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ABSTRACT

Since the lifting of martial law in 1987, the rapid liberalization and democratization of Taiwan has led to the transformation of its political structure from a single-party system to a full-fledged two-party system. Along with this political opposition are the two contrastive concepts, the North and the South. Located in this background, this dissertation focuses on two groups of Taichung people (Taizhong ‘central Taiwan’) in two different sociopolitical contexts. One group resides in Taichung, their home region, and the other group migrates to Taipei, the capital located in northern Taiwan. Taichung is chosen because it serves as the main city on the north-to-south corridor and its speakers are known for their distinctive variety of Mandarin.

This dissertation examines linguistic behavior and ideologies of speakers who stay in their home region versus speakers who migrate from one dialect area to another. Employing the methodology of sociolinguistic variation studies, coupled with qualitative analyses, this study specifically examines two salient dialectal features of Taichung Mandarin: 1) the realization of T4, the high-falling tone, as T1, the level tone, and 2) the substitution of lateral [l] for retroflex approximant [ɻ].

Qualitative analyses of speakers’ social identities, attitudes, ideologies and language practices complement quantitative analyses of patterns of phonological variation. The study finds that the migrant group does make changes in their linguistic production upon constant exposure to a new dialect. Furthermore, the result suggests that speakers’
linguistic behavior is significantly linked with their social networks, identities, language attitudes and ideologies, and the broader sociopolitical context of contemporary Taiwan.

An interesting finding emerges after the examination of how linguistic behavior is conditioned by internal linguistic constraints and external factors such as gender, age, political affiliation, and occupation. The analysis of the data suggests that external factors play a more important role in the substitution of [l] for [r], whereas internal constraints precede external factors in the realization of T4 as T1. I argue that different status and social meanings of the two linguistic variables explain how they pattern in each residence group and how they trigger or fail to trigger accommodation by speakers migrating to Taipei.

Issues examined in this dissertation add to our understanding of voice (identities, attitudes and ideologies) in the border that is generally unheard and unresearched when the contesting ideologies between the north and the south are so dramatic. Additionally, this dissertation provides a detailed understanding of how different linguistic resources (varieties of Mandarin, Taiwanese, and codeswitching to Taiwanese or English from Mandarin) are associated with different social meanings and how speakers use the resources to construct their identities. Finally, combining quantitative rigor and qualitative methods, this dissertation contributes to a broader understanding of identity and language use since the complexity of language use cannot be understood within one single analysis.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Since Labov’s (1963) pioneering Martha’s Vineyard study, sociolinguists have viewed language attitudes as one of the major factors influencing language variation and change. However, as Milroy (2004) notes, analyses of attitudes and of sociolinguistic variables are usually treated independently. Most work on language attitudes has been conducted by social psychologists, independently of analyses of variation, and mainstream variationist work seldom integrates analyses of attitudes and ideologies into accounts of variation and change (but see Preston 2002). Departing from the traditional variation paradigm that treats social categories as given, independent of attitudes and actions of speakers, recent variationist researchers treat social categories as created by social actors, emphasizing the role of speaker agency and ideologies in language variation and change (see Mendoza-Denton 1997; Eckert 2000; Zhang 2005). Treating variation as social practice, these researchers have come to focus on the attitudes and beliefs speakers project and the topics they talk about. After all, “[i]t is individual speakers who bring language to life for us, and whose behavior points us to the social significance of variables” (Eckert 2000:1).

Adopting recent approach to variation coupled with qualitative inquiry, this study examines linguistic behavior and language ideologies of speakers who stayed in their home region and speakers who migrated from one dialect to another in the sociopolitical context of contemporary Taiwan. Over the past two decades, the rapid liberalization and democratization of Taiwan has led to the transformation of its political structure from a single-party system to a full-fledged two-party system. Along with this political
competition are the two contrastive concepts, the North and the South. Located in this background, this dissertation specifically focuses on two groups of Taichung people (Taizhong ‘central Taiwan’) in two different sociopolitical contexts. One group resides in Taichung, their home region, and the other group migrates to Taipei, the capital. Taichung, located in central Taiwan, is chosen because it serves as the main city on the north-to-south corridor and its speakers are known for their distinctive variety of Mandarin.

While there is a growing amount of variationist research that treats variation as social practice, variationist studies of Chinese still tend to adopt the traditional Labovian paradigm that groups speakers according to pre-determined social categories. To my knowledge, Zhang’s (2005) work on Chinese yuppies is the only variationist study on Mandarin that adopts recent social constructivist perspectives. While Zhang’s work focuses on one particular geographical community, this study aims to examine the linguistic behavior of Mandarin speakers in the context of migration. Since there is no empirical variationist work in Mandarin that examines the linguistic consequences of migration and dialect contact and the subsequent change in language attitudes and ideologies, this study proposes to achieve the following objectives:

- To describe the linguistic behavior and ideologies of speakers who stay in their home region versus speakers who migrate from one dialect area to another.
- To understand the impact of the macro-level ideologies on the social meanings of micro-level linguistic practice.
At a general level, this dissertation informs the study of language variation and the study of dialect contact and acquisition. At a local level, this project provides the most recent description of language, identity and ideologies in contemporary Taiwan.

Recent developments in the field of sociolinguistic variation include viewing variation as a reflection of social agency that constructs social meaning (Eckert 2000) and considering how ideologies interact with internal linguistic constraints on variation (Milroy 2004). For example, in her study of U.S. high school students, Eckert argues that Jocks and Burnouts are not given categories; it is through the practices and ideologies that adolescents construct their identities as Jocks or Burnouts. In her study of Latina adolescents, Mendoza-Denton (1997:144) suggests, “Macro-level social ideologies find their way into moment-to-moment speech actions and into low-level variation.” The Latina students in her study vary in their vowels as a reflection of being ‘more/less Mexican,’ ‘a powerful girl’ or ‘school-oriented.’ Moreover, instead of using neutral tone, a prominent feature in Beijing Mandarin, the Beijing yuppies in Zhang’s (2005) work use full tone, a feature that is typically associated with Hong Kong/Taiwan Mandarin, to construct a cosmopolitan style and to project their ideologies of internationalism.

Drawing on insights from these researchers, this project extends its analysis to two different regions that have different sociopolitical situations to investigate linguistic practice, as well as the outcome of dialect contact.

In his book Dialects in Contact, Trudgill (1986) examines factors of long-term linguistic accommodation by speakers moving to a different region from their own. In his analysis of British English speakers who reside in the USA, Trudgill suggests that how, the extent to which, and why accommodation to American English occurs appear to be
due to several factors such as phonological contrast, saliency of features, and strength of stereotyping. Also examining dialect acquisition by people from one dialect region to another, Chambers (1992) focuses on children who immigrated to England from Canada. He suggests that factors in dialect acquisition share common ground with factors in second language acquisition, including the critical period, complexity of rules, and length of exposure. Adopting insights from these researchers, as well as taking language ideologies into consideration, this study suggests factors that trigger or fail to trigger accommodation by speakers migrating to a new dialect area. Given a large extent of migration in China or Taiwan due to economic or political reasons, dialect contact is inevitable as long as the migrants interact with local people. Since there is a dearth of dialect contact studies in the Chinese context, this dissertation will shed light on the study of dialect contact in Mandarin.

Finally, previous sociolinguistic research has detailed how historical, political and sociolinguistic factors have influenced issues of language, identity, and conflicts in Taiwan. However, those studies have largely emphasized language use in the larger macro social structure, focusing on language attitudes, language shift, and language use. Few studies have examined the micro-level variable use of linguistic features in varieties of Taiwan Mandarin (but see Fu 1999; Tseng 2005; Wu 2003; Yang 2008). This study contributes to the field of language variation in Taiwan by examining linguistic variation among speakers of Taiwan Mandarin. It provides a detailed description of patterns of linguistic variation and the associated factors that contribute to the variation. Analyzing the discursive practices of speakers at the micro level, this dissertation broadens our understanding of linguistic practice at the macro structure level. Additionally, by
focusing on people in the border, a group that is generally ignored in the North/South contrast, this dissertation explores identities and ideologies that are sparsely documented and researched¹.

1.1 Research questions

This dissertation reports on a sociolinguistic study of Taichung people in two different sociopolitical contexts: Taipei, the capital, and Taichung, the hometown of the participants. The research questions are:

1) What are the constraints on patterns of variation in Taichung Mandarin? That is, how is linguistic behavior conditioned by internal linguistic constraints and external factors such as gender, age, political affiliation, length of stay in Taipei, and interview type?

2) How are macro-level attitudes and ideologies related to micro-level patterns of linguistic variation? That is, what are the relationships among identity, ideologies, linguistic practice, and speakers’ understanding of the social meanings of different linguistic variables?

¹ The exact areas referring to the North/South contrast are not always clear. See 4.2 for a detailed discussion. Su’s (2005) study on identities and ideologies in Taiwan chose Taipei and Tainan as the cities representatives of the North and the South.
1.2 The historical background of Taiwan: the people, the language and the politics

1.2.1 Geographic and ethnic background

Taiwan, also known as Formosa in the West, is located in East Asia off the southeastern coast of Mainland China by about 150 kilometers of the Taiwan Strait. The total island is approximately 36,000 square kilometers with its population of 23 million people. The map in Figure 1.1 shows the geographic location of Taiwan.

Figure 1.1 Map of Taiwan from Government Information Office (Retrieved April 11, 2009 from http://www.gio.gov.tw/taiwan-website/5-gp/brief/image/info04_map.gif)
The population of Taiwan consists of four distinct ethnic groups, all associated with different language use. The Southern Min people (70% of the population), who migrated from the coastal Southern Fujian region in the southeast of mainland China in the seventeenth century, speak the Southern Min dialect of Chinese (i.e. Taiwanese); the Hakka (15% of the population), who migrated from Guangdong province at about the same time as the Southern Min, speak the Hakka dialect; the Taiwanese aborigines (2% of the population), the original inhabitants in Taiwan since several thousand years ago, speak their own languages that do not belong to the Chinese language family, but the Austronesian language family; and the Mainlanders (12% of the population), who fled to Taiwan from various provinces in China after the Communist Party’s 1949 victory over the Nationalist Party (Kuomintang, hereafter KMT), speak mostly Mandarin.

According to Huang (1994), the majority of the Mainlanders are located in Taipei (47%), followed by Kaohsiung (14%), Taoyuan (10%) and Taichung (8%). The Mainlanders are known as Waishengren ‘out-of-province people’ by local people in Taiwan because they migrated to Taiwan Province from other provinces in China. It should be noted that the Mainlanders are not ethnically homogenous since they come from many different regions in China and speak different language varieties. However, sharing a similar background and history, they formed their own group identity. In a 1994 survey, 49.7 percent of Waishengren regarded themselves as Chinese whereas only 14.3

---

2 Southern Min, Hakka, and Mainlanders belong to the same ethnic group, Han Chinese. Southern Min and Hakka are descendants of early Han Chinese immigrants while Mainlanders are later Han Chinese immigrants who arrived after the Second World War. However, starting from mid 80s, the term “ethnic groups” or “ethnicity” began to be commonly used to refer to different groups of people in Taiwan (Wang 2005). In this dissertation, I follow the convention that treats Southern Min, Hakka and Mainlanders as different ethnic groups.

3 After the KMT government retreated to Taiwan, Taiwan Province became one of the only two provinces they administered. Although the local people no longer consider Taiwan a province especially since the provincial administration was greatly streamlined in 1998, the terms Benshengren and Waishengren are still widely used by the local people in Taiwan.
percent of Benshengren ‘home-province people’ identified themselves as Chinese. On the other hand, 14.1 percent of Waishengren considered themselves Taiwanese while 46.3 percent of Benshengren identified themselves as Taiwanese (Wu 2002). Additionally, since the Mainlanders came to Taiwan with the KMT government as the prestigious group, a greater part of the people worked in public service as government officials, teachers and military officers.

The major population of the Southern Min resides in the west coast of Taiwan, from north to south. Since the majority of the local people in Taiwan are Southern Min, they are commonly known as Benshengren, a term that contrasts with Waishengren. Their dialect, 

\(^4\) Minnanyu “Southern Min language”, is generally known as Taiyu ‘Taiwanese’ since this language variety is spoken by 70 percent of the population in Taiwan.

Although the term Benshengren usually refers to the Southern Min, especially when used by the Southern Min politicians, the local people in Taiwan have not yet reached a consensus on the definition of Benshengren. Some suggest that only the Southern Min people are Benshengren; some claim that Benshengren include the Hakka as well as the Southern Min, and some believe that all who were born in Taiwan are Benshengren.

Like the Southern Min people, the Hakka also immigrated to Taiwan in the seventeenth century. They first settled in the south, but today most Hakka are concentrated in the northern counties between Taipei and Taichung, including Taoyuan, Hsinchu, and Miaoli. The Hakka populations in these three counties are 50 percent, 66 percent and 68 percent respectively (Huang 1994). Although the Hakka and the Southern Min can be collectively called Benshengren as opposed to Waishengren, the Mainlanders,

\(^4\) Although Taiwanese is generally seen as a Chinese dialect, it is still in debate whether Taiwanese is a language or a dialect because Taiwanese and Mandarin Chinese are not mutually intelligible. Additionally, people with different political views tend to treat the question differently.
the Hakka are generally excluded from the *Benshengren/Waishengren* dichotomy, especially during election campaigns, because of the group’s small population.

The Taiwanese aborigines had settled in Taiwan long before the Southern Min and the Hakka immigrated to Taiwan; however, their population has grown slowly because of their living conditions in tribal villages and conflicts with a series of colonizing people. The colonial governments implemented policies to foster language shift and cultural assimilation. As a result, the aborigines have encountered varying degrees of loss of cultural identity and language. Today their total population is approximately two percent of Taiwan’s population and most of them reside in villages in central mountains. Isolated from the modern urban areas, these people also face economic and social barriers.

Both the Hakka and the aborigines face the problem of language shift and language loss (the aborigines particularly) because they have neither a large population like the Southern Min nor an official language status like Mandarin. They are both areas worth researching; however, it is beyond the scope of this dissertation, and therefore, I will concentrate on Mandarin and Taiwanese in the following section.

### 1.2.2 Language background

The Japanese ruled Taiwan for fifty years after Qing China’s defeat in the first Sino-Japanese War. During the period of Japanese colonialism (1895-1945), the government first tolerated local languages even though the Japanese language was promoted as the national language. By the end of 1931, the Japanese government began to strictly enforce a colonial policy of linguistic assimilation and the use of all local languages was
completely banned in public spaces from 1937. Besides, people were encouraged to adopt Japanese names and were rewarded for speaking Japanese at home. This strict Japanese-only policy successfully increased the number of local Taiwanese speakers of Japanese. According to Huang (1994), the number of people in Taiwan who understood Japanese increased from 22.7 percent in 1932 to 51 percent in 1940, and up to 71 percent in 1944, the year before the end of Japanese colonialism. Nevertheless, the suppression of local languages did not result in the replacement of the local languages by Japanese. On the one hand, since local languages were still the major vehicles of communication in daily life, the consequence of the colonial language policy was that a portion of the people became bilingual in Taiwanese and Japanese (Hsiau 2000). On the other hand, the suppression resulted in a stronger feeling of ‘Taiwanese identity’ which led to local movements in Taiwanese literature (Scott & Tiun 2007).

After the KMT took over Taiwan from Japan, the government started to “de-Japanize” and “Sinicize” the local people by enforcing a strict Mandarin-only policy. The purpose of this policy was said to have the minority (i.e. the Mainlanders) control the majority (i.e. the Southern Min). Mandarin, also known as guoyu (literally ‘national language’), was used in public domains, school instruction, and official business, while Japanese and other bentu fangyen or ‘local dialects’ such as Taiwanese, Hakka, and aboriginal languages were banned in public and people were punished for not speaking Mandarin in public spaces, even among children in the playground. For local people, the KMT’s takeover of the island did not represent a return to their motherland; instead, they considered the KMT’s rule a less merciful and crueler colonialism than the Japanese rule. The severe punishment for speaking local languages also deepened the local people’s
hatred for the KMT government and those Mainlanders who retreated to Taiwan together with the KMT. Various ethnic conflicts between Benshengren and Waishengren emerged during the period, which later strengthened a sense of ‘Taiwanese identity,’ particularly among the Southern Min.

It should be noted that although the KMT government proclaimed Mandarin as the only official language, most Mainlanders spoke different regional languages other than the standard Mandarin. However, as the dominant group, the Mainlanders and their descendants were much more willing to learn the standard Mandarin that was taught in school than the dominated Benshengren. Therefore, this ethnic hierarchy also resulted in the linguistic hierarchy in Taiwan: standard Mandarin spoken by the Mainlanders was viewed as the dominant or prestigious language, and Taiwanese spoken by the Southern Min was considered the dominated or vulgar language (Hsiau 2000). In other words, Mandarin was what Ferguson (1959) calls the H (‘high’) language, the superior language used in conjunction with education, government, or other formal occasions. On the other hand, Taiwanese was the L (‘low’) language used in everyday situations between family members and friends or in other informal settings.

Since the lifting of martial law in 1987, Taiwan has undergone liberalization in many respects. Democratization in politics not only led to the legalization of opposition political parties but also has dramatically influenced the island’s language policy, especially the freedom to use local languages. Punishment for speaking local languages was abolished in 1987 and the government began to encourage the teaching of Taiwanese and other local languages at the elementary school level in 1993 (Wei 2008). After the new ruling party, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), ended the KMT’s 50-year rule
in 2000, the government decided to promote and revive local languages. As a result, the teaching of mother tongue language was officially enforced at all elementary schools nationwide.

During the DPP’s eight-year rule (2000-2008), the government attempted to “Taiwanize” and “localize” (or as their opponents claimed “de-sinicize”) the people by promoting the status of local languages and the awareness of one Taiwanese national identity. In addition, the media also played an important role in changing attitudes toward the status of local languages as more and more popular Taiwanese programs, songs, and dramas appeared constantly in the media (Wei 2008). However, Taiwan’s language policy has never succeeded to serve as a unifying force among major ethnic groups (Benshengren versus Waishengren) and the DPP’s rule further exacerbated the conflicts between Mandarin and Taiwanese at the political level. Language use is not only an assertion of ethnolinguistic identity but a tool for politicians to identify with their people or to appeal to others that they have made efforts to learn their languages. For example, the DPP members use Taiwanese when addressing their audience for the purpose of identifying with the Southern Min or implying their political stance of pro-independence by using Taiwanese, the language of Taiwan, as opposed to Mandarin, the language from the Mainland. The KMT Mainlander members also started taking Taiwanese lessons and use Taiwanese especially during the election campaigns when they need to address to the southerners. They believe that they can appeal to more voters by using Taiwanese since the Southern Min still comprise 70 percent of the population. The example illustrates Bourdieu’s (1991) strategies of condescension that the empowered individual with social
legitimacy in terms of language or other kinds of authority appropriates the subordinate language temporarily to earn ‘profits’ from the hierarchical relationship.

As mentioned earlier, the DPP has made efforts to promote the status of Taiwanese language, schools have embarked on programs of teaching local languages, and the society has begun to value the use of local languages. Nevertheless, after nearly forty years of the KMT’s Mandarin-only policy (1949-1987), the majority of young generation Benshengren, especially intellectuals, are gradually losing their mother tongue (i.e. Taiwanese) and regard Mandarin as their mother tongue. Another threat to the government’s revitalization of mother tongue languages is the prestigious status of English in Taiwan. In 2001, the same year that the government made the teaching of mother tongue compulsory at the elementary level, English as a compulsory subject was extended from junior high down to the primary school level. In addition, a large number of English immersion preschools have emerged as internationalization has been promoted in Taiwan. According to the *China Post* (January, 12, 2006), more than 90 percent of parents believe that English ability will guarantee their children better job opportunities and better futures, 85 percent think that English ability would enhance the country’s competitiveness globally, and up to 80 percent hope that English will be the second official language in Taiwan. Having the language ideology that English is the H language, parents are more likely to emphasize English education than mother tongue education regardless of the efforts the government puts to promote the status of mother tongue languages.

In contemporary Taiwan, the government has implemented a multilingual language policy and embraced a multicultural society. However, language discrimination still
exists nationwide. According to Huang (1994), there are two H languages in Taiwan: H₁ is westernized Mandarin, and H₂ is Mandarin. H₁ is used among westernized intellectuals who codeswitch between Mandarin and English and H₂ is standard Mandarin. M (“middle”) refers to Taiwanese and other local languages whose status the government endeavored to promote. L refers to accented Mandarin spoken by speakers of M language. Huang’s linguistic hierarchy, shown in Figure 1.2, summarizes the current linguistic situation in Taiwan.

![Figure 1.2 Linguistic hierarchy in Taiwan](image)

I should note that Huang’s illustration represents the dominant linguistic ideology. The tensions between Benshengren and Mainlanders also result in contested linguistic ideologies. As Woolard (1985) found with Catalan speakers in Spain that the marginalized language Catalan received higher evaluation because of its economically privileged status despite of hegemonic pressures to conform to the standard language, Taiwanese is also evaluated higher especially in the private sector. Since Mandarin is a requirement in the public sector, Mainlanders tend to work at the public sector because of their language advantage whereas Benshengren are more likely to obtain jobs in the private sector. As a result, Benshengren become predominant in ownership and
management of the private industry and their language Taiwanese is preferred in private
workplaces. The frustration that one of my participants showed when he was on his
business trip illustrates the linguistic ideology that favors Taiwanese over Mandarin.

(I went to a place to give a presentation. Originally I should have given, but because,
I couldn’t use Taiwanese, because it was in the local area. I was giving the
presentation in Tainan. You could also use Mandarin, but whether people would
bother to listen to you is another matter. So my boss said, “if your Taiwanese is not
good, we can get another person.” I felt so hurt. Taiwanese is not even the official
language, but you have to use it if you go there.)

1.2.3 Political background

Before Taiwan was conceded to Japan after the First Sino-Japanese War in 1895, the
island was governed by the Qing Dynasty magistrates. During that period, despite their
ethnic differences, the early Han Chinese (Southern Min and Hakka) settlers still had a
strong emotional attachment to China. When the Japanese took over Taiwan, they
enforced strict measures to limit contacts between mainland China and Taiwan,
attempting to effectively transform the Chinese identity to a Japanese identity. During the
later period of the colonization, a stricter policy called “Kominka” was implemented to
make local people view themselves as loyal subjects of the Japanese emperor. This
unequal colonial policy did not succeed in instilling a strong Japanese identity. On the
contrary, many of the local people expressed their resistance to the Japanese colonization
and fought for the return of Taiwan to the Republic of China (ROC), a new regime that replaced the Qing Dynasty in 1912, ending two thousand years of imperial rule in China.

Taiwan was returned to the ROC in 1945 after the defeat of Japan during World War II. Four years later, the KMT lost the Chinese Civil War to the Communists and the ROC government fled from mainland China to Taiwan. When Taiwan was restored to the ROC, local people were overjoyed because they believed that the return to the motherland meant the end of suppression, discrimination and inequality. However, as the mainlanders were the minority in Taiwan, to protect the mainlanders, the KMT treated Taiwan as a colony, enforcing rules that only advantaged mainlanders but suppressed the local people. In addition to the suppression and discrimination, the cultural and linguistic difference also heightened the tension between mainlanders and local people. The discontent and disappointment with the KMT culminated in the February 28th Incident (228 Incident) in 1947, in which an anti-government riot grew into a full-scale armed revolt. The event was violently suppressed by the KMT government, with around 10,000-30,000 prominent local elites being massacred. After the 228 Incident, Taiwan started its 38-year martial law period. Up till now, the 228 Incident is still considered the most important flashpoint in Taiwan’s political history and has continued to be the source of conflicts between the KMT and the DPP (Tsai 2007).

During the martial law period (1949-1987) or the so-called “White Terror” period, the people were governed under one-party rule. Thousands of people were imprisoned or executed once they were found to dissent from the government. Strict policies were introduced to promote the Sinicization and suppress expressions of “Taiwanese identity.” Countless abuses and executions, relentless suppression of free speech and language use,
and socio-economic discrimination all left the local people, especially the victims, a rooted bitterness and intense hatred to the KMT and the mainlanders who retreated together. From local people’s viewpoint, those newly immigrated Chinese not only took over the economic and political spheres but also controlled education, media, language etc., and as a result, their hostile attitude to the mainlanders prevented the KMT from succeeding the efforts to sinicize the island (Tsai 2007).

Starting from the mid 1980s, Taiwan has undergone liberalization in its political system. In 1986, the first opposition party, the DPP, was formed to counter the KMT. In 1987, martial law was lifted. Local people were allowed freedom of speech, language, and publication and more non-mainlanders were put in important governmental positions that were once only offered to mainlanders. After the DPP was legalized in 1991, the party began to have representatives in the Legislative Yuan to challenge the KMT government and promote “Taiwanization.” Additionally, the People’s Republic of China’s (PRC) challenges to Taiwan’s democratization through military force and diplomatic intimidation in the 1990s also raised the island’s awareness with respect to distinguishing Taiwan from China. The KMT’s first non-mainlander president Lee Teng-hui (1988-2000) not only promoted the localization/Taiwanization movement but also began to speak more Taiwanese during public appearances. Political terms to emphasize Taiwan’s distinctness such as “Taiwan First,” “New Taiwan” and “New Taiwanese” were introduced in the late 1990s. As the consequence of Lee’s localization policies, the percentage of the general public who consider themselves only Chinese dropped from 26.2 percent in 1992 to 13.1 percent in 2000 and the percentage of people who consider
themselves only Taiwanese increased from 17.3 percent in 1992 to 36.9 percent in 2000\(^5\) (Tsai 2007).

