particularly important if the impulses behind their use are to be understood. Exact specification of which code is used by whom to whom may be quite as important as quantifying overall usage, as Labov does (Milroy 1980).

Moreover, this study call into question the notion of the speech community as formulated by Labov. Blom and Gumperz's detailed study of small group interactions reveals that residents of the same small town are segmented into groups -- or networks -- which do not in fact share the same linguistic norms. The social meaning carried by the dialect is different for each group. The choice of code is linked to an integrated system of local values and used to convey social meanings.

4.1.4 Speech Accommodation Theory

Speech accommodation theory, as first developed by Giles (1973), is another reaction against the Labovian
sociolinguistic studies, which are theoretically biased in favor of normative explanations.

Speech accommodation theory is a social psychological model to explain and predict inter-individual sociolinguistic behaviors and their effects. From the perspective of social psychology, speech accommodation refers to adjustments in one's speech during interpersonal communication. According to the theory, when speakers come to adopt various socio-psychological orientations vis-à-vis their interlocutors, and have particular motivations for talk and interactional goals, they will select from a range of sociolinguistic strategies, having attended to or anticipated their recipient's productive performance (Coupland et al 1988). This range of strategies mainly refers to speech convergence, speech divergence, and speech maintenance.

Speech convergence refers to individuals who adapt to each other's speech as they perceive it over a potentially very wide range of communicative features and levels, such as segmental phonology and other dialectal features, speech rates, pause and utterance length, and choice of language system (Coupland et al 1988). In other words, the processes can take place not only at the phonological level, but also at the grammatical and lexical level, and are part of a wider pattern of behavior modification under the influence of and in response to others (Trudgill 1986). Speech divergence, however, refers to the process by which speakers may
accentuate believed linguistic differences between themselves and others. Speech maintenance is an attempted strategy of non-convergence and non-divergence, which can signal significant interpersonal meaning.

The theory predicts that convergence strategies will be positively evaluated by receivers, provided they are perceived to be implementing psychological convergence, to be at an optimal sociolinguistic distance from the receiver's own speech patterns, and to adhere to prevailing sociolinguistic norms for the situation. Speech maintenance and divergence will trigger generally negative evaluations and responses, when receivers attribute the sender's motives as due to dissociative intent (Coupland et al 1988).

More specific accommodative forms can be indicated. In an interaction, convergence can be mutual and if mutual can result in style matching. Convergence can also be style switch (i.e. A → B; B → A), although it is less common, according to the theory. Furthermore, convergence can also refer to a speaker's attempt to move toward the other's manifest speech style, or to a speaker's attempt to move toward a style suggested by a belief, expectation, or stereotype regarding the other's style. Additionally, convergence and divergence can be partial or total. Finally, convergence and divergence can be unimodal and multimodal: a speaker can converge to one aspect of the other's speech, or he/she can converge at two or more levels (Giles et al 1986).
In discussing accommodation process, Trudgill (1986) suggests that accommodation follows a fixed route. As shown in Nordenstam's (1979, as cited in Trudgill 1986:24) study of accommodation by Swedish women living in Norway, accommodation begins first at the lexical level. Trudgill explains that this is because lexical differences are highly salient and readily apparent to all speakers of the varieties concerned. They are non-systematic and susceptible to being learned one at a time. More importantly, they can cause comprehension difficulties. Lexical accommodation is usually followed by morphological and phonological accommodation. There are also constraints and regularities which lead to such linguistic accommodation. However, as in child language acquisition and in second-language learning, plenty of room can be found for individual strategies (Trudgill 1986).

Speech accommodation theory is essentially an explanatory framework which is particularly directed as providing explanation for the interaction between speakers in terms of their feelings, values and motives. The central notion of the framework is that during interaction individuals are motivated to adjust their speech style as a strategy for gaining such goals: evoking listeners' social approval, attaining communicational efficiency between interactants, and maintaining positive social identities. In addition, it is the individual's perception of the other's speech that will determine his or her evaluative and communicative responses.
Speech accommodation theory, by looking at situational
norms, or, interactive norms, rather than at established, or
fixed, social or group norms, provides a more dynamic model
for sociolinguistic study. Traditional Labovian
sociolinguistic studies depend exclusively on societal norms
for an explanation of the linguistic variation found in speech
communities. However, social and group norms cannot always
explain the language variation observed. People's linguistic
behavior does not always conform to the social norms.
Individuals may also behave differently. Speech accommodation
theory, by examining individual motivation for convergence and
divergence from the socio-psychological perspective, allows
flexibility, and is thus able to explain problems that cannot
be solved according to fixed social norms.

Secondly, speech accommodation theory enables
sociolinguists to explain individual differences, especially
those differences observed among people who have fluid social
identities, i.e. people not clearly identified with certain
groups, or in groups with loosely defined boundaries. Such
people, who are peripherals and are usually not subject to
strong normative pressure within a certain group to which they
may claim to be affiliated, are able to shift speech styles
more freely than those who are strongly identified with a
certain social group.

Thirdly, while short-term accommodation can account for
speech shift in performance at one point in time, long-term accommodation, according to Trudgill (1986), can explain shifts that occur in languages and dialects over time.

Finally, the model provides a robust interpretive framework, which can be used not only for explaining variation in language use, but also in other areas such as second language acquisition, etc.

However, like many other models in social sciences, speech accommodation theory is not without its weaknesses. As an interpretive framework, the model provides mainly subjective interpretation rather than the basis for objective research. Thus, the results of the model are usually not subject to empirical testing. The plausibility of the model depends solely on the power of the "explanation", i.e. whether the researcher can convince the audience with the given interpretation of the data.

What is more important is that not all language variation is a matter of accommodation. As individuals are members of society, they constantly live under societal rules. It is hard to imagine that an individual can take particular psychological orientations during verbal interaction without conforming to social rules. Variation can also be caused, therefore, by conforming to norms, or by other reasons, which are contrasted with variation caused by accommodation. The accommodation model may work well with social groups in a community that enforce weaker in-group identities. For people
who carry strong social identities, accommodation will hardly take place, because these people tend to stick to their group norms, whether the norms go against those of the listener or not.

4.2 Social Network Analysis: A Dynamic Model

4.2.1 The Social Network Approach

It is the efforts made to overcome the weaknesses in the traditional Labovian correlational model by looking at other levels of linguistic abstraction, together with the insights provided by the interactional studies, that paved the way for the development of a new approach, namely, social network analysis, by Lesley Milroy, a British sociolinguist, in her study in Belfast, Northern Ireland (1976, 1980).

Borrowed from sociology, the notion of social network refers to informal on-going social relationships contracted by an individual, another way of viewing how an individual relates to other individuals in society, or how an individual interacts with other different individuals.

Individuals can have different density connections, either strongly or weakly linked to each other. Density here refers to the number of links that actually exist as a proportion of the maximum number of links that could possibly exist (Mitchell 1969). A network structure that has more connections between individual members are considered to be strongly connected, or tied, otherwise, they are loosely
connected.

Individuals can also be tied to each other in a variety of ways. A multiplex network structure is one in which an individual is tied to others in a variety of ways, e.g. through working together, playing together, and possibly even through intermarriage. On the other hand, a uniplex network is one in which people are related to others in only a single way.

Methodologically, the network model is intended to tackle the central problem of the observer's paradox. Milroy (1980) argues that the observer's paradox influences the range of a community's repertoire that a field sociolinguist can obtain. As a result, most knowledge is restricted to relatively "public" style, or variants of interview style, even though it is important for a variety of practical and theoretical reasons to obtain information about vernacular repertoire.

By employing the network concept in her study in Belfast, Milroy (1980) is able to find a new way to overcome the observer's paradox, which is radically different from the Labovian tradition. Access to the local speech repertoire is obtained by using the social networks of a community.

One method Milroy (1980) uses is that she creates a role for herself as a "friend of a friend". In this way, she manages to be passed on from one informant to another through networks, whose speech she studies, and is accepted as a friend who can "drop in" at certain houses at any time and use
her tape-recorder. Her presence and her tape-recorder, she argues, are unlikely to have any effect on the way in which people speak, which makes the formal interview techniques unnecessary.

She also tries to build up an "exchange" relationship gradually with a particular group of people. Such an exchange relationship defines that there must be some obligation on the part of informants to provide her with services. These obligations are contracted within an individual's network. If the individual wishes to preserve and protect social relationships, tokens of exchange and obligation must be honored (Milroy 1980).

As a field methodology, this model enables the field linguist to play two roles: he/she is an "outsider" during individual interviews, and he/she becomes an "insider" when he/she observes. These two roles allow the linguist access to a greater stylistic range than either can have, working alone. The styles which are observed in the field worker's role as an "insider" can be said to represent a reasonable, but comprehensive, sample of the community's linguistic repertoire. By using this model, it is possible to study genuinely casual speech, as used between friends, because the researcher's presence does not increase the formality of the situation, as usually observed in an interview (Hudson 1980).

This model opens new possibilities for the theoretical interpretation of sociolinguistic data. By becoming a friend
of the people one is investigating, one becomes part of a network of relations among them, and can use the structure of this network as social data to which speech may be related (Hudson 1980).

By taking the individual as the starting point of analysis, the sociolinguist is able to avoid the problem of defining group boundaries. Actually, the results of Milroy's study (1980) shows that a methodology based exclusively on social class membership would not be able to account for the fact that working class speakers do not all use some of the variables in the same way.

Thus, contrary to what one might expect from the findings of Labov and Trudgill, the social meanings conveyed by different linguistic variables were not uniform, even within one social class grouping. Categories based on social class thus do not provide the "explanation" of linguistic variation. Speakers appear to take hold of different variables and variants as markers of different social identities and use them in different ways to signal local identity and community loyalty (Romaine 1980).

4.2.2 The Normative Content of the Links in Networks

Milroy sees network analysis as approach designed to reflect the character of an individual's relationship in the informally constituted groups with which he or she is associated. It is a useful tool for the purpose of
characterizing how persons adapt their language according to the various groups to which they may be said to belong.

According to Gumperz (1982), individuals who interact mostly within closed networks (or within "close-knit" networks, in Milroy's terms) share a number of "communicative preferences" -- as opposed to categorical rules -- of a nonstandard kind. Members of closed networks characteristically have access to nonstandard linguistic repertoires. Gumperz makes the important point that personal network structure is influenced by a very large number of factors, such as education, occupation, individual ambition or general cohort. For this reason, speakers of a very similar social background, even from the same family, may show very different patterns of language use. Therefore, individual patterns of variation in language use can often be accounted for better in terms of network membership than in terms of a speaker's rating on conventional social scales which measure his position hierarchically in relation to the rest of society (Gumperz, 1982).

The major finding of Milroy's study (1980) points to this fact: when variables of age, sex, and social class are held constant, the closer an individual's network ties are with his or her local community, the closer his language approximates localized vernacular norms. This finding is further validated by statistical techniques. The high correlation between vernacular and network structure shown by statistical analysis
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demonstrates that the relationship is more than accidental: it is systematic.

One important explanation given to such relationship is the function of a close-knit network as a norm enforcement mechanism — a point originally argued by Bott (1971) and is now widely accepted by sociologists and anthropologists.

In communities with close-knit social networks where personal ties among members tend to be strong and concentrated in particular groups, language tends to be focused. This is because clusters of strong ties act as a norm enforcement mechanism and give rise to local cohesion, which forces the use of the vernacular. Thus, a close-knit network structure is an important mechanism of language maintenance, in that speakers are able to form a cohesive group, or a conservative force, capable of resisting pressure, linguistic and social, from outside the group (Milroy 1980). The close-knit networks as a norm enforcement mechanism is illustrated in figure 4.1:

![Figure 4.1 The social function of close-knit networks](adapted from Bortoni-Ricardo, 1985:81)

According to Milroy (1982), it is not a new notion to suggest the relationship between group structure and the emergence of a linguistic norm. Le Page (1979) has suggested
that the emergence of a close-knit group, a sense of solidarity, and a feeling of shared territory are all conditions favoring linguistic focusing.

Milroy (1987b) suggests that one important corollary to the link between language maintenance and a close-knit, territorially-based network structure is that linguistic change will be associated with a break-up of such a structure. If the individual's network structure becomes less close-knit, it follows that he or she will be robbed of an important mechanism of nonstandard norm maintenance; he or she will also be free of constant supervision and control. His or her speech may then be more liable to influence from a publicly legitimized norm disseminated through institutional channels. Such change of speech is commonly observed when geographical and social movement is involved.

When strong ties are recognized as playing an important role in language maintenance, sociolinguists have also noticed the role weak ties play. In a suggestive paper, Granovetter (1973) points out that weak and uniplex ties are important channels through which innovation and influence flow from one close-knit network to another, linking such groups to the wider society. This is because such ties are more likely to link members of different small groups than strong ones. In close-knit networks, when extensive overlap is expected to increase in proportion to its strength, it will inhibit the flow of new information coming in.
Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) have suggested a distinction between innovators and early adopters of an innovation. Innovators are marginal to the group adopting the innovation; but the early adopters are central members of the group who often provide a model for other non-innovative members of the group. Only after its adoption by these central figures is an innovation disseminated.

Following Rogers and Shoemaker, Milroy and Milroy (1985) have further proposed two prerequisites for actual diffusion of innovations by marginal innovators: an innovation needs to be evaluated positively either overtly or covertly, and the links through which it is transmitted need to be numerous. Thus, when persons central to the network find direct innovation a risky business, adopting one which is already wide-spread on the edges of the group is much less risky.

When comparing Labov's status-based model and her own solidarity-based model, Milroy (1987b) argues that they are not contradictory. A small-scale network-based analysis of language variability can yield some insights into the nature of the social mechanisms that give rise to stratification of language by age, sex, and social status. The disappearance of multiplex ties in small communities is associated with the emergence of a clear social class system (Mewett 1982). Loose ties function to link small, cohesive groups to a wider stratified society (Granovetter 1973).

One reason for a language/network link is that a highly
focused set of vernacular norms is able to symbolize solidarity and loyalty to a set a values of a non-standard kind; another reason is the capacity of a close-knit network to exercise control over its members so as to ensure that they maintain this set of norms in a highly focused form. However, the important influence of this solidarity factor on patterns of language use should not be taken to play down the importance of the more obvious influence of upward mobility on the language use which generally underlies larger-scale surveys (Milroy 1987b).

A tension between status-based and solidarity-based influences on the social behavior of individuals is frequently observed. Since strong-knit networks are usually found in localized lower-status groups, some speakers choose to turn their backs on the upwardly mobile society outside their own close-knit community: for them solidarity wins out and they remain close to the vernacular culture. Others choose to seek upward mobility actively. However, it should be noted that upward mobility is not the only factor that gives rise to a loose-knit network structure: forced re-location, lack of kin and absence of local employment opportunities may all contribute. Whatever the reason, a low level of integration into the network is likely to be marked linguistically by relative distance from the vernacular (Milroy 1987b). Milroy is not the only sociolinguist who finds and studies the relationship between a speaker's social network and his/her
language use, although she approaches such a relationship quite differently from others.

4.2.3 Other Network Studies

Labov's study of adolescent peer group structure in Harlem (Labov et al 1968) demonstrated a relationship between language use and closeness of integration into the vernacular culture, which is parallel to Milroy's finding. A speaker's language is closely connected with his place in the peer group network structure, with the core members of the group using the zero copula the most.

Although there are a lot of similarities between the Harlem peer group study and the Belfast study, both in the underlying hypothesis and in the general conclusions, Labov did not use the network concept as shown in Milroy's study, and his procedures differ. Labov examined relationships within a bounded group; while the essence of the network approach is that it examines individual relationships without necessarily postulating group membership of any kind. Labov's analytic method depends on a division of speakers into groups of core, secondary, and peripheral members, and lames. The position of these categories in the group structure is then correlated with aggregated linguistic scores. Again, the network concept offers a set of procedures essentially for the analysis of individual behavior (Milroy 1987b).

Gal's (1979) study of Hungarian/German bilingualism in
the town of Oberwart near the Austrian border also demonstrates a relation between network structure and language use. Oberwart has been an agricultural community for centuries, but has recently been subject to economic changes which give the residents opportunities to work in industries outside the area. An opposition of peasant/worker values is symbolized by the two languages, with Hungarian representing peasant values and German representing worker values. Gal has found that a long-established network of the traditional type is associated with a nonstandard repertoire (monolingualism is the preferred norm in Austria), and that the variable of network structure is a better predictor of patterns of variability at the level of individual speaker than is the variable of the speaker's own social status.

Compared with Milroy's approach, however, Gal used a different set of measures for network structures, which is much simpler than Milroy's: what Gal was concerned with was the "peasantness" of the individual's network, specified by the percentage of contacts within a given time of persons who owned animals.

Gumperz is another sociolinguist, besides Milroy, who refers explicitly to the network concept a great deal in his work (1972, 1982). However, as shown in the Hemnes, Norway study (Blom & Gumperz 1972), he does not use the concept quantitatively, as Milroy does. Milroy's approach would involve specifying speaker A's network as being denser than
speaker B's, and less dense than speaker C's. But Gumperz makes a dichotomous distinction between "open" and "closed" network types without necessary reference to the varying structure of personal networks. The close type corresponds to Milroy's dense, multiplex personal network structures, while the open type is relatively spare and uniplex, and is characteristic of geographically and socially mobile individuals.

Despite existing methodological differences in the studies of relationship between language and social network structures, the usefulness of such an approach is recognized. As Milroy (1987b) has pointed out, although the network concept may be of assistance in designing an explicitly principled method of fieldwork, its major contribution is to the analysis of the manner in which individuals utilize the resources of linguistic variability available to them.

4.2.4 Strength and Weakness of the Network Approach

When summarizing methodological advantages of the network concept, Milroy (1987b) suggests that the network concept provides a useful means of studying relatively small, self-contained groups in more detail than is possible within a large-scale survey framework. It provides a means of approaching an analysis where the concept of social class is difficult to apply; this is a problem commonly encountered by researchers studying minority ethnic groups, migrants, rural
populations or populations in non-industrialized societies. Network analysis also offers a procedure for dealing with variation between speakers at the level of the individual rather than the group.

However, there are also limitations to network analysis as a sociolinguistic research tool, principally as a basis for a representative account of patterns of language ability. This is a quite paradoxical problem. Network analysis is basically a kind of correlational sociolinguistic study, although it has adopted data-collecting methods found in typical interactional studies: the ethnographic methods. While detailed observation provides quality data of vernacular language, such data lose the representativeness required by correlational studies. Correlational studies require a random sample for statistical analysis, which the network model can hardly obtain, because contacts among informants are through network chains, through self-introduction as a "friend of a friend", which limits random access to representative data and informants -- it is impossible to observe every member of the community.

Another weakness of the network model is associated with the labelling of a network connection. Although "weak" and "strong" ties in network analysis are usually treated as if they are discrete, the strength of ties is really a continuous variable, rather than categorical. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to label a person as a weak tie, or as
marginal to the group, as far as degree of attachment is concerned. In other words, since network analyses are done with a quantitative methodology, how weak a tie should be labelled as a "weak" tie would be difficult to determine. This problem could further obscure the innovator/early adopter distinction.