In 2000, Taiwan’s first postwar opposition party, the DPP, won the presidential election, ending the KMT’s 51-year rule. The victory of the DPP, according to the party, was very significant because it symbolized that Taiwanese people had defeated the Mainlanders’ domination and suppression. Challenging the KMT’s Chinese nationalism and reunification with Mainland China, the DPP promoted local Taiwanese nationalism, emphasized Taiwanese identity, and supported Taiwan independence. The DPP’s platform has created a significant increase in local support and has quickly made the DPP the ruling party ten years after its legal recognition. After the DPP’s Chen Shui-bian assumed office, he continued to enhance local education, develop local culture and promote “Taiwan Consciousness” by adding the word “Taiwan” to passports and renaming government organizations or roads. According to a survey in 2005, 46.5 percent of the people identified themselves only as Taiwanese (Tsai 2007). However, Chen’s efforts still did not bring the people in Taiwan\(^6\) to a consensus on what Taiwanese national identity is. On the contrary, the bitter political battle between the DPP and the KMT has divided the island into two colors – blue and green, the colors of the KMT and the DPP, respectively. Pan-blue refers to those who support the blue party and pan-green represents supporters of the green party. Moreover, the green/blue contrast is also reflected in regional divisions. Northern Taiwan, where more Mainlanders reside, is traditionally considered the blue area, while Southern Taiwan, where more Southern Min

\(^5\) The rest of the people still consider themselves both Chinese and Taiwanese.
\(^6\) I will use “people in Taiwan” to refer to the four ethnic groups who live in Taiwan because even the local people do not have a consensus of who is qualified as “Taiwanese”. “Taiwanese” alone will be used to refer to the Southern Min dialect.
live, is typically labeled as the green area. Figure 1.3 shows the results of the 2004 presidential election. The map demonstrates that the KMT won in most northern regions and the DPP dominated the south. As for Central Taiwan, local politics is more balanced with the city leaning blue and the county leaning green. Having been manipulated by the two parties for a decade, the tensions and animosity between different ethnic groups have not decreased but have even heated up especially during the general election campaigns. With this political conflict all over the island, people commonly label each other with blue or green, north or south, blame the other “color”, and argue against the opposite “color.”

Figure 1.3 Results of presidential election 2004 by county: green: DPP, blue: KMT (Retrieved April 12, 2010 and adopted from http://gisc.tcgts.tc.edu.tw/research/92gis/92gismap/taiwan/075.htm)
In March, 2008, the KMT’s presidential candidate Ma Ying-jeou defeated the candidate of the ruling DPP by a large margin, ending eight years of the DPP rule and bringing the KMT back to power. According to many observers, Ma’s victory shows the people’s disappointment in the DPP’s poor economic performance and their disgust with the corruption in the Chen administration. The KMT’s landslide victory suggested that ethnic and national identity issues that traditionally play a large role in heated national elections have become less critical in influencing voters. Although he won with 58 percent of the vote, Ma’s overwhelming victory should be viewed more as voters’ disappointment in the Chen administration than as people’s hoping for the return of the old KMT rule. Due to the failure of the Chen presidency, the KMT benefited from a large swing vote. Figure 1.4 presents the results of the 2008 election. As the figure shows, the KMT won all of the districts in northern and central Taiwan while the DPP still won traditional pan-green districts in the south. On May 17, 2009, right before Ma’s first anniversary in office, the DPP organized a massive demonstration to protest against the Ma administration’s incompetence to stem Taiwan’s economic downturn and his China-leaning policies. As the DPP and the KMT have different political ideologies and policies that attract supporters with different historical backgrounds, it seems that the conflicts and tensions between opposing parties will continue to exist regardless of which party is in power.
1.3 Social stratification in Taiwan

During the Mandarin-only policy period (1950-1987), fluency in Mandarin was a requirement for obtaining a government position. The Mandarin skills represented the linguistic capital in the labor market, especially in state sectors (Tsai 2001). Consequently, Mainlanders had a great advantage over the local people in attaining the top-level positions. Local people could only occupy unimportant jobs because of their linguistic disadvantage (Hsiau, 2000). Meanwhile, a linguistic hierarchy that viewed Mandarin as
the dominant language and other local languages as the dominated was established. This also resulted in different socioeconomic status and educational attainment among different ethnic groups in different regions.

In her study of the relationship between language skills and occupational achievement, Tsai (2001) found that the Mainlander group scored higher on Mandarin fluency than the Southern Min and the Hakka. Furthermore, the results indicated that Mainlanders have higher socioeconomic status and higher educational achievement. In her 1999 survey, around 19 percent of the Mainlanders and 11 percent of the Southern Min worked in the state sector; about 58 percent of the Mainlanders were white-collar, whereas only around 44 percent of the Southern Min were white-collar. While Tsai acknowledged that patterns of ethnic effects were changing and that the Southern Min group has gradually increased their number in state-sector and white-collar jobs, standard Mandarin is still the linguistic capital necessary for people to attain high status.

Luoh (2001) examined the relationship between gender and ethnic difference with educational achievement. He found that Mainlanders have a higher rate of entering colleges among different generations, whereas non-Mainlanders (Benshengren) have lower educational achievement. Additionally, females seem to fall behind in both groups regarding their probability of entering college, thought the difference is not significant within each ethnic group. Luoh suggested that the difference in educational achievement between genders will no longer exist while the difference between ethnic groups will still play a significant role. Figure 1.5 shows the difference in gender and ethnicity with regard to the probability of entering colleges.
In his later study, Luoh (2002) researched the ethnic and urban/rural composition of students at National Taiwan University (NTU), the most prestigious school in Taiwan. He found that Mainlanders are more likely to become NTU students. Moreover, around 57 percent of NTU students come from Taipei, the capital, followed by 6 percent from Kaohsiung and 5.52 percent from Taichung. NTU student enrollment was highly correlated with urbanity and ethnicity. Luoh further suggested that parents’ level of education and socioeconomic status have a significant impact on the probability of their children gaining admission to NTU. Since the majority of Mainlanders reside in Taipei and Mainlanders are generally better educated and more likely to obtain government positions, it is not surprising that the majority of the NTU students grow up in Taipei.

Chen (2005) investigated Mainlanders, Southern Min and Hakka who were born between 1940 to 1980 to see whether ethnic effects to educational attainment were
decreasing. She found that while the rate of Southern Min and Hakka attending college has increased, the rate is still significantly lower than that of Mainlanders. Due to greater gender egalitarianism, there was no gender difference within each ethnicity in the younger generations. Chen further suggested that father’s education and urban residence should also be considered along with ethnic effects. When the two factors were included, she found that ethnic effects play a more important role on educational achievement among less-educated families. Additionally, due to educational expansion, ethnic effects have greatly decreased among the youngest generation.

Also focusing on people who were born between the 1940s to the 1980s, Jao and McKeever (2006) examined educational stratification in Taiwan. They found that although Mainlanders have higher average years of schooling, the ethnic educational gap declined among the younger age cohort. However, Mainlanders still have a higher percentage of going to universities, whereas non-Mainlanders have a higher percentage of going to vocational schools. Jao and McKeever further added additional social background for consideration, and they found that Mainlanders’ higher educational achievement is not due to their ethnic advantage, but to other social factors that are associated with ethnicity such as father’s education and father’s social class. However, while Mainlanders are more likely to achieve an academic high school diploma, Jao and McKeever also found that once students obtain the diploma, both Southern Min and Mainlanders have similar odds of going to college regardless of father’s education and social class. As Taiwan gradually becomes an industrialized society consisting of Mainlander-dominated politics and Benshengren-dominated economy, ethnic effect has diminished in importance. Jao and McKeever concluded that academic high schools now
have become the most crucial gate to gain access to higher education and receive greater opportunities in the job market.

All the studies reflect the social stratification in Taiwan. The Mandarin-only policy and the suppression of local languages have resulted in a linguistic hierarchy in Taiwan. Mainlanders, who have obtained the linguistic capital, have more advantages in educational and status attainment than *Benshengren*. Although segregation and difference between two groups have gradually decreased due to educational expansion and the change of social structure, this inequity between *Waishengren* and *Benshengren* during the past few decades is still frequently used as a tool by the two political parties to raise ethnic conflicts and political tensions.

1.4 Summary

Throughout this chapter, I have provided the ethnic, linguistic and political background of Taiwan starting from the colonial period. I have described how language use can become a marker of regional, ethnic or political identity in Taiwan. I have also discussed how language policy has affected people’s language attitude and has resulted in social stratification in Taiwan. Although Mandarin has been widely accepted and has been treated as a common language variety in Taiwan, language choice has never been a simple issue in this multicultural island. As Wei (2008:82) suggests, the contending forces for a broader range of language diversity “came as the result of rapid

---

7 In Zhang’s (2005) study on Chinese yuppies in Beijing, she found that the most prestigious jobs were in the private foreign sectors. This might also be the trend in Taiwan and is worth researching, but neither Tsai nor Luoh included professionals who work for foreign companies in their studies. Generally speaking, state-sector jobs in Taiwan require higher level of education and more standard Mandarin than local private-sector jobs do.
democratization in an election-driven culture where votes mobilized around several key issues: notably, correction of ethno-linguistic injustice, recalibration of identity politics by ways of language diversity in a contested context and the balancing of multiculturalism with economic rationalism.”

Located against this background, this dissertation examines the impact of macro-level structure (attitudes, ideologies, sociopolitical contexts, etc.) on language variation and dialect acquisition. I focus on the linguistic behavior of two groups of younger generation Taichung people. One group resides in their home region and one group migrates to the capital Taipei after high school. Located in central Taiwan, Taichung has a special border-town status, in which identity construction is more fluid than in northern or southern areas. However, the voice in the border is usually unheard and unresearched. As one participant from Taichung expressed how he resisted being labeled as a southerner in the north/south discourse, it is clear that this underrepresented group has its own voice and therefore offers an ideal site for research. Taiwan is an island with its complex cultural and political history. Therefore, why some speakers use more regional linguistic features than others do and why some migrants accommodate more to a dialect different from their own than others do should be understood in Taiwan’s historical and political context. By integrating macro-level structure into sociolinguistic patterns, this study provides a more comprehensive account of language variation and dialect acquisition by focal Taichung people.

The dissertation is organized as follows. Chapter One states the research questions and the objectives of the dissertation. I also introduce in detail the sociopolitical context of the study and provide a historical background of Taiwan.
Chapter Two gives a literature review of dialect acquisition in dialect contact situations, variationist research in Mandarin and studies on language practice and language ideologies in Taiwan. Additionally, I also lay out the theoretical foundation of the study that I draw upon for the analysis in later chapters.

Chapter Three presents the linguistic variables, the rationale for selecting the two variables-Tone 4 raising and the substitution of lateral for retroflex, the research sites, and the methodology.

Chapter Four consists of a qualitative analysis of the macro-level identities, attitudes and ideologies in order to illuminate the language use and linguistic variation of the Taichung speakers who reside in two different regions.

Chapter Five focuses on the variationist analysis of two linguistic variables. I discuss the effects of linguistic factors and social factors on the patterns of variation by the local Taichung group and the migrant group.

Chapter Six revisits the research questions of the study, discusses the significance of the study and offers directions of future research.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter consists of two parts. First, I review previous studies on dialect acquisition, variation in Mandarin, and language practice and ideology in Taiwan. The literature review not only includes research topics concerning this study but also helps to develop factors that are critical to this dissertation and directions where the analyses proceed. The rest of the chapter focuses on the theoretical foundation that I draw upon for the analysis of the data in Chapters 4 and 5.

2.1. Dialect Acquisition

When speakers of mutually intelligible dialects interact and converse, the dialects that are in contact may be changed linguistically. When speakers of a particular dialect are exposed to another dialect in the long term, such as in the case of migration, these speakers may adjust their speech to accommodate to the members of local speech community and modify their pronunciation of certain linguistic variables that are markers within the local community (Trudgill 1986). Gradually, they acquire a dialect other than their native dialect.

In addition to Chamber’s (1992) classic study on dialect acquisition of British English by Canadian children mentioned in the introductory chapter, several studies of dialect acquisition have dealt with second dialect acquisition by children or adolescents. Payne (1980) examined out-of-state children’s acquisition of the local Philadelphia dialect in King of Prussia. Payne found “notable success” (153) by the children in
acquiring phonetic variables such as the fronting of /uw/ and /ow/ and raising of /oy/, and the age of arrival had the strongest effect on the success of acquisition. Contrary to the results of phonetic variables, these children rarely acquired the Philadelphia short a pattern regardless of their age of arrival, possibly due to the complexity of the phonological rule involved in the acquisition of this pattern. One interesting finding was that only the children whose parents were locally born and raised could master the short a pattern. The acquisition of the short a by other children “was usually irregular, sporadic and incomplete” (175). This suggested the importance of parental status in the acquisition of local vernacular forms.

In a study of adolescents in a dialect contact situation in Brazilian Portuguese, Surek-Clark (2000) examined the effects of the relative prestige of parents’ dialects on the acquisition of the local Curitiba dialect, whose dialectal features are non-raising of /e/ and non-palatalization of /d/ and /t/ as compared to final /e/ raising and palatalization of /t/ and /d/ in standard Brazilian Portuguese. Surek-Clark found that parental influence played an important role in these teenagers’ acquisition of local patterns. Individuals whose parents spoke more prestigious dialects acquired fewer local features than those whose parents spoke less prestigious dialects. Among the 40 girls interviewed, only one speaker fully acquired the local pattern because one of her parents was a native in the local community. Surek-Clark suggested that with regard to families who migrated from more prestigious dialects, pressure within the family had a stronger effect on the teenagers than their outside peers. On the other hand, parents who spoke less prestigious dialects had little effect on their daughters.
Starks and Bayard’s (2002) study examined four children born and raised in New Zealand with North American-born parents. The study focused on postvocalic /r/, a feature that differentiates North American English and New Zealand English. Contrary to previous findings that parents play a significant role in dialect acquisition, neither of the two younger children in this study had any clear evidence of postvocalic /r/ even though their parents were users of rhotics. This finding suggests that parents may have little influence on their children’s use of this variable. The two older children who entered daycare later showed a different pattern. Their data reveal relatively higher use of postvocalic /r/, especially prior to attending to daycare. This study shows that the earlier the children are exposed to the local speech community, the more successful they are in mastering a second dialect.

Tagliamonte and Molfenter’s (2007) study is consistent with Starks and Baynard’s (2002) findings that the success of dialect acquisition “is a direct consequence of sustained access to and integration with the local community” (649). The study explored the acquisition of the British English T-voicing (e.g., pudding versus putting) by three Canadian children who moved to England at age two, four and five respectively. Over six years, the children all moved incrementally from Canadian English to British English because of face-to-face interaction with the local community. While the three children all clearly sounded British, Tagliamonte and Molfenter also indicated that the children were still not able to fully acquire the local dialect and “will always retain ‘flavors’ of their mixed repertoires” (673).

Also discussing parent and local influence, Stanford (2008a) investigated child dialect acquisition and development on lexical and tonal variables in exogamous Sui
clans in rural China. In Sui clan-based society, women immigrated to another clanlect as a result of exogamous customs. These in-migrant women tended to maintain their original clanlects regardless of the length they stayed in the local community. Stanford found that as children grew older, they transitioned from the matrilect to the patrilect. Some children remembered speaking the matrilect when they were little, but they were motivated to change to the patrilect for fear of peers’ ridicule and teasing because establishing a loyal identity with the fathers’ clan is crucial in Sui society. Although mothers were the primary caregivers in Sui society, children were constantly admonished if they spoke like their mothers. Surrounded by two clanlects, the Sui children showed awareness of the dialect differences in their parents, but they had to consciously avoid matrilectal features that belonged to outside clans. Stanford’s study suggests that even at a very young age, children are able to detect meaningful social groups and construct their own identity through their language choice.

Unlike children or adolescents who are more likely to make major changes to their speech, adults are thought to have passed critical periods and their dialect “is solidified by early adulthood” (Conn & Horesh 2002: 47). As Bowie (2000: 12) suggested, “the changes seem to be a matter of degree rather than actual shift,” adults are unlikely to make large alternations to their system. Studies of adult dialect acquisition have demonstrated complex factors that affect the acquisition, including language attitudes and identity, social network, the notion of salience, and the linguistic status and the social meaning of the dialectal feature.

Clyne (1992) studied the speech of adults who moved from the United States to Australia. Among the nine adults, five of them “still have fairly intact American English
phonological systems” (Clyne 1992: 311) but selectively switch to Australian lexical items to avoid communication breakdown. Clyne suggested that individuals’ attitudes determine the extent the speakers want to adapt to Australian English. For example, some informants were offended by some Australian words and some shifted back to American expressions because American words are better understood, while some did not mind if their children spoke differently from them. Although Clyne did not explain in detail to what extent the immigrants acquired or failed to acquire Australian phonological features and what exact linguistic features he examined, his study provides insights on how individual difference affects their acquisition.

Several studies of dialect acquisition by adults have employed Milroy’s (1980) social network concept to explore the effect of interpersonal relationship on language change. Milroy’s network theory, based on her research in Belfast, suggests that close-knit networks maintain local forms whereas loose-knit networks facilitate change. Amastae and Satcher’s (1993) study of Honduran Spanish speakers in contact with Northern Mexican Spanish after moving to El Paso, Texas discussed how different social networks had an effect on speakers’ reduction of their velarization of final (n) in a nonvelarizing community. They found that those who had extensive contact with local Spanish speakers greatly reduced the rate of velarization while those who had stronger ties with their own community reduced velarization at a lower rate. However, Amastae and Satcher also noted that the amount of contact with local speakers had no effect on the reduction of s-aspirating in a nonaspirating community. They suggested that different effects the amount of contact had on the two linguistic variables might be due to different
social status the variables have. Since s-aspiring has not been shown to have social value, speakers may not feel subject to change this dialectal feature.

Thomas (1997) examined the speech of Texas Anglos and found that stereotypical Texas features such as monophthongal /ai/ and lowered /e/ are being lost in metropolitan areas. He discussed the rural/urban dialect split as a result of mass migration since the Second World War. In-migrants from outside Texas tended to move to urban areas and they may have seen the monophthongal /ai/ and lowered /e/ as regional features. Since more in-migrants interact with local Texans in urban areas and form a new social relationship, this new social network may explain the decline of their use of stereotypically southern features. On the other hand, close-knit networks in rural communities have resulted in the preservation of the two stereotypical features.

In her study of Appalachian migrants in Michigan, Evans (2004) also focused on the role of social network in adult dialect acquisition. She found that speakers who had tighter Appalachian network were less likely to possess /æ/ raising, a feature of language change in the Northern Cities Shift (NCS) by which Michigan has been affected. Additionally, like what previous studies such as Eckert’s (1989) study in suburban Detroit and Ito’s (1999) study in rural Michigan have found that women tend to lead in the use of raised /æ/, Appalachian women were also more likely to demonstrate this feature of the NCS, especially when their native dialect was stereotyped as “southern”.

More recently, Vélez-Salas et al. (in press) examined variable subject personal pronoun (SPP) used by Puerto Ricans who moved to San Antonio, Texas where Mexicans constitute the majority of the Spanish-speaking population. They found that social and professional networks had an effect on speakers’ rate of SPP use. Speakers
who interacted with Mexican or Texas Spanish speakers showed convergence with the local norm in their SPP use. On the other hand, speakers who interacted mainly with Puerto Ricans maintained their linguistic distinctiveness with respect to their use of SPPs. In addition to the network concept that has been heavily drawn upon, the notion of salience has also been found to have an effect on long-term dialect accommodation (Trudgill 1986). As Trudgill outlines, the degree of salience is related to factors such as stigmatization, linguistic change, phonetic distance and phonological contrast. The salience of the variables turns the variables into markers within the community and if features are perceived by the speakers as more salient, they may be acquired or given up more easily and faster than less salient ones. Auer, Barden and Grosskopf (1998) investigated the role of salience in the context of migration in German dialects. The study focused on speakers of Saxonian who migrated from East Germany to West Germany for political and economic reasons. Saxonian vernacular has traditionally been perceived as low prestige, and given its low prestige, accommodation to standard German was expected. Among the twelve vocalic and consonantal variables examined, speakers were able to identify stronger vernacular features and give examples of how the features were stereotyped. Furthermore, the more salient the vernacular features are, the less frequently they were realized in reading style as compared to how they were realized in informal interview style. However, Auer et al. also noted that some salient vernacular features were resistant to change, possibly due to the exclusive lexicalization of the variables or different ideological values associated with the variables (i.e. having a more prestigious status in other dialects).
The above studies of adult dialect acquisition all focused on the speech of migrants and the extent they accommodated to/acquired the target dialect. A few studies compared those who stayed in the home region with those who moved away. Huffines (1986) studied the intonation pattern in Pennsylvania German English and found a different intonation pattern spoken by residents of the region regardless of their fluency in German. The study showed that those who stayed in their home region used the local intonation pattern, whereas those who migrated to non-Pennsylvania German communities not only acquired standard intonation patterns but also lost their nonstandard Pennsylvania German features in their English. Interestingly, Huffines also found that although the English of those who moved away closely approximated standard varieties of English, these people still retained the Pennsylvania German yes/no question intonation pattern, though at a lower rate than those who stayed in their home region. The finding supports previously mentioned studies that adults may only acquire the new dialect partially.

Bowie (2000) compared the linguistic production of those who lived in Waldorf, Maryland their entire lives with those who moved away from Waldorf (Waldorf exiles), whose years away ranged from two to fourteen. He found that while some Waldorf features were gradually changed to the new dialect the exiles were surrounded by, some Waldorf features were realized the same by both groups regardless of the length of time the exiles were away from their home region. One generalization Bowie made was that if a feature is not in the state of change in Waldorf, it is less likely to be affected by constant exposure to a new dialect. On the other hand, linguistic features that are part of changes in progress in Waldorf are subject to change when exiles are constantly exposed
to a new dialect. Similar to Huffines (1986), Bowie’s study also suggests that adult exiles only partially lost their native dialect and partially acquired the new dialect.

In terms of adult dialect acquisition, it seems that unlike children who are more successful in acquiring a second dialect, adults can only partially acquire the second dialect, even after a long-term exposure. Stanford’s (2008b) study of immigrant women in rural China provides an even more interesting case in which the married women had not changed their speech at all even after forty years of stay in the new region. Stanford examined the speech of immigrant women who moved from south to north, women who moved in the opposite direction, from north to south, and the nonmobile adults and teenagers in both regions. The results showed that the married women maintained their original dialectal variants, except for one woman who had acquired some features of her husband’s region, possibly due to her more constant interaction with local children. Most immigrant women reported that they would be ridiculed if they did not use their original dialectal features. As Stanford (2008b: 446) suggested, “[a]n individual’s identification with his or her home clan outweighs the common human tendency to adapt to a new dialect region,” it is therefore not surprising that these women did not accommodate to their husbands since they were consciously aware of their own speech and their identity to their home region.

After a review of several studies, it is clear that a complex variety of factors contributes to adult dialect acquisition. Some studies focus on social factors such as social network, extent of exposure, the status of the linguistic variable, attitudes, and identity to explain dialect acquisition by adults, while others concentrate on linguistic factors such as the notion of salience to account for the acquisition of new dialects. Since
the reasons for changes in adult speech are less clear, it seems that a combination of different factors, both social and linguistic, needs to be examined to explain why and to what extent adults change or maintain their native dialects.

### 2.2 Variation Studies in Mandarin

Variationist research in Mandarin is limited to relatively few studies. They include Barale (1982) and Xu (1993), both examining final nasal deletion by Mandarin speakers in China using sociolinguistic interview techniques and variable rule analysis. Xu re-examined lexical conditioning of nasal deletion because Barale turned to lexical diffusion only when exceptions to phonological constraints were found and her case was based on four words. With regard to phonological factors, Xu’s study confirmed Barale’s findings that nasalization of the vowel, quality of the vowel and tone contribute to nasal deletion in Mandarin. In terms of social factors, Barale’s and Xu’s results for style differed. Barale found deletion was favored in informal style (i.e. conversation and fable telling) and disfavored in formal style (i.e. passage reading) when speakers paid more attention, whereas Xu did not find significant difference between formal and informal styles. Xu did find that occupation played a role in nasal deletion, with workers tending to delete more, followed by managers, then students. The results seem reasonable as nasal deletion is perceived as a deviation from the standard. Turning to lexical conditioning, Xu did find that high frequency words favored deletion, which supports the proponents of lexical diffusion that sound change is lexically gradual and that high frequency words tend to be changed earlier in a sound change (Wang 1969). However, Xu also found that two highly
frequent lexical words did not have any occurrence of deletion. He suggested that lexical
diffusion does not rule out phonological constraints in sound change and phonological,
social or lexical factors alone cannot account for language variation.

More recently, Jia and Bayley (2002) investigated null pronoun use by native
Mandarin speakers in two different discourse contexts - classroom and phone
conversation. In the classroom context, second person plural pronouns favored the null
option, whereas in telephone conversations among friends second person plural subjects
favored overt pronouns. With regard to second person singular pronouns, the two
discourse contexts showed the opposite effect: overt singular pronouns were favored in
teacher discourse but disfavored in phone conversation. The results of their study suggest
that the patterning of null and overt second-person pronouns might be related to the
nature of different discourse contexts. In the classrooms teachers usually stood before the
class and addressed all the members of the class as a group. Therefore, they seldom
overtly expressed second person plural pronouns. It is when the teachers addressed
children individually that they used overt pronouns. On the other hand, telephone
interactions normally involve only two people and the second person singular is clearly
the expected form without being overtly expressed.