4.2.5 Social Network and Speech Accommodation

As discussed in Section 4.1.4, speech accommodation theory provides a model of sociolinguistic identity-marking which predicts specific linguistic tendencies in defined social-psychological contexts (Coupland 1988:146). Figure 4.1 shows such a model of situation types, derived and adapted from Giles and Ryan (1982:220) by Coupland (1988:147). It depicts that linguistic features can be selected by individuals to mark many different dimensions of identity so that there may be complementary or competing interpretations for the choice of any features or co-occurring set of features (Coupland 1988:146).

However, as a model based on social psychology for face-to-face interaction, accommodation theory is concerned with interpersonal accommodation strategies decided basically by interactive norms rather than societal norms, the latter being extremely important if explanation of sociolinguistic patterning of a specific group is concerned.
### Status-stressing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salient Variables</th>
<th>Marked: Competence</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Salient Variables | Marked: Status | Power | Prestige | Social Class | Advantage | Superiority |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person-centered</th>
<th>Group-centered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salient Variables</th>
<th>Marked: Benevolence</th>
<th>likableness</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Similarity of personal attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Salient Variables | Marked: In-group solidarity | Language loyalty | Belief similarity | Ethnic pride | Family pride |

### Solidarity-stressing

**Figure 4.2: A model of situation-types predicting linguistic selection (Coupland, 1988:147).**

Considering this, I would argue that the model can be best used only in conjunction with the social network model (Milroy 1980). The social network model provides a way to determine an individual's social relationship with other people with whom he or she associates, to see whether this person has contracted a close-knit network or a fairly loose one. Once such social information is determined, the effects of speech accommodation can be best understood. In other words, the two models are in a complementary relationship. The social network theory is concerned with social factors in connection with language variation. It can best exhibit the correlation between a close-knit network cluster and linguistic focusing within the cluster. While linguistic
diffusion is observed correlated with loose-knit networks, and with those speakers who are loosely tied to groups, no convincing explanation can be provided by the network model. It is here that speech accommodation theory can play an important role, because only such loosely associated speakers are able to choose strategies in communicating with others.

4.3 Social Network Analysis: Its Application in an American Chinese Community

Just as the Labovian methodology presupposes that the stratification of the society as a whole is significant, the network model postulates that the kinds and density of relationship that an individual has within primary groups is significant for linguistic variability. However, the network model has universal application: stratification applies to only one type of society, but every one lives within a social network irrespective of the type of larger society. By using networks, the researcher can get a picture of the individual within the local community.

Different kinds of networks both make up and are affected by the social conditions in the community. And language variation can be observed in the actual patterns of relationships where the vernacular emerges and is used. In principle, social networks could be studied in any social strata. Thus, it should be possible to apply the model in ethnic minority community studies (Milroy 1987a). However,
although major studies have been undertaken in the working-class vernacular, found in close-knit networks, relatively fewer systematic analyses have been conducted in ethnic minority communities with this solidarity-based model. Even less has been done in urban American Chinese communities.

Some aspects of linguistic phenomena in current urban American Chinese communities present a unique situation for sociolinguistic study. In these communities, where people cannot easily be pigeon-holed into groups according to their social class, many newly-arrived members are confronted with norms that are contradictory to their original ones as the result of social and geographical movement. Obviously, linguistic adjustment takes place.

The study done by Bortoni-Ricardo (1985) on the linguistic adjustment of rural migrants to Brazlândia, Brazil provides some interesting data for looking at such a problem. Instead of positing a linguistic movement by the migrants in the direction of an urban standardized norm of the kind familiar in studies using the social class variable, she takes as a starting point the group's own linguistic norms and examines the extent to which speakers have moved away from their stigmatized Caipira dialect.

Bortoni-Ricardo hypothesizes that social structure associated with the change from rural to urban life involves a move from an insulated network consisting largely of kinfolk and neighbors to an integrated urban network where the links
will be less multiplex and associated with a wide range of social contexts. Linguistically, the process involves dialect diffuseness -- a movement away from the norms of the Caipira dialect.

Two separate network indices are used to measure the changing social relationships: the integration index and the urbanization index, which extend the application of the network variable beyond an analysis of small, close-knit groups, to consider the extent to which individuals have detached themselves from such groups.

Bortoni-Ricardo's study is one of the few that employ network analysis to study language in loose-knit networks. The language change involved is the result of loosening close-tie connections because of migration from relatively close-knit rural networks to newly-formed, loose-knit urban networks. The degree of language change is positively correlated with detachment from the rural networks demonstrated by the network indexes. It is an innovative use of network theory.

Essentially, Bortoni-Ricardo's study has explored how language change takes place as a result of social and geographical movement. In other words, as people move away from close-knit networks, the cohesive force exercised by such structures is lifted. Therefore, such people are more exposed, and therefore more vulnerable, to societal norms. Their language, as a result of pressure from such societal
norms, moves away from the Caipira forms which can be prestigious in the rural speech communities but become "stigmatized" in Brazlândia, and towards the socially more "accepted" forms.

The innovative use of network theory in Bortoni-Ricardo's study provides some insights for the study of American Chinese communities. The situation in many urban American Chinese communities shares some similarities: language change takes place as a result of social and geographical movement, as observed on the part of people from Mainland China. However, the direction of the change is the opposite: their language tends to move away from the socially more "accepted" to the locally defined more prestigious Taiwan Mandarin forms. Instead of migrating from close-knit rural networks to newly-formed, loose-knit urban networks, these Chinese have moved into communities with established close-knit network clusters with different norms.

Then, what is the significance of studying an ethnic minority community using the network model?

As a theoretical framework, the network model provides a promising way to study language variation. In this model, Milroy has drawn strength from both Labovian correlational studies and from the interactional, or ethnographic model represented by Gumperz and Hymes' studies; at the same time, she is able to overcome the weaknesses found in both correlational and interactional studies. While statistical
evidence provides the general patterning of language variation at the communal level, the method of participant-observation yields detailed information about the social values associated with different linguistic forms, and differences in language use at the personal level.

As a variable, network structure is more applicable than social class when ethnicity is involved. In a correlational sociolinguistic study, it is important to handle variables properly. However, the notion of social class is highly abstract and difficult to handle in application, especially in studying minority ethnic groups. With the large number of first generation immigrants with different backgrounds, the urban Chinese communities present even more problems for a status-based model. The network model, therefore, provides a means of approaching an analysis (Milroy 1987a).

The study of American Chinese communities whose network structures are unique to such communities are an interesting area for research. In an American Chinese community, there are numerous network clusters, many with different norms. In addition, as an ethnic minority community, it faces the same problem found in other ethnic communities, namely, how to adjust itself to the mainstream society. Only an individual based model is able to deal with the issue.

The network model is also an effective way to solve methodological problems caused by the observer's paradox. In linguistically dynamic American Chinese communities, such
problems are greatly increased, because the act of linguistic choice is more visible (cf. Milroy 1987a). Speakers have a consciousness of two or more named components in their repertoires which may be either structurally indistinguishable (e.g. Standard Mandarin and Taiwan Mandarin), or quite different typologically (e.g. Chinese and English). But each code could be associated with different sets of social values (e.g. local norm and ethnicity). The detailed ethnographic observation employed by the network model enables the researcher to obtain access to a larger range of linguistic repertoire of the speakers, and to find the values associated with choice of linguistic codes.

As Milroy (1987a) has noticed, to obtain quality data, a fieldworker acceptable to an ethnic minority community needs to be selected carefully for a range of characteristics such as religion, geographical prominence, or political affiliation, all of which are associated with a distinctive ethnicity. Since I am Chinese and a native speaker of Mandarin, I am in a good position for using a participant-observation based model to study language variation in a Chinese bilingual community. It would be easier for me to be accepted by the community and to play the role of an insider than it would be for many others, whose ethnicity and language ability would prevent them from obtaining quality data.

Because of the advantages discussed above, it is considered theoretically sound and methodologically applicable
to use the network model for studying language variation in an American Chinese community.

Notes:

1. Although code-switching between Chinese and English would also be an interesting topic for research in bilingual American Chinese communities, it is a different level of analysis and will not be touched here.
5.0 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the process of integration on the part of Mainland Chinese immigrants into the local American Chinese community and its accompanying linguistic consequences. In the first section, the urban American Chinese community in the larger Los Angeles area will be characterized briefly. In the second section, different kinds of network clustering in this community will be assessed in relation to the patterns of integration of Mainland Chinese into the community. In the third section, the process of differential degrees of dialect accommodation towards Taiwan Mandarin will be addressed. The non-linguistic data provided here are particularly relevant to an understanding of the links between a speaker's language use and the structure of that speaker's informal social relationships.

5.1 The American Chinese Community in Los Angeles Areas

Whenever a new immigrant living in Los Angeles, or someone who is visiting, is invited to dine in a restaurant in or near Monterey Park, he, or she, would naturally ask the same question, how many Chinese there are in the area. Like American Chinese communities in other major cities in the United States, the Chinese community in Los Angeles and nearby
areas has been growing at a very fast pace in the past ten years.

Since the official results of the 1990 Census are not yet out, there is no accurate demographic data available for ethnic Chinese living in the area. However, according to unofficial statistics provided by the Chinese organizations there (Anonymous 1991:72), the total number of ethnic Chinese living in Southern California should be between 600,000 to 700,000, with about 40% (about 250,000) living in Monterey Park and the San Gabriel Valley to the east of Los Angeles City, about 15% (around 100,000) living in the area to the south of Los Angeles City and in Orange county, about 10% (50,000) living in the area to the north and in San Fernando Valley, about 5% (30,000) living in the South Bay area, Torrance, and Santa Monica. Therefore, if we exclude those living in San Diego (about 60,000) and other areas farther away from Los Angeles, there are about 430,000 ethnic Chinese living in an area within 30 or 40 minutes drive from Los Angeles City in all directions.¹

According to the 1980 Census data, however, there were only 93,447 ethnic Chinese living in Los Angeles County and only 14,210 Chinese living in Orange County.² Of those living in Los Angeles County, 44,353 people were living in Los Angeles City, most of whom, probably, aggregated inside the boundaries of Chinatown. Compared with the estimate supplied above, the ethnic Chinese population has increased by nearly
four times in ten years in this area, mainly attributed to immigration from Taiwan, but also to those from Hong Kong, and from Mainland China. Although there are no records available, the last of these has gradually become one important source over the last ten years. Almost all the new immigrants live outside the inner-city Chinatown.

Such a large aggregation of ethnic Chinese population over a fairly large area is quite unique in the United States, perhaps with the only exceptions found in the San Francisco /San Jose and New York/New Jersey areas. Different from old Chinatowns, there are hardly any physical boundaries that divide the Chinese from other ethnic groups. Actually, it is impossible to establish such boundaries. The most densely concentrated Chinese population in this area is found in Monterey Park and part of Alhambra, where over half of the total population is Chinese. However, in the remaining part of the area, the Chinese population becomes more dispersed, but with the tendency to increase and densify. Therefore the whole Chinese community is still expanding further east. This Chinese community is well interwoven into the local communities that had been there long before the Chinese arrived. There Chinese live, work and do business side by side with Whites and Hispanics. It is quite common for Chinese to become the majority. In some schools in Arcadia, for example, Chinese comprise 90% of the student population, in which 70% are from Taiwan and have just immigrated to the
United States. In sum, the American Chinese community in the Los Angeles areas can be depicted as having some focal points with the rest extending in all directions, well interwoven into other communities.

It is those focal points of in the community that play an important role in maintaining the Chinese culture and the language. The more towards the center one goes, the more Chinese the whole environment becomes. Chinese culture and tradition is well-preserved there.

With the sharp increase of Chinese population in the area, numerous businesses and large investments have been brought in from Taiwan and Hong Kong. Businesses owned by Chinese range from banking and real estate to import/export and whole-sale/retail, from supermarkets and restaurants to laundries and barber shops. There are so many business signs written in Chinese that many local governments have to establish new laws to regulate and constrain them. The flourishing business in the Chinese community has provided an abundance of employment opportunities for the community.

In many Chinese communities found in smaller urban areas, such as Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and Albany, New York, the population can clearly be classified into a few middle-class groups, such as university professors, engineers, government employees, and restaurant owners (Chi 1988, 1989). This is because most of them settled there following the same pattern: they received advanced education in the United States and then
found their job in those cities.

However, it is hard to find a similar grouping of Chinese population in Los Angeles. Although one frequently meets people who are American-trained engineers and professors, those who came through the sponsorship of relatives far more exceed those so-called student immigrants. Those relative-sponsored immigrants all vary in their original occupation and education, and the present jobs they have. It is hard to label them in terms of social classes. The social class index, which is usually determined by such indicators as occupation (as in Macaulay 1978), education (as in Jahangiri & Hudson 1982), and the two with income (as in Labov 1966), can hardly reflect a person's social status in this community. There is usually no relationship between occupation, education, and income. It is common for a restaurant waiter to own a couple of $200,000 houses (cf. Trudgill 1974) but for a university professor from Mainland China to work as a plumber in a small motel. With people from Mainland China, this is especially true. With much less access to financial resources, Mainland Chinese can usually only seek employment which is usually much below their education and training. On the other hand, many from Taiwan, having been here longer and also having benefited from the economic boom in Taiwan, usually become small entrepreneurs who may not have received education beyond high-school.

Moreover, one important component of the community is
students from Mainland China and Taiwan pursuing graduate studies in the United States. They live, work and go to school in the area. They are active members of the community. It is difficult to put them into a status-based group according to the kind of jobs they presently have.

Such a community, therefore, can be characterized as heterogeneous and lacking clear boundaries, which would present a problem to Labovian correlation studies. In the Labovian model, the community has to be defined as well as the social economic status. A speech community is usually defined as any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of a shared body of verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language use (Gumperz 1968). However, a speech community does not necessarily consist of a group of speakers who share one set of norms and rules for the use of language. Very often language variation is not uni-directional, but multi-directional and multilevel (Romaine 1982). Therefore, different claims will be true of differently delimited communities. Moreover, the concept of speech community implies concrete groups and any given person either is a member of a particular one or is not (Hudson 1980:30). As observed in the Los Angeles Chinese community, it would be methodologically difficult to place people into groups.

The problem of defining the speech community is bypassed here by using the network model, which represents a level of
abstraction below the speech community, because the model starts from individuals, not groups. Therefore, no group boundaries are necessary.

5.2 Social Network Patterns in the Community

An individual's social network is simply the sum of informal social relationships which he or she has contracted with others. The precise determinants of the kinds of network relations will vary from community to community. In Gal's study of Austrian-Hungarian bilinguals, for example, degrees of peasantness proved to be crucial; in W. Edwards' study (1984) of urban and rural communities in Guyana, however, vernacular urban culture was marked by frequenting rum shops and street dancing, and vernacular rural culture was associated with attendance at certain festivities, rustic dress and Afro-Guyana cuisine. Therefore, close ethnographic observation is necessary to enable the analyst to identify the important factors for a given community.

Network studies reveal that close-knit network clusters are usually associated with territorial boundaries. However, networks found in the Los Angeles Chinese community are not necessarily territorially bound, but they can still be very close-knit. Unlike those working class communities with closed territorial boundaries, the Los Angeles Chinese community is relatively open and extended with some focal points. A person's ties can be ten miles away from where he
or she lives, and different people are always tied with the focal points of the community in one way or another. Therefore, in such a community, other factors in addition to those found in previous network studies have turned out to be important in determining the interpersonal relationships.

Employment proves to be a very important characteristic of the network structure in the community. Since numerous businesses are owned by Chinese, the preferred pattern is that employees are also Chinese, so that the communication barrier can be reduced to a minimum between the management and the employees. Therefore, usually, in a Chinese company the majority (if not all) of the employees are Chinese, no matter whether they are from Taiwan, Mainland, or from Malaysia and Indonesia. Many Chinese companies have six-day working weeks and a longer working day, so employees are together with each other more than with any other people. In this environment, it is quite natural that only Chinese is spoken, unless one has to speak English when dealing with somebody from outside. People brought together in this way by work usually contract a close-knit network cluster, which often extends outside of work. They become close friends and spend much time together when not working. Many Mainland Chinese have started their personal networks through fellow-workers and colleagues at work, who are usually the first ones they become acquainted with and by whom they are introduced to others.

Another important factor in determining social networks
is place of residence and a sense of attachment or belonging to the Chinese community. As mentioned before, the Chinese community in the Los Angeles area has some focal points where Chinese is the overwhelming majority. Monterey Park serves as the best example. Chinese people living in or nearby these sections tend to contract denser ties within the community than outside the community. However, many Chinese living further away from these focal areas of the community travel to these areas for social interactions and gatherings, because they have a sense of belonging, just like the Hammer people described in Milroy (1980). Others come to these areas on a regular basis to do grocery shopping, to dine, to buy traditional Chinese daily necessities. Many simply come to visit friends and relatives. Chinese who frequent these focal areas are also strongly tied to the community.

On the other hand, since the Chinese population is increasing rapidly in areas further away from those focal points, it is now also easier to find neighbors who are Chinese, to eat in a Chinese restaurant, and to shop in a Chinese supermarket in the same neighborhood. Clusters of close-knit networks can also be found away from those community focal areas.

One important social function of the Chinese community is to provide public service for its members. Many Christian churches and missions have been established and undertaken by and for the Chinese, and Sunday schools and Bible studies have
also been sponsored. These religious institutions provide a basis for close-knit networks. It is found that Chinese who regularly attend a particular church have a strong sense of attachment and usually feel that they share more with people attending the same church. Since the church they attend is for Chinese, people they associate with are also Chinese. One important change among Mainland Chinese is, very interestingly, that many of them have become Christian. Those who were Christians before they came to the United States, become even more faithful. Church becomes an important part of their life.

In addition to church, Chinese language schools and other various kinds of extra-curricular schools, such as Chinese art schools, dance schools, have been set up which play an important role in the community network structures. Although many such schools are for children, usually adults are also deeply involved. Chinese, no matter whether they are from Taiwan or from Mainland, always believe that education is crucial for one's future career. In addition, these extra-curricular schools are also considered important means of transmitting cultural heritage to the younger generation. Therefore, parents' support and involvement are indispensable for the success of the school programs. Such school programs bring parents together, who become a cluster of network.

Other social activities, such as holiday celebrations, various organizations such as special interest groups,
associations based on friendship and on business, various kinds of parties, and even night clubs, all provide Chinese people in the community with opportunities to initiate social network ties with others. Some can become very close-knit clusters over time.

Kinship always seems to play a role in network structures. Gal (1979), Milroy (1980), and numerous others have shown that close-knit networks in their study groups tend to have a strong kin basis. People are certainly close to their kin. This is also the case in the Los Angeles Chinese community. Traditionally Chinese take kinship seriously. In addition to that, a large number of immigrants came under the sponsorship of their kinsmen. A lot of Mainland students came also because their relatives had sponsored them. When they came, they also preferred to live near their relatives. It is not difficult to understand why they are closely related to each other.

The last kind of network cluster, perhaps the most important, is the interpersonal relationship based on friendship or voluntary association. Friends, whether made at work, at social gathering, or through other friends, are always tied together much more closely than others. To keep such ties, much time is committed to being together, and certainly one is able to influence another more within the circle. Making friends is usually the result of mutual appreciation, but often it can be instrumental, especially
when one wants to get into a certain cohesive group. Some Mainland Chinese only make friends among people from Taiwan, while others have no intention of making any friends from Taiwan at all.