Departing from the traditional variation paradigm, Zhang (2005) adopted a recent
approach that treats variation as social practice to examine the linguistic behavior of
Chinese yuppies in Beijing. With the rapid globalization of Mainland China, a group of
professionals started working for foreign business. Zhang found that those who worked in
the international business sector used local Beijing features at a significantly lower rate
than those who worked in state enterprises. Furthermore, these yuppies tended to use the
full tone, a feature of Hong Kong/Taiwan-Mandarin, as a resource for constructing a new, cosmopolitan persona, while those who worked in state-own businesses never used full tone. Zhang’s study sheds light on how linguistic variables can contain social meanings and how individuals can use the linguistic resources available to them to construct different identities.

In terms of variation in Taiwan Mandarin, to my knowledge, all studies concern phonological variation. For example, Fu (1999) found that people in Taichung use a certain rising tone of T3\(^8\) (pitch value 324), which differs from the usual realization of low-falling T3 (pitch value 31) used by people in non-central Taiwan. Examining high school students, Fu found that social network, style and gender affected the occurrence of vernacular features. Peripheral members in the school social network had a heavier Taichung accent than core members did. What is interesting is that peripheral girls used more vernacular forms in formal interviews than in casual group conversation. Fu suggested that accommodation may explain the result. In one-on-one interviews the girls tended to speak in their own styles whereas when conversing in a group they might accommodate to the core members who employed fewer vernacular features. Regarding gender, the results were similar to other variation studies. Female students used more standard forms than their male counterparts did since girls generally show more positive attitudes toward standard forms.

Also examining speakers in central Taiwan, Wu (2003) found that there is a tendency of T4 (a high-falling tone) raising at the intonation-unit-final position and more in the context of casual speech than in interviews. Regarding the phonological

---

\(^8\) Fon and Chiang (1999) analyzed the tonal value and proposed that tone contour in standard Taiwan Mandarin should be T1:44 (high-level); T2:323(dipping); T3: 31(low-falling); T4:42 (high-falling).
environment, T4 is more likely to raise when it is preceded by T1, T2, T3, the tones that end in high pitch. Additionally, the findings show that males with a high density social network in central Taiwan showed higher frequency of local variants than their counterparts with a low density social network, whereas females with a low density social network unexpectedly showed higher frequency of local variants than females having a high density social network. Wu postulated that females with a high density local network might be aware of the researcher’s non-local accent and might try to converge to a more standard accent. One interesting part in the study is that the youngest group showed the highest frequency of the vernacular forms and the oldest group showed the lowest. This finding suggests that T4 raising may be a recent sound change led by adolescents\(^9\) or that young people are less constrained by the standard language ideology imposed by the KMT government during the martial law period.

Contrary to Wu’s (2003) finding that younger people tend to possess more vernacular features, Tzeng’s (2005) study of Mandarin in a Hakka community shows that younger speakers have more standard features than older speakers due to the successful promotion of Mandarin in the past two decades. Tzeng investigated the fronting of alveolopalatal initials \(j\)-, \(q\)- and \(x\)-, a common feature of Hakka speakers of Taiwan Mandarin. In addition to the age factor, Tzeng found that both an internal factor (when preceding high front vowels, possibly as a result of assimilation) and external factors (gender, education level, and discourse contexts) interact with the frequency of the fronting of alveolopalatals. As expected, male speakers, speakers with lower education, and informal style all favored the vernacular fronting of alveolopalatals. The fronting of

\(^9\) My observation of people in Taichung agrees with Wu’s finding that I rarely find people over age 40 speak with a Taichung accent.
alveopalatals is a stereotypically well-known feature in Hakka Mandarin, but the survey results show that speakers in Tzeng’s study generally did not perceive their pronunciation as a deviation from the standard. However, the finding shows that speakers did tend to speak more standard in formal style. It would be interesting to examine qualitatively how speakers think and talk about what they hear and produce.

More recently, Yang (2008) examined the variation of /f/ and /hw/ in Taiwan Mandarin in the context of intermarriage between Taiwanese women and mainlander males. Yang found that the Taiwanese women who are the first generation of intermarriage, have a more positive attitude toward their mother tongue (i.e. Taiwanese), and did not receive a good education would tend to produce the non-standard form [hw], in place of the standard variant /f/. Additionally, Yang also noticed that the women would hypercorrect /hw/ for [f] and this hypercorrection is found especially among old speakers, women with a high education level, and those who have a Hakka language background. Yang suggested that this phonological variation of /f/ and /hw/ is the result of intermarriage. However, from my observation, this phenomenon can be found in Southern Min people without intermarriage. Since the KMT took over Taiwan in 1949, a Mandarin-only policy has been successfully enforced and as a result the majority of the Southern Min can now speak Mandarin. When two languages are in contact, the linguistic system in one language is likely to affect the other. Since Mandarin is perceived as the high language, it is not surprising that Southern Min speakers would hypercorrect their speech in Mandarin. Chung (2006) also observed that hypercorrection is found more frequently in Southern Min speakers who attempt to use Mandarin.

---

10 I have noticed that the substitution of [hw] for /f/ and hypercorrection of /hw/ in the speech of my mother and my aunt, two Southern Min women who married Southern Min men.
Therefore, it seems that language in contact rather than intermarriage is the major reason for variation in /f/ and /hw/.

Although there are relatively few studies of variation in Mandarin, these studies provide insights on how variation in Mandarin, like variationist studies in other languages, is conditioned by a combination of both internal and external factors. The same factors may have different effects on different varieties of Mandarin in different regions, among different ethnic groups, or in different sociopolitical contexts. Drawing insights from these studies and studies mentioned in dialect acquisition, this dissertation examines variation in the context of migration, a topic which has not been explored in variationist work in Mandarin.

2.3 Language Practice and Language Ideologies in Taiwan

Although there is a dearth of studies on language variation in Taiwan Mandarin, Taiwan’s complex history and ethnic and linguistic conflicts resulting from the island’s ongoing change in its sociopolitical situation have attracted many scholars to explore local speakers’ language practices and ideologies. For example, Kubler (1985) conducted a survey of linguistic usage and language attitude to college students in Taipei. He found that half of the native Southern Min spoke Taiwanese to their parents and the other half spoke both Mandarin and Taiwanese to their parents. Inside the home, half spoke both languages with their siblings, a quarter spoke Mandarin and a quarter spoke Taiwanese with their siblings. Although the majority of the respondents expressed desire to speak both Mandarin and Taiwanese with their future children, Kubler expressed his concern
that Southern Min is in danger of disappearing with the great emphasis on Mandarin in education. Now two decades after Kubler’s study was undertaken, Southern Min speakers who mainly speak Taiwanese with their parents have decreased drastically and the majority of the young Southern Min speakers mainly use Mandarin with their siblings.

Also concerning the status of Taiwanese language, van den Berg (1992) examined language practices across three generations in Taiwan. He suggested that long-term accommodation toward the societal language norm seems to be the main explanation for the reduction of monolingual Southern Min speakers across generations. Since the out-group norms (i.e. Mandarin) represent the language of power, education and wealth, monolingual Southern Min cannot participate in the society where Mandarin is required and therefore this group of people will gradually disappear over time.

In her study of language maintenance and language shift among elementary school students, Chang (1996) suggested that the interlocutor is the most important factor to determine children’s language choice behavior. Since Mandarin has been the instructional language in schools and children spend most of their time in schools, they have become accustomed to using it among themselves. Another important factor that influences children’s language behavior is language proficiency (their own or others’). Chang noticed that if the parents or older relatives are not proficient in Mandarin, the children are more likely to keep their Taiwanese or Hakka language ability to communicate with them. As for the attitudinal factor, Chang noted that if the students perceive their native languages (Taiwanese or Hakka) as an essential part of Taiwan’s cultural heritage, they would try to keep up their native languages in order to maintain their heritage. An interesting finding Chang noted is that the children in her study think
speaking ability in Taiwanese or Hakka could be helpful for getting a job, which is contrary to general beliefs that Mandarin is the instrumental language for getting a job. Chang suggested that recent political and social transition in Taiwan might have resulted in this perception. As the native language movement emerged in the late 1980s and the government implemented policies to maintain and rejuvenate native languages, the children may have perceived the shifting status of their mother tongue and viewed their native languages as valuable resources.

Different from the above studies that adopted the survey method to quantify language practice and language choice, Sandel (2003) qualitatively examined how speakers articulate the reasons for their language use. Sandel explored language practices of three generations of Taiwanese-Mandarin bilingual speakers through discussions of two issues: 1) personal history of learning both Mandarin and Taiwanese, and 2) language use among parents and children and the related ideologies that support the choice. The findings indicate that school-based language policies have an impact on speakers’ language practices, market values and ideologies. Southern Min parents who suffered from a lack of linguistic capital (i.e. standard Mandarin) at school would pass on this market value to their children. As a result of this prevailing linguistic ideology, their children speak much more fluent Mandarin than Taiwanese. However, Sandel also acknowledged that the liberalization in Taiwan’s political situations has led to a new market value attached to local languages. It is likely that people’s language practices and ideologies will continue to change along with the change of market values. The evidence is that more parents and educators are now concerned about ways to increase children’s Taiwanese language proficiency.
Situated in an institutional context, Baran (2004) adopted ethnographic methods to examine language ideologies and practice at a high school in Taipei. Students in her study expressed the view that Taiwanese is a countryside vernacular and implicitly suggested that Taiwanese indexes a lower level of education or working-class status. Moreover, Mandarin was perceived as a more pleasant and gentler language while Taiwanese was perceived as a harsh and rude language that boys tended not to use when girls were present. Baran suggested that while Taiwanese is now given an official spot, the fact that Taiwanese lacks a unified writing system causes the language to be seen as a local vernacular. However, it should be noted that Baran’s study took place in Taipei, the capital where most Mainlanders reside and where Mandarin is used in almost all domains. It is also possible that language attitudes and ideologies in this school might only reflect how people in Taipei generally view Mandarin as the prestigious, standard language and other languages as rural, vernacular languages.

The language choice between Mandarin and Taiwanese is not only the choice between prestigious and rural or standard and vernacular, it also becomes a strategic choice in political discourse, especially to mend or break an ethnic boundary line (Wei 2003). In her study of language and politics in Taiwan, Wei examined how the former president Chen Shui-bian, the first DPP candidate who won the presidential election and ended the KMT’s 51 year rule, codeswitched between Mandarin and Taiwanese as linguistic resources for his political purposes. For example, Chen’s choice of Mandarin can be explained as his performance of his identity as the authoritative and official figure whose words should be understood by citizens in general regardless of their political affiliation since Mandarin is the national language and a symbol for ethnic integration.
On the other hand, his switching to Taiwanese “functions as the “we-code” among DPP members and his choice [of Taiwanese] further helps solidify morale and gain access [for himself] to group membership” (Wei 2003:152). When Chen uses Taiwanese, the language spoken by the majority population (i.e. the Southern Min) in Taiwan and the language used by the DPP, instead of breaking the boundary line, he purposefully marks ethnic boundary and emphasizes his local “Taiwanese identity” with the Southern Min as well as the DPP members. Wei’s study on Chen demonstrates how language choice reflects the conflicting ideologies in Taiwan and how identities can be constructed within discourse.

Rather than focusing on one person, Su (2005) situated her ethnographic research in two regions of Taiwan: Taipei and Tainan (a southern city which is typically labeled as deep green and where the former president was born and grew up), to show how people switch codes within discourse to construct different identities. Focusing on language use of college students in both regions, Su found that students who reside in the region different from their birth regions were able to articulate regional differences to a great extent and that they used different linguistic resources to construct their identities as being different from local people. For example, a Taipei student studying in Tainan tended to switch to English lexical items to emphasize her identity as a cosmopolitan Taipei-an. On the other hand, a Tainan student in Taipei tended to codeswitch among Taiwanese and Taiwanese-accented Mandarin frequently to emphasize his strong solidarity to Tainan and his pride on being a Tainanite. Yet meanwhile, his mixing English phrases in conversation and his articulation that “it is normal to use English in the North” (Su 2005: 143) also suggest his alignment with some characteristics associated
with Taipei. Compared with the Taipei student who was worried about assimilation to the non-standard features, the Tainan student seems to have more positive attitudes toward both his hometown and place of residence, as evidenced in his construction of multiple identities by employing a wider range of language choice in different topics.

Finally, in an earlier study, I looked at how different linguistic variants index certain social and political identities and how language ideology affects the perception of different regional dialects (Liao 2008). I examined students’ perception and attitudes of Taipei Mandarin and Taichung Mandarin. Results indicate that people tend to perceive speakers with a Taipei accent as Mainlanders from the northern city who speak more standard Mandarin and support the blue party. Contrarily, speakers with a non-Taipei accent would be identified as Southern Min from the southern country who have lower level of education and support the green party. This study demonstrates that different varieties of Taiwan Mandarin are linked to different social meanings and that speakers are assigned with identities and values based on people’s presupposed ideologies.

Language diversity was once discouraged and banned but is now encouraged and promoted in Taiwan. As the consequence of changing language policies from Mandarin-only to Mandarin-plus, people in Taiwan now use languages as different linguistic resources to construct different identities and different languages are linked with different social meanings by people with different histories and experiences. Taiwan is not a monocultural island with one homogeneous ideology and identity. The discussion of studies during the past two decades provides a solid basis for understanding the changing of language practice and language ideologies in Taiwan.
2.4 Theoretical Foundation

This section lays out the theoretical foundation for this dissertation. These concepts are extensively drawn upon for the analysis of language variation and language ideologies and practice in Taiwan in later chapters.

2.4.1 Indexicality

Indexicality, according to Silverstein (2003), is a semiotic association between a linguistic form and a contextualized meaning, such as a social meaning. Silverstein claims that “any n-th order indexical presupposes that the context in which it is normatively used has a schematization of some particular sort, relative to which we can model the “appropriateness” of its usage in that context” (2003:193) and that the concept of indexical order is “necessary to showing us how to relate the micro-social to the macro-social frames of analysis of any sociolinguistic phenomenon” (2003: 193). He compares his orders of indexicality with Labov’s (1972) taxonomy of sociolinguistic ‘indicators,’ ‘markers’ and ‘stereotypes.’ First-order indexicality presupposes the existence of an identity or pragmatic function. At this stage, an indexical form is a presupposing index that has not been used by speech-community members to do social work. In Labov’s taxonomy, “indicators” are first-order indexicals that are “realized characteristically by every member of a group or category” (Silverstein 2003:217) and show no patterns of stylistic variation in users’ speech. Second-order indexicality refers to how speakers or listeners notice, rationalize or frame their understanding of first-order
indexicality and then establish a new or non-conventionalized social meaning onto the linguistic form in the local historical context. Second order indexicals “reveal a 1st-order indexical variation that has been swept up into an ideological-driven metapragmatics” (Silverstein 2003:219). At this stage, speakers come to notice that different forms are used by different people or in different contexts and their understanding of the linguistic form may be reflected through their linguistic behavior such as codeswitching, hypercorrection, and style-shifting. Speakers use different linguistic variants in different contexts, and this kind of linguistic variable that shows stylistic variation is what Labov refers to as ‘markers’. Finally, ‘stereotypes’, the subjects of overt comments, are “markers that have tilted in the direction of ideological transparency” (Silverstein 2003:220). In the case of ‘stereotypes’, “n+1st-order indexicality has become presupposing…replacing an older n-th-order indexical presupposition” (220).

Taking the French pronominal address tu and vous as an example, the use of a particular term is understood to presuppose something about the age of the interactants. Young people may tend to address each other as tu, while vous would automatically be used between a younger person and an older person or between older people. The presupposing character of pronominal address in French is what Silverstein calls first order indexicals (Morford 1997). The use of tu and vous cannot only function as the indication of the relationship of between speakers but also as the marker of the status or characteristics of the speaker. For example, vous functions as the elite status-marking and tu as the lower-middle-class marking, and in terms of political orientation, the use of vous is linked with conservatism whereas the use of tu is associated with progressivism. When the use of tu and vous comes to index traits such as status and political orientation that are
associated with specific groups, it is what Silverstein calls second order indexicals (Morford 1997).

Also drawing on Silverstein’s concept of indexical order, Johnstone, Andrus and Danielson (2006) describe how first-order indexicals, the linguistic forms that presuppose a sociodemographic identity or pragmatic function can give rise to second order indexicals, which suggest the meaning of the linguistic forms is shaped by ideologies about class, correctness or localness. Once people notice the second order features available for social work, they start using regional stereotypical features to perform self-conscious local identity. This kind of identity work, according to Johnstone, Andrus and Danielson, is third-order indexicality. The authors illustrate different types of indexical meaning with how Pittsburghers talk about the use of local linguistic form monophthongal /aw/ in Pittsburgh. The first type of indexical order can be seen in Pittsburghers who use monophthongal /aw/ invariably but are not aware of their speech being nonstandard and different from people elsewhere. The use of the linguistic form is correlated with geographic location but is not noticeable by local speakers as they think “[e]veryone would have spoke the same” (2006: 88). Second order indexicality is seen when Pittsburghers associate monophthongal /aw/ with working class and incorrectness. Being aware of their nonstandard accent, this type of Pittsburghers shifts styles in their own speech. Third order indexicals arise when “markers” become “stereotypes.” People explicitly talk about the second indexicality of the linguistic forms and books about how to speak like a Pittsburgher are published. At this stage, both Pittsburghers and non-Pittsburghers can use the local linguistic resources to perform or stylize local identity.
Located in contemporary Taiwan, my study of people’s perception to different varieties of Taiwan Mandarin also draws on “orders of indexicality” to explain how linguistic forms come to index social identities (Liao 2008). Even though the KMT government tried to create a unified linguistic market (i.e. Mandarin) after they retreated to Taiwan in 1949, the majority of the local speakers speak Taiwanese as their native language. Due to language contact with Taiwanese, these people developed vernacular accents that are different from the standard Mandarin the KMT government sought to promote. As a result, speaking vernacular Mandarin was presupposed to index local identity and speaking standard Mandarin to index Mainlander identity. This is what Silverstein (2003) calls first-order indexicality. After Taiwan began to liberalize its political system two decades ago, the DPP grew so quickly that it became the ruling party in 2000. This drastic political change has indirectly changed how people perceive others’ language use. It is widely known that the image of the KMT is as a Mainlanders’ and Chinese nationalists’ party whose supporters are mainly located in northern cities, whereas the image of the DPP is as the local Taiwanese party whose supporters are located in southern rural areas. Therefore, speaking vernacular Mandarin or standard Mandarin has come to indirectly index political alignment, region and urbanity. Speaking more standard Mandarin would presuppose indexing Mainlander identity and thus indirectly indexing the speaker’s political ideology or orientation toward the KMT because that is the official language the KMT enforced. Speaking with vernacular features, on the other hand, would directly index the local Taiwanese identity and therefore indirectly index the political alignment with the DPP, because the DPP has been
trying to promote the status of Taiwanese language and emphasize local Taiwanese identity. This is what Silverstein regards as a second-order indexicality.

As Silverstein (2003:194-195) suggests, “[any] sociolinguistic fact is necessarily an indexical fact” in which linguistic use points to sociocultural macro-contexts structured for speakers. This dissertation draws on the concepts of indexicality to understand how different linguistic variants in different styles are associated with different social groupings and how a particular variant becomes ideologically associated with particular social meanings in particular social contexts in Taiwan.

2.4.2 Linguistic Differentiation

According to Irvine and Gal (2000:35), “[t]he significance of linguistic differentiation is embedded in the politics of a region and its observers”. They further discuss three semiotic processes: iconization, fractal recursivity and erasure, by which people construct ideological representations of linguistic differences. Iconization refers to the linguistic features that display the social group’s inherent nature or essence; in other words, the linguistic features are made to be the iconic identities of the speakers. Fractal recursivity “involves the projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level” (37). That is, within a given group, the same principles that divide the group can further divide the subgroup. Erasure is “the process in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some persons or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible” (38). Since the contesting ideologies between major groups are so drastic, voices from other groups are usually ignored and disregarded.
Andronis (2004) draws on Irvine and Gal’s (2000) three aspects of linguistic differentiation to explain the linguistic ideologies in Quichua-speaking Ecuador. On one level, while Spanish is both the official and dominant language in Ecuador, Quichua, the language spoken by indigenous people, is iconized as being “low prestige,” “backwards,” or “peasant” contrary to “urban” and “modern” Spanish. Since this type of iconization is so pervasive among non-indigenous people, the perception that Quichua is simple or without culture erases all the complexities of the language. On the other level, there is considerable variation among the sub-dialects of Quichua; the standardized form of Quichua or ‘Unified Quichua’ has been promoted in educational programs. While people in the city start speaking the unified Quichua, those in the Amazon still keep their authentic dialect. The same ideological dichotomies between the non-indigenous and the Quichua in the larger context are mapped on to the indigenous communities. This process is what Irvine and Gal call “fractal recursivity.”

The processes of linguistic differentiation can also be seen in the metapragmatic awareness of the listeners in my earlier study on perceptions of Taiwan Mandarin (Liao 2008). A person is probably a Mainlander from Taipei metropolitan area if he or she speaks with a standard accent. A person may be identified as Southern Min from a southern rural area because of the Taiwanese-influenced Mandarin. The iconized belief of the identity and characteristics of a speaker based on certain linguistic features is what Irvine and Gal (2000) call iconization. Furthermore, although the political situation has divided the people into Mainlanders and home-province people in Taiwan, the dichotomizing process that involves two opposite groups recurs as people within the group have different ideologies. To be more specific, the same oppositions that
distinguish Mainlanders and home-province people can also be applied within the home-
province people. If home-province people speak standard Mandarin, they will likely be
identified as Mainlanders who are from the northern, urban areas and support the blue
party. On the other hand, if the home-province people speak Taiwanese-accented
Mandarin, they would probably be identified as people from the southern, rural areas who
are in favor of the green party. Figure 2.1 illustrates this process of “fractal recursivity.”
Finally, the consequence of the two separate oppositions leads to erasure. The contesting
ideologies between the two major groups are so drastic that voices from other groups (e.g.
the aborigines) are usually ignored and disregarded.

Figure 2.1 Example of fractal recursivity in Taiwan (Liao 2008: 395)
In their discussion of exploring ideologies of linguistic differentiation, Irvine and Gal (2000) suggest:

[W]e are concerned not only with the ideologies’ structure but also, and especially, with their consequences. First, we explore how participants’ ideologies concerning boundaries and differences may contribute to language change. Second, we ask how the describer’s ideology has consequences for scholarship, how it shapes his or her description of language(s) (Irvine and Gal 2000:36).

In later chapters, I draw on the concept of linguistic differentiation to discuss how speakers describe their and/or others’ language and how their linguistic ideology may or may not contribute to change in their speech.

2.4.3 Style and Language Variation

The concept of stylistic variation has always been central to sociolinguistics. Rickford and Eckert (2001) offer three reasons for examining style in the study of variation. First, all individuals and groups have their own stylistic repertoires. Hence, the styles in which they are recorded may affect sociolinguistic analyses. For example, in his analysis of the speech of an assistant in a travel agency, Coupland (1980) finds that the assistant shifts her styles when conversing with clients, co-workers and fellow travel agents. Second, stylistic variation in speech provides us with clues for language change in progress. Labov (1966) argues that it is in the vernacular and casual speech that we find the most accurate and regular indication of how language is changing in progress. Finally, analyzing styles helps us understand the individual’s internationalization of social meaning of variation. In Eckert’s (2000) work on adolescents in a Detroit high school, the individual creates his or her own style of verbal behavior through adopting certain
variants of vowels so as to resemble the group like “jocks” or “burnouts” with which he or she wishes to be identified.

Research on stylistic variation begins with Labov’s (1966) New York City study, in which he focuses on “attention paid to speech” as the main factor that influences a speaker’s style. Labov found that regardless of social classes, age-groups and genders, speakers all progressively use more of the standard postvocalic (r) feature as the formality of their speech increases. He argues that speakers are more attentive to careful styles such as reading out a passage or lists of words, and as they pay more attention to their speech, they tend to produce the more standard variants. Although being challenged by many sociolinguists, Labov (2001:86) confirms his attention-to-speech theory in his later article saying “[f]or a stable sociolinguistic variable, regular stratification is found for each contextual style; and conversely, all groups shift along the same stylistic dimension in the same direction with roughly slopes of style-shifting.”

Soon after the Labovian model of style, social psychologists developed speech accommodation theory, suggesting that language style is influenced by the speaker’s orientation and attitude to addressee (Giles & Powesland, 1975). This accommodation theory later led to Bell’s (1984) “audience design” model, where he argues that stylistic shifts are due to the speaker’s responses to primarily the actual addressee and also the referees (in the mind of the speaker). According to Bell (2001:141-142), “styles focuses on the person. It is essentially a social thing. It marks inter-personal and inter-group relations. It is interactive and active.” In his study of how speakers vary their style in response to addressees, Bell examined four New Zealanders varied by gender and ethnicity being interviewed by three different interviewers, also varied by gender and
ethnicity. He found that the speakers used different amounts of the discourse particle *eh*, a marker of the English of male Maori, with different interlocutors, with the Maori man used the most *eh* with the Maori male interviewer. Bell further suggested that style-shifts can also be used as identity marker since speakers may position themselves differently in relation to different groups, including their own in-groups.