In any communities where close-knit networks are found, there are also marginals. By marginals, I mean those who are not closely attached to a group, or who have only "weak ties", in Granovetter's terms (Granovetter 1973, 1982; Milroy 1985), in the community. According to Milroy (1980), when a person changes his or her job, this person not only moves from one network of ties to another, but become relatively marginal to any given cohesive group as a result of less time commitment given to it. In the case of immigrants from Mainland China, when they immigrated to the United States and settled in the Chinese community, they moved away from their network ties back in China, and they became marginal relative to the cohesive groups already existing in their new environment. Over time, many of them have built up ties with given cohesive groups, and have become accepted by those groups and established close ties with a given group. At the same time, others decide not to associate themselves too closely to those given groups. They remain as marginals relative to the network clusters in the Chinese community. Still others from Mainland China may even build close ties with those also from the Mainland like themselves, while remaining marginal to the local network clusters. Some Chinese also prefer to build up
their connections only with English speaking Whites, considering it wise "when in Rome, to do as the Romans do". Therefore, the marginals in the Chinese community can be the result of lack of time commitment caused by a relatively shorter stay after immigration, or by an intentional distance kept from the community, which is an outcome of the individual's "social decisions", in the terms of Foster and Seidman (1989:52).

The network structures in the Los Angeles Chinese community thus present a picture in which the community as a whole forms a large social network with portions or clusters of it being close-knit. These close-knit network clusters are interaction-based and project close social relations. Depending upon each individual's decision, integration on the part of recent immigrants from Mainland China into this community varies from person to person. While many of them become active members in the tight, interacting groups, others just shun any involvement by being a marginal.

5.3 Degree of Integration and Dialect Accommodation

The discussion of marginals in the last section points to a logical consequence: if the kind of network a person contracts determines the degree of this person's integration into the local community, then, this differential integration will in turn have an impact on the language a person speaks. As Milroy (1980, 1982) has noticed in her study,
linguistic focusing is strongly correlated with social network strength. The language variety spoken by members of a close-knit network is comparatively more focused than that spoken in a network whose ties are weak. The explanation for this is that clusters of strong ties act as a norm enforcement mechanism and give rise to local cohesion, which forces the use of the vernacular (Bott 1971).

Thus, those close-knit network clusters found in the Los Angeles Chinese community, as described in the previous section, do not only ensure the use of Chinese among its members, as against the use of English, but the variety of the language as well. In the community, it is not Cantonese, and not standard Mandarin, but TM which is the norm. People from Hong Kong who normally speak Catonese have to learn this totally new dialect. However, those from Mainland China, who already speak this dialect, are confronted with another problem, the problem of accommodating their language to this particular variety. Pressure comes from the other members of the group to ensure the process. Therefore, those Mainland Chinese who have integrated themselves well into the community and have built around themselves close-knit networks with TM speaking Taiwanese tend to change more in the way they speak as a result of the process of accommodation, to sound more like TM. Those Mainland Chinese who have not integrated themselves with the local community make ties more loosely with other people in the community, who are usually TM
speaking, and their way of speaking changes much less. The following passages and accounts will provide interesting illustrations of this observation.

When an informant from Beijing, who had been living in the community for eight years, was commenting on the change in the way she spoke Mandarin, she pointed out that she had been surrounded by Taiwanese for many years. The people she interacted with, at work, at church, and even at home (roommates), were all Taiwanese. Only recently did she make some Mainland friends. She attributed the sharp change in her language to this.

Her point of view is shared by another informant, who had worked with and for Taiwanese people for a period of time. She found:

Wǒ gāng lái de shíhòu shì gěi Táiwān rén zuòshì, zhuǎnmén jiēchū Táiwān rén. Houlái ... wǒ péngdao yíhuǒ Táiwān rén ... tāmen shuō "nǐ jiāng de Pǔtōnghuà gēnběn jiù xiàng Táiwān de Guóyǔ".

'When I first arrived, I worked for Taiwanese, and always dealt with Taiwanese. Afterwards ... [when] I met some Taiwanese, they said "your Putonghua is just like Taiwan Mandarin".'

Most Mainland Chinese who have integrated themselves well into the community are aware of the fact that the whole social environment in the community and the social relationships they have established with the others all have an impact on their language, as one informant from Beijing observed:

Zhēi zhōuwéi yǒu zhèì-ge huánjìng, nǐ zhīdào ba, ... xiàng wǒmen zhèiyàng dōu hěn zhùyì le ... jiāng huà jiù jiāng de bìjiāo màn yídiǎn, yòng cí -a jinliàng yǒng tāmen de cí... bùrán-de huà wǒ jiāng
kuài le yīhòu tāmen jiù tíng bu dǒng.

'There is this environment around here, you know, like us, we have already paid much attention ... When we talk we talk slowly; as for vocabulary, we try to use theirs ... otherwise, when I speak fast, they don't understand.'

Another informant also says:

Yǒu shíhou yǒu zhèzhǒng gànjué, jiù hǎoxiàng shì zhèiqūn rén lǐ de yǔyán.

'Sometime I have the feeling that the way I talk just resembles the language of this bunch of people.'

An informant commented on the role church can play in the formation of a closely knit network circle and its influence on language. He gave the following reason why his sister's language had changed so much:

Huánjìn wèntí, yīnwèi tā lái-le yīhòu, tā nà-shíhòu Zhōngguó xuéshēng hěn shǎo, érqǐě tā jiù shì, jiàohuì-a, tā zāi jiàohuì-lǐ, zhēngé hěn shēng, nà tā yǒu shíhòu yízhī zài jiàohuì lǐ, xiǎnzǎi hái zài jiàohuì lǐ, nàmé, jiàohuì-lǐ ne, zhèlí jiàohuì lǐ dōu shì Táiwān rén le, érqǐě zài jiàohuì-lǐ ne, zhēngé zhēngé wénhuà huánjìn shì zhēiyáng de, tā hěn zhírán, tā mǎshāng xīnchéng yīge quǎnzì, jiùshì zhēiyàng.

'This is a problem of environment, because after she came, at that time there were very few Chinese students; moreover, she was, church, she was in the church, was deeply involved; she sometimes was in church all the time; she still is; then, in the church, those in the church here are all Taiwanese; moreover, in the church, the whole cultural environment is so, it, quite naturally, it soon forms a circle, that is why.'

At work, it is usually the bosses' language that will have an effect on the employees. When Mainland Chinese communicate with their bosses at work, the variety of Mandarin they speak natively is marked, for it sharply differs from the
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TM their bosses speak. Therefore, convergence takes place. It is Mainland employees who usually try their best to accommodate towards the bosses, rather than the other way round.

However, it is during lunch time when employees sit around and talk that interpersonal communication reaches its peak. Normally Chinese companies are not large, involving people ranging from a few to about twenty or so. They are usually a close-knit cluster. Many informants consider this period of time during the day to be important in shaping the way they presently speak. One informant said:

Yǐnwèi wǒ zhōuwéi huánjìn dōu shì Táiwān rén. Tāmen jiāng de guóyǔ...yǒu Táiwān qiāng... Wǒmen zài gōngsī méitiān lunch de shihou, dàjiā jiù hui liáotiān shuōhuà. Tāmen dōu zhēme jiāng, wǒ yě jiù mànman xīguàn le, hěn xīguàn.

'Because all the people around me are Taiwanese. The Mandarin they speak...has a Taiwanese accent... When we have lunch every day at the company, everyone chats with everyone else. They all speak like that, I also became used to, quite used (to speak their way also).'

When referring to the lunch time talk, one informant also pointed out the fact that he was constantly corrected by his TM speaking colleagues, which obviously has put some pressure on him to speak the "proper" Mandarin.

Only typical Beijing Mandarin, which is still considered "pleasing to the ear", is tolerated to some extent in the TM speaking majority environment, other varieties are labelled "strange" by TM speakers. For example, the author himself was once questioned by a TM speaker during field observation. The
question was concerned about the strangeness of the Mandarin spoken by a girl from Shanghai. Such an attitude among colleagues would certainly place pressure on the girl and force her to change the way she spoke.

This pressure on Mainland Chinese to converge during communication is also revealed in the following short remark by a young Taiwanese about her roommate, who is from the Mainland and also works for her in her hair-shop:

Ta bian-le hen duo, xiang shenmo yin-a, ta you shihou dou jiang-de na-ge, gen wome de qiandiao bu yiyang, wome jiu jiuzhen ta.

'She has changed a lot, such as in pronunciation. Sometimes when she talks, her accent is different from ours, so we correct her.'

Those who are not tied closely to TM speaking Taiwanese, however, never feel the pressure, or the need for any modification in their language. Although Mandarin is used for communication on a daily basis, there is no reason why they should sound like the TM-speaking Taiwanese. Here is what one informant said:

Wome you yi-ge jiu shi Taiwain ren ... yikuai he yong zhe-ge warehouse de ... cong lai bu gen ta jiang ... wome jiang wome Guoyu ta ye ting de dong, ta jiang ta de, ye ting de dong ... dajia yuyan dou tong de me.

'We have one who happens to be Taiwanese ... he shares the warehouse with us ... we never talk to him [i.e. "try to learn TM features"] ... we speak our Mandarin and he understands, he speaks his Mandarin and we can understand ... our language is mutually intelligible.'

One informant from Beijing even expressed his negative attitude toward the language accommodation he witnessed taking
place on the part of several of his colleagues at work. These colleagues of his are also from the Mainland, who, like himself, are surrounded by a TM-speaking majority. He obviously did not regard himself as part of the group. He even fought against the use of non-standard Mandarin. He said:

Yǒu gùyì xué Táiwān de. Wǒ méiyǒu gùyì. Wǒ juéde hěn biěniú, wǒ juédé tāmen xué Táiwān huà hěn biěniú... yǒu tāmen nà-ge Táiwān qiāng, shuō Guóyǔ yě shì yǐyàng ... wǒ xiānzhài gēn tāmen shuōhuà lǎo jiǔzhèn... zhěntiān gěi Táiwān rèn jiǔzhèn fāyīn.

'There are people who imitate those Taiwanese on purpose. I don't do it on purpose. I feel it awkward. I consider it very awkward for them to imitate Taiwanese people ... [when Taiwanese talk in English] there is that Taiwanese accent, it is the same when they speak Mandarin ... Now when I talk to them, I always correct them ... all day I correct the pronunciation of those Taiwanese people.'

Therefore, what has been observed points to the fact that different people, who have built different patterns of network ties, may integrate into the community to a different degree. Thus, they may be under differential degrees of normative pressure to converge to Taiwan Mandarin, which is the norm of speaking in the American Chinese community found in the larger Los Angeles area. The remainder of the dissertation will be devoted to reporting the field research carried out within the framework of the social network model.
Notes:

1. This area covers the whole Los Angeles county and Orange county. The tendency is that the community is still expanding eastward along Highway 605 and Highway 10.

2. Note that the ethnic Chinese population was under-counted in the 1980 Census, due to these problems: the reluctance of respondents to report an ethnic identification that still carried a social stigma, the inability of unlearned people to understand the complex census questionnaires, and misplacement of the respondents themselves in the "others" category.

3. The Chinese community in Houston is catching up, but is still much smaller in population and areal coverage.

4. Many businesses owned by people from Taiwan either have close relationship with Taiwan (e.g. as distributors) or are financially supported by Taiwan (e.g. by parent companies.)
6.0 **Introduction**

This Chapter focuses on fieldwork strategies and sampling methods. Sampling both speakers and language is in direct association with the research design and research objectives, which in turn determines the claims an investigator can make about the results. In early sociolinguistic studies, researchers were sensitive to the need to give a representative account of the language of a given group of speakers so that it would not be biased towards any particular subgroup. However, difficulties have presented themselves with regard to obtaining a random sample, e.g. the sample size frequently being too small to postulate the population within measurable and statistically specifiable confidence limits (Moser & Kalton 1977) and replacement of informants of the original sample who cannot be interviewed for some reason (Romaine 1980). Labov's generalizations were based on 88 speakers, Trudgill's on 60. Shuy, Wolfram and Riley carried out over 700 interviews with 254 families, but used only 36 speakers for analysis because of general suitability caused by data-handling problems. Frequently, after subdiving, many surveys have fewer than four speakers in each subgroup (Milroy 1987a:22). Difficulties of this kind have led some researchers to query both the wisdom and the validity of a
complicated sampling procedures which in the end might not measure up to the standards demanded by disciplines outside linguistics (Milroy 1987a:19).

The range of sampling methods used in recent works suggests that researchers are now more relaxed than they once were about such methodological issues as whether their account should be technically representative or whether strict random sampling procedures should be used (Milroy 1987a). Strong preference is now given for judgement samples. With a judgement sample, the researcher can decide in advance on the basis of careful observation about the meaningful divisions in society and draw on a smaller judgement, or quota, sample which reflects these divisions. The regularity and consistency of the relationships between language and social factors which these judgement samples can detect leave little doubt as to their validity (Edwards 1986:53).

This shift in attitude, which signifies the maturing of sociolinguistics as a field of study, enables researchers to select more freely than was once possible from a range of methods (Milroy 1987a:38). These methods of speaker selection, tailored to suit research objectives and being within a defensible theoretical framework, best enable researchers to achieve their goals.

One such judgement sampling method is associated with the social network model. The major characteristic of any kind of network procedure of speaker selection is that the unit of
study is the pre-existing social group, rather than the individual as the representative of a more abstract social category (Milroy 1987a:35). Thus, sample size, as Milroy points out, is not an issue in a network study, because the sociolinguist is not concerned about selecting speakers in such a way as to give a "scale model" of variation in the community as a whole. The methodological advantage of the network model is that the researcher is able to attach himself or herself to a group and obtain a more substantial corpus of spontaneous speech than would be possible in interaction with a single individual who is isolated from his or her customary social network.

The first section of this chapter is dedicated to a description of the sampling procedures and the relationship between the field worker and the informants, in the second section the composition of the sample and sociodemographic data on the sample population are presented, and in the third section, the fieldwork strategies are addressed.

6.1 Sampling Procedures

The fieldwork in the Los Angeles area was carried out in two periods of time: from May to August, 1989, and from May to August, 1990. During the first period of time, the activities were rather exploratory - mainly ethnographic observations and some preliminary data collection. The major task of this period was to obtain an insider's view, or to use
an anthropological term, an emic view, of the community and the language variation that could be observed among Mainland Chinese in the community. As the fieldworker, I lived in Monterey Park, one of those focal points in the Los Angeles American Chinese community where the most dense Chinese population is found. Living like every other Chinese in the community, I experienced what other Mainland Chinese could possibly experience as far as social relationships and language use are concerned. Efforts had been made to get involved with local people in the community. Friends had been made and some ties with potential informants in the target population had been established with the help of friends.

During this first period of fieldwork, I also worked as an employee in a Taiwanese-owned Chinese business selling computers and related equipments, where direct observation of the linguistic accommodation of several Mandarin speaking colleagues from the Mainland was made, and relevant linguistic data were written down or recorded during observation.

The results of the first period of work yielded large quantities of qualitative data concerning the local Chinese community for initial analysis, and more importantly, it revealed the extent of the linguistic accommodation which was possible among different Mandarin speaking Mainland Chinese immigrants in the community. The first period of work also generated a basic network cluster of my own, from where I could return and undertake further investigation. All this
prepared the second period of fieldwork, which was devoted to sampling of informants and to the actual taping of the linguistic data.

Just before the second period of data collection started in May, 1990, a minor political incident caused some problem for the fieldwork. A Chinese diplomat, an education consul working in the Chinese Embassy in Washington, D.C. defected. The person revealed to the public a topic-secret Chinese government document containing the most current policies towards the Chinese students in the United States, which divided the students into five categories according to their attitudes towards the Chinese government. He warned that since many students had been involved in the anti-Chinese government and anti-communist protests in June, 1989, ignited by the June 4th Tienanmen Square incident, the Chinese consulates in the United States would keep closer surveillance on the students, through different means. This not only affected the Mainland Chinese students but the general Mainland Chinese population in the community as well. The already frightened Mainland Chinese, the group of people in the Chinese community who are of major interest in this research, thus became considerably more suspicious and nervous, for fear of speaking anything that could be used against their relatives in China or against them when they return to China.

This suspicion among many Mainland Chinese led to
distrust of people whom they did not know or had never met before, especially someone bringing a tape-recorder along and asking questions, even personal ones. The usual method of social network model, namely, introducing the fieldworker himself or herself as a friend of x or y, became less effective. Sometimes, this x or y would simply not introduce his or her friends, although this x or y could be a close friend of the fieldworker. For example, one informant, who had been one of my best friends for 25 years, dating back to childhood, would not introduce his network ties to me, for fear his friends would be unhappy about it. The effects of this strongly limited the researcher's decision regarding the kind of subgroups of informants that could be used. It was hard to fill quotas of the sample to specification. ¹ I had to make do with the available informants.

Although the first period of fieldwork rendered the author some important contacts with the local Mainland Chinese group, this circle of friends was still too limited to be useful. Fortunately, my wife had been living in the area for over two years intermittently and had made many friends there. Therefore, the best solution to obtaining access to the Mainland Chinese group was, therefore, to start with her and use her already existing first-order zone network ties, or, those with whom she was directly tied in her own network. Since those people knew her well and, through her, knew about me, there was much less suspicion involved. Usually no
questions were asked beyond those concerning the nature of the research. As the intimate relationship developed, through the introduction and help of some of these people who were better friends, I was able to meet other informants who trusted me and were willing to participate in the research.

The Mainland Chinese in the Los Angeles Chinese community, if considered as a subgroup in the community, are spread all over the area, and many of them are well integrated into the local community. It is sometimes hard to judge their origin from their appearance and even their accent. Therefore, it is important to point out here that although the overall Mainland Chinese in the community are quite numerous, the number of informants to whom I could have access was quite limited. This, coupled with the distrust problem, made obtaining a larger sample virtually impossible.

6.2 The Sample

The sample is divided into two groups, a primary one and a secondary one. The data of only the primary group are used for statistical analysis. The secondary group, which consists of PTH speakers as well as Taiwan Mandarin speakers, is used as a control group for comparison.

The primary sample obtained consisted of people living in different parts of the Los Angeles area, which included almost all the Mainland Chinese that my wife could find in her first order zone, my own limited friends, and those introduced to me
through the help of friends.

The sample was made up of 35 informants, which is comparable to other social network studies.\(^2\) There were 18 women and 17 men with ages ranging from 24 to 50. According to age, the 35 informants in the sample could be divided into three age groups with 14 informants in the 21-30 group, 15 in the 31-40 group and 6 in the 41-50 group.

An important factor to be controlled in the analysis of the linguistic variables was geographical background. As discussed in Chapter Three, for example, the drop of retroflexes found in Taiwan Mandarin can also be found with speakers of other Southern Chinese dialects, and even with speakers of some Northern Mandarin varieties, and that the Wu dialect has had an important influence on Taiwan Mandarin. Taking this into account, three different subgroups of informants were considered for analytic purposes. The first subgroup comprised 14 informants from Beijing, 6 men and 8 women. The second subgroup comprised 11 informants from Shanghai, 6 men and 5 women. The third subgroup comprised 10 people, 5 men and 5 women, from the other areas in China, of which 6 people were from Northern and Southern Mandarin speaking areas and 4 people were from other Southern Chinese dialect speaking areas. All informants who speak a Southern dialect in the second and third subgroups speak Putonghua with fairly little or no trace of the Southern accent.

This is a group of well educated people, with everyone
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having a college degree. Most of them had completed or were near the completion of graduate studies in the United States. Everyone had a job, which varied, but almost nobody was working as a blue-collar worker, although some of them held positions beneath their level of training. Some informants had lived in the community for a long period of time while others had moved in not long ago from China or from other parts of the United States. Therefore, time of residence in the Los Angeles Chinese community ranges from several months to ten years, with 26 informants between 1 to 4 years, 6 informants over 5 years, and 3 informants less than a year. The sample seem to represent, with a reasonable degree of confidence, the Mainland Chinese in the Los Angeles areas.

The comparison group is mainly used as a control group to test linguistic differences among Mandarin varieties and linguistic accommodation involved. It consists of 13 PTH speakers, with 11 from Beijing and other Mandarin speaking areas, and 2 from Shanghai and other Southern dialect speaking areas. These informants are all students and their families at Louisiana State University, who are in a totally different community; thus little (if any) linguistic change has been observed in their Mandarin. In the comparison group are also 5 Taiwanese speakers, not including those who were involved in the group sessions to be discussed below.
6.3 Fieldwork Strategies

According to Milroy (1987a), the guiding principle of participant observation, a crucial part of the network model, is that the observer should be part of the setting he or she is studying. In many sociolinguistic studies which use the network model the fieldworker has to work on establishing intimate relationships with members of the community before she or he can be accepted as a friend. The quality of the linguistic data as well as an accurate apprehension of the social phenomena under study would ultimately depend on the establishment of a good rapport with the local people.

In one sense, establishing relationships with informants was not a serious problem for this research, because the sample obtained consisted of people who were friends even before the fieldwork started. There was also no problem associated with the image of the fieldworker. In studies where participant observation is used, the fieldworker tends to have a defined social position in the local community which in turn gives rise to varying social roles in relation to the interviewees (Nordberg 1980:5). Thus, for example, the fieldworker must first disassociate himself or herself from the image of being a middle-class person among his or her working class informants. Such social-status asymmetry did not exist in the case of this study, because with respect to social attributes, the fieldworker was closely matched with all the informants.
The fieldwork was to a great extent facilitated by the informants' tremendous cordiality and disposition to collaborate. They were very affable and concerned with the fieldworker's welfare and the fulfillment of the research goals. Many of them were eager to help. During the fieldwork, it was explained clearly and truthfully to the informants that the research was for my dissertation, and that it was concerned with the differences between Taiwan Mandarin and Putonghua and with the language change taking place among Mainland Chinese. In most cases this explanation was sufficient, and only very rarely did further details on the research project have to be provided. In those rare cases, some informants who had had some education in similar disciplines wanted to know more about the project and attempted to comment on it.

The major concern during the fieldwork was to minimize anything that would cause distrust or nervousness among the informants. The tape-recorder was the single most sensitive factor that could arouse feelings of insecurity. Such feelings, as pointed above, were not linguistic but political. It was quite a different problem from what is commonly referred to as the "observer's paradox". Informants usually were not concerned with how they said things, but with what they actually said. Everything said was on tape and could potentially be used against them, if something happened. Moreover, these Chinese people generally were not comfortable
in front of tape-recorders, including people from Taiwan. Therefore, to minimize the psychological effects, a small portable tape-recorder was used without an external microphone. Permission was obtained each time before taping and the promise given that any sensitive contents would not be revealed to any party. This was really a matter of trust, and this trust was almost always granted to me, by the informants from the established networks.

Throughout most of the fieldwork, I had the assistance of my wife, who accompanied me to many of the places. The advantages of this were twofold: first, since many informants were her friends, the interaction was not so rigid, or restrained, with her presence; and second, my wife usually played the role of intermediary between the informants and me. The latter was very important when female informants were involved, because, as Milroy (1987a:81) noted, it is hard for a male fieldworker to gain access to a domestic setting with female informants. This did not become a problem when my wife was the person visiting and I went along. Therefore, most of the interactions with the informants turned out to be gatherings among friends, rather than formally established interview events conducted and controlled by a fieldworker. In fact, many informants at different times referred to these occasions, quite interestingly, as liáotiān, or 'chatting', rather than cāifāng, or 'interview'.

The interaction with the informants was carried out in
different circumstances and in different forms. Most recordings were made in the informants' houses involving differing numbers of people, or at our home when informants -- friends -- visited us. Some recordings were made at church parties, friends' parties, and informants' work-places. Some telephone conversations were also recorded.

Some informants who were close friends volunteered to tape the activities they had with the others. Recordings thus obtained were usually natural and could bring in more extensive and diverse data. However, one disadvantage of this was that the quality of such recordings was not easily controlled. Occasionally the tape-recorder was not used properly or placed at a position that was too far for the recorder to pick up voices. Therefore, the idea was soon abandoned.

Since many informants had known either my wife and me for some time and many shared same backgrounds with us, it was usually not difficult to find topics of common interest, which included work and work related matters, personal experiences, political issues, and future plans. Usually the talk was quite personal, so I would try not to chat (liáotíān) on topics touching sensitive areas in our group sessions, such as attitudes towards China and the Chinese government. Sometimes someone in the group would remind the others that they were on tape and therefore should avoid discussing such topics. Out of eagerness, some informants would just concentrate on
discussing the differences between Taiwan Mandarin and Putonghua, and on how much their language changed. When this happened, I would try to distract their attention from these topics, because such discussion would affect the use of language.

Social information about informants was obtained very carefully during the interaction between the fieldworker and the informants. Sometimes this would occasion problems if too much were asked, because most informants were under the assumption that I was concerned only with their language. They did not know that relevant social information was also an important part. One careless question could create the suspicion that I was spying on them. Therefore, I tried to bring up the questions as naturally as possible, and to accumulate social information through time. However, there were informants who were not concerned about this, and they talked or even wrote down in detail such information about themselves.

Although occasionally I participated in some heated discussions, most of the time, I refrained from playing an active role in the interaction, and tried to be an observer. It would be ideal if the fieldworker could sit outside the circle of people talking, and observe and tape the conversation. This was not practically possible because everyone was aware of my presence -- I was constantly in the limelight, with a tape-recorder. A conversation among friends
that did not involve me or ignored me would have been interpreted as impolite by the informants.

Speech accommodation was an important factor to be controlled in the fieldwork. Efforts had been made to ensure that each informant was recorded on different occasions so that some occasions involved TM speakers while others did not include any TM speakers. However, it was difficult to record both kinds of occasions for every informant. Prior arrangement of speech events that included the desired participants would be unnatural and many informants would be unwilling to attend. Therefore, only recordings that did not have TM speakers involved were used for statistical analysis, while those that did include TM speakers could only be used as data for qualitative comparison. One advantage of this is that factors of speech accommodation could be controlled. The informants did not have the need to accommodate when there was no TM speaker present. Thus, what they said truly reflected the changes that had taken place in their language -- the effects of long term accommodation.

In Milroy's Belfast study (Milroy 1980) and in other social network studies, the fieldworker was described as being able to knock at the door of informants' houses and drop in at any time. However, this was not the case with this research. Informants lived in different parts in the area, some even 30 miles away. Most of them were extremely busy, even on weekends. Therefore, interview events were usually arranged
through telephone calls, be it a party, or a friendly chat, when informants had the leisure time. It was usually hard to know before hand who else would be present.

By the end of the fieldwork, I was able to obtain about 75 hours of recorded spontaneous interaction, with varying amounts for each of the 35 informants in the primary sample. These range generally from 1 hour to 5 hours for each informant. For a few informants, I obtained over 10 hours of recording. All conversations were recorded in natural settings through informal group sessions, or, "chatting", and they revealed substantial variation of language use and linguistic change among the informants.

Notes:

1. In fact, this is a common problem associated with the model. Milroy (1987a:79) suggested that the problem associated with filling quotas to specification was the most severe disadvantage of a participant-observation study, because the groups studies were self-recruited. The fieldworker by definition relinquished control over choice of informants.

7.0 Introduction

The major aim of the analysis of linguistic variation and change in this dissertation is the assessment of the Mainland Chinese's long-term language accommodation process in the Los Angeles Chinese American community.

As discussed in Chapter 5, language accommodation co-occurs with the speakers' process of integration into the local Chinese community. What is needed is a quantitative analytic method which is capable of capturing with a reasonable degree of accuracy the linguistic complexities of this social phenomenon.

Methods used in the traditional Labovian model, namely, the variable rule model, assume that variation is an inherent and rule-governed property of human language and not a product of irregular dialect mixture. However, these methods are intended to be used to analyze grammars for whole communities, or for group averages, rather than for individuals. They call forth the problem of group boundaries. As discussed above, speech communities are hard to delimit satisfactorily, as are groups within the communities. Without an absolutely precise definition of the speakers for whom a given grammar is intended, however, any claim will be untestable and essentially empty (Hudson 1980).
Moreover, a group oriented model would not resolve the issue of the linguistic phenomena under consideration here. The solution lies only in a model that is oriented towards individuals. In the analytic model adopted here, the informants are treated individually. The analysis aims at assessing the extent of individual variation. To accomplish this, the individual linguistic variable scores are correlated with the social network strength scores, which are determined through a group of indices as indicators of the informants' integration into the local Chinese community.

The methods for assessing the network indices are described in the first section, which is concerned with the extra-linguistic variables. Ten linguistic variables, at different levels of linguistic analysis, have been selected as the indicators of language accommodation. They are discussed in Section Two in conjunction with the discussion of the methods used for linguistic scores.

7.1 Extra-linguistic Variables

7.1.1 Social Network Strength Score

The network strength score is used to determine the underlying social variable. An individual's social network is simply the sum of informal social relationships which he or she has contracted with others. The content and structure of individual network ties can be both directly observed and quantified.
Social network strength, a quantitative concept for a person's network ties, is measured on the basis of a group of indicators. The indicators, employed to examine the degree of integration into the local community, are to reflect quantitatively two dimensions of a personal network, namely, density and multiplexity.

Methodologically, this way of measuring network strength, as utilized in this study, differs from the standard practice in sociology and anthropology, which seeks the measurements of overall density and multiplexity of networks concerned. Cubbit (1973) suggests that density in key sectors or clusters of the network, that is, compartments associated with specific fields of activity, is actually a more important means of compelling normative consensus than overall density. Specific clusters, such as those of kinship, neighborhood, work situation, and voluntary association, are particularly important, and these vary significantly from one personal network to another. On the other hand, speaking practically it is extremely hard to measure overall density in a network involving several hundred relationships; where it is possible, density is always low. Therefore, in the present study, as in other sociolinguistic studies that use the social network model, density and multiplexity are expressed indirectly by indicators.

Although indicators are treated quantitatively, it has been pointed out in several studies (Milroy 1987a:106; Lippi
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1989:216; Edwards 1986:57) that they are culturally determined and vary from one community to another. Therefore close ethnographic observation is necessary to identify the relevant factors for a given community. The two criteria (Milroy 1987b:141) for selecting the precise, well-defined indicators are: (1) they should be easily collected and verifiable from field data, and (2) as other studies have consistently proven, they should be capable of predicting the normative pressure potentially exerted on the individual.

Based on the fieldwork in the Chinese community in the larger Los Angeles area (for details, see Chapter 5), the following indicators were chosen for the present study, for which the network strength score for each indicator can range from 0 to 3, except for kinship, which ranges from 0 to 2.

**Density:**

1. **Group Membership:** is the individual concerned a member of a high-density, (territorially based) Taiwan-Mandarin speaking cluster?

   Basically, the indicator asks the question, to what extent has an individual associated himself/herself with a TM speaking network cluster which, no matter how large or small, is close-knit in internal structure? A cluster is understood here as a portion of a personal network where relationships are denser internally than externally (Milroy 1987:142). In a cluster, closer relationship is brought about within a group.
of people because of a certain shared activity. Therefore, a cluster is a sector or compartment of the network associated with specific types of activities, such as leisure-time activities, work, etc. (Bortoni-Ricardo 1988:88).

This indicator, which is given a numerical value ranging from 0 to 3, can be symbolized along a scale as follows:

not at all ←------------------- absolutely

Multiplexity:

Multiplexity refers to interactional or content characteristics of personal networks. The multiplexity of an individual's social network is determined by five indicators, which are determined on the basis of ethnographic work in the community. If all these five are satisfied, the proportion of the individual's interaction with members of the local Chinese community is inevitably very high, thus indicating better integration. These five indicators are:

1. Work:
   (1) Is the person employed in a company owned by Taiwanese? And do the bosses speak TM?
   (2) Is the individual involved with two or more TM speaking co-workers at the place of work?
   (3) Does the nature of work involve dealing with customers who are TM speaking?

This indicator, concerned with the work place, is determined by three sub-questions. As discussed in Chapter 5,
in a company owned by a Taiwanese, the language used tends to be TM, and employees are usually Chinese. The language of TM-speaking bosses tends to have some influence one way or another on the employees, especially on those from Mainland China, who are quite sensitive to their way of speaking in front of their boss.

Moreover, other TM-speaking colleagues in the company are also extremely influential as far as language is concerned, specially during the lunch-time "chatting". In companies where business deals are part of the work, TM-speaking business partners and customers determine to some degree the individual's use of language.

2. Friendship: (voluntary association with TM-speakers in leisure hours, i.e. after work)

(1) Does the individual have TM-speaking friends with whom he/she has close frequent contacts outside work?

(2) If also attending school, does the person associate with TM-speaking schoolmates frequently?

This indicator is concerned with the people with whom the individual associates voluntarily after work. Language use has always been proven to correlate with peer pressure, especially from those whose friendship the individual treasures most. Therefore, the frequency and quality of such contacts are determined here for the informants, who tend to be affected linguistically through such interaction. For
those who are studying at university, their schoolmates can be important friends.

3. **Social/religious activities:**
   
   (1) Does the individual frequently participate in social activities in the community sponsored by TM-speakers?
   
   (2) Does he/she go to local Chinese church on a regular basis?

   Social activities here refer to any kind of activities, from voluntary participation in friendship or business based associations, to participation in occasional parties and meetings of some kind. Obviously, church can be considered as a special form of social activity, which is usually regular and intense.

4. **Neighborhood/roommate:**

   (1) Does he/she live in focal areas of the Chinese community, such as Monterey Park and Alhambra; if not, does he/she frequently go to these areas, for such activities as working, grocery shopping, dining, or seeking services?

   (2) Does he/she have roommates, or neighbors (if having close contact), who are TM speaking?

   Although networks in the Los Angeles Chinese community are not strictly territory based, it is quite obvious that those in or near the focal points of the community are able to exert more pressure. Belonging to such clusters because of
residence puts the individual directly under such influence. A cluster which is developed because of living together or next door, even though geographically not in the focal areas of the community, is also considered being able to exert similar pressure.

5. Kinship:

Does he/she have TM speaking relatives living in the same area whom the informant contacts frequently (for example, has the informant married a TM speaking wife)?

Since many Mainlanders in the community do not have relatives living nearby, for those who do have, there is an extra possible content in their network cluster. Nevertheless, for the kind of networks of Mainland Chinese in the community, kinship does not play a role as important as that found by Gal (1979).

Maximum range of scores:

The lowest score can be 0; the highest score can be 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This scale is designed solely for the purpose of the sociolinguistic study in Los Angeles American Chinese communities, and for differentiating individuals. An idealized informant with a score of 17 would be characterized as someone who is completely integrated into the local Chinese
community, in the sense that he/she: (1) works at a place where most colleagues and bosses speak TM; (2) has only TM speaking friends with whom he/she is associated frequently; (3) lives with TM-speaking roommates in one of those areas where the TM-speaking population is extremely high; (4) participates actively in the activities taking place around, or goes to a Chinese Christian church where TM-speakers attend; and (5) has quite a few relatives from Taiwan with whom he/she has close contacts.

Informants who have high scores on the scale are expected to exhibit stylistic change as a result of speech modification because of in-group pressure from their TM-speaking peers in the network clusters to which they belong. Since the model is oriented toward the individual, the focus of the scale reflects the individual's degree of integration into a set of relationships which constitute a group capable of exerting normative pressure.

As the scale is designed for examination of an individual's integration into the community, it would not be possible to examine Mainlanders, or those PTH speakers, who have developed a very close network cluster among themselves. They will have a lower network strength score here. As far as integration into the networks considered here is concerned, they will be considered as marginals.

One weakness of the network strength score adopted here is that it is unable to reflect one important factor, namely,
duration of time, in the content of the networks. In other words, there is a lack of time depth in the analysis of a particular individual as part of the network. Perhaps it is an inherent weakness of the model (to be discussed fully in Chapter 9). Usually, the social network model is applied in studies that deal with closed networks that have existed for quite a long time, with each individual a long term member, such as the ones in Milroy's Belfast study (1980) and in Gal's study (1979) in a rural Austrian village. However, Mainland Chinese in the present sample vary in the length of time they have lived in the community, which ranges from a few months to 10 years. Time obviously plays an important role in understanding or interpreting the relationship between integration into the local community and linguistic change among the Mainlanders. Degrees of integration and change are not necessarily in comparable proportions. Therefore, room for caution should be left in interpreting the results.

7.1.2 Sex and Social Network

Most correlational sociolinguistic studies carried out since the mid 1960s have investigated the covariance of linguistic norms with the parameter of sex. The existence of sex differences in language use is well documented in various communities. The results have generally supported the assumption that in Western urbanized societies, women on the average deviate less from the prestige standard than men in
both their actual speech and in their attitudes towards language.

Three main explanations have been proposed for this persistent difference (Cameron & Coates 1988:13): women are more conservative, status conscious, and experience less pressure to adhere to the vernacular norms than men.

That women are more conservative than men has been a recurrent claim. Trudgill (1983:83) quotes the examples of Koasati and Chukchi as cases where women's language preserves older forms. However, there is a problem with the "conservatism" explanation. While women's speech has repeatedly been found to be closer to the prestige standard than men's, this could indicate conservatism on the part of middle-class women only. Among working-class women it would indicate the opposite, because use of the standard variety represents innovation from the working-class vernacular. A conservative pattern would involve preserving vernacular variants (Cameron & Coates 1988:14).

In connection with this, Wolfram and Fasold (1974) contend that the sensitivity to prestige norms would put women in a position of initiating linguistic changes (see also Labov 1972b). However, this generalization only holds when the change is progressing in the direction of a prestige norm, because, they claim, women tend to use speech to gain status.

According to Trudgill (1972), differences in the speech of men and women in complex urban societies could be
associated with two socio-psychological factors: (1) the position of women in society is usually less secure (or less valued) than that of men and this might impose on the females a stronger necessity of adopting status signals, including prestigious linguistic forms; (2) nonstandard variables are probably used by males as symbols of masculinity and toughness, and of group solidarity, i.e. these may have covert prestige (Trudgill 1972; Cheshire 1982).

Cameron and Coates (1988:15) have argued that the status explanation is closely tied up with the social stratification model, which is highly biased against women: women's social-economic status is classified with the men, and men's verbal behavior is the norm from which women can only deviate. They further point out that if the non-standard language is associated with working class culture and has connotations of masculinity, working class men will have in-group norms while working class women will be excluded from working class culture, and become "lames" (Cameron & Coates 1988:17).

In view of the gender controversy, Milroy (1980:112) argues that sex is a less important factor in determining who leads in a linguistic change than the social values peculiar to various subgroups in the population. Women who have different experiences will behave differently (Cameron 1988:7) and different economic opportunities open to men and women lead to differences in language (Nichols 1988). Numerous counterexamples do exist to the claim that women are more
standard in their speech, such as those found in the social network studies of Milroy (1980), Edwards (1988), and Thomas (1988).