Instead of treating stylistic variation as intra-speaker reflection of social structure, recent work on style treats speakers as social actors and variation as social practice. According to Coupland (2001b:197), “Style, and in particular dialect style, can be construed as a special case of the representation of self, within particular relational contexts-articulating relational goals and identity goals.” He suggests viewing style as persona management and focuses on individual speakers’ use of different linguistic resources to invoke different social meanings. Coupland used the talk of a Cardiff radio show host to illustrate how the host strategically selected dialect features to project different identities in different segments of the show. For example, when the host talked about Cardiff people and related events, he tended to use more locally signifying variants to project his identity as a local radio show host. Similarly, he used consistent Cardiff features when he made fun of himself and tried to be funny to present himself as a member of the local community. On the other hand, when he wished to present his persona as a competent news anchor, he used more standard variants since speaking the standard allowed him to perform his identity as a public announcer with “competence” and “expertise.” Coupland (2007:121) suggests, “the variation resources available to speakers are multi-valenced. They are ‘called into meaning’ by discursive frames and have their effects in diverse social dimensions.” As his example illustrates, the radio host
not only used different linguistic variants to project different identities, but also used the same resources to stylize different identities.

From an anthropological perspective, Irvine (2001:23) views style as a “social semiosis of distinctiveness.” While Coupland focuses on individual speaker agency in the distinctiveness of style making, Irvine emphasizes the community processes that create distinctiveness. She suggests that “[t]he linguistic phenomena that constitute registers and styles, as forms of linguistic distinctiveness, have a consistency that derives, in some degree, from local ideologies of language” (Irvine 2001:33). According to Irvine, the role of ideology is of particular importance in speakers’ style choice. How speakers act and speak is ideologically mediated by their understanding of their social positions, the practices to which they have access, and the social space in which they are. One of Irvine’s illustrations comes from her ethnographic work in a rural Wolof community in Senegal. In the community, the villagers associated two salient styles of speaking with two different rankings in society: high-ranking nobles and low-ranking griots. Differences in ranks were acknowledged by the villagers and the linguistic differences among the villagers were motivated by their ideology about the traditional caste hierarchy system. Irvine suggests that participants’ acts of speaking are influenced by their perceptions and interpretations of each other’s behaviors and the social world and that we should focus on how participants’ ideologize sociolinguistic differentiation to understand their styles of speaking.

Echoing Coupland and Irvine, Eckert (2001:123) defines linguistic style as “a clustering of linguistic resources, and an association of that clustering with social meaning.” Eckert (2004a) proposes that linguistic variables do not come into style with a
predetermined meaning, but rather, variables come to take on social meanings in the process of stylistic practice, which is a process of *bricolage*, whereby people combine multiple pre-existing materials to construct new meanings of styles. An example of style as bricolage can be seen in Podesva’s (2004) study of /t/ release by Heath, a gay medical student. /t/ release has traditionally been used for emphatic effects, expressions of anger, or in academic settings to sound superior, intelligent and educated. Recently, /t/ release has also been associated with gay speech. Although Podesva found that Heath used more /t/ release in the clinic to project his competent and educated persona as a physician, he used longer /t/ release to project his playful “bitchy diva” persona at the barbecue with his friends. Podesva interpreted this creative and exaggerating use of /t/ release as Health’s attempt to convey prissiness, a characteristic in keeping with the diva style he enjoyed performing with his friends. Eckert (2004a:51) suggests the stylistic perspective to analyze variation for the following reason:

    [W]e need to examine the use of variation up close, to understand how (and to what extent) it is used to express very local and personal meanings. To do this, we have to focus on the role of variation in constructing personae-to see how people deploy linguistic resources to create styles.

    I have reviewed previous work on styles. Sociolinguistic styles have changed from merely referring to simple relationships between linguistic forms and social groups/categories to referring to a complex phenomenon in which linguistic resources are deployed and recontextualized to make social meanings. In later chapters, this dissertation focuses on the kind of style discussed by Coupland, Irvine and Eckert, considering style as a part of persona management, social distinction, and construction of social meaning to examine the linguistic behaviors and the ideologies of speakers of central Taiwan.
3. METHODS

This chapter begins with an introduction of two linguistic variables in Taichung Mandarin and the rationale for variable selection. Next I explain the rationale for selecting the two research sites and describe the methodology used for selecting the speakers and coding the data. Then I list the internal and external factors that I coded for the two linguistic variables. Finally, I discuss the methods used for quantitative and qualitative analyses in Chapter 4 and 5.

3.1 The well-known Taizhong-qiang “Taichung accent”

As mentioned in Chapter One, Taichung has a unique sociopolitical status, where the local politics is more balanced in the north/south contrast. In addition to its function as a hub on the north-to-south corridor, Taichung is chosen as the home region of the speakers in this study because Mandarin in central Taiwan or Taizhong-qiang (“the Taichung accent”) is well-known for its salient phonological variants that differ from the variants used by people in non-central Taiwan. In spite of the very limited documented research on Mandarin in central Taiwan (see reviews of Fu 1999 and Wu 2003 in Chapter Two), the Taichung accent is probably the most discussed variety of Taiwan Mandarin in daily conversations. In fact, just a few weeks before I started this chapter, two young Taichung people posted a video on YouTube demonstrating “how to master the Taichung accent in three minutes.” Figure 3.1 and 3.2 are video screens taken from YouTube. The video received more than 100 thousand views and numerous comments in few days and it became so popular that SET News, a major Taiwanese news cable network, broadcast the
video two days after it was posted. However, despite the popularity and the seeming
success of the video, the two young Taichung people received some criticisms for not
understanding the essence of the Taichung accent at all. In their three-minute clip, they
introduced the Taichung accent in terms of the pet phrases and the telephone vocabulary.
Selected comments from the viewers are as follows:

xxzdx¹¹ (3 weeks ago)
還有台中腔的特點就是尾音會上揚會漂，影片中這些全台灣本省家庭的小孩都會使用。
(Also, the feature of the Taichung accent is raising and floating in terminal sounds, all children from the home-province background can use the features shown in the video)

bctvanw (2 weeks ago)
這叫口頭禪或語助詞而不是腔調
所謂台中腔是語尾有上飄的感覺
(This is called pet phrase or particle, not accent, the so-called Taichung accent is raising in sentence final.)

bill19911026 (1 week ago)
腔調和用語是不一樣的東西喔
影片所介紹的東西是用語吧
台中腔最著名的特色是
尾音上揚
(Accent and usage are different, what is introduced in the video is usage. The most well-known feature of the Taichung accent is raising in terminal sounds.)

juiceATT (3 hours ago)
完全沒有對台中“腔”的描述
空洞、嘩眾與寵
ps.台中腔應該針對注音五聲(音)說明，例如：晚上(ㄕㄤ、) 唸成晚上(ㄕㄤ)
(Absolutely no description of Taichung “accent,” vain, claptrap
p.s. The Taichung accent should be discussed in terms of zhuyin.¹² For example, wânshâng “evening” is pronounced as wânshâng.)

¹¹ The comments were all retrieved on March 15, 2009 from
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DNA3SiNNWME. English translations are my own.
¹² Zhuyin is a phonetic system for transcribing Chinese, used widely in Taiwan.
This video demonstrates how the Taichung accent is clearly perceived by non-Taichung people and how local Taichung people tend not to have the ability to perceive the well-known phonetic features that distinguish them from other Taiwan Mandarin speakers. In my interviews, my interviewees also frequently expressed their inability to perceive the so-called Taichung accent even though many have heard that raising in terminal sounds is a distinct feature of the Taichung accent. The following examples show how Taichung people generally think of the Taichung accent.

(1) yīnwèi táizhōng de qiāng, bùzhīdào wèishéme, dājiā dōu tīngde chūlái, hěnnán xíngróng, wǒ tīng bùchūlái. (J. Chang: 6/22/2008)

(Because the Taichung accent, I don’t know why, everyone can hear it, it’s difficult to describe, I can’t hear it.)

Figure 3.1 First Lesson: Taichung people’s pet phrase (Retrieved March 15, 2009 from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DNA3SfNNWME)
Figure 3.2 Second Lesson: Taichung people’s telephone vocabulary (Retrieved March 15, 2009 from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DNA3SfNNWME)

(2) tāmén shuō táizhōngrén yǒu yīzhǒng qiāngdiào, kěshì wǒ yìzhí tīng bù chūlái. (J. Shi: 7/22/2008)

(They all say Taichung people have an accent, I can never hear it.)

(3) hǎoxiàng yǒurén huì shuō, táizhōngqiāng hǎoxiàngshì, fāyīn, yǒuxiēzi niànfā bù yíyàng, wěiyīn bù yíyàng. (Y. Lo: 7/3/2008)

(Seems that people say, the Taichung accent seems to, the pronunciation, some words are pronounced differently, the terminal sounds are different.)

(4) tāmén shuō, táizhōngqiāng shì nǐ wēiyīn hui shàngyáng, wǒ zǐjī jiùshì méi gānjué ā, wǒ gēnbèn fènbiàn bù chūlái. (R. Chuang: 2/26/2008)

(They say, the Taichung accent is raising in terminal sounds, I can’t feel it, I can’t even tell the difference.)

I take the speech samples of the interviewees to demonstrate this distinct feature of the Taichung accent. In the sentence in Figure 3.3, zhījīn réngrán shì méiyímù dōu lingrén
nánwàng “Till now every scene is still unforgettable,” the speaker clearly pronounced the four syllables lingrénnánwàng “unforgettable” in the final position as the dictionary forms falling, rising, rising, and falling tone respectively in read speech.

Figure 3.3 Pitch contour in read speech

On the other hand, in the sentence in Figure 3.4, yīnwèi, wǒ shì xiǎng shuō, kěnéng zhīhòu yào huàn gōngzuò “because, I think, maybe later I want to change jobs,” the dictionary forms for the disyllable word gōngzuò “job” in the final position are level tone and falling tone respectively. However, the Taichung speaker realized the falling tone more as the level tone in spontaneous speech. The pitch contour shown below illustrates Wu’s (2003) results, which suggest that there is a tendency of T4 raising at the intonation-unit-final position.
Another noticeable feature that distinguishes the Taichung accent from standard Taiwan Mandarin is the substitution of lateral [l] for retroflex approximant [ɻ].\textsuperscript{13} For example, the pronunciation of ‘person’ by a Taichung speaker might be ‘len’ [lən] instead of ‘ren’ [ɻən]. It should be noted that the retroflex sounds in standard Taiwan Mandarin are softened considerably compared with the standard Mandarin in Beijing due to the influence of Taiwanese. Many Southern Min speakers of Mandarin even lack the distinction between the retroflex initials zh-, ch-, sh-, r- and their non-retroflex dental

\textsuperscript{13} It has been suggested that the standard Taiwan Mandarin differs from Beijing Mandarin in terms of the quality of retroflexion. Therefore, I adopt the retroflex approximant [ɻ] instead of the retroflex fricative [ʐ] used in Beijing Mandarin to better describe the retroflex r- in Taiwan Mandarin.
equivalents z-, c-, s-, l- because the retroflexed phonemes do not exist in Taiwanese (Kubler 1985). Even though the substitution of [l] for [ɻ] is not a unique feature in the Taichung accent, it exists frequently in bilingual speakers of Mandarin and Taiwanese and is also the second most frequently discussed feature of the Taichung accent by public perception next to T4 raising. The followings are two examples taken from an online forum about the Taichung accent.

(5) 熱和樂分不清楚
ex: 今天天氣好樂喔!
嗯嗯~~~我也是熱樂分不清...
(Can’t tell the difference between hot ‘rè [ɻɤ]’ and happy ‘lè [lɤ]’
e.g. Today is very hot ‘lè [lɤ]’. hmmm…I can’t tell the difference between hot and happy either)

(6) 不會發“ㄖ” ㄈ,試練習以下句子:
沒人會喝熱的可樂
台中腔: 沒ㄌㄣ會喝樂的可樂
(Can’t pronounce “r”, try practicing the following sentence:
Nobody ‘méirén [meɻən]’ drinks hot ‘rè [ɻɤ]’ coke.

When asking about the Taichung accent, I found that my participants could identify and demonstrate this feature as the Taichung accent more easily than they could demonstrate T4 raising. It seems that for Taichung speakers, the substitution of [l] for [ɻ] is more “metapragmatically transparent” (Silverstein 1981: 14) than T4 raising. The following two examples show Taichung people’s awareness of their substitution of [l] for [ɻ].

\(^{14}\) ㄖ,ㄌ,ㄣ are phonographic symbols of Chinese (also called bopomofo), these symbols are still used in Taiwan. ㄖㄌㄣ are equivalent to ‘r’, ‘l’ ‘en’ in pinyin respectively.
(7) wǒ chéngrén wǒ fā bù qīngchú, kuài lè, kuài rè, fēn bù tài chūlái, yǒu zài xiǎng de huà kěyǐ ā, kuài lè, hǎo rè (K. Fu, 2/21/2008).

(I admit that I can’t differentiate clearly, happy (kuài lè), almost hot (kuài rè), can’t tell clearly. If I think, yes I can tell, happy (kuài lè), very hot (hǎo rè).

(8) wǒ hái mán yánzhòng de, lián táizhōngrén dōu hui jiǔzhèng wǒ , jiù huí yōurén shuō, wǒ mén lái fā ‘lòu’ gēn ‘ròu’ yǒu shéme bù yí yàng (L. Chang, 2/29/2008).

(Mine is very obvious, even Taichung people would correct me. People would say, let’s pronounce leak (lòu ) and meat (ròu ) and see if there’s difference.)

Figure 3.5 and 3.6 show the spectrograms of zhōngbùrén ‘Taichung people’ uttered by two Taichung speakers. As we can see from the figures, the speech sample in Figure 3.5 suggests that the speaker pronounced more [ɻ] because there is a clear F3 dive and F3 comes closer to F2. F3 in Figure 3.6, on the contrary, is much flatter. In addition, the F3 is higher, which suggests it is more like the lateral [l].

Figure 3.5 No substitution of [l] for [ɻ] in the word zhōngbùrén
Taipei and Taichung are chosen as the places of residence of the focal Taichung people because of the special status of both regions. Taipei (or Taibei, literally the north of Taiwan) is the capital, as well as the center of politics, culture, commerce, education, and mass media. Thus, Taipei is widely recognized as the most modernized and urbanized city in Taiwan and has become one of the global cities. In terms of language use in Taipei, the official language Mandarin is preferred by most speakers and is used in almost all language domains. Besides, Taipei Mandarin is considered to be more similar to the standard Mandarin in Beijing and is less influenced by Taiwanese. Therefore, a Taipei accent is generally perceived as the standard Mandarin in Taiwan. Moreover,
compared with other regions, Taipei has a much higher concentration of Mainlanders\textsuperscript{15}, and therefore the local politics is usually perceived as “deep blue.”

Taichung (or \textit{Taizhong}, literally the center of Taiwan), located in central Taiwan, is where the focal participants grew up and which they identify as their hometown. Taichung is the third largest city in Taiwan after Taipei and Kaohsiung and serves as a hub on the north-to-south corridor. The majority of the local people are Southern Min, Hakka comprise 20 percent of the population in Taichung County and Mainlanders consist of about 16 percent of the population in Taichung City and 8 percent of the population in Taichung County (Huang 1994). With regard to local politics, even though the blue party has swept the most recent elections (both the legislative and the presidential election in 2008), local politics is still generally regarded as more balanced in terms of leaning toward blue or green because it is the first major Southern Min (i.e. Taiwanese)/Mandarin region south of Taipei (Hsu, 2004). As for language use, the older generations (middle age and older) of the Southern Min mostly use Taiwanese and the younger generations (young adult and younger) use Mandarin more frequently. Besides, Taiwanese and Mandarin are preferred in different language domains. Mandarin is preferred in more formal settings such as schools, department stores, government offices, whereas Taiwanese is preferred in local settings such as traditional markets, stands, and so on. Both Taiwanese and Mandarin are used interchangeably to accommodate to the interlocutors in settings like hospitals, banks, and local stores.

\textsuperscript{15} According to Huang (1994), 49.5\% of the Mainlanders reside in Taipei metropolitan area.
3.2 Participants

This dissertation focuses on the younger generation of Taichung people whose parents consider Taiwanese their mother tongue/first language (i.e. the Southern Min people). The younger generation refers to those who entered elementary school after 1982, the year that the government enforced the law that all children between 6 to 15 years old must receive nine years of compulsory primary school education. Starting in elementary school, Mandarin, a compulsory subject named guoyu ‘national language’, is taught by immersion. Having been immersed in a Mandarin environment, although raised bilingually, this generation of Southern Min tends to use Mandarin more often than Taiwanese for all communications, even with their parents who speak Taiwanese to them.

In addition, in order to examine whether there are links between the use of linguistic features and social factors such as political inclinations and sociopolitical contexts, participants from two genders, two political orientations (KMT “the blue” and DPP “the green”) and two places of residence (Taipei and Taichung) were selected. Moreover, the participants were recruited from three age groups to examine if different historical contexts play a role in language variation. The first group, whose age ranges from 30 to 32, entered school few years before the lifting of martial law in 1987. The participants in this group still have vivid memories of being punished for speaking Taiwanese in public. The second group, whose age ranges from 25 to 27, entered school right after the lifting of martial law in 1987. Although Taiwanese was no longer banned, Mandarin was the predominant language among peers both in public and private discourse. The last group, whose age ranges from 20 to 22, entered school in the 90s when Taiwan had seen liberalization in many aspects of society and education. Furthermore, participants who
reside in Taipei were all born in Taichung and moved to Taipei at age 18 or later for school; therefore, their length of stay in Taipei is also a factor I will examine.

3.3 Participant recruitment

Participants were recruited by two approaches from February 2008 to July 2008. The first is the social network approach, using the “friend of a friend” method (Milroy, 1980). Growing up in Taichung and going to school in Taipei at age 18, I consider myself an insider in the community and have some personal ties with Taichung people in Taichung and Taipei. The second approach is through online recruitment. I posted an advertisement at a forum about Taichung on the biggest BBS (Bulletin Board System) in Taiwan.\(^\text{16}\) In both methods of recruiting, I recruited Taichung people who fulfilled all four of the requirements: 1. Taiwanese is the mother tongue of your parents; 2. You live in Taichung or Taipei (If you are in Taipei, you moved there at age 18 or later for school); 3. You belong to any of the three age groups (20-22, 25-27, 30-32); 4. You have a political orientation (blue or green).\(^\text{17}\)

Researchers have suggested that the presence of peers may affect the quality of sociolinguistic interviews (Cukor-Avila & Bailey 2001). Since gift certificates were offered as an incentive, some participants also invited friends who were qualified to join the interview. Besides, although most interviews were conducted at coffee shops or fast-food restaurants where the participants felt most comfortable, some interviews were conducted at participants’ homes with the presence of their family members or friends.

\(^\text{16}\) PTT is the most popular BBS site in Taiwan with 750 thousand active users.
\(^\text{17}\) The measure of having a political orientation was based on participants’ self-evaluation. During our interviews, I also asked them to explain the reasons they support the blue or the green party.
Even though I had planned to have one-on-one interviews, I ended up having group interviews with 15 participants. Since the presence of peers may have an impact on the interviews, I also coded interview type (one-on-one interviews versus group interviews) as an external factor.

Occupation has long been considered as possible influence on language variation (e.g. Labov 1966). Since this study focuses on the younger generation whose age ranged from 20 to 32 and all the participants either were attending college or had graduated from college at the time they were interviewed, it is unlikely that their occupational roles would be greatly stratified. Therefore, I coded occupation for two categories only: students and working professionals. Table 3.1 shows the participant demographics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social grouping</th>
<th>Numbers of speakers in Taipei (N=20)</th>
<th>Numbers of speakers in Taichung (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group interview</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one interview</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working professionals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Participant demographics
3.4 The effect of the interviewer

Labov (1966) points out that the “observer’s paradox” may undermine the goal of collecting natural linguistic data since the interviewees may adapt their speech due to the presence of the fieldworker. Tagliamonte (2006) suggests that common personal associations (ethnicity, place of origin, etc.) are important for the fieldworker to enter the community successfully and also mitigate the observer’s paradox. Therefore, it is important to address my background as the fieldworker. I was born and grew up in Taichung; I moved to Taipei for college just as all my participants in Taipei. Both my parents consider Taiwanese to be their mother tongue, but Mandarin is my dominant language even though I was raised bilingually in both Mandarin and Taiwanese. Sharing a similar background with the participants, I would be able to mitigate the “observer’s paradox” in the interview situation (Tagliamonte 2006).

With regard to my own accent, I have confirmed with two friends who are linguists that I have neither the standard Taipei accent nor the typical Taichung accent. Having lived in Taipei for four years and the United States for five years, I still frequently replace retroflexes with their non-retroflex counterparts (e.g. [ts] instead of [tʂ] in zhège “this”) but I have lost the feature of T4 raising although I am aware that some features of the Taichung accent do appear when I speak very fast or get excited. However, I argue that not carrying the obvious Taichung accent might only influence the interviews minimally for two reasons. First, the majority of the participants expressed their inability to perceive the Taichung accent, and many of them did not think their accent different from Taipei accent. Since they cannot perceive the difference, they would not adapt their speech
because of my accent. Second, some participants did guess my accent as the Taipei accent or even the Mainlander accent because of some of my lexicon. Nevertheless, these people were the ones carrying a more typical Taichung accent. If they were to accommodate to the more standard variety, they would have shown fewer features of the Taichung accent.

Last, my gender and age (female and 27) are also factors that may affect the quality of the interviews. However, I argue that if these factors do influence the interviews, they would only have minimal effects and would not invalidate the data for the following reason. As I mentioned earlier, having spent 18 years in Taichung, I consider myself a member of the community. Oftentimes during the interviews, my participants and I either found out that we went to the same elementary school, junior high, or high school or realized we have similar memory over certain events happening in Taichung. These connections become an advantage for me to gain access to their vernacular speech.

3.5 Data Collection

The speech data were collected by means of sociolinguistic interviews and a reading passage. Interviews are the most commonly adopted approach among sociolinguists to elicit the spontaneous vernacular usage of speakers (Milroy & Gordon 2003). The interviews lasted about an hour and a half for the individual interviews and about two hours for the group interviews and consisted of three parts. The goal of the first part is to gain access to the vernacular speech. Since the primary interest of the interviews is to elicit natural conversational speech, I included questions that “hit(ting) upon a topic that
will engage the interviewee” (Milroy & Gordon 2003:66). When interviewees are emotionally engaged in the conversation, they are more concerned with the content than with the linguistic features. Therefore, I prepared a list of topics that might engage the participants in free conversation and allow them to bring about their emotional reactions. For example, I asked their experience about the 9.21 earthquake that occurred in central Taiwan in 1999 and caused thousands of deaths and billions in damage. Bayley and Pease-Alvarez (1997) also found that asking participants to recount their experiences of the 1989 San Francisco earthquake turned out to be successful in eliciting narrative discourse. Additionally, since the “friend of a friend” approach (Milroy, 1980) was one of the methods for participant recruitment, I found that talking about people we both know enabled me to reduce the unfamiliarity with my participants and successfully engage them in our conversation. Some other topics in the interviews include: family anecdotes, educational histories, current school/work life, sports, dramas, and our shared experiences. Since my goal was to elicit naturalistic speech, I was also very flexible and willing to adjust the topics in conversation that were more likely to engage the participants. Although I had prepared a set of topics, I found that oftentimes new topics emerged during our conversation and those topics actually provided fascinating naturalistic speech. For example, one participant and I found out that we went to the same elementary school and had the same teacher. However, the ways the teacher treated us were so different that we were so engaged in our discussion to figure out the reason. Since those emerging topics proved to provide fruitful speech data, I seldom needed to cover all the topics I had prepared. Besides, the participants were all informed that the first part of the interview was more like a casual conversation, going with the flow instead of following an
interview schedule in this part of the interview proved to be more effective in eliciting longer responses.

Schilling-Estes (2004:190) found in her study that speakers will employ a range of different linguistic features to put on different personas in different topics and viewpoints and that “identity, […], is dynamic and multifaceted and is very much a product of unfolding talk.” In order to investigate whether the participants use linguistic resources to construct their social identity, the second part of the interview focused on two different fields: 1) language attitudes and linguistic practices, and 2) political ideologies and political situations in Taiwan. Since the purpose of this part of the interview was to explore the attitudes and beliefs the participants projected, I created an interview schedule so I could cover all the topics I was interested in exploring and navigate them without any reference to any papers (see Appendix 1 for questions and topics I covered). Questions for language-related issues include: comparison of regional accents, language ability and use (cf. Mandarin, Taiwanese, and English), language and ethnicity, and language attitudes toward four speech samples (one male and one female from both Taipei and Taichung). Political topics include: blue/green contrast, north/south contrast, ethnicity and political inclinations, Taichung status, and Taiwan local identity.

Finally, in addition to exploring how speakers use linguistic resources to construct their identities, I also wished to examine how they understand the social meanings of different linguistic features. It is suggested that when speakers pay more attention to their speech, they would approximate their speech to the norm of higher-status social groups (Milroy & Gordon 2003). In my previous study, I also noticed that speakers employed fewer vernacular features when they were asked to read a passage (Liao 2008). Therefore,
I asked participants to read a one-page passage (see Appendix 2) that describes an experience of the 9.21 earthquake. The passage contains the target linguistic variables in different environments. Having the interviewees read a passage allowed me to capture their understandings of the standard norms and the vernacular features.