Based on these previous network studies, another perspective can be taken in the explanation of linguistic differences between the sexes: linguistic differences are related to differences in the social networks members of each sex have contracted. The network structures of the sexes in different communities may vary sharply, due to employment (as found in Milroy 1980), or due to confinements within the limits of homes and close neighborhoods (as found in Bortoni-Ricardo 1986). Such differential network structures may very well contribute to differences between sexes in language use.

One important difference between women in the Chinese community and those in Milroy's (1980) and Bortoni-Ricardo's (1986) studies is that there are no restrictions preventing Chinese women from contracting networks similar to men's in the Chinese community found in the Los Angeles area. Like men, they go to work, associate with people in the community, make friends beyond their family circle, and participate in different social and religious activities. If differences do exist in network structure between the sexes, then, these differences cannot be attributed to differential access to the resources for developing such networks, but lie in differential motivation and efforts between the sexes in contracting them. Such differences in efforts and motivation
eventually lead to differences in local network integration between males and females, which accounts for differences in language accommodation and change, as has been observed between Mainland Chinese males and females (this will be further discussed in the following chapters).

7.1.3. Age and Social Network

Like the variable of sex, an individual's personal network structure as well as language structure is likely to be influenced by age, or age-grading. Age-grading may reflect appropriate behaviors for different stages in the life history of an individual. However, it is important that age be considered in association with a broader social matrix that includes the social values and conflicts characteristic of the specific community under study. For example, Bortoni-Ricardo's study (1986) shows striking differences in the linguistic behavior of the two age groups: the younger group has a higher level of education, is more exposed to mass media, and has more spatial mobility and a higher political awareness. All of these factors have played an important role in explaining the linguistic variation.

To see how age-grading affects the process of integration into the local community, and thus influences language use in the analysis carried out in this study, three age groups have been delineated. These are those aged 21 - 30 years, 31 - 40 and 41 +, although the last group is represented by only
informants. The data analysis shows some differences in the linguistic behavior as well as in the degree of integration among these three groups (see Chapter 8).

7.2 Linguistic Variables

A linguistic variable is a linguistic unit with two or more variants (alternants) that covary with other linguistic and social variables. The variants are socially and stylistically different but linguistically equivalent ways of saying the same thing.

Of great methodological importance is the principle of accountability, which in essence states that analyst should not selectively pick out from a text only those variations of a variable which tend to confirm their argument, while ignoring others which do not (Milroy 1987a:113). All occurrences of a given variant in the section of speech being examined should be noted; so should all non-occurrences in the relevant environments, where it is possible to define the variables as a closed set of variants (Labov 1982).

Following this methodological principle, ten linguistic variables have been selected as indicators for the study, on the basis of my ethnographic observation of speakers' use of the variants, informants' awareness of these features, and the literature comparing the variants. A full discussion of the linguistic differences between Taiwan Mandarin and Putonghua has been provided in Chapter Three. In this section, I define
these variables and discuss the methods used for assigning individual linguistic scores for these indicators. It is important to note that these variables are not necessarily presenting categorical differences between PTH and TM; many features are tendencies showing relatively more salient Taiwan Mandarin or more PTH features. In addition, some TM variants can also be found in other Southern dialects.

7.2.1 Phonological Variables

7.2.1.1 De-retroflexion

The phonemic contrast between retroflexed consonants and their non-retroflexed counterparts in Putonghua (Pinyin, the standardized romanization symbols, is employed here; for phonetic value of the consonants, see Chapter 3) is neutralized in Taiwan Mandarin through de-retroflexion of the retroflexed consonants. Therefore, the three retroflexed consonants in PTH [zh], [ch], [sh] become respectively [z], [c], [s] in TM. Informants were examined to see if such de-retroflexion takes place in their speech. The following are the phonetic variables and their variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/zh-/</td>
<td>[zh] vs. [z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ch-/</td>
<td>[ch] vs. [c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/sh-/</td>
<td>[sh] vs. [s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. chîfan vs. cîfan  &quot;eat meal&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since such de-retroflexion is also found in the PTH spoken by...
many Southern Chinese dialect speakers and by some Northern Mandarin speakers, due to imperfect learning of PTH, these variables are only applicable to informants from the Beijing area. Informants from Beijing are examined for the relative frequency of the variants [z], [c], and [s].

7.2.1.2 Insertion of tones

This variable is based on the differences in tone between Putonghua and Taiwan Mandarin. In PTH, neutral tone occurs in constituent-final position directly preceding a boundary, which is mostly the second syllable of a bisyllabic word (such as a noun or a verb). The occurrence of the neutral tone is quite infrequent in Taiwan Mandarin at the constituent final position. In Taiwan Mandarin, the neutral, or weak, syllable becomes toned. Therefore, the variable of neutral tone involves two variants, either neutral or toned.

The tone change in kinship terms is also treated here as part of the same problem, where neutral tone is not realized in Taiwan Mandarin. As discussed in Chapter 3, there are two tone patterns for kinship terms in TM: (1) the duplicated second syllable of a bisyllabic kinship term, which usually carries a neutral tone in PTH, becomes toned in Taiwan Mandarin, as in: bàba — bàbà 'papa, father'; and (2) a total tone sandhi change, due to borrowing from Taiwanese, is found in TM where the two syllables are in the tone sandhi of a neutral in the first syllable followed by a rising tone, as
in: māma → mamá 'mama, mother'.

All occurrences, or tokens, of either neutral tone or tonation of neutral tone in the data are recorded for all informants, which also includes the tone sandhi change for kinship terms.

7.2.2 Morphological Variables

Variables under analysis at this linguistic level involve two adjective/adverb intensifiers: the first is hǎo, which is more lexical in nature, and the second is the copying of a monosyllabic adjective.

7.2.2.1 Hǎo "very, quite"

The adverb hǎo "very, quite", used to intensify the following monosyllabic or bisyllabic adjective or adverb is quite frequent in TM, especially when used to express appreciation, exclamation. This contrasts with PTH, in which the use of hǎo as an intensifier is much lower in frequency, and it is extremely rare when it precedes a bisyllabic adjective starting with the morpheme hǎo-. Other intensifiers, such as hēn, zhēn, tè, tīng, are more frequently used among PTH speakers. Therefore, the more TM intensifier hǎo is one variant that contrasts with other more PTH forms: e.g. hǎo kǎ-ài vs. zhēn kǎ-ài 'very lovely', hǎo hǎochī vs. tè hǎochī 'very delicious'.

Although some slight semantic differences exist between
adverbs such as hēn, zhēn, tè, tīng as far as intensity is concerned, their semantic equivalence to hǎo is justified by the fact that hǎo itself covers a large spectrum of intensity, depending on context and the speaker.

Since hǎo is also found as part of some fossilized bisyllabic adjectives, such as hǎo-duō "quite a lot", these words are treated as cases of exceptions, and are thus excluded.

7.2.2.2. Copying of the Adjective

The morphological process of copying a monosyllabic adjective so as to intensify it is found more frequently with TM. Usually -de is added at the end, and the construction is often used as the predicate, or as a complement. This contrasts with Mainland PTH: a mere adverb is often used before the adjective, rather than the copying process. Therefore, the more TM word quàiguài-de "very strange" would contrast with a more PTH counterpart zhēn guài.

7.2.3 Morpho-syntactic Variables

Romaine (1980, 1984) argued that linguistic variables should not go beyond the morphological level, because strict semantic equivalence is hard to achieve beyond that level, and because there is simply no sound semantic/pragmatic theory to account for syntactic variation.

However, as Cheshire (1987:273) points out, syntactic
variation, as well as semantic and pragmatic variation, are inherent characteristics of natural language, and linguists cannot help facing them. One way to deal with the problem is to seek out variable syntactic elements where meaning variation does not constitute a serious problem (Milroy 1987a:164). This is the approach taken in this study.

The three auxiliary verbs, yóu, yào and hui, which are of interest here, are actually lexical in nature. They function syntactically in the sentence as an auxiliary verb, which contrasts with a null auxiliary verb. Whether the auxiliary verb is realized or neutralized does not affect the semantic meaning of the sentence. The semantic equivalence problem is well under control here.

Of the three auxiliaries, the first is not found at all and the other two are used less frequently in PTH. The frequent use of these in TM is caused by borrowing and influence from Taiwanese.

7.2.3.1 Yóu 'have'

The auxiliary verb yóu in TM, borrowed from Taiwanese yú, is used obligatorily to denote past and perfective as well as habitual action. It is also used as the operator in short answers and in A-not-A questions (see Footnote 4, Chapter 3).

In PTH, past and perfective action is usually expressed by le and guo, or even neutralized totally. There is no marker in PTH for habitual actions. No operators are used in
forming a short answer or an A-not-A question; usually the main verb is used. Only in the negative form, i.e. méiyǒu, does PTH share this with TM. However, the negative form appears more frequently in TM, replacing those otherwise negated by bù in PTH.

Based on this, therefore, the variable yǒu is defined as having the TM variant yǒu contrasting with PTH variants guo/le/0 in affirmative statements, short answers, and A-not-A questions. The negative form is not considered because of its complexity. Also, the auxiliary verb yǒu is contrasted with other uses of yǒu, notably as the transitive verb expressing possession.

7.2.3.2 Yao 'will, want'

Yào is used obligatorily in TM; it suggests volition and immediate future. It is not frequent in PTH, particularly rare when used as the operator in short answers, yes-no questions, and A-not-A questions (see Li & Thompson 1981).

In PTH, volition or intention is not often overly marked by an auxiliary, or is expressed through other verbs, such as xiāng, and yuànyì.

This difference between TM and PTH, however, could be blurred, because TM yào (for its Taiwanese counterpart beh), coincides with similar forms in Southern Chinese dialects. Therefore, PTH spoken by some southerners can be expected to involve a higher frequency of yào than for Northerners.
The more TM variant, use of yào, and the more PTH variant, non-use of yào or use of other words, constitute the two variants of this variable.

7.2.3.3 Hui 'likely'

The auxiliary verb hui, used obligatorily (as the Mandarin counterpart of Taiwanese e) to denote likelihood, i.e. irrealis events in TM, and as the operator in short answers and A-not-A questions, is often neutralized, like the case in yào, in PTH. Its relative lower frequency in PTH is due to the fact that PTH does not obligatorily mark likelihood, or irrealis events, with an overt auxiliary. Likelihood is more often neutralized in PTH, or expressed through lexical items, such as the adverb kē-nêng.

However, like yào, hui also has a higher frequency in Southern Chinese dialects, thus difference would be expected between northerners and some southerners as far as the variable is concerned.

In PTH the word hui is more frequently used to indicate ability. Therefore, occurrences of hui used to express ability in the data are sorted out and not considered as part of the variable.

7.2.3.4 Auxiliary Verbs as Operators

As discussed in the above sections, yǒu, yào, and hui are used as operators to form A-not-A questions in TM, while in
PTH usually it is the main verb, not an auxiliary verb, that is used in A-not-A construction. For example, in the following A-not-A question, yào is used as the operator, which is contrasted with the PTH version that does not employ an operator:

**TM:** Nǐ jīntiān yào bù yào qù xuéxiào?
'Are you going to school today?'

**PTH:** Nǐ jīntiān qù bù qù xuéxiào?

To examine this, a separate linguistic variable is designated here. Tokens are recorded to see the frequency of the auxiliaries used as the operator.

### 7.2.4 Sentence-Final Particles

In Taiwan Mandarin, a very high rate of sentence-final particles is found, much higher than those in Mainland PTH, due to transfer from Taiwanese. In PTH, most sentences end without particles. Phonetically, these particles would carry a level tone when spoken by a TM speaker, rather than a neutral, weak tone as they are in PTH. For example: Bù shì la vs. Bù shì 'It is not so.'

In PTH, some sentence-final particles are the result of the fusion of two particles, but in TM these particles may carry a new meaning beyond the one expected in the fusion. Therefore, in addition to a higher frequency of such particles in TM, some particles involve slight semantic difference between TM and PTH.
Since there is usually no one-to-one contrast between TM and PTH, and since many particles can be used interchangeably, it does not make sense to seek out arbitrarily variants which are semantically equivalent for each particle. What is of interest here is to check the total frequency of particles used in a portion of an informant's speech. Thus, sentences with particles are contrasted with those without.

The most commonly used particles are: la, ma, a, ai; me, ba, ya, le, ou, ao, lao, na, ne.

Those particles that are used to form questions, or attached to questions (both yes-no and wh-questions), are excluded to avoid complications.

7.2.5 Lexicon

Due to a lack of direct contact with Beijing Mandarin, the base language, over a long period of time, many lexical items in Taiwan Mandarin differ from PTH (Zhu & Zhou 1990). This is quite natural and to be expected. The lexical differences between TM and PTH are of three kinds: those lexical items unique to TM, those shared by TM and PTH in meaning, but different in morphology, semantics, or syntactic function, and those shared by TM and PTH in form but differing in meaning.

With increasing exchange between Taiwan and the Mainland in recent years, many TM terms have been introduced and accepted in the Mainland. The same is true of PTH words in
Taiwan. Therefore, there is no clear-cut diglossic line between the two. People may differ in opinion with regard to the question of which word should be considered as TM and which as PTH. The contrastive pairs of lexical items listed in Appendix I, taken from my field work as well as from the literature, are based on usage tendency, or on greater frequency of usage by one group over the other, and they serve as the database for analyzing the data.

Before quantitative analysis was carried out, all recordings made during the field work were transcribed, and then each informant's language was examined closely to find the rate of tokens of TM colored variants as contrasted to tokens which are generally used in PTH, for each of the linguistic variables discussed above.

With the linguistic variables defined above, it is now important to point out that the purpose of employing these linguistic variables is not to study the variables per se, but rather their capacity as sensitive indices of the whole process of language accommodation by the Mainland Chinese population in the local Chinese community in the Los Angeles area.

Notes:

1. The density of a network (D) is calculated by the following formula, which express the ratio of the total possible links (N) to the total actual links (Na) in the
The multiplexity score for an individual (M) is calculated as ratio of multiplex ties (Nm) to all relevant ties (N):

\[ M = \frac{Nm \times 100\%}{N} \]
CHAPTER 8

The Quantitative Analysis of the Linguistic Data

8.0 Introduction

This chapter reports the analysis of the linguistic variables that have been selected as potential indicators for the magnitude of Mainland Mandarin speakers' language accommodation. In every case sociolinguistic variation has been approached through analytical statistical procedures that deal with aggregated scores and individual scores. The informants are divided into subgroups according to area, sex, and age, and the mean linguistic variable scores of the subgroups are compared. The individual linguistic variable scores are correlated with the network strength score (NSS). Spearman rank-order correlation tests are used.

Spearman rank order correlation -- the correlation coefficient it gives is represented by $r_s$ -- is a non-parametric correlation procedure which is interpreted the same way as Pearson product-moment correlation. Both correlation tests tell the extent to which two or more characteristics vary together in a given population. However, Spearman rank-order correlation allows ordinal data. Since no information on the distance between members of the sample is available, network strength scores can best be interpreted as an ordinal measure (Fasold 1984). Spearman rank-order correlation analyzes to what extent the sample is ranked in the same (or
The purpose of adopting the quantitative analytical procedures here is to find out whether or not, and to what extent, each diagnostic linguistic variable is undergoing a process of change towards TM, the local prestigious form, from PTH, the standard variety. The working hypothesis adopted here is that the more advanced the person is in the process of getting involved in the local social networks, as reflected in his or her NSS, the more exposed he or she is to the pressure of the local linguistic norm, and the more he or she will accommodate his or her language towards the local variety, which will be revealed by higher frequencies of TM features in his or her speech. This accommodation towards the local variety, which reflects the way of speaking within the local networks, may be contrasted with Putonghua, or Guoyu, which is the Standard variety in both the Mainland and Taiwan.

8.1 The Distribution of Network Strength Scores

Since each individual in the sample is assigned a numerical score for his or her network integration (i.e. NSS), it is now possible to examine systematically the effects of the variable of network structure on a speaker's language change. Before we proceed to look at linguistic variation among groups and the relationship between network structure and linguistic variables for individual speakers, we first explore the distribution of network scores across sex, age,
and area subgroups. This information is a necessary preliminary to a more direct investigation of the relationship between language and network.

The overall mean network score for the sample population is found to be 7.83 (with the median being 8.0 and the mode being 9.0). Table 8.1 illustrates the mean scores of each subgroup. It is found that the females' mean network score is higher than the males' (8.67 : 6.94, an 11% difference), that younger people between 21 to 30 years of age have a higher score than the other age groups (9.42 : 6.6 and 7.17), and that Shanghainess seem to integrate into the local networks better than those from Beijing and other areas (9.09: 7.14 and 7.40). However, in general there are no considerable differences among the groups as far as network scores are concerned. In other words, the differences noted are not statistically significant, as shown by the F-scores; all scores are below the critical value at the level of significance of $\alpha = 0.05$. F-ratio is a parametric statistical procedure that is used to examine variance among groups.

Table 8.1 Mean Network Scores among Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex: Overall</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>2.198 p&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: Overall</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>41-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area: Overall</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interactions between the independent variables of
sex, age and area are examined, with the network score treated as the dependent variable here. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 8.2 and Table 8.3. Table 8.2 gives the results for the sex-by-age interaction. An examination of the male and female means for the three age-grading groups reveals that both male and female speakers of the 21-30 group score higher than the rest of the age groups. Of the two, the female 21-30 group scores higher than its male counterpart (10.14 : 8.71). The female 21-30 group scores the highest of all the groups, which is almost 25% higher than the male 41-50 group (6.00), which has the lowest score.

Table 8.2 Mean Network Scores of Sex by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p &gt; .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.626</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A look at the interaction between sex and area (Table 8.3) shows that women from Shanghai score substantially higher than the other groups, the latter differentiate very little with the mean network scores among themselves. Again the difference is below the significance level.

Table 8.3 Mean Network Scores by Sex and Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beijing</th>
<th>Shanghai</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p &gt; .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>3.020</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, the analysis of mean network strength scores demonstrates that differences are found among the subgroups,
but such differences are not statistically significant. Females have the same range of access and resources as males in developing network ties in the community, as addressed in Chapter 7, but they achieve a substantially higher mean score. This shows that Mainland Chinese women integrate into the local Chinese community to a higher degree than Mainland Chinese men do, which is particularly the case with women from Shanghai, who have a mean score substantially higher than all the rest (11.80). Although the network scores for different age groups do not clearly show that younger people integrate more than older people along a scale, the youngest group, both male and female, seems to integrate better (8.71 and 10.14).

The differences between mean network scores turn out to be not statistically significant in all cases. In other words, the differences observed are more intra-group rather than inter-group. The differences are not so large as to suggest that these subgroups, divided according to such social variables as sex, age, and area, are drawn from different populations. As far as their social network is concerned, they represent the same population, that is, people from Mainland China living in the Los Angeles area, who share a similar network patterning among themselves.

8.2 Correlations between Network Scores and Language Scores

8.2.1 The Correlation Tests for the Sample Population

With the general patterns of variability in network
structure established, network scores are compared directly with linguistic scores in this section. The hypothesis to be tested is that differences in network scores are related to differences in linguistic scores in the way that increasing linguistic variable scores are correlated with increasing network scores.