3.6. The Linguistic Variables

Sociolinguistic research in regional Taiwan Mandarin is still in its infancy. Indeed, to my knowledge, only two studies examined language variation in central Taiwan (Fu 1999; Wu 2003). Therefore, variables selected for analysis are from the two previous studies, nonlinguists’ comments about the regional features and my personal observation. The principles for selecting variables are 1) features that show socially patterned variation and contain local significance (Milroy & Gordon 2003); and 2) “general socially diagnostic variables” (Wolfram 1993:204). Based on the selection principles, the two features discussed in section 3.1 are chosen as the dependent variables for analysis. In addition to the external factors (gender, age, region, political orientation, interview type and topic) that I have discussed and explained in previous sections, in Section 3.6.1 I discuss the first linguistic variable and the internal factors I coded and in Section 3.6.2 I discuss the second linguistic variable along with the internal factors that constrain the variation.
3.6.1 T4 raising: the realization of T4 as T1 (T4/T1)

As mentioned earlier, speakers in central Taiwan are said to have a higher and more raising pitch, especially in the intonation-unit-final position (Wu 2003). This raising phenomenon is perceived most saliently when the default contour in standard Taiwan Mandarin is a high-falling tone (T4). The internal factors I coded are listed and explained in the following:

(1) T4 in positions of intonation units (IU): In Wu’s study, she found that T4 raising tends to occur more frequently in IU-final than in other positions. Chafe (1987:22) defines IU as “a sequence of words combined under a single, coherent intonation contour, usually preceded by a pause.” Adopting this definition, I coded one word or a sequence of words following a pause as an intonation unit. Four IU positions with the occurrence of T4 are illustrated below:

(a) Phonological utterance: dui “yes”
(b) IU-initial: fumuqin de shengji “father and mother’s ethnicity”
(c) IU-medial: wou buzai taiwan “I am not in Taiwan”
(d) IU-final: taibei haoxiang… “Taipei seems…”

(2) Preceding tone: It is suggested that the phonological environments also play a role in T4 raising. Wu’s data showed that T2, the high-rising tone, has a more significant influence on T4 raising, followed by T1, the high-level tone, then followed by T3, the falling-rising tone. In this study, six phonological environments were coded: T1, T2, T3, T4, T0 (neutral tone), and Ø (no preceding environment).
(3) Grammatical functions: In English, content words tend to be stressed while function words are more likely to be unstressed in connected speech. Studies also show the tendency for function words to be reduced and/or assimilated to surrounding words (Jurafsky et al. 2001; Shi et al. 1998). In their cross-linguistic comparison of English, Mandarin and Turkish, Shi et al. (1998) found that function words were reduced acoustically and phonologically in spontaneous speech recordings. Indeed, based on my previous observation, my participants also tended to raise T4 in discourse markers such as ránhòu “then” and jiùshì “that is” or in adverbs such as bǐjiào “comparatively” and fānzhèng “anyway.” Therefore, I also coded grammatical functions into five categories: nouns, verbs, content words other than nouns and verbs (e.g. measure words, classifiers, adjectives, and time words18), function words (e.g. adverbs19, conjunctions, and prepositions), and discourse markers.

3.6.2 r-lateralization: substitution of lateral [l] for retroflex approximant [ɻ] (r/l20)

Even though r-lateralization is more an ethnic marker than a regional marker owing to its occurrence among Mandarin/Taiwanese bilingual speakers (i.e. Southern Min

---

18 Time words always appear before the verb/predicate it modifies. In the following example, the time word zuótiān ‘yesterday’ modifies the verb máng ‘be busy’.

wǒ zuótiān hěn máng
I yesterday very busy
“I was very busy yesterday.”

19 Unlike in English, adverbs are categorized as function words in Chinese because they cannot stand alone and mean nothing out of context. For example, in the following sentence, the adverb jìngrán cannot stand alone as the English adverb ‘unexpectedly’, and it means nothing if taken out of context.

tā jìngrán (adv.) méiyǒu lái
he unexpectedly not come
“Unexpectedly, he didn’t come.”

20 Throughout the dissertation, phonetic symbols in the IPA are given in square brackets, to distinguish them from Chinese or English spellings. Hányǔ pīnyīn, the romanized spelling system, is used to annotate standard Chinese sounds.
people), I also included this feature to analyze because it is a “general socially diagnostic variable” (Wolfram 1993:204) as illustrated by an online forum and my participants in Section 3.1. The internal factors I coded are listed below:

(1) Following segments: The structure of a Mandarin syllable consists of initials and finals. Any Chinese consonant can function as an initial, but different initials may take different finals. For example, the unaspirated stop b can take a single vowel a to form a syllable bà as in bàba ‘father’, but the retroflex r cannot take the vowel a to form a syllable. There are thirteen finals that the retroflex r can take: an, ang, ao, e, en, eng, ong, ou, u, uan, ui, un, uo, and the retroflex can also stand alone as ribēn 21 ‘Japan’.

(2) The frontness of the finals: I coded the finals that the retroflex r takes into three categories, front, central and back, depending on the frontness of the finals. Since the dental lateral [l] is more fronting than the retroflex counterpart [ɻ] in terms of the tongue position, it is worth examining whether the frontness of the following finals would influence the frontness of the initial sound.

(3) Grammatical functions: For the (r/l) variable, following the coding scheme for the (T4/T1) variable, I also coded grammatical functions into five categories: nouns, verbs, content words other than nouns and verbs (e.g. measure words, classifiers, adjectives, and time words), function words (e.g. adverbs, conjunctions, and prepositions), and discourse markers.

21 Although the vowel i is combined with r to form a syllable in pinyin, it should be noted that the retroflex r here is a syllabic r. In bopomofo, only the symbol ṛ is used to represent the first syllable in the word ribēn.
3.7. Data Analysis

This study employed the methodology of sociolinguistic variation studies, coupled with qualitative analyses to examine two salient dialectal features of Taichung Mandarin. Variationist sociolinguists have returned to the roots of the discipline (Labov 1963) and are again using techniques of qualitative analysis to find out how variation comes to happen in any particular case. By incorporating qualitative data to unveil ideologically social distinctions and language patterns in conjunction with quantitative variationist analysis, this research not only aims to understand both the social and the linguistic aspects of language use but also focuses itself within the current sociolinguistic wave (e.g. Mendoza-Denton 2008; Podesva 2007; Zhang 2008).

3.7.1 Quantitative analysis

The interviews lasted between one hour and a half to two hours depending on the interview types (group or one-on-one interviews). Each interview was transcribed and coded, yielding 8162 tokens of T4 and 3089 tokens of r. Since Mandarin is a tonal language with only four basic tones, it is unrealistic to code every single occurrence of T4. Therefore, I coded about 50 consecutive tokens from a randomly selected section in each topic from each speaker, yielding around 200 tokens per speaker. Regarding the r variable, I coded all occurrences of r because it occurs less frequently. Among the 3089 tokens, 623 token were either realized as the nasal sound [n] or deleted, so only 2466
tokens that were realized either as lateral [l] or retroflex approximant [ɻ] remain for further quantitative analysis.

Coding of each token took place in two phases. In the first phase, I coded the data of the first two interviews via Praat, a computer-based acoustic analysis program. For (T4/T1) variable, the pitch contour allowed me to judge whether T4 was raised. The acoustic analyses showed that lowering in F3 and F2 during preceding vowels helps in distinguishing approximant [ɻ] from [l]. I compared my auditory judgments with the acoustic analysis so that I could train myself to hear the variation consistently. After I had established consistent measurements to code the tokens through inspecting the spectrograms and the pitch contours, in the second phase I coded the remainder of the data auditorily and went back to the acoustic analysis when needed. Since I did not have another native Mandarin speaker to code the data for a reliability check, any effects my judgments may have influenced on the coding were consistent across the coding process.

After finishing coding, I examined the linguistic variables and linguistic and external factors that constrain linguistic variation by means of Goldvarb, generally referred to as VARBRUL, a specialized application of logistic regression that is used extensively in variationist research (Bayley 2002; Tagliamonte 2006). VARBRUL analyses allow researchers to investigate the systematic choice of linguistic variables speakers make when they use language (Tagliamonte 2006) and all contextual factors, whether the linguistic environment or the social phenomena, that might explain the observed variability (Bayley 2002). Indeed, Guy (2009) also suggested that Goldvarb is still the

22 The retroflex fricative [ʐ] used in Beijing Mandarin was also realized by some speakers. Both retroflexed variants were coded as one factor group for VARBRUL analyses.
right tool for the study of linguistic variation not only because it is a tool designed specifically for linguists to do quantitative analysis of linguistic data but also the lingua franca that linguists or students of linguistics have shared for the past few decades.

3.7.2 Qualitative analysis

The contents of the interviews were coded in ATLAS.ti, a qualitative data-analysis program that enables researchers to associate codes or labels with chunks of text. In ATLAS.ti, codes are created as necessary, and they are linked to particular quotations. Once I click the codes, all the quotations under the same code appear in the same screen. This not only allows me to organize and analyze large quantities of data but also makes it possible to address the relationship between the phonological variables and the qualitative (ideological/attitudinal) analysis since all the codes are theme-driven. I examine the interview responses, focusing on the second part of the interview (see Appendix 1 for a list of questions) by means of four resources: stances, membership categorization devices (MCD), stylizations and codeswitching.

Du Bois (2007: 25) defines stance as “a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field.” According to Johnstone (2007), claims to social identity for oneself and ascriptions of identity to others can function as stancetaking moves. In her study on Pittsburghese, Johnstone showed how people talk about local speech such as performances of dialect competence provides resources for
stancetaking. By analyzing stancetaking in the data, I can capture how participants use language to evaluate, position and align with one another and how identity and dialect are linked.

Another approach to analyze discourse is MCD, developed by Sacks (1992) focusing on the local management of speakers’ categorizations of themselves and others. Membership categories are “the common-sense knowledge that ordinary people […] have about what people are like, how they behave, etc. This knowledge is stored and accessed by reference to categories of member/person” (Schegloff 2007:469). How people are categorized by speakers at a given moment is socially and interactionally meaningful. By applying MCD, I have insights into how people use classifications or social types to describe or label persons.

In addition, I also examine stylization processes in the interview data. Stylization, or styling the other, refers to how “people use language and dialect in discursive practice to appropriate, explore, reproduce, and challenge influential images and stereotypes of groups that they don’t themselves (straightforwardly) belong to” (Rampton 1999:421). Coupland (2001a) also sees stylization as performance and social practice. By looking at how people perform “non-current-first-person personas” (Coupland 2001a: 345) in discourse activities, I am able to explore how people use language to index either in-groups or out-groups and also how ideologies are reflected via language use.

Finally, I analyze where codeswitching occurs in the data. Codeswitching between Mandarin and Taiwanese has found to be very common among bilingual speakers in Taiwan (Kubler 1985). In my earlier observation, I also found that younger speakers tend to codeswitch between Mandarin and Taiwanese, and occasionally English in response to
different situations or interlocutors. Codeswitching from Mandarin to Taiwanese or English suggests how young speakers construct their ethnic, regional and national identities (Su 2005). By looking at instances of codeswitching, I can examine how multifaceted identities are constructed and how the social meaning of different language choice is understood by speakers.
4. IDENTITY, IDEOLOGIES, AND LANGUAGE PRACTICE

4.1 Introduction

Traditionally, variationist sociolinguistic studies have used quantitative analysis to examine the frequency and distribution of linguistic variables. Speech data are collected through sociolinguistic interviews, a methodology developed by Labov (1966) that allows researchers to elicit personal narratives, a more casual and spontaneous style characterized by more vernacular variants of the linguistic variables. While the Labovian sociolinguistic interview is still an important tool for data collection in sociolinguistic research, many variationists have returned to the roots of the discipline. Like Labov (1963) in his study of language change on Martha's Vineyard, they are again using techniques of qualitative analysis to find out how variation comes to happen in any particular case. In addition to using the correlational methods to account for patterns of variation in groups, researchers in language variation have come to pay close attention to individual speakers’ repertoires and the role “acts of identity” (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985) play in the choice of variants. LePage and Tabouret-Keller suggest (1985:181):

[T]he individual creates for himself the patterns of his linguistic behaviour so as to resemble those of the group or groups with which from time to time he wishes to be identified, or so as to be unlike those from whom he wishes to be distinguished.

As Bucholtz and Hall (2008) suggest, recent trends in contemporary research on language and society have focused on two avenues: “the concern with the linguistic construction of identity in social interaction and the relationship between individual speaker and larger social structures and processes” (404). Recent research has viewed identities as
accomplished by the agentive activity of individuals with respect to larger groups rather than assigned category membership. For example, the pronunciation of word-final *er* is not simply a feature of the fixed Greek style in Australian English, but rather the feature is used so repeatedly by the immigrants to create a solidary stance that a style emerges to link the feature with the social identity of the immigrants (Kiesling 2005). Turning to the Chinese context, we see that the Beijing yuppies use full tone, a feature of Taiwan Mandarin, along with their avoidance of Beijing variants to construct their new yuppie identity in the global market (Zhang 2005). Also, the in-marrying women in Stanford’s (2009) study of Sui dialect contact persist in their dialect distinctiveness that indexes their home communities to construct their identity despite long-term contact with local residents. The above examples all suggest that ‘acts of identity’ are not mainly about claiming memberships; on the contrary, these acts involve individual perceptions of the larger social order (Eckert 2008).

Furthermore, as linguistic ideology is seen as “a crucial mediating link between linguistic form and social structure” (Woolard 2008: 436), sociolinguists have also turned to linguistic ideological perspectives to understand the complexity and the ways that speakers use languages (Eckert 2000; Irvine & Gal 2000; Milroy 2004). Silverstein (1979: 193) defines linguistic ideologies as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use.” These sets of beliefs are not merely ideologies of the ruling class, but rather, they are diverse beliefs about the superiority/inferiority of specific languages, about how languages are acquired, about language contact and multilingualism, about how languages are used in the social world (Kroskrity 2004). By incorporating qualitative analysis into investigations of how
identity and ideologies interact with speakers’ linguistic behavior and practice, we will have a more nuanced understanding of why certain patterns of variation emerge and how speakers interpret the meaning of variation in linguistic forms.

Before I embark on the discussion of linguistic micro-variations, I explore the macro-level identities and ideologies in this chapter. I address individual as well as shared beliefs, views and evaluations of selves and others. I also explore how social meanings of linguistic variables emerge in their discursive practices. In the following sections, I examine the discourse of North/South contrast and “big Taipei-ism,” a long established Taipei-centered point of view resisted by people outside Taipei. These discussions aim to provide a social context in which the participants are situated before I discuss their language attitudes and practices in the remaining part of the chapter.

4.2 Discourses on North/South

As mentioned earlier in the introductory chapter, the North ‘bei bu’ and the South ‘nan bu’ in Taiwan are traditionally labeled with different colors representing voters’ different political affiliations. The exact areas referring to the North and the South are not always clear. Media reports generally mark the ZhuoShui River, a river that flows along the border between Changhua and Yunlin, as the dividing line. Public commentaries also often mark Taichung as the border town between northern and southern Taiwan. Although scholarly work and political discourses divide Taiwan into four general regions as seen in Figure 4.1, most attention in daily interaction and media

---

23 The idea of the capital as the standard is common in many countries such as Beijing Mandarin in China and Parisian French in France. It is also common that people outside the capital resent the capital-centered viewpoint.
has been paid on the North/South contrast. Discourse on eastern Taiwan is usually left out because the region is less developed and central Taiwan is sometimes left out or combined with the South as ‘zhong nan bu’ in the two-way dichotomy of North vs. Central and South (Su 2005). Only during the general election campaigns would central Taiwan become the focus of public discourse because politics in central Taiwan is usually more balanced compared with the North and the South. Slogans such as jue zhan zhong tai wan ‘decisive battle in central Taiwan’ are especially heard frequently during presidential elections to emphasize whichever party wins the votes in central Taiwan will win the election.

Figure 4.1 A map of Taiwan with regional divisions (Retrieved July, 14, 2009 and adopted from http://ms2.ecjh.tpc.edu.tw/~s961211/taiwan-map.gif )
In addition to differences in political orientations, discourse on North/South differences also touches upon mundane issues such as consumption behaviors, dressing styles, and language abilities and use. Analyzing North/South discourse in media, Su (2005) provides a brief summary of phrases used to describe regional differences. The North is generally associated with the base of colonizers (Taipei in particular), sophisticated, urban, international, trendy and shrewd, whereas the South is associated with authentic Taiwanese spirit, lively, energetic, limited world views, concerned for the land, loyal to local relationships and straightforward.

When asked about whether the North/South contrast exists in Taiwan, some speakers also brought up how the media discusses the contrast. J. Shih\textsuperscript{24} commented:

\begin{quote}
(1) xīnwén huíshūō, zhōngbēiqīngnán, zhúōshūīxī yǐnán jiàò nánbù, lèišī zhèzhōng, zhǐshāo yáoyǒu ge zhōngbù cúnzài ba, wǒ juéde, běi zhōng nán, yào zhōngshí táizhōng ā, yīnggāi shì wàng jì le ba (J. Shih, 20MCG, 7/22/08).

(The news says, emphasizing the north and ignoring the south, the south is below the ZhuoShui River, something like that, at least the central should be there, I think, north, central and south, they should also emphasize Taichung, perhaps they forget [Taichung].\textsuperscript{25})
\end{quote}

Their comments not only indicate that the media has long put more emphasis on the north but also suggest that while the distinctions between the north and the south are firmly maintained, the discourse of any other differentiation is disregarded, or as Irvine and Gal (2000) put, the discourse of other regional differences undergoes the process of \textit{erasure}. G. Ho explicitly expressed that it is necessary to differentiate the central from others and that people in central Taiwan dislike being categorized as the south. G. Ho said:

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{24} All the names are pseudonyms. The series of letters and numbers represent speaker age, sex, residence, political orientation and date of the interview. For example, in (1) 26MCG, 7/22/08 means J. Shih is 20 years old, male, residing in Taichung, supporting the green party, and was interviewed on July 22 in 2008.

\textsuperscript{25} All the translations in this dissertation are my own.
\end{quote}
(2) zhōngbù de rén yě huì xiǎngyào gěn nánbù huì kāi ba, xiǎng táiběirén shuō, o nǐmén nánbù zēnyang de shìhòu, jiù wǒmén huì xiǎng shūō, yào huāfēn chū zhōngbù lái, yěshì bǔxiǎngyào zhījiē běi guīlèi zài nánbù limiàn ba (G.Ho, 22MPG, 7/5/08).

(2) People in the central region also want to be separate from the south, like people in Taipei say, well you southern so and so, we would think, want to, mark the central, also, we don’t want to be directly categorized as the south.)

Interestingly, while they all show sentiments that discourse on Taichung should also be included, most likely because it is where they grew up, their comments provide another example of perceptions of erasure. As shown in Figure 4.1, Taiwan is traditionally divided into four regions, but discourse on the eastern region is usually ignored.

Additionally, regardless of where the speakers currently reside and with which political parties they affiliate, they frequently associate the North/South contrast with the blue/green contrast and the Mandarin/Taiwanese contrast. For example, T. Cheng gave a brief explanation of what the North/South contrast is all about. He said:

(3) shì jiăng wàishěng gēn běnshěng ba, qíshí jiǔshì, táiyǔxi gēn guóyu, jiā shàng zhèngdăng méiti méibìyào de fēnzhēng (T. Cheng, 22MCB, 6/20/08).

(3) It is, [the conflicts] between Mainlanders and home-province people, actually it is, between the Taiwanese group and the Mandarin group, plus, unnecessary disputes stirred up by political parties and the media.)

Y. Lo went into more detail about how political parties are associated with the North/South contrast. Moreover, her comment not only resonates with the general public awareness of beilannanlǐ ‘North blue South green,’ a phrase widely spread in media, election campaigns, and daily interactions, but also suggests the border town status of Taichung, a more balanced place in terms of political orientations. Y. Lo commented:

(4) wǒ méicì kàn xuǎnjū, hǎoxiāng zhúshùxī yǐnán shí lǚ de bǐjiāo duō, jīběnshǎng, wǒ juéde táizhōng shì ge hùnhé, ránhòu táizhōng yībēi jiūhui bǐjiāo
piān lán, yǐnán jiǔ huì piān lù de gān jué, jiǔ huì jué de shì jiào yòu chéng dù, gān jué hào xiāng yǐnán jiū shì rénkǒu wài yì, nián qīng rén dōu dào běi bù, gān jué běi bù shì zhī shì shuǐ zhùn bī jiǎo gāo, dōu shí cóng méiti kàn lái (Y. Lo, 30FCB, 7/3/08)

(Every time I watch elections, it seems that below the Zhuoshui River is more green, basically, I think Taichung, is a mix, and north of Taichung is more blue, south [of Taichung] is more green, I think it’s because of the level of education, I feel in the south, people move out, young people all move to the north, I feel the north has, higher level of knowledge, I heard this all from the media.)

J. Shih, who expressed the need to emphasize Taichung in public discourse in previous paragraphs, suggested Taichung’s border town status from linguistic perspectives:

(5) wǒmén jiā huì jiāng tái yǔ, suǒyǐ zì rán jiǔ huì jiāng, kēnénɡ, táibēi rén bǐ jiǎo shǎo jiāng, suǒyǐ yǒu diǎn bú huí, kēnénɡ jiāng yǔ yú bǐ jiǎo duō, nán bù gān jué dōu zài jiāng tái yǔ, gān jué nán bù, xiàng tán ēn ā, tāmén dōu jiāng tái yǔ, bēi bì kēnénɡ nǐ qū wán, tán ēn jiǔ shì gēn ní jiāng yǔ yú bǐ jiǎo duō, wǒ jué de zhōnɡ bù shì yī bàn yī bàn.

(In my family we speak Taiwanese, so we naturally can speak, perhaps, Taipei people, fewer people speak [Taiwanese], so they can’t speak, maybe they speak more Mandarin, in the south I feel they all speak Taiwanese, I feel in the south, like vendors, they all speak Taiwanese, when you go visit the north, vendors speak more Mandarin to you, I think it’s half half in the central.)

J. Shih’s comment provides more details of the North/South contrast as conflicts between the Mandarin group and the Taiwanese group that T. Cheng mentioned. Mandarin is preferred in the north whereas Taiwanese is favored in the south. As for people in central Taiwan, they can switch between Mandarin and Taiwanese just as they can swing votes between blue and green depending on different situations.

Although the discourse on the North/South contrast is pervasive and all the above speakers are aware of the contrast, one common stance emerges from their utterances: the central, or Taichung has a special status that should not be ignored. While public commentaries at the national level tend to group the central and the south together as zhōnɡ nan bu, the Taichung speakers disalign themselves from the south by commenting
how different they are from the south both politically and linguistically. F. Liu made a comment about the status of Taichung. Although she seemed to be joking, her comment did define a separate Taichung identity that contrasts with others. She stated:

(6) táizhōng wǒ juéde kěyǐ, zìjǐ chénglì yīge guójiā, wǒmén jiùshì táizhōngguó (F. Liu, 22FPB, 7/1/08).

(I think Taichung can, establish our own country, we are Taichung State.)

Another interesting thing I noticed is the high frequency of comments about the media when participants spoke about the North/South contrast. Blommaert (2005:163) suggests “[n]o ideological process today can be understood without taking into account the way in which messages, images, and discourses are being distributed and mediated by the mass media.” Indeed, the high frequency of comments about the media not only suggests the influence of the media in contemporary information society but also shows that people use media information and take media as “evidence” in the construction of their attitudes and opinions (van Dijk 1985). According to van Dijk (1998), the media serve as ideological institutions that bias toward the reproduction of a limited set of dominant, elite ideologies despite the large ideological variety in society. Before the lifting of martial law in 1987, the media in Taiwan were controlled by the KMT government and the use of local dialects in mass media was strictly limited. Some restrictions included not using dialects to interview people and avoiding accented Mandarin (Huang 1994). Although now the media in Taiwan are considered to be one of the freest in Asia, the fact that most major television stations and newspapers are located in Taipei, the capital, reinforces its ideological work toward the northern perspectives.
Even though many speakers reject the northern perspectives on the discourse of the North/South contrast in the media and the lack of a voice for Taichung, still others think there is no North/South contrast and blame the politicians and the media as the causes of the conflicts between the north and the south. For example, F. Lin said:

(7) táiwān zhèmìxiào, yǒu shéme nánběi? zhèngzhì rènwù gēn méiti dōu yàofū hěndà de zérèn, huóxū xiāngfā shì zhěndé bùyíyang, kěshì wèntí shì, zhèngzhì rènwù diū yìge huáti chūlái, méiti gènzhe nǎo (F. Lin, 30MPB, 7/1/08).

(Taiwan is this small, is there south or north? Politicians and the media both need to take full responsibilities, perhaps there is really difference in thinking among people, but the problem is, politicians throw out a topic, and the media stir it up.)

Also agreeing that the media stir up the contrast, C. Hsieh thought the contrast does exist, but is not as serious as what the media reveal. Although she did mention that her boyfriend would call her a central/southerner, she did not take it as an offense. She said:

(8) wǒ juéde méiyǒu méiti xuànrān de nàme yánzhòng, dāngrán yǒude shìhòu wǒmen huí, pírú xiāng wǒ gèn wǒ nánpéngyǒu, yōushìhòu wǒ jiūhuì shuō “nímén bèibùrén”, tā jiūshuō “nímén zhōngnánbùrén” (C. Hsieh, 27FPG, 2/29/08).

(I don’t think it’s as serious as what the media exaggerate. Of course sometimes we would, for example between my boyfriend and I, sometimes I would say “you guys northerner”, and he would say “you guys central/southerner.”)