Table 8.4 gives the results of Spearman's rank-order correlation tests carried out with individual scores of all 35 informants in the sample. The results, or the Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient values $r_s$, reveal positive and highly significant correlations between network scores and language scores on all nine variable tested, as shown by the $t$-tests$^2$ ($t$ values in the table), at the significance level of $\alpha = 0.01$ and better.$^3$ The null hypothesis (i.e. the population correlation is zero) is thus rejected, and the research hypothesis for the study accepted. (For complete linguistic scores for the variables, refer to Appendix II.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$r_s$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De-retroflexion</td>
<td>0.7716</td>
<td>4.202</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone insertion</td>
<td>0.6546</td>
<td>4.910</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td>0.4807</td>
<td>3.149</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(you)</td>
<td>0.8400</td>
<td>8.940</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(yao)</td>
<td>0.5970</td>
<td>4.270</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hui)</td>
<td>0.6756</td>
<td>5.168</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux-not-Aux</td>
<td>0.5635</td>
<td>3.919</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>0.4886</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td>0.6118</td>
<td>4.443</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results demonstrate that there is in fact a positive correlation between the Mandarin which a Mainland Chinese speaks and the structure of his or her social network. When the network scores increase, the linguistic variable scores increase accordingly. Note that except for the linguistic variables of 'sentence-final particles' and 'intensifiers' (i.e. hǎo and AA-de), all other variables achieve very high coefficient values, well above 0.50 (i.e. over 50% of the variation observed can be explained by the linear relationship between the two variables).

Since the tokens, both realized or possible ones, for each of the variables (hǎo) and (AA-de) are very few in speech, the scores for the two closely related linguistic variables are combined, treated as one variable, i.e. intensifiers, in the analysis.

8.2.2 Correlations in Subgroups

Not all speakers relate the same linguistic variables to their personal network structure in the same way. It is very likely that different patterns can be found between men and women, speakers of different age groups, and speakers from different areas. Such differences are inevitable since the network patterns of the sexes, age groups and areas have already displayed some differences, as shown in Section 8.1. In addition, interactional differences among subgroups may also affect the way linguistic variables are related to the
personal social network, although it would be difficult to separate from each other the effects of the two kinds of differences on the linguistic scores.

In order to examine such complexities, informants are divided into subgroups based on sex, age and area again. The relationship between linguistic scores and social network strength scores is tested. Table 8.5 gives the results of the correlation tests run on the network and language relationship based on sex. Scores for male and female informants are tested separately for each linguistic variable:

Table 8.5 Correlations between network strength scores and linguistic variable scores based on sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Mean %</th>
<th>$r_s$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Level of sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De-retroflexion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>0.6000</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>0.9940</td>
<td>22.256</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone Insertion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>0.2700</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36.27</td>
<td>0.9317</td>
<td>10.261</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>0.1970</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(you)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28.54</td>
<td>0.5467</td>
<td>2.651</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>0.7619</td>
<td>4.556</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(yao)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td>0.9252</td>
<td>9.752</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hui)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>52.65</td>
<td>0.5130</td>
<td>2.319</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58.08</td>
<td>0.6736</td>
<td>3.646</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(you)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40.36</td>
<td>0.6297</td>
<td>3.142</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hui)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40.87</td>
<td>0.7528</td>
<td>4.575</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux-not-Aux</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37.43</td>
<td>0.4804</td>
<td>2.138</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48.34</td>
<td>0.6823</td>
<td>3.733</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>0.5324</td>
<td>2.436</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>0.5154</td>
<td>2.406</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47.55</td>
<td>0.4000</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51.78</td>
<td>0.7646</td>
<td>4.746</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not statistically significant

As shown by the mean scores, women as a group used more TM colored variants than men in all accounts, with exceptions
in only two cases, i.e. de-retroflexion and sentence-final particles. This more frequent use of TM variants by female informants may well be explained by the fact that they have higher network scores, as shown in Table 8.1. However, in several cases, the contrast between the sexes is very sharp. Women used TM colored intensifiers, i.e. hǎo and AA-de, almost twice as frequently as men did (28.54:10.56), and they out scored men by a large margin in tone insertion (36.27:22.84) and in the use of auxiliary verbs (i.e. yǒu, wèi, and huì) as operators in A-not-A questions (48.34:37.43). These differences can only be attributed to sex differences.

More striking, however, is the fact that network scores and linguistic variable scores correlate much better for women than for men. The correlations between social network scores and the scores of the nine linguistic variables for women all turned out to be highly significant. In fact, three of the correlations (for de-retroflexion, tone-insertion, and yǒu) are close to perfect ($r_s = 0.994, 0.9317, 0.9252$). This means all the nine linguistic variables are sensitive to network structure of women. Women not only use more TM colored features in their speech, but such use is also closely correlated with how well they integrate themselves into the community.

However, not all linguistic scores correlate well with men's network scores. Significant and highly significant correlations are found with variables associated with the
auxiliary verbs ǒu (rs=0.7619, p<0.001), ǎo (rs=0.513, p<0.05), and hui (rs=0.6297, p<0.01), with the auxiliaries as operators in A-not-A questions (rs=0.4804, p<0.05), and with sentence-final particles (rs=0.53224, p<0.05). Three linguistic variables, i.e. tone insertion, intensifiers, and lexicon, are not so sensitive to men's network structures. The correlations observed between these variables and the network scores are not significant (rs = 0.27, 0.197 and 0.4 respectively). The same is true with the variable of de-retroflexion. However, the rs value for network/de-retroflexion correlation for men is actually fairly high, which reaches 0.60. Since the sample is small (N=6), the rs value does not reach the significance level (i.e. α = 0.05).

This is a problem that should be noted here. The test for significance against chance is very much more stringent where the N is small. In other words, a much higher r value is required to demonstrate significance. Therefore, if a significant result is obtained when the N is small, it can be said with confidence that the relationship between network and language is very strong. However, more often, when the informants are divided into subgroups, based on sex, age, and area, the N becomes small and it is hard for the r value to reach the significance level. This is a constant methodological problem associated with sociolinguistic studies, especially with those using the participant-observation method as a way of data collecting, as already
addressed in Chapter 6 -- it is impossible for the researcher to employ a large sample, a sample that can be broken down into subgroups with the N remaining large enough for statistical exploration.

Table 8.6 reports the correlation tests for the interaction between language and social network structure.

Table 8.6 Correlations between network strength scores and linguistic variable scores based on age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>( r_s )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>Level of sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone insertion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.96</td>
<td>0.4640</td>
<td>1.830</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>0.7357</td>
<td>3.916</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>0.8829</td>
<td>3.760</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.28</td>
<td>0.3132</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>0.5526</td>
<td>3.916</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>0.7614</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(you)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>0.8230</td>
<td>5.019</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>0.6655</td>
<td>3.215</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>0.9404</td>
<td>5.530</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(yao)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>0.4624</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>0.5700</td>
<td>2.502</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48.88</td>
<td>0.8827</td>
<td>3.757</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hui)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.28</td>
<td>0.4242</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.36</td>
<td>0.6461</td>
<td>3.052</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>0.9710</td>
<td>8.122</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux-not-Aux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.96</td>
<td>0.5392</td>
<td>2.223</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.84</td>
<td>0.5100</td>
<td>2.166</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.24</td>
<td>0.7165</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>0.4680</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>0.6595</td>
<td>3.163</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>0.6286</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.08</td>
<td>0.3885</td>
<td>1.469</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.78</td>
<td>0.7799</td>
<td>4.493</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54.27</td>
<td>0.6286</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

♦Not statistically significant
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based on age.

The sample size problem is exemplified here because the age group for informants between 41-50 years old (Group 3 in the table) is fairly small (N=6). This is mainly due to the availability of informants for this age group, a sampling problem already addressed in Chapter 6.

For the 41-50 age group, significant correlations have been found between the social network scores and the linguistic variable scores of tone-insertion ($r_s=0.8829$, $p<0.05$), yǒu ($r_s=0.9404$, $p<0.01$), yào ($r_s=0.8827$, $p<0.02$), and huì ($r_s=0.971$, $p<0.01$). This means that the relationship between network structure and the four linguistic variables is very strong indeed for this age group (N=6).

For the other four variables, a fairly high correlation coefficient is found for each one, i.e. $r_s=0.7614$ for intensifiers, $r_s=0.7165$ for the auxiliaries used in A-not-A questions, and $r_s=0.6286$ for both sentence-final particles and for lexicon. However, since the N is small for this age group, these correlations are not statistically significant. Higher coefficients are needed for them to be significant.

What is more interesting about the results in Table 8.6 is the comparison between the 21-30 age group and the 31-40 age group. For the 31-40 age group, all the linguistic variable scores correlate well with the social network scores. The correlations are either significant ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) or highly significant ($\alpha \leq 0.01$). In other words, all the eight
variables serve as good sociolinguistic markers for network integration of the group.

However, no significant correlations are found between social network scores and most of the linguistic variable scores for the 21-30 age group, except for two variables, i.e. yǒu ($r_s=0.823$, $p<0.001$) and the auxiliaries serving as operators in A-not-A questions ($r_s=0.5392$, $p<0.05$). It seems that social network scores for members of the group are not as sensitive to these linguistic variables.

If we put the 31-40 and the 41-50 groups together and compare them with the 21-30 group, the situation is that the linguistic variables selected are good network markers for older people, but not so for younger people.

As noted in Section 8.1, younger people in the sample have a higher mean network score (9.42 as opposed to 6.6 and 7.17 for the other groups), and as shown by the mean scores in Table 8.6, they use TM variants of these linguistic variables at a much higher frequency in most cases. These facts, coupled with weaker correlations between social network scores and linguistic variable scores, suggest that younger people perhaps are eager to use the TM variants in identifying themselves with TM speaking local community members, even though they may not yet have built close-knit network ties with other TM-speaking people in the community. The high use of the TM features may function as a card to get accepted by, or to gain access to, the networks. Clearly this is a case of
speech accommodation in process.

Correlations between network scores and linguistic variable scores have been found to be different between the sexes and between the age groups. The same is also true with the network/language interaction based on area. As discussed in Chapter 7, TM shares some features with Southern Chinese dialects, which would affect the sensibility of the linguistic variables selected as markers.

Table 8.7 summarizes the results obtained from correlation tests carried out separately according to areas for each linguistic variable. The results reveal very interesting differences between the groups. Significant correlations between network scores and linguistic variable scores are found for the Beijing group in all tested linguistic variables, with the only exception being the variable sentence-final particles. Like TM speakers Mandarin speakers from Beijing may also speak with many sentence-final particles; the difference may lie in the choice of particles. TM and BM speakers may have different preferences in selecting particles. Particles like la, ma, ai, de-la seldom appear in the speech of a person from Beijing.

As expected, the linguistic variables of yào and hui do not correlate with the network scores well enough to be significant for the Shanghai group (\( r_s = 0.5334 \) \( p > 0.05 \) for yào; \( r_s = 0.1927 \) \( p < 0.05 \) for hui). This may be associated with the high use of the two auxiliaries in Wu, one of the Southern
Table 8.7 Correlations between network strength scores and linguistic variable scores based on area.

B = Beijing; S = Shanghai; O = Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>rs</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Level of sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone insertion</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>0.8381</td>
<td>5.322</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td>0.7799</td>
<td>3.738</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>0.2561</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>0.4000</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>0.7954</td>
<td>3.937</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>0.3580</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(you)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>0.7022</td>
<td>3.416</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>0.9450</td>
<td>8.667</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>0.8471</td>
<td>4.509</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(yao)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>48.04</td>
<td>0.7132</td>
<td>4.281</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>62.51</td>
<td>0.5334</td>
<td>1.892</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>58.03</td>
<td>0.2439</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hui)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>36.34</td>
<td>0.7774</td>
<td>4.281</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>47.64</td>
<td>0.1927</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>0.6647</td>
<td>2.516</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux-not Aux</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>0.5300</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>65.93</td>
<td>0.7051</td>
<td>2.983</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>0.1910</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>0.4386</td>
<td>1.691</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>0.7473</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>-0.0381</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>47.41</td>
<td>0.7806</td>
<td>4.327</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>56.35</td>
<td>0.8441</td>
<td>4.723</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>45.68</td>
<td>-0.0549</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not statistically significant

dialects spoken by people from Shanghai. The actual PTH spoken by people from Shanghai may already involve a highly frequent use of the two auxiliaries, thus the variables are not sensitive to the network scores. For all the other six variables, however, language and network correlations are all
significant for the group, and in most cases, highly significant. This is the same with the Beijing group.

While significant correlations are generally found with most linguistic variables for people from Beijing and Shanghai, the picture of network/language correlation is blurred for people from Other Areas of the Mainland. Language and network correlations are found to be significant for only two variables, i.e. the auxiliary verb yōu (r_s = 0.8471, p < 0.01) and the auxiliary verb hui (r_s = 0.6647, p < 0.05). There are no significant correlations with the other six linguistic variables. This may be associated with the fact that informants in this group were from different areas in Mainland China other than Beijing and Shanghai.

Five informants in the group are Mandarin speakers, with four speaking Northern Mandarin and one speaking Xiajiang Mandarin. The other five informants are bidialectal speakers, who speak Mandarin and one of the Southern dialects. This different linguistic background may have affected the results of the correlations. Bidialectal speakers from Mainland China who speak Mandarin as a second dialect may be more easily influenced by the Mandarin variety spoken in the Los Angeles Chinese community than the others in the group. Moreover, the linguistic variable scores of two informants in the group are often found to go to extremes, distorting the whole linear relationship. Since the sample size is already small, it is hard to make statistical adjustments in order to achieve
satisfactory results concerning this variable.

To sum up the discussion on the results presented by Table 8.7, consistent results are found, as in other tests discussed above, with people from Beijing and Shanghai. The correlations turn out to be significant in almost every case, with only few linguistic variables found not significantly correlated with network structure, which can be explained by a higher frequency of the marked variants found in the variety of language some informants speak. A lack of correlation between most of the linguistic variables and network structure for the Others group may be due to the following possibilities: (1) the TM variants are also used in some Southern dialects spoken by some informants in the group, (2) extreme scores of a couple of informants distorted the correlations, and (3) there was a lack of control as far as the group composition is concerned.

Language/network interactions based on sex by age and on sex by area have also been examined. Since the sample size in each test is too small after informants are further divided (in most cases N < 6), correlations are generally not significant. Only with one subgroup, i.e. female Beijing informants (N=8), did most correlation tests turn out to be significant.

Table 8.8 indicates that the linguistic variables selected for the study are most sensitive to Beijing females as a group, which is also reflected in the findings discussed
Table 8.8 Correlations between network strength scores and linguistic variable scores for Beijing females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_s$</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>p&lt;0.02</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

above: generally these linguistic variables work well with females and with speakers from Beijing. Beijing females just intersect these two groups.

8.3 Individual Linguistic Variables as Markers

As discussed in passing above, not all linguistic variables correlate well with the social network variable for all groups. Some linguistic variables turn out to be consistently sensitive as markers for all groups, but others repeatedly show a lack of correlation for some groups. Therefore, it is also necessary to look at language/network correlation from the perspective of the linguistic variables.

The four variables that are based on the auxiliary verbs, i.e. **yǒu**, **yāo**, and **hui**, and the three used as operators in forming A-not-A questions generally correlate well with network scores, and are good sociolinguistic markers for social network structure. The correlation tests for the variable **yǒu** generate results that are significant without any exception, for all the subgroups tested. This is the single most powerful variable for determining language and network correlation in the study. The variables **yāo** and **hui**, together
with the variable Aux-not-Aux, are only weaker when the influence of Southern dialects gets into the way. When these effects are well understood and properly controlled, they also serve as fairly good markers.

The correlations of the two phonological variables, de-retroflexion and tone-insertion, are both highly significant when the whole sample population is tested. When tested with subgroups, de-retroflexion turns out to be a better sex marker for females. The correlation for males \( (r_s=0.6) \) is not significant because two informants used the TM variants with substantially higher frequency (36.97 and 38.64 as opposed to the group mean of 15.4). When they are taken out of the sample, the correlation coefficient rises to \( r_s=0.8 \). Since the sample is now reduced to \( N=4 \), the coefficient is not significant. Satisfactory answers could be obtained if the sample were larger.

Tone insertion also serves as a good sex marker for females. It is also sensitive to the network structure of people over 30 years old and people who were from Beijing and Shanghai. If de-retroflexion can be considered, not without argument, as a network marker used by males, tone-insertion is clearly not the one for males. This may be associated with the attitude towards the use of tone-insertion on the part of males: for males, excessive use of tone-insertion for neutral tones sounds feminine. Tone insertion does not work well with young people between 21-30, nor with informants in the Others
group either.

Sentence-final particles are good social network markers for both sexes. The correlations of network and the variable are significant for older people as well as for people from Shanghai. However, the variable is not sensitive to the network structure of younger people and people from Beijing and Other areas. In other words, these groups of people do not use these variables as markers of their social network integration.

Intensifiers, i.e. hǎo and AA-de, are network markers for females, for older people, and for people from Shanghai. They are not quite sensitive to the network structure of males, younger people, and people from Beijing and other areas, and this difference cannot be attributed to dialect differences.

A similar pattern is found with lexicon, with the only exception being for Beijing people, who do use lexical items as their network markers. Thus, females, older people, and people from Beijing and Shanghai use lexical items to identify themselves with the local community. This suggests that these people higher frequency of TM lexical items is closely related to a similar higher integration into the networks. As far as the variable of lexicon is concerned, a pattern of network integration is not found with males in general, with younger people, and with people from the Others group.

In order to examine whether there is any patterning, or any route, that the Mainlanders follow in the accommodation
process, four out of the nine linguistic variables, whose TM variants are not found in PTH at all, were selected, each representing a different level of analysis. The TM variants were not previously in the linguistic repertoire of the informants -- they had to acquire these variants before they could use them. To control speaker factors, linguistic scores of only Beijing females were used, since these scores were the most consistent. Table 8.9 is the summary of the scores.

Table 8.9 Network strength scores and scores of 4 linguistic variables for Beijing females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf.</th>
<th>NSS</th>
<th>De-retro.</th>
<th>you</th>
<th>Intens.</th>
<th>Lexicon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>59.26</td>
<td>64.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>60.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>35.64</td>
<td>77.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 7.25 8.41 9.78 22.29 44.38

It is found that TM variants of lexical and morphological variables appeared to be acquired first and used with a higher frequency. The syntactic and phonological variables were much lower in frequency, probably because they are at a higher stage of the accommodation process. (Data obtained from TM speaking informants show that you can go to as high as over 80% in the speech of a TM speaker.) This finding supports Trudgill's contention about long-term accommodation (1986), as discussed in section 4.1.4, that long-term accommodation
follows a fixed route.

8.4 Speaker Differences in Using Linguistic Variables as Markers

Now it is clear that the correspondences between the social network structure of an individual and the manner in which this individual uses the resources of variability open to him or her are closely related along with the variables of the speaker's sex, age and area where he or she is from. It is partly because the social network structures characteristic of different subgroups are different; in particular, women score higher than men and Shanghai people score higher than others on the network strength scale. It is also reasonable to suggest that particular "bits" of language are significant, in terms of their social function, to different subgroups in the population.