Although the majority of the speakers recognized the North/South contrast and many expressed the desire to emphasize the status of Taichung, ideologies are grounded in social experiences and never uniformly distributed even within the same community. These different viewpoints not only show that ideologies are not general and all-pervasive but also suggest that power-regulating institutions such as the media have the power to construct deep ideological messages in local lives (Blommaert 2005).
4.3 Da Taibei Zhuyi ‘Big Taipei-ism’

As Taiwan develops into a full-fledged two-party system, the DPP’s efforts to develop the south, which has long been ignored by the KMT, have increased Taipei people’s awareness of regional difference and terms like taibei shawen zhuyi ‘Taipei chauvinism’ or da taibei zhuyi ‘big Taipei-ism’ also emerge as a resistance to the long established Taipei-centered point of view (Su 2005). During my fieldwork, many speakers, especially those who migrated to Taipei, have described similar experiences of their encounters with Taipei people and provided examples of their Taipei-centered sense of being. Before I move on to speakers’ daily interactions with Taipei people, I begin with a discussion of two maps which provide a sketch of regional difference in Taiwan from the Taipei-centered point of view. The authors of the maps are unknown but the maps were so widely forwarded via emails that they were mentioned several times in interviews, which is the reason I knew about the maps and went online to look for them. For example, F. Lin brought up the maps when talking about Taipei people, he said:

(9) táiběirén, kēnéngh shì táiběISHI, chūlái zhīhòu jiǔhūi juéde hāoxiàng shuō, zēnme zhēlǐ gèn wǒmen táiběISHI bùyìyang? nǐmen zhēbǐān shibūshí luòhòu, zhōngnánbú? zhīqiăn búshí yóurén huá dǐtú mǎ? táiběISHI, ránhòu táiběIXIān, táiběIXIān yǐnán de, quānbù dōu jiāozuō nánbú, nàdìtú shì táiběrén de dílǐ rénzhī, yě chángcháng tǐngdào yóurén jiāng shuō, à nǐmen, zhōngnánbú dàdǎo shibūshí gèn táiběISHI wânquán jiéránbùtong de shìjiě? tāmén de rénzhīshāng shì, zhīyào zhōngnánbú shì táiběISHI jiùshì xiāngxiā, méiyǒu shéme fánróng de dìfā (F.Lin, 30MPB, 7/1/08)

(Taipei people, maybe Taipei City, when they go out [of Taipei] they seem to feel, why is here different from our Taipei City, are you in the backward, central/southern regions? Didn’t someone draw a map before? Taipei City, then Taipei County, below Taipei County, are all so-called central-southern regions, that map represents Taipei people’s geographic knowledge. I also often hear people say, is your central-southern region a totally different world from Taipei? It is their cognition that, central-southern regions equal to countryside, there is no prosperous place.)
As we see from Figure 4.2, from a Taipei-centered point of view, the term *Taipei* refers to Taipei City and even Taipei County is considered to be a more rural place. Moreover, the proportion of Taipei in the map is bigger than the rest of the regions in Taiwan, which represents the ideology of “big Taipei” versus others. Apparently, the central region is erased in the “big Taipei” ideology and the eastern region is diminished to the yellow labeled as the stereotypically undeveloped aboriginal territory. The rest of the area in the map represents south of Taipei, which equals to southern countryside where the low-class *taike* reside. According to Su (2005:238), “[t]he term *taike* invokes a cultural stereotype of a young adult in Taiwan whose lifestyle, linguistic repertoire, and fashion sense are considered distinctively local, unknowingly unsophisticated, and unsuccessfully imitative of the current trends without an awareness of their limitations.” Additionally, speaking *Taiwan guoyu* ‘Taiwanese accented Mandarin’ has been perceived as the iconic identity of *taike* (Su 2009). Using the term *taike*, Taipei people distinguish themselves, the trendy, sophisticated and high-class urbanites who speak Mandarin, from those outside Taipei, the local, unsophisticated and low-class *taike* who speak *Taiwan guoyu*. Last, their lack of geographic knowledge of “not sure if Yunling or Changhua is more northern” further reinforces the stereotypical image of Taipei people who care about nothing but Taipei.
Figure 4.2 An example of “Big-Taipei-ism” (Retrieved July 14, 2009 and adopted from showian.pixnet.net/blog/post/24432692 )
Similarly, the map in Figure 4.3 also depicts views of Taiwan from Taipei’s perspectives. Again, we see a clear North/South contrast in the map. The North, painted in blue, refers to the capital Taipei City and its suburbs Taipei County, whereas the South, painted in green, refers to regions outside Taipei, and differs from the traditional four-
way regional divisions in Figure 4.1. Some stereotypical images of the south include: the south is oriented toward the green party and taxi drivers there all listen to dixia diantai ‘underground radio’ or ‘pirate radio.’ Most underground radio stations in Taiwan favor Taiwan independence and the typical image of their listeners is southern hard-core pan-green supporters, especially those rural working-class males in their middle age and beyond who speak mainly Taiwanese. Although taike and listeners of underground radio refer to different age groups (young adults vs. middle age and beyond), linking the South with either term clearly delivers the same message: we high-class Taipei urbanites are different from you southern low-class country folks.

Now I turn to my interviewees’ reports of their experiences interacting with Taipei people. Four examples are given, two speakers who migrated to Taipei, support the green party and the blue party, respectively, and two speakers who stayed in Taichung, also support the blue party and the green party, respectively.

C. Lo, a supporter of the green party who has stayed in Taipei for eight years, shared his experience in extract (10).

(10) yīnwèi wǒ yánjiùsuǒ lăobăn shì táizhōng rén, ránhòu, yòushì báimù xuédì, jiànjīng, ránhòu tā jiù, jīnlái, yòu gèn wǒ náge báimù tóngxué liáo tiān, liángge dōu tāiběirén(r), jiū liáotiān liáodào lăoshí, “e lăoshí shì nǎlǐ rěn(R)26 ā? gănjué bútàixiàng tāiběirén(R),” wǒ tóngxué shūō lăoshí būzhū tāiběi, ránhòu xuédì jiù xiàyǐtiào, ō, lăoshí būzhū tāiběi, tā būshí tāiběirén(R) mǎ? ránhòu wǒ tóngxué jiǔshūō, būshí ā, tā táizhōnggrén, ránhòu měi ge líbài kái tāde BMW lái tāiběi shàngbān.” ránhòu xuédì jiǔshūō, ”o!kàn de chū lái, tā jiāng guóyǔ jiù bǐjiào mēi náme bīāozhūn, jiù bǐjiào yǒu qiāngdiào,” tā shuō, “ō xiàng wǒmen tāiběirén(R) jiāng guóyǔ jiǔshū hén bīāozhūn de guóyǔ, ránhòu tāmēn nàzōng zhōngnánbū jiāngde guóyǔ jiǔhui yǒu qiāngdiào, bǐjiào bū bīāozhūn” (C. Lo, 26MPG, 3/11/08).

(Because my boss in graduate school is from Taichung, then, it’s the baimu junior again, Jianguo High School, then he, came in, and chatted with my baimu classmate,

---

26 To differentiate variation of the initial r- clearly, I use the capital letter (R) to represent the retroflex fricative [ʐ] used in Beijing Mandarin and the small case (r) to represent the retroflex approximant [ɻ] in Taiwan Mandarin hereafter.
they are both from Taipei, then they talked about our teacher, “hey, where is our teacher from? I feel she doesn’t look like someone from Taipei. “ My classmate said the teacher doesn’t live in Taipei, then the junior was so surprised, “oh, the teacher doesn’t live in Taipei, so she’s not from Taipei?” Then my classmate said, “no, she’s from Taichung, and she drives her BMW to Taipei to work every week.” Then the junior said, “Oh, I can tell, her Mandarin is not that, well has an accent.” Then my classmate asked, “Accent? What kind of accent?” He said, “oh, like us Taipei people speak standard Mandarin, and those central-southern people speak Mandarin with an accent, less standard.)

In the first extract, C. Lo began his narrative with his evaluation of the two Taipei people. By using the phrase baimu ‘white eyes’, a lexical borrowing from Taiwanese used to describe individuals who are mean or hard to get along with, to describe both Taipei people, C. Lo not only disaligned himself from those mean Taipei people who only value standard Mandarin but also aligned himself with Taiwanese speakers. Additionally, describing the junior with contrasting information: baimu and Jianguo High School, the most prestigious high school in Taipei as well as Taiwan, C. Lo continued to disalign himself from those Taipei people who hold a sense of superiority, suggesting that their sense of superiority is a kind of baimu behavior. When he moved on to his narrative, C. Lo purposely heightened his pitch and clearly pronounced the retroflexes as the Beijing Mandarin variant in all the occurrences of the word ren, which is different from the reduced retroflex in ren he pronounced in the third line. Using higher pitch and (R) instead of (r), C. Lo conveyed his image of Taipei people as showy and pretentious. The last utterance further supports C. Lo’s perception of Taipei people and provides a clear example of the “big Taipei-ism.” Taipei people express their Taipei-centered point of view by drawing a distinction between “us” and “those”: “us” as the Taipei people who speak standard Mandarin and “those” as the central-southernners who speak with an accent.
L. Hsieh, like C. Lo, who moved to Taipei for college and has also stayed in the city for eight years, provided an example of “big Taipei-ism” from geographical perspectives in extract (11). Similar to what the map in Figure 4.2 demonstrates, Taipei people, especially those from Taipei City, consider places outside Taipei to be southern. Even Taoyuan, the county below Taipei that is traditionally included in the northern regions in political discourse, is marked as southern from the Taipei-centered viewpoint. Even though L. Hsieh was surrounded by the Taipei-centered discourse, by emphasizing that “I am going back to Taichung, I am going back to the central,” he not only rejected the Taipei sense of superiority but also claimed his regional identity. (I think northerners have, strong self ideology, especially those from Taipei City, many people from Taipei City, they all say the same thing, once you go out of Taipei, it’s like going abroad, many of them [say so], when I was a freshman and sophomore, many Taipei people say, “oh, are you going back to the south?” In their perception, maybe Taoyuan is already southern, let alone the central. I replied, “I am going back to Taichung, I am going back to the central.” Almost, all the Taipei people have this kind of tendency, many of the Taipei people I know are like this, they think once you get out of Taipei, you are in the south, or they can never imagine, living in the south, this kind of feeling.)

The ideology of “big Taipei-ism” is perceived not only by those who migrated to Taipei, but also by those who stayed in their home region. Since Taiwan is a small island, migrating to other regions for school or work or traveling to other regions is not uncommon and therefore people generally have experiences interacting with outsiders. In
extract (12), although K. Lu has never lived in Taipei, she was able to provide examples of “big Taipei-ism” by drawing on her experiences with her classmates from Taipei and her relatives’ working experiences. Here, K. Lu suggested that the use of the Taiwanese phrase e gang “lower harbors” by Taipei people to describe central-southerners is apparently from a self-centered viewpoint. By using the word e, meaning ‘below,’ ‘under’ and ‘lower’ in Taiwanese, Taipei people distinguish themselves, the higher and superior ones, from others. Then K. Lu supported her argument about how Taipei people discriminate against others in daily interactions by sharing her own experience. Although her Taipei classmates would express the prejudice that people outside Taipei have never experienced things they have experienced, K. Lu would come forward and refuse to be positioned as someone local. By stating that “we also have these things in Taichung,” K. Lu aligned Taichung people with those urban and modern Taipei people and disaligned themselves from rural locals.

(12) wǒ juéde, táiběirén, yǒu bùfèn táiběirén, hǎoxiàng, jiùshì, táiběiguó de gānjué, ránhòu duì wǒmen zhōngnánbùrén, hǎoxiàng yǒudiàn qǐngshì, kānbūqǐ de gānjué, qǐnshěntiányī, jiùshì yǐ wǒ zhūjiān gēn tóngxué de xiǎngchū jǐngyàn, háiyǒu wǒ de qǐnqǐ , qú táiběi ā, gōngzuò de jǐngyàn zhèyàng, tāmén dōuhui jiǎng wǒmen zhōngnánbù shì ‘è gang’27, qíshì wǒ juéde ‘è gang’ shì yǒudiàn qíshì de, yǒngcí, érqì tāmén dōuhui juéde shuō, xiàng, wǒ táiběi de tóngxué dōuhui juéde shuō, wǒmén zhèzhǒng zhōngnánbù de, yídīng zhěge méi kànguò, nàge méi kànguò, zhěge yě bù zhīdào, nàge yě bù zhīdào, wǒ jiùshuō, ” wǒmén dōu yōu kànguò ā, zhèxiē dōngxī wǒmén táizhōng dōuyōu,” wǒ huì jīnliàng bù yáo ràng tāmén yǒu zhèzhǒng hǎoxiàng wǒmén “hěnsóng” de gānjué (K. Lu, 25FCB, 6/19/08)

(I think, Taipei people, some Taipei people, seem to, that is, feel in Taipei State, then toward us central-southerners, they seem to disrespect, look down on us. My personal experiences, are from experiences I had with my former classmates, and my relatives, who go to Taipei, their working experiences. They all say our central-southern regions are ‘e gang’. Actually I think the term ‘e gang’ is a discriminating, usage, and they all think, for example, my Taipei classmates all think, we central-southern

27 Taiwanese phrases or lexical borrowings from Taiwanese are in italics. English phrases or lexical borrowings from English are in bold. My emphases of the text are underlined.
people, must have never seen this, never seen that, don’t know this, don’t know that
either. I would reply, “we’ve all seen that, we also have these things in Taichung.” I
would try, not to make them feel that we are very local.)

The last example comes from C. Chang, who has lived in Taichung since she was
born. Unlike the three previous examples that illustrate Taipei people’s “big Taipei-ism”
through the comments they made about others, the salesperson from Taipei explicitly
stated that her level is higher than other local people. In C. Chang’s example, the
cosmetics salesperson kept emphasizing that she was from Taipei, she was different from
other local salespeople and her level was higher. In the cosmetics field, modernity and
trendiness are two important elements. By stressing that she was from the capital Taipei,
the cosmetics salesperson wished to position herself as the competent salesperson who
knew the trend and meanwhile to disalign herself from other local salespeople. Her
association of Taipei with urbanity and trendiness resonates with the media discourse
about Taipei that Su (2005) mentioned. C. Chang commented on the salesperson’s
behavior with “so what,” suggesting that she disagreed with this Taipei sense of
superiority.

(13) běibùrén yǒu yìzhòng, yōuyuēgăn ā, jiù juéde shuō, “wǒ táiběi lái de”, hāoxiàng
bābù dé quánbù de rén dōu zhīdào tā shì táiběi lái, dàtáiběi jiūshì zhèyàng, wǒ qù
zhuāngguì măi gè bāoyăngpǐn, yě yǐzhí qiángdiào, tā shì táiběi zhuāngguì xiālái de,
kěyì jiǎngshuō, tā shì táiběi lái de, ā shì zěn yang? jiù yǐzhí qiángdiào, “wǒ gēn tā
bùyíyăng ā, wǒ shì táiběi lái de, táiběi xiālái de zhuāngguì xiăojiē, suŏyī wǒ de
shuǐpíng bǐjiào gāo” (C. Chang, 30FCG, 7/24/08).

(Northerners have this kind of, sense of superiority, they think, “I am from Taipei”,
they seem to want everyone to know that they are from Taipei. This is the so-called
“big Taipei.” I went to a cosmetics counter to buy some lotions, she kept emphasizing,
she’s coming down from their cosmetics counter in Taipei, she said it purposely,
she’s from Taipei. So what? She kept emphasizing, “I am different from her, I am
from Taipei, I am coming down from our cosmetics counter in Taipei, so my level is
higher.”)

As is shown in the two maps and narratives by four Taichung speakers, people outside Taipei generally believe that Taipei people subscribe to the “big Taipei-ism” ideology. The “big Taipei-ism” ideology might result from geographic location, different consumption behaviors and linguistic difference. Additionally, given that most Taiwanese media are based in Taipei, they generally take a Taipei-centered viewpoint (Su 2005). Even though the Taipei-centered point of view is pervasive in media discourse, resistance to this discourse has not disappeared but even flourishes. The bitter battle between Taiwan’s two main political parties has further increased regional awareness. Moreover, the awareness of regional difference and discourse about the north/south contrast also emerged in this social context. The successes of the DPP in two presidential elections and mayoral elections in Kaohsiung (the second largest city located in the south) further emphasized the party’s representation of the south and the authentic Taiwanese-ness, in contrast with the long-established KMT based north-centered viewpoint. Additionally, the DPP’s effort to develop the south, especially Kaohsiung, has made Kaohsiung an attractive modern cosmopolitan metropolis, almost keeping pace with Taipei.  

Although the “big Taipei-ism” ideology is still prevalent in Taipei, the growth of Kaohsiung has undoubtedly increased Taipei people’s awareness of regional difference and decreased the ideological positioning of Taipei as the only hotspot of modernity and cosmopolitanism. Located against this background, although Taichung is the third largest city in Taiwan after Taipei and Kaohsiung, the discourse on Taichung is generally perceptually erased. Taichung is most frequently brought up in public commentaries when it comes to its well-known distinctive accent. Given the prevalence of the erasure

---

28 Kaohsiung’s Mass Rapid Transit was launched in 2008, and Kaohsiung was also the host of the 2009 World Games, a multisport event primarily composed of sports not featured in the Olympic Games.
of discourse on Taichung, I turn to the following sections to explore Taichung speakers’ awareness and evaluation of their own and other varieties of Mandarin in Taiwan as well as their language practice and ideologies.

4.4 Awareness of the Taichung accent

Starting from Labov’s (1963) groundbreaking study of Martha’s Vineyard, sociolinguists have shown that speakers use different linguistic forms to do identity work. Although researchers have added “identity” to their lists of social variables, only recently did they start attending to what speakers had to say about their own speech. Johnstone and Kiesling (2008:19) suggest:

[T]he indexical meaning of a form for a particular speaker cannot be predicted with any certainty on the basis of ideological schematizations that circulate on a broader scale, we avoid speculating about what these speakers may be intending to do through the way they pronounce words unless we have clear independent evidence in the form of matched-guise or interview data.

Drawing on these insights, I explore speakers’ metalinguistic awareness through data from the interviews as well as a speech perception task, which will be discussed in later sections. In the interviews, I avoided the term “Taichung accent” so the speakers would not detect what I intended to ask. I only started using the term “Taichung accent” after they had mentioned it. The forty interviews show four different ways Taichung people talk about the Taichung accent and its social meanings (see Appendix 1 for a list of the interview questions).
4.4.1 Everyone speaks the same

Although most of the speakers had heard of the term “Taichung accent,” they expressed different understandings. Among the speakers, especially those who stayed in their home region, some considered the way they talk to be no different from other people. While they acknowledged that people link a certain accent with Taichung, the fact that they have more dense sociolinguistic networks but little opportunity to interact with outsiders has limited their exposure to other varieties and therefore they are unaware of regional difference in speech. In spite of the intense exposure to the mass media with standard pronunciation, their accent remains divergent from the standard dialect rather than convergent with it since they do not interact with people in the media. As Labov and Ash (1997) point out, despite hours of daily exposure to standard American English on television, the local accents of Boston, New York, Philadelphia and other cities are even more different from each other than before. This correlation between linguistic forms and demography, which members of the community have not noticed, is what Silverstein (2003) calls first-order indexicality.

T. Chang, who exhibits a high rate of T4 raising (see Chapter 5), is a junior in college who also has lived in Taichung since she was born. She stated that she did not hear any difference in speech between her classmates from Taipei and her Taichung peers.

(14) S.L: nǐ juéde nǐ táiběi péngyǒu yōuméiyōu gēn nǐ yòngzì qiănci búyíyang? (Do you think there is any difference in language usage between you and your Taipei friends?)

T. Chang: háihào e, jiù zhīyǒu qiăngdiào búyíyang, tāmén juéde qiăngdiào búyíyang, kěshì wǒ zìjī tíng bújuéde, ā wǒ tíng tāmén jiănghuà wǒ būhui juéde búyíyang, kěshì tā tíng wǒmen jiănghuà, jiūhuí juéde búyíyang jiūshì wǒ bùzhīdào wéištìme e
In the interview, T. Chang claimed that she had never heard people tell her that Taichung people have a Taichung accent until she entered college where she met classmates from other regions. Before college, T. Chang was not exposed to other regional dialects since people she interacted with on daily basis all lived in Taichung. Even though she started interacting with outsiders in college, the majority of the people she interacts with are still Taichung people since her college is only ten minutes from home and she bonds better with her Taichung classmates. Living in these dense social networks, they have never talked about or noticed the Taichung accent. In short, this group of people is not geographically mobile, and therefore, they have not noticed the correlations between certain linguistic forms and their region.

4.4.2 I know what the Taichung accent is but I cannot hear it

Contrary to the first group who lives in socially dense networks, this group of Taichung people has more contact with speakers of different varieties of Mandarin. They were able to talk about the Taichung accent and have heard their friends or classmates describe what a Taichung accent is. However, when asked whether they can produce or characterize the linguistic forms with examples, they showed “limits of awareness” (Silverstein 1981) and admitted that they could not tell the accent.
D. Tian moved to Taipei for college and is currently working in the entertainment industry in Taipei. Unlike the first group who thinks everyone speaks the same, D. Tian acknowledged that the Taichung accent does exist. Except for the Taiwanese discourse marker heh-ah, meaning “yeah,” that is typically associated with Taichung speakers and southerners, he was not able to characterize other more well-known regional linguistic features such as tonal difference. The reason that D. Tian could only associate the Taiwanese discourse marker with the Taichung accent might be because codeswitching to a Taiwanese discourse marker is more “metapragmatically transparent” (Silverstein 1981: 14) than other linguistic variants in Mandarin. Unlike T4 raising where it is difficult for him to pinpoint the difference because the phonological contrast does not change the meaning in an utterance, the Taiwanese discourse marker heh-ah is relatively transparent because of its stigmatized status as a Taiwanese variant of the Mandarin equivalent dui-a and therefore it is more concrete for him to point out. Since he could not describe the Taichung accent even though he was aware of it, he used his classmate as an example of a typical speaker with a Taichung accent to supplement his knowledge of this regional accent. By mentioning that the classmate lives near Ling Ting University, a university located in Taichung City, D. Tian supported the notion that certain accented features are doing first-order work, indexing Taichung identity.

(15) D. Tian: tāmen dōu huì shuō táizhōngrén jiānghuà yǒu táiwān guóyǔ, duì, yìfēngdào jiù zhīdào shì táizhōngqiāng. (They all say Taichung people speak Taiwanese-accented Mandarin, yeah, once they hear it they know it’s the Taichung accent.)
S.L: táizhōngqiāng shì táiwān guóyǔ mǎ? (Taiwanese accent is Taiwanese-accented Mandarin?)
D. Tian: tā yǒu jīge qiāng, pírú shuō “heh-ah” wǒ bùzhīdào tāmén zěnme tīng de, tāmén jiù juéde, zhèige jiùshì táizhōngqiāng. (There are some accented features, for example “heh-ah,” I don’t know how they hear it, they feel, this is the Taichung accent.)
S.L. nǐ zìjǐ tīng de chūlái mā?  
(Can you hear it?)
D. Tian: wǒ tīng bù chūlái.  
(I can’t hear it.)

D. Tian: xiàng wǒ nàge tongxué, tā shì zhùzài lǐngdōng nà fùjīn, tā yì jiānghuà, dàjiā jiù shuō tā yǒu táizhōngqiāng, tā jiùshì, wǒ bùhuì xíngróng e, wǒ bùhuì mǐngfāng tāde qiāngdiào  
(Like my classmate, he lives near Ling Tung, as soon as he speaks, everyone says he has a Taichung accent, he is, I can’t describe it, I can’t imitate his accent (D. Tian, 27MPB, 7/12/08).)

Like D. Tian, R. Chuang, who left Taichung for Taipei twelve years ago, was also aware of the Taichung accent. She was first told that she had a Taichung accent when she was a freshman in college. Although she first denied having an accent, she eventually came to realize that the Taichung accent does indeed exist. Since she has been working and interacting with her colleagues in Taipei for several years, she was able to talk about what others say about the Taichung accent. As how others have typically described the Taichung accent, R. Chuang associated raising tone in the terminal sound with the Taichung accent. However, she claimed that she was unable to hear the terminal raising, though she actually raised the fourth tone dào to dāo in her spontaneous speech.

(16)  R. Chuang: wǒ zhīdào(T1), tāmén shuō, táizhōngqiāng shì nǐ wēiyīn hui shàngyáng  
(I know, they say, the Taichung accent is terminal raising.)
S.L.: nà nǐ zìjǐ juéde ne?  
(How do you feel about that?)
R. Chuang: wǒ zījī jiùshì méi gānjué ā, wǒ gěnběn fēnbiān bù chūlái, jiùsuàn, tā shì táizhōnggrén, wǒ yě fēnbiān bù chūlái, wǒ juéde wǒ dui zhèige méi yǒu sense, bù mǐn gàn  
(I can’t feel it, I can’t even tell a difference, even if, he is from Taichung I can’t tell either, I think I, have no sense, not sensitive.)

(R. Chuang, 30FPG, 2/26/08)
Although neither D. Tian nor R. Chunag showed a full grasp of the Taichung accent, the fact that they exhibit a much lower rate of T4 raising than local Taichung people (see Chapter 5) suggests that they have begun to lose the feature of T4 raising without being able to identify the feature after constant interaction with Taipei speakers. To sum up, like D. Tian and R. Chuang, this group of Taichung people is aware of Taichung accent and is able to link certain linguistic forms to the accent. However, these speakers have limited awareness of their own regional accent. They are either only able to hear the transparent feature or unable to hear the difference in the Taichung accent even though they can describe it.