Much of the variation among individuals observed, however, may not necessarily be explained by subgrouping the sample according to sex, age, and area. Individuals may differ in taking advantage of the resources available to identify themselves with the networks. When a range of such "bits of language", which are referred to here as markers, is available, some may be employed by some people, while others may be used by different people, but all are used in general to serve the same purpose. Not everyone needs to use the exactly the same linguistic variables, and even if they do use
the same ones, they do not have to use them in the same way. Individual differences may exist.

Table 8.10 gives data for 10 speakers which serves to illustrate the difference among individuals. CK and TH, two informants nearly at the two extremes of the network scale, can be considered as most consistent with their linguistic scores, which means that their linguistic variable scores are comparable to their network scores. Compared with them, however, others selected here show differential use of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>NSS</th>
<th>De-ret</th>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Inten</th>
<th>you</th>
<th>vao</th>
<th>hui</th>
<th>A-not-A</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td><strong>68.89</strong></td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td><strong>75.00</strong></td>
<td>17.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LZ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>38.64</strong></td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>32.73</td>
<td><strong>59.26</strong></td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>66.10</td>
<td>45.19</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>20.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td><strong>67.39</strong></td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>17.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>36.97</strong></td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>55.32</td>
<td>35.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td><strong>56.25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>10.00</strong></td>
<td>32.08</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>67.27</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>22.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58.59</td>
<td><strong>24.39</strong></td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>80.65</td>
<td>56.35</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td><strong>12.83</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>89.71</td>
<td>35.64</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>66.92</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>28.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the linguistic variables as markers, not necessarily corresponding to their network scores.

JC, whose network score is low (NSS=4), scored extremely high for the TM variants of the two variables, the auxiliary verb yào and the A-not-A questions with the auxiliaries as the operators, while other linguistic variable scores were comparable to her network score.

LZ and JF, two male informants from Beijing, had
disproportionately high scores for de-retroflexion. However, their scores for auxiliaries as operators in A-not-A construction is low (in fact, a zero). For LZ and JF, de-retroflexion plays a more important role as a network marker than other variables.

DP had almost the highest score for intensifiers in the entire sample, but her network score did not even reach the middle of the scale. The same can be said about EG, who scored very high for the auxiliary hi. Therefore, intensifiers for DP and hi for EG are the more important linguistic variables which they use as markers.

For those informants who had higher network scores, linguistic variable scores might not be comparably high throughout. Compared to his network score, WD had a higher score for particles, but he used no TM variants of intensifiers. MG and LD both had very high scores for their networks, but MG did not use tone-insertion so frequently, neither did LD with TM variants of intensifiers and particles.

The argument here is that individual differences may lead to highly frequent use of particular TM variants as markers for some people. From the individual point of view, focusing on some variants and using them highly frequently may in effect achieve the same goal as using a whole repertoire of different variants, namely, as markers to identify the speaker with the local networks. In fact, the language of some informants who were labelled as "sounding like those from
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Taiwan" by others actually involved frequent use of only a few TM variants. Statistically, however, individual differences may cause some problems, especially when the sample size is small.

8.5 Summary

To sum up the chapter, the results support the research hypothesis that the more an individual integrates into the local network, the higher the linguistic variable scores he or she achieves. However, differences are found in the subgroups. Women are better able to integrate themselves into the local community, and they are better able to use linguistic resources to show their identities. Men's use of linguistic resources for this purpose is not as high. Language and network structure are closely correlated for individuals in the older groups, but it is not so with younger people. It is possible that younger people are eager to develop close ties with the local community members, and thus accommodate more intensively to achieve the goal. Language and network correlation is generally found with people from Beijing and Shanghai, but people in the Others group do not share this pattern. Perhaps a lack of control over the informants in the Others group, who came from different regions of the Mainland, is the reason. Most linguistic variables selected turn out to be sensitive, and lexical and morphological accommodation seems to take place before
syntactic and phonological accommodation. When patterns of language and network correlations are examined, it is important that individual differences in using the variables as markers be noted.

Notes:

1. The following formula is used for Spearman rank-order correlation where ties, or equal values, are present (Thomas, 1986)

\[
    r_s = \frac{\sum X^2 + \sum Y^2 - \sum d^2}{2/\sum X^2 \sum Y^2}
\]

where

\[
    \sum X^2 = \frac{n^3 - n}{12} - \sum T_x \\
    \sum Y^2 = \frac{n^3 - n}{12} - \sum T_y \\
    t^3 = t
\]

2. The t-test, or Student t-test, tests whether a correlation coefficient is significantly different from zero, so that it is not caused by chance. If the value the t-test calculation gives is significant at \( p<0.05 \) or better, then the coefficient is significant (Fasold 1984:104).

3. In the present study, levels of significance were determined with the Student t Distribution Table in Lentner ed. (1981).

4. For some linguistic variables, the difference between variants is that of frequency. For these variables, the difference lies in the fact TM variants and PTH variants are totally different, i.e. TM and PTH have clearly contrasted variants.
CHAPTER 9

Theoretical and Methodological Issues: General Discussions

9.0 Introduction

Verbal interaction is a social process in which utterances are selected in accordance with socially recognized norms and expectations. In analyzing linguistic phenomena within a socially defined universe, the study is of language usage as it reflects more general behavior norms (Gumperz 1972). How this usage is studied, however, can raise different issues and bring about different results.

According to Milroy (1987b), most current sociolinguistic models rest on a rather narrow base derived from relatively formal styles or relatively educated varieties. It is important, however, to obtain more information about the facts of specifically nonstandard speech in a range of everyday contexts. Network analysis in this sense is a break-through for the problems encountered in Labovian models.

In this chapter, different issues that have been brought up in the study from both theoretical and methodological perspectives will be addressed within the framework of the social network model, on the basis of the data obtained from the present study.

9.1 Networks and Dialect Focusing and Diffusion

Claimed to be capable of universal application and less
ethnocentric than social status based models, network analysis for sociolinguistic studies has mostly been applied to working class and peasant communities in Western societies. In such communities, the close-knit, and territorially based network structure has been demonstrated to be associated with speakers' adherence to a vernacular or non-legitimized norm. This association of network structure and vernacular norm, according to Milroy (1987b), suggests that a close-knit network structure is an important mechanism of language maintenance, in that speakers are able to form a cohesive group capable of resisting pressure, linguistic and social, from outside the group. The development of the sense of group identity leads to language focusing, or, the emergence of a norm in which variability follows systematic patterns (Le Page 1980).

However, if the individual's network structure becomes less close-knit, the individual will be robbed of an important mechanism of nonstandard norm maintenance, and he or she will be free of the constant supervision and control. Linguistic diffuseness, or language patterns not characteristic of any particular group but rather a mixture, can thus be witnessed. Such linguistic diffusion was found in Bortoni-Ricardo's study (1986), where migration of rural Caipira speakers to Brazlândia resulted in the loosening up of close-knit rural networks.

The function of network structure as a norm-enforcement
mechanism in regulating linguistic focusing and diffusion provides a powerful framework with which to look at the accommodation process observed in the Los Angeles Chinese community. The immigration of Mainland Chinese to the United States resembles in some respects what happened in Bortoni-Ricardo's study (1986): geographical movement literally takes away from these Mainlanders the pressure to adhere to whatever norms they would otherwise have followed. As a result, change has been observed in many Mainland Chinese' PTH. However, this is not a similar phenomenon of language diffusion as witnessed in Bortoni-Ricardo's study. The change has followed systematic patterns. In the Mandarin speaking Chinese community, Mainland Chinese immigrants, as new members of the community, are immediately confronted with a different linguistic norm, a norm that is contradictory to the one they were used to. TM, spoken in the local community, is the covert prestige variety that exerts a powerful influence on the language behavior of speakers in the community. For many Mainland Chinese who have identified themselves with the local community, adjustment has to be made in their language, and they are compelled to accommodate their language to the local speakers, as pressure to make such a change comes constantly from those with whom they are already tied with in the networks.

Therefore, what is observed in these Mainland Chinese' language is not a process of change from dialect focusing to
dialect diffusion, as in the case of Bortoni-Ricardo's study, but rather one from dialect focusing on one variety to a different one, or dialect accommodation. In other words, this is a process of change of linguistic norm. Such a language change process could hardly be accounted for using a traditional status-based model. Only a more individual-oriented model, such as the social network model adopted here, would be able to tackle the complex process.

9.2 Gender Differences

Gender differences have always been an important issue in sociolinguistic studies. How gender differences are marked out by language, however, varies from community to community. In Western societies, sex-marking is generally interpreted as women approximating the prestige norm more closely than men of similar status. Men tend to be the innovators in leading linguistic changes, except where changes are taking place in the direction of the high-status or standard norm, in which case women tend to be in the vanguard (Trudgill 1983:92-94).

Although these salient gender differences do exist and are theoretically important, the interpretation of the differences relies on the analyst's capacity to assign a comparable social-class index score to both males and females. Since women are often classified arbitrarily for their social status, it is always hard to take seriously the various interpretations of linguistic sex-marking which are based on
the stratificational analysis. Therefore, as Milroy (1987b:102) points out, a more common explanation of the patterns that emerge from a status based model is that in the absence of opportunities to mark their status by occupation, women resort to language. Even this explanation can be rejected: if women are motivated by a desire to mark prestige, why should wives of men in high-status occupations not simply imitate the language of their husbands (Coates 1986). Moreover, it is clear from studies cited in Chapter 7 that women do not always and everywhere produce speech nearer to the prestige standard than men's.

Milroy (1987b, 1980) suggests that gender differences can be related to characteristic occupations of men and of women, which can be distinctly different, to the kinds of relationships with co-employees associated with them, and more importantly, to network structure, i.e. the general patterns of informal social relationships contracted by men and by women.

As discussed in Chapter 8, the findings of this study show that female Mainland Chinese in the Los Angeles Chinese community have higher network scores than men, and moreover their language is closely correlated with their social network structure. However, the language of male Mainland Chinese does not correlate with their network structure in the same way. Such gender differences are closely associated with network integration, which is also found in Milroy's Belfast
study (1980). However, gender differences in the two studies are not of the same nature. In Belfast, women's language and network correlations differ from men's because there are differences between the network structure of the two sexes, as a result of differential employment patterns and differential social roles for the sexes. In this study, Chinese women from Mainland China are found to have basically equal employment opportunities, and there is no different overtly-defined social role for Mainland Chinese women to play. In other words, they share the same access to network resources as men do to contract network ties. As it turns out, however, women integrate into the local community much more fully than men — they have developed closer ties with others in the community. Moreover, the linguistic resources have been fully explored by women to identify themselves with the local people they have tied with. All the linguistic variables selected for study turn out to be used as the network markers by Mainland Chinese women. But this is not true with men. Not all the variables are used as markers for them.

These gender differences show that Mainland Chinese women, who are better integrated into the local networks, are leading the accommodation process towards Taiwan Mandarin, which is the local norm and can be considered as possessing prestige in the community. Therefore, this accommodation process, in which women take the lead, is toward the local norm, despite the fact that the PTH they spoke before is the
standard, more prestige variety in Mainland China (Kalmar, Zhong & Xiao 1987) where they came from. To Mainlanders, long-term accommodation toward TM would mean losing the ability to speak the prestigious standard. In this sense, the accommodation does not seem to be toward the prestige standard, but rather toward the nonstandard local norm, a fact which is contradictory to the assumptions of many previous sociolinguistic studies.

However, prestige is always relative. The situation can be re-analyzed from a different perspective. Since PTH, the standard variety spoken in China, does not have normative forces in the American Chinese community over the nonstandard TM (PTH has never been the norm in the American Chinese community, and is not likely to be in the near future), Mainlanders who are not returning to China are not concerned about losing the Mainland prestige variety in the American context. Moreover, now in the American Chinese community, Mainlanders have become economically and socially the less privileged, and consequently the varieties they speak do not share the same status with TM. Although it is still hard to say that PTH is a stigmatized variety in the American Chinese community, it is obvious that it has never gained the same prestige as TM. Mainland Mandarin varieties may only signal a less privileged social status to many local people.

In this sense, accommodation led by women may be understood as moving toward a covertly prestige variety, if
not the standard, within an American context. Mainland Chinese women are then more status conscious, especially when the target status they aim at is in contrast with the one they originally had. They are more eager to disassociate themselves from the image of being from Mainland China, or not to be considered as a fresh immigrant from the Mainland, who are considered indigent and naive. They prefer to live and share just like the others in the community.

Men, on the contrary, seem to be more conservative in the integration process. Although they do frequently employ linguistic markers to identify themselves with the local people, they do not seem to be as enthusiastic as women. The linguistic accommodation witnessed in men is not as drastic. Many of them still cling to their old linguistic norms. Some of them, such as one informant in the sample, would even fight desperately for their old norms by correcting TM speakers.

One more complication can be found in the already complicated gender differences. TM as the prestigious form is only relative within the local Chinese community. For Mainland Chinese, the prestige issue can be explored at different levels. While there is the prestige standard in Mainland China, there is the local covert prestige variety TM in the American Chinese community, and as a bilingual community, there is also another level to consider, which is the norm of the mainstream society. If TM is the local norm, then English is the norm for the mainstream society. As the
ethnographic observation reveals, some men from Mainland China think that the broader societal norm is more important. They are not concerned much with the variety of Mandarin they speak and how they speak it, but they pay much more attention to how they should speak English properly. For such people more code-switching to English could be observed in their speech. These men are marginals in the community, as discussed in Chapter Five.

Therefore, the argument here is that gender differences, just like many other differences among social groups, should be viewed within the context of social background. Different perspectives taken in viewing the same issue can lead to different answers, and the particular perspective taken to look at the issue would directly affect the results obtained. Therefore, a simple generalization without referring to the relevant social context would be unjustified. In the case of gender differences among Mainland Chinese in their language accommodation process, linguistic variables serve just as means not ends, which reflect, from one perspective, Mainland Chinese women and men's differential social motivation and value, and the subsequent network integration in the Los Angeles Chinese community. Mainland Chinese Women integrate better because they are generally more sociable and they are more conscious of the fact that they are from the Mainland, which suggests a lifestyle alien to the local norm. This is especially true to those just arrived. Better integration
Age-grading, as a social variable, is another area that has been much studied in sociolinguistic studies. In many places, younger speakers, especially males, appear to approximate more closely to the vernacular than middle-aged speakers (Milroy 1980:114). One of the best-known studies of the effects of age on speech is Labov's Martha's Vineyard study (1963), in which younger speakers approximate more closely to the vernacular than the middle-aged. This has also been found in Trudgill's study in Norwich (1974) where younger people used the more vernacular variant of the variable (a), which was a diphthongized reflex as in words "bad" and "man", representing a movement away from the RP norm. However, the pattern is not always so clearcut. Milroy (1980), using network analysis, found that rather than younger people showing better network/language correlations than older people for all linguistic variables, younger and older speakers used different linguistic variables as their social network markers.

The quantitative analysis carried out in the present study reveals that younger people from Mainland China have higher network strength scores, which mean they have generally developed closer ties with TM speaking local people. They include TM variants in their language much more frequently
than the older people. However, the correlations between their network structure and most of the linguistic variables selected are not statistically significant. In other words, for younger Mainlanders, differences found in network scores are not related closely to differences found in linguistic variable scores. For many of them, a higher rate of TM variants in the language is not necessarily accompanied by comparable higher social network scores, while lower social network scores do not suggest a lower rate of TM variants.

The data from ethnographic observation show that younger people are more active in the local community. They generally make more TM speaking friends. Since many of them still do not have family, they associate with their friends more, and are eager to get involved in the social activities. They can be described as a group of people who learn and use the TM features at a higher rate, appear to be less conservative in giving up their old norms, and more ready to accept and adhere to the new norm.

This may suggest, as addressed in Chapter 8, that younger people in the study are apparently more innovative in the accommodation process. The lack of significant correlations between network structure and linguistic variable scores could be contributed by, for the most part, high use of TM variants on the part of some younger speakers who do not have comparable high network scores. This indicates that the accommodation process in their language may proceed faster
than their network integration. These younger people have fully employed the linguistic resources to identify themselves with the community, although their network may not yet be as dense and multiplex as others.

9.4 Individual Speaker Differences

Another factor that could have contributed to the lack of correlations between network scores and linguistic scores for the younger speakers is individual differences in using linguistic variables as markers.

As illustrated in Table 8.10, differences can be found in the use of the linguistic variables as network markers among Mainlanders. While most differences can be accounted for by speaker differences based on sex, age and area, differences can also be contributed by individuals who may have differential access to linguistic resources, and who may also differ in utilizing linguistic sources available. While a whole range of linguistic differences can be found in the community, the linguistic repertoire of one individual can differ from that of another. Such differences will be fully reflected in the correlation tests. Therefore, while some linguistic variables, such as 你, carry multiple social values for everyone, to varying degrees, in their function as network markers, other variables are most salient for particular groups, or even for particular speakers. As for individual speakers in the study, some use mainly lexical
items as markers, others use syntactic or phonological items more. Such individual differences described here are even more prominent among Mainland Mandarin speakers who are initiating the process of accommodation.

While statistical techniques provide powerful evidence that validates the assumption that network analysis reveals the patterns of linguistic variation among individuals, individual differences in essence cannot be explained by statistical methods. When a correlation test fails to show that a group of speakers' network scores are strongly related to their scores for a particular variable, this does not necessarily mean that the particular variable is not a marker for particular speakers in that same group. This perhaps is one weakness of the Milroyan social network model, which leans heavily on statistical procedures. Patterns of linguistic variation have to be found with people still treated as groups according to sex, age, and area etc. It is certainly important in sociolinguistic studies to find patterns, on which generalizations and theories can be developed. However, an individual-oriented model should be able to allow individual differences, since sometimes there is simply no clear cut patterns within groups. A more qualitative account is what should be introduced here.

9.5 *Time Dimension in Network Structure*

Another issue concerning the social network model is
associated with time depth. While network density and multiplexity are important factors in deciding the network structure, time is another important factor involved, especially when the network structures of Mainland Mandarin speakers are under concern. The extent of dialect accommodation depends not only on how a speaker is integrated into the community, but also how long such an integration into the community has persisted and whether there is any change of the network pattern involved.

In the social network model as used in sociolinguistics, there is no device that would allow a researcher to add the time dimension into the picture. Perhaps time depth was not an important factor in the previous networks studied, which were mostly in working-class and peasant communities, because these communities usually have not experienced tremendous social change over time. Individuals' networks have been part of the on-going social process for years, or decades. Nothing has changed drastically. Therefore, time as a variable is well controlled in those network studies.

For speakers who are experiencing a change in their network structures because of geographic movement, and consequently a change in their linguistic norm, the variable of time is extremely important. It intersects with the correlation between network structure and language change. Therefore, in the case of Mainland Chinese speakers in the Los Angeles Chinese community, a speaker who has lived in the
community for a long time but has never developed fairly dense and multiplex network structure may exhibit similar magnitude of dialect accommodation as, or even higher degree of dialect accommodation than, another speaker who has settled in the community for a relatively shorter period of time but has contracted close-knit ties with other local speakers.

On the other hand, although contracting a close-knit network or becoming accepted as a member of a close-knit network requires a sufficient time commitment, a speaker who is anxious to identify himself or herself with the network can contract close-knit network ties within months because of the efforts made, but his or her language change would not be as drastic simply because one is not able to accommodate his or her language on an extensive basis in a short time, especially when forms of the target variety are not already in his or her linguistic repertoire.