4.4.3 The Taichung accent means something to me

This group of people not only notices what a Taichung accent is but also attributes a number of meanings to the accent. Although they all link the linguistic forms to Taichung, they do not necessarily give the Taichung accent the same social meanings for reasons such as different ideologies or different attitudes toward their accent. Linking the Taichung accent to different ideologically-driven social meanings is what Silverstein (2003) calls second-order indexical work.

Y. Lai, who just graduated from college, is preparing to leave Taichung for graduate school in Taipei. Although she has never lived in Taipei, her college classmates from Taipei and even professors all told her that she has a “thick” Taichung accent. After she first heard about the “Taichung accent,” she started paying attention to the details and was able to describe the characteristics of the Taichung accent and also able tell if a
person had the accent or not. Y. Lai was aware of her own accent and also completely aware that many people consider the accent to be local or hěn tái, literally “very Taiwanese.” Ever since the adjective tái has gained its popularity in daily interactions, it has been taken as a more derogatory term, meaning vulgar or low-class. Moreover, females generally perceive tái more negatively than males (Su 2009). However, when asked about whether she liked being told that she hěn tái or that she has a Taichung accent, Y. Lai replied, “táizhōngqiāng hěn yǒu tèsè hăo bù hăo, hăoxiăng fāyăng” (The Taichung accent has very distinguishing features, I really want to spread it). Although others may associate the accent with vulgarity or the working class, Y. Lai was proud of her Taichung accent and her Taichung identity. Placing a high value on the Taichung accent and an awareness of its signal of Taichung identity, Y. Lai accordingly raised many of the fourth tones in her speech. Indeed, her rate of T4 raising is one of the highest among all the speakers (see Chapter 5). In the following extract, Y. Lai was talking about the Taichung accent and how she felt about it.

(17) wǒ shàngcì(T1), kàn nàge hăiyangrè(T4), nǐ yǒu kànguò èrlinglingsān nà yǐjìe mā? ránhòu(T1), jiūyóu yíge Sunshine Boy, zuò le yishōugē, jiào táizhōngqiāng, chāokùde, wǒ ài táizhōngqiāng, jiăng le hěnduō táizhōngqiāng de zì, ránhòu(T1), zìjì dōuhui(T1), kàndào dōuhui juéde hěn yǒu gòngmíng (Y. Lai, 22FCG, 7/1/08)

(Last time I, saw that Ocean Fever concert. Have you seen the one in 2003? Then, there was this band Sunshine Boy, they made a song, called the Taichung Accent, it’s super cool, I love the Taichung accent, there were many words of the Taichung accent, then I, watched it and felt very resonant with it.)

As Y. Lai mentioned in the extract above, she had a very positive attitude toward the accent and was proud of the song that the band wrote about. For Y. Lai, speaking with a Taichung accent creates social solidarity with fellow Taichung people. Her frequent raising of T4 to T1 supports her sense of identity.
Like Y. Lai, C. Tsai not only was aware of the Taichung accent but also could tell whether someone was from Taichung. However, his attitude toward the accent differed from Y. Lai. He admitted that he felt uncomfortable when his Taipei friends told him that he had a Taichung accent or a thick local accent. He felt it was like someone slapping you in the face but you can’t do anything (“rénjiā dă nǐ yībāzhāng, nǐ yē bùnéng zěnmeyāng”) when being told you have an accent. C. Tsai was aware that having a Taichung accent can index a stigmatized local identity and this awareness also reflected in his own speech in extract (18) when he talked about the Taichung accent.

(18) wǒ rènshì de táiběi rén, yìtīng jiù zhīdào wǒ shì táizhōng lái de, bùrán jiūshì wǒshì zhōnggū lái de, yǐnwèi yóuzhōng dōngxī jiào táizhōngqìāng, zhèzhòng dōngxī shì wǒ, lái táiběi zhīhòu cái fāngdào zhēgè cí, tāmén shuō wèiyīn huì shàngyāng, yǒu yízhènzhì wǒ fēngde chūlái, yǒu yícì wǒ chūqù chīfàn(T4), gèbǐ zhuō zuò de liàngge nánshēng, tīng jiù juéde, tāmén jiānghuà, yǒu yíge dífāng guàguài(T4), shuō bù chūlái nǎl guà(T4), gēn zījī bùyíyang(T4), jiūshì(T1), jiù tāmén yǒu yīge yān ā, wǒ jiù shuō, “tāmén jiānghuà guàguài de ma?” tāmén jiù shuō, “duì a, shì táizhōnggrén” (C. Tsai, 22MPB, 7/14/08).

(The Taipei people I know, all know that I am from Taichung once they hear me speak, or know I am from the central. Because there is this thing called the Taichung accent, this thing I, I first heard of this phrase after I came to Taipei. They said it’s raising in terminal sounds. I could hear it for a while, one time I went out to eat, there were two guys sitting next table, I heard them and felt, their speech, something is strange, I can’t describe what’s strange, it’s different from mine, that is, there was a sound, so I said, “ is their speech strange?” They [Taipei friends] said, “yeah, they are Taichung people.”)

Compared with Y. Lai, C. Tsai only raised T4 to T1 when he pronounced the discourse marker jiùshì ‘that’s’ in the extract. While Y. Lai associated a Taichung accent with social solidarity, C. Tsai linked a Taichung accent to localness. Even though his Taipei friends told him he had an accent when he first moved to Taipei, he said his “thick” accent gradually disappeared over the years and the regional features only emerged when he talked to his parents. Therefore, it is not surprising that C. Tsai’s rate of T4 raising is
lower than the average of those who migrated to Taipei (see Chapter 5). When asked about the Taichung accent in the interview, C. Tsai explicitly said the speech of Taichung people sounds strange and thought his is different from theirs. Asking his Taipei friends if those people sound strange, he clearly aligned himself more with his Taipei friends and disaligned from his Taichung fellows. Living in Taipei and changing his social network, C. Tsai gradually reduced his T4 raising, the regional form that indexes localness.

In brief, this group of speakers links regional features to second-order sociolinguistic work. They notice the accent, talk about the accent and attribute social meanings to it. These speakers may have different interpretations of the Taichung accent and different indexical meanings of regional features because of their different attitudes, identities, social networks, and sociolinguistic contexts.

4.4.4 I use regional features to perform self-conscious identity work

When speakers play an agentive role that involves a degree of metalinguistic awareness to contextualize meanings in variation, they are performing speech (Coupland 2007). They have awareness of how their performance would likely be perceived by themselves and others. For example, as Y. Lai mentioned previously, the band Sunshine Boy performed the song “Taichung Accent” with which many Taichung people resonate. The lyrics “táizhōngqiāng, táizhōngqiāng, wǒ ré[ll]ài táizhōngqiāng” (Taichung accent, Taichung accent, I love Taichung accent feverishly.) repeat many times in the song. What is interesting in the song is their attempt to pronounce [l], the lateral sound instead of the standard retroflex for the phrase rèài ‘love feverishly’ to claim their knowledge of the
Taichung accent. Besides, since tones do not get marked when we are singing, the singer purposely raised his pitch toward the end of each line to show terminal raising, another well-known feature of the Taichung accent. By performing terminal raising, the singer not only displayed his knowledge of the local dialect but also aligned himself with the dialect speakers. This kind of performance of identity can be found among my interviewees as well.

When asked about the Taichung accent, F. Liu, who previously showed her Taichung pride in section 4.2 by suggesting that Taichung should become an independent country, performed her identity while talking about the accent.

(19) búhuì xiàng, tàiběirén, jiānghuà hěnxìàng zhúbō, fēicháng zìzhēngqiângyúán, ránhòu wǒmen de wéiyīn hui, wǒ juéde, shāowéi tuō yìdiān, wǒ juéde wó běijíào dàn yìdiān, wǒ běnlái jiānghuà[T1] jiù[T1] bǐjiào[T1] …

( [The Taichung accent] is not like, Taipei people, they speak like anchormen, very, each character has the right tone and the intonation flows smoothly, and our terminal sounds, I feel, we prolong a bit, I feel my [accent] is lighter a bit, I naturally speak more [light]…)

Unlike C. Tsai who used the expression “their speech” when talking about the Taichung accent to distance himself in the previous section, F. Liu said “our terminal sounds” to align herself with the dialect speakers and explicitly claim her Taichung identity.

Although she acknowledged that her accent is lighter than her Taichung fellows, she purposely pitched her voice higher and raised all the T4 words to T1 in the underlined utterance to perform what has been stereotypically considered as features of the Taichung accent. By not having the standard tone for each character like Taipei people, F. Liu was self consciously constructing her Taichung identity in her performance.

Similarly, R. Hong, a 26 year old graduate student studying in Taipei, also used available linguistic resources to construct his identity in his performance. When I asked
him about the Taichung accent, he explicitly listed the two well-known features: raising in the terminal position and the substitution of [l] for (r). Having lived in Taipei for eight years, he was aware that he had reduced his accent to some extent but admitted that he still says hào lè instead of hào rè ‘very hot’ when the weather is hot. When asked to read a passage, he not only substituted the lateral for the retroflex but also tried to sound more supralocal to construct his local identity as seen in extract (20).


(What if I speak with Taiwanese accented Mandarin? What if the result is not standard?)

In this extract, R. Hong clearly performed his non-Taipei identity by sounding supralocal. In addition to using ă, a common Taiwanese prefix marker, he purposely pronounced Taiwanese accented features that do not exist in his un-self-conscious speech. Here, he stylized the stereotypical Taiwan guoyu that is usually associated with tauke or middle-aged local people. His styling the other (Rampton 1999) suggests that he was making a claim about his non-Taipei/local identity. Moreover, although the Taichung accent and Taiwanese accented Mandarin are not necessarily the same thing, many standard Mandarin speakers do stereotypically consider the Taichung accent to be a variety of Taiwanese accented Mandarin. By performing the stereotypes of the Taichung accent, R. Hong demonstrated that he had access to different linguistic resources and was able to use them in the construction of social identity.

Although both F. Liu and R. Hong show a lower rate of T4 raising than local Taichung people because of their contact with the Taipei norm, the fact that they exhibit a higher rate of T4 raising than the average of the migrant people (see Chapter 5) suggests
that they did not wish to align with Taipei people and chose to employ vernacular features at times to indicate their non-Taipei identities.

To conclude this section, I show the sketch of the discussion in Table 4.1. The interview data suggest that the indexical meanings of linguistic features can vary within a community. How these speakers interpret a particular feature is not determined by some large-scale patterns because different people experience the sociolinguistic world differently (Johnstone & Kiesling 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect awareness</th>
<th>Everyone speaks the same</th>
<th>I know what the Taichung accent is but I cannot hear it</th>
<th>The Taichung accent means something to me</th>
<th>I use regional features to perform self-conscious identity work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of awareness</td>
<td>First-order indexicality: members of the community have not noticed the correlation between linguistic forms and demography.</td>
<td>Limits of awareness: Members of community can only perceive more metapragmatically transparent linguistics forms.</td>
<td>Second-order indexicality: members of the community link the Taichung accent to different ideologically-driven social meanings.</td>
<td>Performance of identity: members of the community are able to use linguistic features in their construction of social identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Speakers think everyone speaks the same way.</td>
<td>Speakers are told that T4 raising is one of their regional features but they can only hear other features such as <em>heh-ah</em>, the Taiwanese discourse marker.</td>
<td>Some speakers link T4 raising to social solidarity while others link the feature to localness.</td>
<td>Speakers purposely raise their pitch or realize [l] for (r) to perform local identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Types of dialect awareness among Taichung speakers
4.5 ‘Standard’ and ‘non-standard’ Mandarin in Taiwan

In the previous section, I showed that speakers have access to different metapragmatic activities about particular regional linguistic forms and some speakers do not have access to any of them (Johnstone & Kiesling 2008; Santa Ana & Parodi 1998). In this section, I explore their metapragmatic awareness of the standardness of Mandarin in Taiwan. In the introductory chapter, I mentioned that standard Mandarin was established by the KMT authorities in Taipei using the Beijing variety as the basis to unify the island, which brought local people in Taiwan both linguistic and social disadvantages (Wei 2008). Although my interviewees might not be aware of their own linguistic difference, they generally notice the existence of different varieties of Mandarin and acknowledge that there is a variety of Mandarin called standard Mandarin, though people may have different understandings of standard Mandarin. Some associate varieties of Mandarin with regions, some link them to ethnic groups, some put them together with both regions and ethnic groups, and some even connect gender, education and class to different varieties of Mandarin.

As the Mandarin-only policy was established by authorities in Taipei, it is not surprising that many speakers associate standard Mandarin with Taipei speakers and non-standard Mandarin with southerners. Y. Liu, a sophomore studying in Taipei, said that she has constantly paid attention to her own speech and that some people told her that she has a Taipei accent. Her very low rate of [l] realization for (r) (see Chapter 5 Table 5.20) may explain why people mistook her as someone from Taipei. When talking about
varieties of Mandarin, she expressed a clear difference between Taipei Mandarin and Tainan Mandarin in extracts (21) and (22).

(21) wǒ juéde táiběirén jiănghuà, fūmǔ hui rang tāmen, biăodá zǐjí de xiăngfā, suŏyī tāmen, dui yúwén zhāngwǒ néngli dōu mánhāo, kǒuyīn shì yībūfèn, jiùshì hén yǒu zixin de gànjué, jiùshì guòyú bìjiào biāozhǔn, yǐnwèi huánjìng ba, ránhòu būchāng jiăng táiyǔ, yōuxiĕ fūmǔ būhuí gēn xiăohái jiăng táiyǔ, kěnéng juéde táiyǔ bìjiào ciwénhuà ba, érqī kěnéng bàmā yě bútāihui jiăng.

(I think when Taipei people speak, their parents let them, express their own thoughts, so they, have a good grasp in language ability, accent is one part, their accent sounds confident, their Mandarin is more standard, because of the environment, and they don’t speak Taiwanese often, some parents don’t speak Taiwanese to their kids, maybe they feel, Taiwanese is a sub-culture, and maybe the parents don’t speak Taiwanese well.)

(22) táinánrén de kǒuyīn hěn yánzhòng, tā yì jiănghuà nǐjiù zhīdào, “o nǐshì táinánrén, huòshì gāoxióngrén, jiùshì táitái de, huívō yìdiăn, tāmén de fāyīn hui bìjiào xiăng táiyǔ de fāyīn, yōuxiĕrén hui, hui zhīdào tā yídīng shì nánbūrén (Y. Liu, 20 FPB, 6/24/08).

(Tainan people have a thick accent, once he speaks you would know, “oh, you are from Tainan,” or from Kaohsiung. It sounds Taiwanese, they have a bit, their pronunciation is more like Taiwanese pronunciation. Some people you would, would know that he must be a southerner.)

For Y. Liu, Taipei people speak standard Mandarin because they do not speak Taiwanese whereas southerners speak non-standard Mandarin because their pronunciation sounds like Taiwanese. Y. Liu, as well as some other interviewees, also mentioned that the reason Taipei people do not speak Taiwanese might be because the parents do not speak Taiwanese to the children since they may consider Taiwanese to be a sub-culture. Her comment echoes the bilingual parents in Sandel’s (2003) study who thought the market value of Taiwanese was low so they decided to have their children invest in the linguistic capital- Mandarin ability. As parents usually pass on their values to their children, the young generation Taipei people may also believe that speaking Taiwanese or speaking

See Figure 4.1 for Tainan’s geographic location.
Taiwanese accented Mandarin indexes a lower level of social status. High school students in Taipei in Baran’s (2004) study expressed the same attitude: they perceive Taiwanese as a working-class or countryside vernacular and standard Mandarin as the language of cultural prestige.

While Y. Liu and other interviewees suggested that southerners speak non-standard Mandarin because they use Taiwanese frequently, some interviewees consider standardness to be more related to ethnicity. Unlike Y. Liu and other younger speakers who have never experienced the martial law periods when Southern Min people were punished if they spoke Taiwanese, S. Chuang, who started schooling a few years before the lifting of martial law and is currently an elementary school teacher in Taichung, suggested that only mainlanders speak standard Mandarin:

(23) wǒ niànshū de shí hòu, gāozhōng niànhū, yòu yí ge jiānghuá, guóyǔ hěn biǎozhūn, yíge nánshēng, yìtiēng jiù zhīdào tā shì wàishěngrén, niàn gāozhōng de shǐhòu, zhèngchéng jiānghuà nàme biāozhūn, zāi wǒmen nàge niàndài dōushi, wǒ juéde tā biāozhūn de yuányīn shì yǐnwěi, tā xiǎoshíhòu jiù bèijiāo guóyǔ, ér méiyǒu bèijiāo tāiyǔ cáihuí zhèyàng, yīnwèi wǒ juéde tā shì yīge nánshēng, nǐ xiǎnxué tāiyǔ zài xué guóyǔ jiù, bùzhū de jiùhui yǒuquǎng le (S. Chuang, 31MCB, 7/3/08).

(When I was in school, in high school, one classmate spoke, very standard Mandarin, a boy, once you hear him you know he is a mainlander. In high school, people who normally spoke standard, in our generation were [mainlanders], I think the reason he spoke standard is because, he was taught Mandarin in his childhood, and was not taught Taiwanese. Because I think in terms of language, if you learn Taiwanese before Mandarin, you would not speak standard, you would have an accent.)

S. Chuang’s comment suggests that people who speak standard Mandarin were not taught Taiwanese when they were children. Because mainlander parents generally did not speak or learn Taiwanese due to the language’s low status, the students whose Mandarin was more standard were generally mainlanders. Since their Mandarin was not influenced by
Taiwanese, they would speak more standard Mandarin. On the other hand, Southern Min parents would tend to codeswitch between Mandarin and Taiwanese when speaking to their children. Therefore, the children would speak more or less non-standard Mandarin since their Mandarin was influenced by Taiwanese to different degrees. S. Chuang’s observation resonates with Surek-Clark’s (2000) and Stanford’s (2008a) studies that the relative prestige of the parental language plays a role on their children’s acquisition of a second dialect. Since Mandarin was the H language, mainlander parents taught and interacted with their children only in Mandarin. On the other hand, Taiwanese was the L language, and southern Min parents would tend to codeswitch between Taiwanese and Mandarin when interacting with their children so the children could acquire both Taiwanese and Mandarin. Moreover, later in the interview S. Chuang further suggested that the reason Taipei Mandarin became the standard Mandarin in Taiwan is because more mainlanders reside in Taipei. His perception supports my language attitude study (Liao 2008) in which listeners tend to identify the speakers as mainlanders and northerners if they perceive the speech sample as standard Mandarin.

As individuals perceive their sociolinguistic world differently, they create different indexical meanings. In addition to region and ethnicity, some interviewees also associate standardness of Mandarin with class, education and gender. For example, J. Chang suggested that more low to middle educated Southern Min people live in the south, and since these people tend to use Taiwanese, their Mandarin is as not good as northerners. He said:

(24) nǐ qù táinán găoxióng, nǐ hui fāxiàn, yīnwèi tāmén nàbiān hěnduō, mǐnnánrén, jiūshì, zhōngdī zhīshì de, jiūshì shū méi nián nàme duō de, nǐ hui fāxiàn, tāmén táiyù de shíyòng cìshù bǐjiào duō, suǒyì tāmén de guóyǔ bǐjiào būhāo (J. Chang, 27MCG, 3/20/2008)
(If you go to Tainan or Kaohsiung, you’ll find, because there are many, Southern Min people, that is, middle and low educated, those who are not educated you’ll find, they use Taiwanese more frequently, so their Mandarin, is not as good.)

J. Chang’s comment suggests an indirect indexical relation between non-standard Mandarin and low-education. Speaking non-standard Mandarin directly indexes southerners whose dominant language is Taiwanese and thus indirectly indexes low-educated southerners since they do not go to school where fluency in Mandarin is of primary importance.

Additionally, some other male interviewees also linked standard Mandarin with females. For example, some suggested that women speak more standard Mandarin because they are not good at speaking Taiwanese. As Taiwanese is perceived as a rougher language, some young women refuse to speak it and therefore their accent would be more “refined.” On the other hand, some did not agree that speaking Taiwanese has anything to do with why women speak more standard. They suggested that women are naturally more talented in language and therefore their Mandarin is more standard. Interestingly, none of my female interviewees discussed gender difference when asked about standard and non-standard Mandarin in Taiwan.

Although interviewees generally have their own metapragmatic awareness of standard and non-standard Mandarin, they rarely discussed whether the Taichung accent is more standard or non-standard in their discussion. While many of them expressed the same comments that Taipei people speak standard Mandarin and southerners speak Taiwanese-accented/non-standard Mandarin, only seven interviewees suggested the Taichung accent as either Taiwanese-accented or non-standard and among them four interviewees thought that the Taichung accent is non-standard but not Taiwanese-
accented. For example, C. Ke (31FPB, 7/7/08) said “yīnggāi shì bǔbiāozhŭn, búshì táiwān guóyŭ názhŏng, jiù yǒuzhòng tèshū de”([The Taichung accent] may be non-standard, but it’s not Taiwanese-accented Mandarin, it’s special.) Since Taiwanese-accented Mandarin is usually associated with working class males who live in the south, it is not surprising that Taichung people refuse to view their accent as Taiwanese-accented. I end this section with J. Chang’s metapragmatic comment about different varieties of Mandarin. I do not intend to suggest that his comment explains the distribution of varieties of Mandarin as the sociolinguistic setting in Taiwan is quite complex and different individuals create different indexical meanings for particular language varieties. But perhaps J. Chang’s comment, though very simple, provides a good example of how Taichung people generally perceive varieties of Mandarin.

(I think there are three categories, northerners, standard Mandarin, then the second one, central people, that is the Taichung accent, the third one is southerners, Taiwanese-accented Mandarin, the coarsest one.)

4.6 Speech perception task and evaluation of varieties of Mandarin

In the previous two sections, I explored interviewees’ metalinguistic awareness of their own regional accents and other varieties of Mandarin in Taiwan. I mentioned earlier that we need to focus on what speakers say in order to draw conclusions about the indexical meaning of certain linguistic forms. In this section, I discuss a perception task that asked speakers to listen to speech samples from both Taichung and Taipei and
explicitly elicited their comments on the identity of the speakers and the characteristics of the accents. My goal is to explore whether what people say about language varieties matches what they hear.

4.6.1 Stimulus materials

The speech samples come from my earlier perceptual study (Liao 2008). Two Taipei Mandarin speakers and two Taichung Mandarin speakers, a male and a female from each region, were recruited through “a friend of a friend” (Milroy 1980) method. They are all natives of their respective regions and all have university education. Their age ranged from twenty-five to thirty. The speech data were collected by means of story elicitation. In the story elicitation, speakers watched “The Pear Stories” film designed by Chafe (1980) and were asked to summarize what they saw. I further selected a 30-second stimulus from each speaker that has the least noise in the form of hesitation markers, long pause, or inconsistent speech rate that might affect listeners’ judgments. The interviewees were asked to listen to each speech sample and speculate about where the speaker is from. They were also invited to talk about the characteristics of the speech sample and provide any other comments they had about the speaker.

4.6.2 Perceptions of Taipei speakers

Figure 4.4 shows interviewees’ perceptions of the Taipei male speaker. As the figure shows, “standard” was mentioned 19 times, followed by “Taipei” 18 times,
“mainlander” 9 times and “northern” 8 times respectively, and “central or south” was mentioned only 9 times among the 40 interviews. Figure 4.5 shows their perceptions of the Taipei female speaker. As illustrated in the figure, “Taipei” was mentioned 20 times, followed by “standard” 19 times, “mainlander” 7 times and “northern” 6 times respectively, and “central or south” was mentioned only 5 times. The results show that the perception task generally agrees with the interviewees’ metalinguistic comments of standard Mandarin. Interviewees tended to recognize the speakers as from Taipei, from the north or as mainlanders if they perceived the speech as more standard. Once interviewees formed these perceptions, they also associated characteristics that are stereotypically attached to Taipei people, northerners or mainlanders to the speakers. For example, “Taiwanese was not good” was mentioned quite frequently to describe both speakers. Others such as sounding like having a good education, supporting KMT, and speaking good English were all stereotypes that are generally linked to Taipei people. Moreover, it is not surprising that sounding like a broadcaster or a teacher was also mentioned since broadcasters and teachers are usually required to speak more standard Mandarin.
Figure 4.4 Interviewees’ perceptions of the Taipei male speaker

Figure 4.5 Interviewees’ perceptions of the Taipei female speaker
4.6.3 Perceptions of Taichung speakers

Compared with the results of interviewees’ perceptions of Taipei speakers, their perceptions of the Taichung speakers show more discrepancy between the two speakers. The results are not surprising. As I have explored in previous sections, these interviewees have different metalinguistic awareness of their regional accent and some are not even aware of their own accent. Therefore, they may perceive the speech samples differently depending on their understanding of their own accent and other varieties. Figure 4.6 shows the perceptions of the Taichung female speaker. In terms of where the speaker is from, 10 interviewees were able to identify the Taichung female as someone from Taichung, and 9 successfully identified her as from central Taiwan. If the interviewees identified the speaker as from Taichung or central Taiwan, they generally would also express that the speech sounds friendly, familiar or like their own speech. This supports previous studies that people tend to judge speakers with a regional accent more positively in sociability traits such as easygoingness and friendliness (Ryan & Giles 1982).