Moreover, there is also the problem of whether a speaker's network structure would be held constant over the years. Since the network score is usually assigned by the field worker according to the present situation, the network history can hardly be revealed by the score assigned, especially when there is a major change in the network. For example, some informants in my sample told me that their language changed back because of a change in their network structure. Such change in their network structure was caused by a few reasons. In some cases, close relatives came to live
with them, who complained about their TM-colored language. Some others had witnessed change in their network because of the change in life from being a student to being employed.

While the time dimension appears to play an important role in understanding the relationship between network structure and the language accommodation process, the commonly used method with which the network strength score is determined simply does not allow for a time dimension. One possible solution to this problem could be to treat the time factor indirectly through adjustment of the index scores for the relevant network indicators. The particular index score could reflect individual network structure over the years, including possible changes. Such a technique could lead to the question of credibility.

9.6 Linguistic Accommodation and Network Structure

The relationship between linguistic accommodation and network structure is the most important subject of this dissertation. They relate respectively to two theoretical frameworks in sociolinguistic studies, which are both indispensable for an understanding of the linguistic phenomena of Mainland Chinese in the Los Angeles Chinese community.

As described in chapter 4, linguistic accommodation, from the sociopsychological perspective, explains linguistic modification as a result of psychological orientations during face-to-face interaction. However, interpersonal
communication is a social process in which utterances are selected in accordance with socially recognized norms and expectations. When a group of speakers is involved, social norms that govern face-to-face interaction, in addition to psychological factors, come into play.

Therefore, linguistic accommodation takes place when a speaker chooses from various sociopsychological strategies to either converge, or diverge, or maintain. However, what kind of choice the speaker makes and how much the speaker modifies his or her speech are to a large extent determined by the person's relationship to others in the community. A speaker who is constantly under strong normative pressure from other members of a group could hardly diverge. On the other hand, a speaker who is not identified with any group may choose strategies more freely at his or her will to accommodate. Therefore, it is very difficult to talk about psychological orientations of a speaker during interpersonal communication without considering the speaker's social relationship to the interlocutor and to others in the community. The claim I am strongly making here is that since a speaker's social network structure is a way to look at interpersonal relationships, it is closely related to and affects his or her accommodation process during his or her verbal interaction with other speakers.

In the present study in the Los Angeles Chinese community, an understanding of the linguistic accommodation
process observed on the part of Mainland Chinese requires an analysis of both the speakers' decision to integrate into the community and their network structures. As pointed out above, many previous network studies were conducted in working-class and peasant communities where network clusters had been long established ones; and since members of the community were born and brought up at the same place, they had always been tied to each other ever-since. Therefore, the choice of accommodation strategies available for these people is limited. Any attempt to diverge tends to be ridiculed by speakers around them.

In a fluid and expanding ethnic community like the Los Angeles Chinese, speakers from Mainland China came and settled down. Although he or she is immediately aware of linguistic norms of the community, as a new member of the community who has not yet contracted close network ties and who has not accepted the local norm, this Mainland Mandarin speaker really has a choice of accommodation strategies. For him or her, divergence is not impossible. In the case of some informants in the study, who can probably be labelled as marginal in the community, they have never chosen to converge consciously. Although they are tied in some way to the others in the community, they mostly keep diverging from their TM speaking interlocutors (and even try to make their interlocutors converge toward their variety). However, unconsciously they have acquired and used some TM features, mainly lexical ones, in their speech, a fact they usually deny.
To many Mainland Chinese, convergence takes place out of necessity when they first arrive in the community. As Trudgill (1986:21) and Haugen (1966) have argued, the need to be understood is an important factor for individual speakers to accommodate. Although mutual intelligibility is usually not a serious problem, speakers in this sort of situation rapidly become aware that some features are likely to cause interlocutors more trouble than others. When referring to this situation, one informant in the study said:

Liaotian shihou zhuyi, têbêi shi yongci, Bêijêng rén hai-yǒu yûshù, yîmiăn bu lî-jiê.

'When chatting, attention is given, especially to use of vocabulary; for people from Beijing, there is also speech speed, so as to avoid not being understood.'

Therefore, in order to assist comprehension, this speaker from Beijing converged in vocabulary, speech speed, and Beijing Mandarin retroflex suffix -r and vernacular jargon words.

For new arrivals from Mainland China, an initial learning stage is a prerequisite for successful accommodation. The learning seems to proceed from lexical items, to morphological, and later to syntactic and phonological features of the target variety.

Most of the time, however, accommodation is found to proceed beyond the necessity for comprehension. Speakers make an investment in accommodation for social purposes. For people who plan to stay in this country, accommodation plays an important role at the beginning stage of their involvement.
in the community. Accommodation can be instrumental at the beginning when one wants to be accepted by a TM-speaking cluster. Convergence usually wins approval from local TM speakers, which would make it easier for Mainlanders to find jobs and make friends in the community. Therefore, it is crucial in gaining acceptance into the local community.

Such instrumental use of accommodation strategies is sometimes quite effective, especially in a politically subtle situation. One example is that an informant, who used TM vocabulary with high frequency, would deliberately refer to Jiang Jie-shi ('Chang kai-shek', the late president of Taiwan) as Jianggong ('The Revered Chang'). The effect was immediate and he was appreciated by his uncle, a veteran Nationalist, who financially supported his study and offered him a decent job. Another example is an informant who got help from TM speakers whom she had never met before. She got sympathy from these people because her grandfather was a Nationalist general killed by the Communists during the civil war, and then she converged extensively to identify herself with the group, to keep her group membership, and to gain further help. Only a few years later when she got a job and her network structure changed, she started to lose TM features in her speech.

Thus, choice of accommodation strategies to achieve interactional goals is more often affected by broader social, political and economic considerations. For many Mainlanders, accommodation is largely based on the decision to stay in the
United States or go back to China some day in the future. Such a decision determines how they are going to integrate themselves into the local community. Language accommodation, either convergence or divergence, then becomes closely related to degree of integration into the local community, as reflected in the network structure. Those who decide to stay contract close-knit networks in the community and converge extensively. Those who do not decide to stay in the community tend to remain marginal in the community; linguistic maintenance is more likely. Political considerations are vital here, especially for people who plan to go back to Mainland. These people would not want to sound like "Taiwanese". On the other hand, those Mainlanders who plan to stay and who are sensitive about their origin will endeavor to minimize the differences by convergence with their interlocutors.

Once a speaker becomes a conscious member of the community who has developed substantial ties with other community members, he or she is not free to choose the interactive strategies of convergence or divergence. They are under the surveillance of people with whom they are tied. It was found in the study that normative pressure takes different forms: (1) speakers of TM complain by saying that the way the particular PTH speaker talks is strange, and that they feel uncomfortable with it; (2) speakers of TM correct the way the particular PTH speaker speaks, and make the
speaker "say it the right way"; and (3) speakers of TM sometimes simply suggest that they are unable to understand (e.g. "what did you say?", "I don't understand."), but actually they mean or hint that the way PTH speakers speak is different from how they do. Such pressure from TM speakers is constantly felt by Mainlanders. As one informant said, subconsciously PTH speakers know that they are Mainlanders and the norm they are used to is in conflict with the local norms. Therefore, when talking to TM speakers, they are constantly monitoring their speech, because they feel pressed to do so. Verbal interaction thus becomes very tiring because of continuing efforts required to converge. When talking to other Mainlanders, however, the feeling of pressure to use the proper language is not so strong and speaking is not so tiring.

Those who plan to stay only temporarily do not consider themselves as full members of the community, and there is no need to identify themselves with the local people in speech. Their value system and viewpoints have remained as before, or otherwise they have accepted those of the mainstream society. Thus, their network ties with the local speakers will be loose. Although daily association with TM speakers will place the speaker under the influence of TM, he or she is free to choose maintenance or divergence, as one of the informants did: whenever he hears TM speakers talking, he corrects their pronunciation, although it would not have any effect in their
Language attitude, as illustrated by informants' accounts on language in Chapter 5, is also fully reflected in the correlation of network integration and language accommodation. Speakers who integrate more fully into the local networks usually hold the view that it is necessary to speak like the others. They learn TM to their heart's content and do not consider speaking the variety as degrading their language style. However, those who are less integrated into the local networks, for whatever reasons, do not want to learn any TM intentionally and they often show contempt for those accommodating to TM. Some of them cannot even stand hearing others speaking it, labelling it as nántīng jī le "extremely unpleasant to the ear" (see Chapter 5 for examples and details).

Occasionally, there is a tug-of-war situation for some Mainlanders who have accommodated to TM. They converge so much because all their friends, colleagues, and roommates speak like that. When their PTH speaking close relatives come afresh from the PRC to live with them, these same speakers converge backward to accommodate their relatives under their pressure. Some informants in the study have experienced such convergence back and forth between two difference varieties.

The kind of linguistic accommodation observed among Mainland Chinese in the Los Angeles Chinese community has been referred to by Trudgill (1986) as long-term accommodation:
speakers from other speech communities accommodate to local speakers. The process of long-term accommodation, or style shifting, is actually a form of language change at the individual level. The ability to shift the style backward decreases with years of effort to accommodate to the other variety. As a results of long-term accommodation, TM features become crystallized. While in the beginning conscious efforts are needed to converge, after years the speaker becomes a natural speaker, and he or she cannot even tell in his or her language which aspects are the TM features and which ones are the PTH ones. He or she becomes basically a speaker of the other variety. But for those who have stayed for a shorter period of time in the community, shifting back to PTH features is much easier, usually leaving little trace of TM (of course TM variants should already have been acquired as part of the speaker's repertoire). Therefore, for the latter people, when they talk to other PTH speakers, it is possible for there to be no trace of TM features. This does not mean they cannot, or do not speak with TM features. They may have accommodated backward, although methodologically it is hard to determine whether or to what degree backward accommodation takes place.

To sum up the section, linguistic accommodation and network integration interact with each other, as observed in the study. While linguistic accommodation theory gives consideration to psychological factors in interpersonal communication, such consideration is not given in the network
model. Network theory does not consider individual factors, nor does it look at psychological factors in individual decision-making mechanisms, which at times turn out to be important. Choosing ties is often an act of will. Individuals place themselves in the control of the norm of a group with which they prefer to identify. Therefore, the two models are complementary in explaining sociolinguistic phenomena, as in the present study.
CHAPTER 10
Conclusions

This dissertation set out as its goals to study the linguistic accommodation process among Mandarin speakers from Mainland China who live in the urban Los Angeles Chinese community, and to test the social network model in an ethnic American community where social-economic status is not relevant among speakers. It has been my hope to contribute to sociolinguistics in general and to Chinese sociolinguistics in particular.

I have found in this study that where linguistic accommodation is observed, it has been closely correlated with the speaker's social network structure. The closer the Mainland Mandarin speaker is tied to the local speakers, the more change is found in his or her language, as a result of long-term accommodation towards TM, the dominant Mandarin variety spoken in the Chinese community. The ten linguistic variables selected as potential social network markers turn out to be sensitive on the whole as predictors of a particular Mainland Chinese speaker's integration into the local Chinese community. Differences found among subgroups based on sex, age and area indicate that there are different accommodation patterns among subgroups. As far as the relationship between social network and linguistic accommodation is concerned, men and women, and older people and younger people do not behave
the same way. Women appear to be more innovative than men in using the TM features in their language, but younger people's frequent use of TM features does not necessarily suggest a comparable high degree of network integration.

Although the present study was conducted in the Los Angeles area, the Chinese community found there is not unique. It represents to some extent the general situation in other major urban Chinese communities in the United States. As illustrated in Chapter Two, the Chinese communities in the United States have experienced tremendous changes over the years. For decades young Chinese have continued to leave Chinatowns. Many of them and their children have since then basically lost their ethnic language and even their ethnic identity. However, the continuing flow of immigrants from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and in recent years, from Mainland China, into the United States has not only injected new blood in these Chinatowns, bringing vigor and vitality to Chinese culture and language, but has greatly expanded the Chinese communities far beyond the boundaries of former Chinatowns. This rapidly growing ethnic group is beginning to play a more and more important role in the American society. They have become a social force which cannot be neglected, nor can the language they speak.

Taiwan Mandarin, the variety of Mandarin spoken nowadays by most people in American Chinese communities, was brought over to the United States by the numerous immigrants from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and in recent years, from Mainland China, into the United States has not only injected new blood in these Chinatowns, bringing vigor and vitality to Chinese culture and language, but has greatly expanded the Chinese communities far beyond the boundaries of former Chinatowns. This rapidly growing ethnic group is beginning to play a more and more important role in the American society. They have become a social force which cannot be neglected, nor can the language they speak.

Taiwan Mandarin, the variety of Mandarin spoken nowadays by most people in American Chinese communities, was brought over to the United States by the numerous immigrants from
Taiwan. It was discussed in Chapter Three, and deserves emphasis here, that as a local variety spoken by the majority as a second dialect in Taiwan, Taiwan Mandarin is so referred to because it has incorporated Taiwanese and other Southern dialect features. The use of the term "Taiwan Mandarin", however, may sometimes be misleading, for it implies a distinct variety that can be described in terms of its linguistic characteristics. When one looks into this issue, it becomes clear that it is difficult to define "Taiwan Mandarin", for many of the nonstandard features that might be considered characteristic of the variety are actually variable features that alternate in occurrence with the corresponding standard forms. This means that "pure" Taiwan Mandarin does not exist other than as a theoretical abstraction.

A similar state of affairs exists for standard Mandarin. Although standard Mandarin has been clearly defined by both the PRC and ROC governments, which is called Putonghua in the PRC and Guoyu in ROC, variation is as characteristic of this variety as of any other. Therefore, as differences in the two varieties are concerned, it would be best to consider them as two polarities on a scale with differences between them scattering along it. Sometimes TM features differ from those of the standard variety only in frequency of occurrence, such as the auxiliary verb vāo; sometimes they are widely, or categorically, different, such as the auxiliary verb yǒu.

How are such linguistic differences explored by Mandarin
speakers from Mainland China in accordance with socially recognized norms and expectations set upon them in the local community? It was found in this study that Mainland Chinese accommodate to their TM speaking interlocutors so as to identify themselves with the local Chinese. Such linguistic convergence, however, is not a random process. It is systematically correlated with the speaker's network structure, or his or her degree of integration into the local community. Therefore, while accommodation theory presupposes psychological orientations for interlocutors during verbal interactions, within the social context, the choice of such strategies is usually quite limited. Once a person is closely tied to a group that has a distinct linguistic norm, convergence is the strategy that has to be endorsed in interpersonal communication.

In an American Chinese community, a Mainland Chinese speaker's network integration, whether loose-knit or close-knit, may be initially influenced by his or her decision in how he or she should relate to others in the community. A marginal is more likely a person who chooses to be a marginal in the first place. On the other hand, while a person who is closely tied with other TM speaking local speakers is under normative pressure to speak like the others in the network, it is also important to note that it is the speaker himself or herself who has decided to do so. The social, economic and political considerations behind such decisions are extremely
important in understanding the subsequent network integration and linguistic accommodation.

Chinese sociolinguistics is still at its infancy. While general sociolinguistic research frameworks are available, systematic sociolinguistic studies carried out among Chinese speakers are still far too few, not to mention how very few have been done in American Chinese communities. Although many comparisons have been made between Standard Mandarin and Taiwan Mandarin, such differences have not been studied within the social context. This being the case, I mention some limitations of this dissertation.

Several linguistic variables selected, (e.g. particles), do not seem to work as well as the others, although all the variables in the study were selected on the basis of the ethnographic work that reveals the informants' judgements toward the social markedness of the variables. There might be methodological problems in defining and treating such variables. The lack of systematic patterns found in one of the subgroups, i.e. the Others group, might be partly caused by a lack of control as far as the informants in the group are concerned. More importantly, although accommodation is the major goal of the study, it is hard to detect whether any backward accommodation is involved or how much there may be in the recordings collected. Although the comparative study carried out using some informants' conversation recorded on different occasions involving different participants suggests
that stylistic change is not sharp, it is difficult to insure that everyone's language will be the same on these different occasions.

For future Chinese sociolinguistic studies, it is suggested that considerable attention be given to solving the problems identified in the present study. Moreover, some issues have been raised in this dissertation with regard to the network model, i.e. the impact of individual differences upon understanding language and network correlation, psychological factors such as the effects of individual decision in the formation of networks and subsequent language use, and the relationship between network structure and the linguistic accommodation process. I suggest that these issues be addressed further in future sociolinguistic studies.

The linguistic variables selected and the findings obtained in this study, which may be controversial, provide a basis for further research. However, they should be tested further to find out whether they are community-particular or significant generally in Chinese communities elsewhere.

It is the author's hope that this dissertation will contribute to the development of Chinese sociolinguistic studies both in the United States and in China by providing some first-hand data and analysis, and implement further research in this hardly explored area of study.
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Lexical Differences between Taiwan Mandarin and Putonghua*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM</th>
<th>PTH</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xiānshēng</td>
<td>àiren/zhàngfu</td>
<td>husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tàitái</td>
<td>àiren/qìzi</td>
<td>wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guóyǔ</td>
<td>Pǔtōnghuà</td>
<td>(the standard Mandarin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nouns:**
- diànnǎo  jísuànjī  computer
- lǎngqìjǐ  kǒngtǐáó  air-conditioner
- luǎntí    luǎnjìàn  software
- yóuzhīyuán yóu-ér-yuán  kindergarten
- jiàohuí   jiàotáng  church
- zhúzhǐ    dízhǐ    address (including work)
- lèsè      lǎijǐ    garbage
- wāsí      mèiqì    gas
- bòndàng  dàide fàn  meal brought to work
- lùyìngjǐ  lùxìàngjǐ  video-camera
- shuízhùn  shuípíng  standard
- rénjīguānxì qùnzhòngguānxì  relationship with other people
- zuòshí    gōngzuò  work
- pínzhí    zhíliàng  quality

**Verbs:**
- liányíuò línxi    contact
- zhúfàn    zuòfàn   cook food
- liúyū    lǐjǐ    understand
- bāitúō  bāngmáng/láojià  give me a break; help

**Adjectives:**
- nánshēng nándé  male
- nǔshēng  nǔde    female
- míngzhì   cōngmíng  wise (refer to people)
- lán     zāogāo/cì  bad in quantity
- nǔlì   qínfēn/yònggōng  hard-working

* Most words listed here are those frequently used by the PTH speaking informants in the sample. The list is by no means exhaustive.
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### Appendix B

#### Social Network Strength Scores and Linguistic Variables Scores for 35 Speakers

| Inf. SS | M1 | T1 | T2a | T2b | T3 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | T10 | T11 | T12 | T13 | T14 | T15 | T16 | T17 | T18 | T19 | T20 | T21 | T22 | T23 | T24 | T25 | T26 | T27 | T28 | T29 | T30 | T31 | T32 | T33 | T34 | T35 |
|---------|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|         |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Beijing: Male |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Beijing: Female |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Shanghai: Male |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Shanghai: Female |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Others: Male |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Others: Female |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

* Age group and length of time in the Los Angeles Chinese community

** Tokens of (hae) * tokens of (M-de) / Possible occurrences
Vita

Hong Chi was born April 19, 1955 in Shanghai, China, where he received his primary and secondary education. He graduated from Shanghai Institute of Foreign Languages, Shanghai, People's Republic of China, as an English major in 1977, and started to teach English at that Institute the same year. In 1979 he transferred to Shanghai University, Shanghai, PRC, where he taught English until he came to the United States for further education in 1985.
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