Furthermore, since interviewees generally did not consider the speaker to be someone from Taipei or speaking standard Mandarin, many of them also suggested that the female speaker was able to speak Taiwanese. One interesting thing to note here is that although more interviewees believed that she could speak Taiwanese, that her Taiwanese was not good was mentioned 5 times, the same frequency as their perceptions of the Taipei female speaker. This resonates with the public belief that women (especially of the younger generation) generally do not speak Taiwanese well since Taiwanese is stereotypically considered to be a less refined and less polite language (Baran 2004) and
reflects Taiwan’s gender ideologies that women are frequently subject to the evaluation of whether they have *qizhi* ‘refined disposition’ or not (Su 2008). As Su noted, the term *qizhi* has a significant impact on regulating how women (especially educated women) in Taiwan should behave linguistically. While the association of Taiwanese with vulgarity and masculinity is hardly challenged in Taiwan’s social context, the use of Taiwanese on the contrary impedes the evaluation of a women’s *qizhi*. Therefore, it is not surprising that some interviewees judged the Taichung female speakers as someone who might speak Taiwanese because of her local features while others judged her as someone who does not speak good Taiwanese because of the gender ideologies in Taiwan.

![Perceptions of the Taichung female speaker](image)

*Figure 4.6 Interviewees’ perceptions of the Taichung female speaker*
Figure 4.7 Interviewees’ perceptions of the Taichung male speaker

As for the Taichung male speaker, it appears that interviewees generally thought that he could speak Taiwanese well and perceived him more as one from southern Taiwan than from Taichung or the central region. One possible reason may be due to the speaker’s frequent tokens of the substitution of vowel [ɔ] for [uo] and [ou], which are salient features of Mandarin influenced by Taiwanese (Kubler 1985). For example, ránhòu ‘then’ in standard Mandarin is pronounced as lánhò; shuīguō ‘fruit’ is realized as shuīgō in Taiwanese-accented Mandarin. As mentioned earlier, speaking more Taiwanese-accented Mandarin directly indexes the “southerner,” and therefore, it should not be surprising that many interviewees thought that the Taichung male speaker was a southerner even though his speech data are rich in Taichung phonological features. This also suggests that for Taichung people, Taiwanese-accented features (e.g. the substitution
of vowel [ɔ] for [uo] and [ou]) are more salient than their regional features (e.g. T4 raising) since these people may have “limits of awareness” to their native variety. Additionally, in contrast to the Taipei speakers who were described as receiving good education, speaking good English, and living in the city, the Taichung male speaker was described by a small number of the interviewees as not speaking good English, not educated, and being aboriginal. Although these responses were from the minority of the interviewees, they do illustrate that the media might have strengthened the stereotypical images of southerners as mentioned in earlier sections.

4.7 Regional differences in language use and language choice

The previous sections suggest that interviewees share a belief that regional difference in language practices is associated with how standard one’s Mandarin is. For example, standard Mandarin, Taipei or northern, broken Taiwanese, and good English ability are associated with one another whereas non-standard Mandarin is linked to southernness, good Taiwanese ability, and broken English. Regardless of whether the speakers stayed in Taichung or migrated to Taipei, they commonly mentioned the same trend: the farther north you go, the more English you hear; the farther south you go, the more Taiwanese you hear. As for Taichung, “it’s always half half,” as one of the interviewees suggested repeatedly. Below are some quotes that describe regional difference in language practices.

J. Cheng, an elementary school teacher in Taichung, described the regional linguistic difference she experienced. In Taichung, she chooses either Mandarin or
Taiwanese depending on the interlocutors. But she would choose Taiwanese if she goes to the south and Mandarin if she travels to the north. J. Cheng’s different language choices reflect her understanding of different language ideologies in Taiwan: while people in Taichung have a more neutral attitude toward both languages, northerners regard Taiwanese as a crude and low language and southerners consider Taiwanese a genuine and friendly language. J. Cheng commented in (26):

(26) 　wǒ xiànzài zài lùshàng wènhuà dehuà, wǒ zài táizhōng wènhuà wǒ huì yòng, guóyǔ wèn, gēn làorénjiāng kēnénghuìyòng táiyǔ, kěshì dào nánbù dehuà, wǒ huì hěn ziranérrán de, huānchéng táiyǔ, juéde nánbùrén kēnénghòu yòng táiyǔ bā, dào běibù jìu yídīng yòng guóyǔ ā, tāmén kēnénghòu, lián táiyǔ zhěmē jiāng dōu búzhīdào ba, wǒ juéde kēnénghòu shì, táiběirén bùxīhuān yòng táiyǔ, shì yīnwèi, wǒ juéde yǒuxièrén shuò táiyǔ jiāngqǐlái, jiūshì hěn cūsú, tāmén juéde yòngle yìhòu, hāoxiǎng zìjǐ shěnfēn diwèi jiū dǐ, kěshì zài nánbü de huà, qíshì wǒ juéde yòng táiyǔ shì gānjué, ràng rénjīa juéde, jiūshì hěn qīnqiē ā, kě rúguō shì nǐdào táiběi qù de dehuà, nǐ jiāng táiyǔ, rénjiā jiù mǎshàng zhīdào nǐ shì nánbü lái de. (J. Cheng, 27FCG, 3/6/08)

(If I ask for directions, in Taichung I would use, Mandarin to ask, maybe I would use Taiwanese when I ask older people, but if I go to the south, I would naturally, change to Taiwanese. I think southerners use [Taiwanese] more often, Of course I would use Mandarin if I go to the north, I just feel they may, not know how to speak Taiwanese. I think the reason, Taipei people don’t like to use Taiwanese, might be because some people think speaking Taiwanese, is very crude, so they don’t like using it. They think once they use it, their social status becomes low. But in the south, I actually think using Taiwanese, would make people feel, very friendly. But if you go to Taipei, and you speak Taiwanese, they would know right away that you are from the south.)

P. Lee, a 26 year old woman who is working in the public sector in Taichung, offered an explanation for why northerners consider Taiwanese a low language:

(27) 　táiběi bijiào duō gōngwù jīguān, nà yīqián gōngwù jīguān, jiūshì cóng zhōngguó lái de, guómíndàng de nàxiē, tāmén kēnénghòu túhuí jiāng táiyǔ, yè bùxiǎng xué táiyǔ, ránhòu táiwānrén yào gēn tāmén gōngzuò, táiwānrén yídīng shì tāmén de shūxià, jiūyào shíyòng guóyǔ, ránhòu jiānjiān de, tāmén xiàyídì jiāotán yěshì yòng guóyǔ jiāotán (P. Lee, 26FCG, 3/3/08)
(There are more sectors of public affairs in Taipei, in the past those sectors, were from China, those KMT officials, they might not speak Taiwanese, they did not want to learn Taiwanese either, then Taiwanese people wanted to work with them, Taiwanese people must be the subordinates, so they had to use Mandarin, then gradually, their next generation also uses Mandarin to talk.)

Similarly, S. Chang, another elementary school teacher in Taichung, offered his explanation:

(28) běibùrén, shèjīng dìwèi bǐjiào gāo, érqì, běibùrén běnlái jiù bǐjiào duō wāishèng, nánbùrén dōushi jiāng táiyū ā, dōushi mín-nánrén ā, wǒ juéde huìbùrén jiāng táiyū dōushi jiălí de yǐnsù bījiăodùō, zhōngbùrén yīnggāi yēhui jiāng táiyū la (S. Chuang, 31MCB, 7/3/08).

(Northerners, have higher socioeconomic status, also, there are more mainlanders in the north. Southerners all speak Taiwanese, they are all Southern Min people. I think whether one can speak Taiwanese or not is more related to the family. People in the central can also speak Taiwanese.)

Both P. Lee and S Chang suggested that the reason northerners do not speak Taiwanese is because of the high concentration of mainlanders in the north. The mainlanders who came with the KMT government occupied the top-level government positions and therefore have traditionally obtained higher socioeconomic status. P. Lee further suggested that since the local people were the subordinates, they had to accommodate to the higher status language - Mandarin. As local northerners have gained greater awareness of this linguistic hierarchy and have chosen to speak Mandarin, the linguistic capital, on daily basis for decades, it is not surprising that their descendants also hold the same values. In (28) S. Chang also mentioned that the family plays an important role in language choice and education. These comments support Sandel’s (2003:547) finding that “the value of linguistic capital extends across generations as it was passed on from parents who suffered from a lack of linguistic capital-Mandarin-to children.”

Z. Lo’s experience in Taipei resonates with S. Chang’s comment that parents influence their children’s language choice. Z. Lo has been a junior high school teacher in
Taipei for three years. She noticed that many of the students in Taichung could speak both Mandarin and Taiwanese (or at least could comprehend Taiwanese well though they might not speak well). On the other hand, her students in Taipei could not even understand simple Taiwanese phrases. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the government now encourages schools to start “mother tongue” language program nation-wide. However, Z. Lo was questioned by the parents why the school even tests the students on Taiwanese.

(29) wǒ juéde táizhōngrén, yīnggāi háishi bǐjiào duō rèn hui táiyǔ de, yīnwèi wǒ jiùshì fājué shuō, wǒ zài táiběi yǒushíhòu wǒ shāngkè hui jiāng yixiě táiyǔ à, kěněng yǒu yībǎn xiăohái tīngbùdōng, […] érqìē wǒ hái cóngjiǔ bēi jiāzhāng zhīyí guò, kāi jiāzhānghuì de shíhòu, tāmén jiùshuō, wèishéme xuéxiào yào kăo táiyǔ (Z. Lo, 27FPB, 7/13/08).

(I think Taichung people, there are still more people who can speak Taiwanese. Because I notice, in Taipei sometimes I use some Taiwanese in my class, maybe half of the students don’t understand. […] and I was also questioned by the parents, when we had our parent-teacher meeting, they said, why does the school give test on Taiwanese?)

While Z. Lo noticed that northern parents in her school do not value Taiwanese language education, J. Chang described a new phenomenon he noticed in (30). Taiwanese ability is negatively correlated with not only Mandarin ability but also English ability. Although northern parents may not emphasize Taiwanese education, J. Chang noticed that they are willing to invest in their children’s English education. This suggests an emerging language ideology in the north. In the past, as the dominant language ideology the KMT promoted, northern parents believed that their children would perform better in school and later in career if the children were immersed in standard Mandarin. But today as Taiwan has become a developed country, there is more need for English, the global language, both in public and private sectors to connect Taiwan to the world. English has
become the new capital in Taiwan’s linguistic marketplace, especially in Taipei. When the society is struggling with its history, on one hand the government is attempting to revalorize the mother tongue, on the other hand people recognize that enhancing their English ability will promise better job opportunities and upgrade the country’s competitiveness. Therefore, more northern parents choose to let their children learn English, the linguistic capital in the global market.  

(Mandarin ability] is negatively correlated with Taiwanese ability, because you, practice makes perfect! The more you use, the better your Mandarin is. This is also related to the extent of urbanization, so the farther north the better Mandarin. But there is a phenomenon, the farther north the better English, those kids, they are terrific! Look at the advertisements, look at the news, northerners are richer, northern parents are really willing to spend money, they let the kids learn English. But many of the central or southern people are low-income, they can’t learn, so their English ability is far from northerners.’)

4.8 Language practices at home

In the previous section, J. Cheng, S. Chuang and Z. Lo all briefly suggested that Mandarin and Taiwanese are more balanced-used in Taichung. When I looked at the interview data in more detail, I found that these bilingual speakers demonstrate three

---

30 Although parents in Taichung or southern cities also value the importance of English education, they do not invest in their children’s English as much as northern parents, probably due to the reason that most foreign companies are located in northern cities and people who reside in the north have more opportunities to interact with foreigners.
different family language environments, with some environments favoring Taiwanese maintenance more than others.

4.8.1 Taiwanese as the dominant language in the home

These speakers use Taiwanese in daily communication in the home. They talk to both their parents and their siblings in Taiwanese. The speakers in this group either began first grade before the lifting of the martial law or have parents who are older (born before the KMT took over Taiwan) or who have a low socioeconomic status. Unlike the Mexican parents in Schecter and Bayley’s (2002) study who decided to use Spanish in the home to ensure that the children did not lose Spanish, these parents talk to their children in Taiwanese not because they want to maintain the mother tongue, but because Taiwanese is the only language in which they are fluent and feel comfortable using. Growing up in this language environment, these speakers become accustomed to speaking Taiwanese in all family interactions and have developed fluency in Taiwanese.

S. Chuang, the 31 year old teacher whom I mentioned earlier, described his home language practice and how different language practices can influence how standard one’s Mandarin can be:

(31)  wǒ juéde bìāo bù biāozhūn shì kàn bāmā, tā kěnéng zài jiālǐ xiăoshíhou jiăng guóyǔ, dāngrán biāozhūn, wǒ bāmā gēn wǒ jiăng táiyǔ, wǒmén jiă yě méiyōu zài jiăng guóyǔ å, gēn didi, wǒmén zài jiălǐ dōu jiăng táiyǔ, xīguan le, wǒmén shèjìng diwèi bìjiăo dī, dōu jiăng táiyǔ (S. Chuang, 31MCB, 7/3/08).

(I think whether one [s‘ Mandarin] is standard or not depends on the parents, if he spoke Mandarin at home in his childhood, of course his is standard, my parents talk to me in Taiwanese, we don’t use Mandarin at home, with my brother, we all speak Taiwanese, I am used to it. Our socioeconomic status is lower, we all speak Taiwanese.)
4.8.2 Language choice depending on interlocutors

These speakers frequently codeswitch between Taiwanese and Mandarin in the home to accommodate to the language preferences of their interlocutors. They tend to use Taiwanese when talking to the parents but switch to Mandarin when interacting with their siblings. They are used to accommodating to their interlocutors, so if the parents start with Mandarin, they also respond in Mandarin. The parents of these speakers went to school when the Mandarin only policy was strictly enforced so they generally do not have trouble speaking Mandarin. Since these parents first and only spoke Taiwanese at home and learned Mandarin later in school, Taiwanese is their dominant language. When asked why they preferred speaking Taiwanese to the parents, some speakers said because the parents are more fluent in Taiwanese and therefore they tend to accommodate to the parents’ language use. J. Shih represents this group of speakers in (32).

(32)  wǒ gēn wǒ bà mā hui jiāng táiyǔ, yǐnwèi tāmèn jiǔshì jiāng táiyǔ xíguàn le ba, gēn wǒ gē, guóyǔ ba, hui jiăzá yídántái yǔ (J. Shih, 20MCG, 7/22/08).

(I talk to my parents in Taiwanese, because they are used to speaking Taiwanese, with my brother, Mandarin, but mix a bit Taiwanese.)

While speakers like J. Shih speak Taiwanese to accommodate to the parents. Some speakers like P. Ho choose to use Taiwanese because they want to know more about their heritage language. P. Ho’s father is a politician who belongs to the DPP party. He started emphasizing Taiwanese language education when P. Ho was young because he thought it shameful if Taiwan people don’t speak Taiwanese. However, P. Ho didn’t start speaking Taiwanese to her father until recent years. She talked about her changing ideologies as follows:
4.8.3 Mandarin as the dominant language in the home

These speakers use Mandarin as the dominant language in family interactions. Although they have no difficulty comprehending Taiwanese, they all claimed that they do not speak fluent Taiwanese because their parents chose to speak Mandarin to them even though the parents speak Taiwanese to each other. Some parents chose Mandarin as their dominant home language because they did not want their children to fall behind or speak less fluent Mandarin because Mandarin has been the most valuable linguistic capital since the KMT took over Taiwan. Some parents chose Mandarin because they were punished for speaking Taiwanese in school and they did not want their children to have the same experience. This is similar to some parents in Sandel’s (2003) study who taught their children Mandarin to avoid the same linguistic sanctions they faced in childhood.
L. Hsieh and C. Chang represent two different reasons for choosing Mandarin as the home language. L. Hsieh’s mother is a teacher and his father is a lawyer, he described his family as middle to upper class. In (34), he described how his mother taught him Mandarin to help him keep up with his classmates. On the other hand, in (35) C. Chang, who described her family as a “traditional Southern Min” family who supports the green party, said that her father purposely chose Mandarin to talk to them. The father thought once the children became accustomed to speaking Mandarin in school, they could avoid the punishment for speaking Taiwanese.

(34) wǒ bàmā dōu jiāng à, tāmén hùxiāng, huì jiázuò, kěshì, tāmén gēn wǒ jiānghuà dōushi jiāng guóyǔ, wōmā tā yǒu gēn wǒ jiāng shuō, xiǎoshíhòu pà wǒ guóyǔ jiāng būhāo, gēnbūshàng, jiù yǐzhí gēn wǒ jiāng guóyǔ. Tā hòulái cái zhèyang gēn wǒ jiāng de (L. Hsieh, 26MPB, 7/30/08).

(My parents speak both, they, mix [Mandarin and Taiwanese] with each other, but, they only speak Mandarin to me. My mom told me, when I was young she was worried that my Mandarin would not be good, not keep up with others, so she kept speaking Mandarin to me, she told me this later.)

(35) wōbà huì, tèbié de yòng guóyǔ gēn wǒmen jiǎotán, duì, yīnwèi wǒmen yǐqián nàshíhòu háishi, bǐjiào, qián jīn nián de shìhòu yǒushuō, bùnéng shuō táiyǔ huì bēi fá, wǒmen zhèshìhòu gāngghào shì mòduàn, wǒ méi bēi fáguò ba, hǎoxiäng hǎishì yǒu, wǒ wàng le, wōbā yīnwèi zhèyang, jūshì jǐnliàng gēn wǒmen jiāng guóyǔ, miàndé wǒmen zài xuéxiào méiyǒu bānfǎ shìying (C. Chang, 30FCG, 7/24/08).

(My dad would, purposely use Mandarin to talk to us, yeah, because during our time, it was still, more, it was a few years ago, you couldn’t speak Taiwanese, or you would be punished, we were at the end of that period, I had not been, punished, or maybe I had, I forgot, because of that my dad, tried to speak Mandarin to us, in case we could not get used to it in school.)
4.9 Language attitudes toward vernaculars

In the previous section, S. Chuang suggested that whether one speaks standard Mandarin or not depends on the parents. His point is that if the children speak Taiwanese to the parents, their Mandarin will be influenced by their Taiwanese and therefore they may not speak the standard Mandarin which is based on the dialect of Beijing. It is true that parents play an important role on their children’s language learning. In addition to parental influence, when discussing the influence of Taiwanese on Mandarin, Kubler (1985) further noted that the influence of the peers has proven stronger than that of the parents. Among studies on dialect contact I have reviewed in Chapter Two, many suggest that identity, social network and language attitude also have an impact on the maintenance or loss of one’s own vernaculars (Clyne 1992; Evans 2004; Stanford 2008b; Thomas 1997). In this section, I explore how speakers articulated their attitudes toward their own vernaculars and the reasons they wanted to change or maintain their own accents.

Y. Huang, who exhibits categorical absence of retroflex usage (see Chapter 5), is a 25 year-old English teacher in Taichung. She expressed that she subconsciously wants to speak more standard because speaking nonstandard would index sòng (Taiwanese) “unrefined, crude” or having no qízhí (Mandarin) “refined disposition.” Her comment resonates with those of the interviewees in Su (2005) about who has more/less qízhí. Interviewees in Su’s study suggested that méiqízhí “not refined” is used to describe people, especially southerners, whose speech exhibits lack of retroflex, who speak Taiwanese-accented Mandarin, or who swear in Taiwanese. On the other hand, they
linked having qìzhí to a socially preferred femininity and correct ways of speaking. The association of qìzhí or refinement with female speech is not limited to Taiwan’s gender ideologies. In certain Western societies, “the good woman” is a stereotype of a kind of woman who strives to be refined and superpolite (Eckert 2004b) and is expected to exhibit a greater degree of refinement and standardness than men of the same class. In a similar fashion, linguistic forms that index polite, gentle and refined styles continue to be ideologically linked to womanly ways of talking in contemporary Japanese society (Okamoto & Shibamoto Smith 2008).

While women in contemporary societies are still more subject to the evaluation of their degree of refinement, it should be noted that the comments by Su’s (2005) interviewees are mostly from Taipei students, and their comments may just reflect the dominant language ideologies that attach values to other varieties of Mandarin as less refined. Although Y. Huang said that people used to tell her that she had a Taichung accent, her comment in (36) conforms to the dominant language ideologies which see nonstandard Mandarin as unrefined. Also, her attempt to realize the Beijing variants of all the retroflex sounds in bold-faced instead of the Taiwan reduced retroflexed variants proves that she is constantly monitoring her speech to sound more standard. Her comment in (37) after she heard a speech sample and realized that T4 raising is a feature of the Taichung accent is further evidence that shows her perception of vernaculars as unrefined. Her attitudes may come from her identity as a female English teacher, since speaking more standard may project her as a more refined woman and a more competent English teacher. As I have discussed in previous sections, speaking good English is positively correlated to speaking standard Mandarin.
(36) yīnwèi wǒ juéde, nǐ jiāng bù biāozhŭn, tīngqǐlái hui hěnsòng, huòzhě shì ràng nǐ gānjué qīlái bǐjiào méiyǒu, méiyǒu qìzhì, suǒyǐ wǒ huì yáōqiú wǒ zījì jiāng de zhōngwén shì biāozhŭn de, suǒyǐ wǒ xiānzāi jiāng zhōngwén hui yǒudiān fēi lǐ (Y. Huang, 25FCB, 6/20/08)

(Because I feel, you speak nonstandard, it sounds very crude, or make you feel less refined, so I demand myself that my Mandarin is standard, so now it takes me a bit of effort to speak Mandarin.)

In (37) Y. Huang demonstrated the standard way of pronouncing the two T4 words that the speaker of the sample raised to T1 in underlined.

(37) suǒyǐ táizhōng qiāng, qíshí háímán yǒu yidián sòng ō, wǒ bùzhīdào la, duì a, wǒ fāxiàn tāshì de shīhòu, juéde háímán …shàng(T4) gēn hòu(T4).

(So the Taichung accent, actually it’s a bit unrefined, I don’t know, yeah, when I found out hers is [Taichung accent], I feel… ‘under’(T4) and ‘after’(T4) )

So if speaking standard Mandarin is associated with having qìzhí, do men tend to speak more in a nonstandard way because they do not want to be identified as someone with qìzhí, a socially preferred feminine characteristic? While acknowledging that more men speak Taiwanese-accented Mandarin, L. Hsieh, who exhibits low rates of T4 raising and retroflex usage (see Chapter 5), offered another social meaning associated with speaking standard from a male perspective in (38).

(38) wǒ juéde nánshēng hěnduō dào zuihòu, dōu biān táiwān guóyŭ, dào chéngnián zhīhòu, wèishéme ō, háoxiāng yě bùyídīng, nǔshēng kēnēng bǐjiào gù xīngxiàng ba, wǒ chāo gù xīngxiàng de, bùzhīdào shībūshí yīnwěi gù xīngxiàng e, kēnēng shì ba, jiū bǐjiào, bǐjiào zhèngjīng yidiān, jiānghuà bǔbīāozhūn wǒ huì juéde, gănjué bútài jīngmíng (L. Hsieh, 26MPB, 7/30/08)

(I think many boys eventually, all gradually possess Taiwanese-accented Mandarin, after they become adults, why? Maybe not exactly, girls may care more about self image, I care a lot about my image, maybe, I am more, more serious, speaking nonstandard I would feel, feel not being very clever and having keen judgment.)
Instead of *qìzhí*, L. Hsieh associated speaking standard with being clever and having keen judgment. Although he agreed that women generally speak more standard Mandarin than men do, he said he consciously tries to speak more standard not because he wants to disalign from his male fellows but because he wants to position himself as a clever person with keen judgment. He still uses Taiwanese when he swears or purposely stylizes in a nonstandard way when talking to very close friends. As mentioned before, L. Hsieh is working in a governmental research institute in Taipei. Since he said he cares a lot about his image, he may need to sound clever in his working environment by avoiding the vernacular.

S. Lu, on the contrary, thought that it is very normal that different individuals speak their own vernaculars. S. Lu has lived in Taipei for 14 years and is currently managing her own electric appliance shop there. She said she would accommodate to the language preference of her customers. If they speak Taiwanese to her, she would speak Taiwanese too. If they prefer Mandarin, she would use Mandarin as well. However, as to consciously changing her Taichung accent, she did not think it was necessary. She said those who think speaking with a Taichung accent is unrefined are regionally discriminating against others and she particularly disliked those Taichung people who think they are Taipei people after living in Taipei for a long period of time. While acknowledging that many people told her that she has a thick Taichung accent, she did not take it as a negative comment. She said it is normal for Taichung people to speak with a Taichung accent. S. Lu showed a positive attitude toward her own vernacular because she linked the accent to her own Taichung identity. Indeed, her speech data does show a
higher rate of T4 raising than other migrant speakers (see Chapter 5). S. Lu commented in (39):

(39) bènlái jiù táizhōng rén ā, yǒu táizhōngqiāng hěn zhèngcháng, ā bùrán nǐ hui zěnyang? qíshí wǒ juéde hui zěnyàng de rén bǐjiào qíguài, jiù xiàng wǒmen jiāng yīngwén, rén jiā gèn nǐ shuō, e nǐ yǒu yìzhōng tàiwān guóyu yìngwén, jiǔshì, nàyīguórén jiāng yīngwén, qíshí wǒ yǒu zǐjī bènshēn yǜyán de qiāngdiào, wǒ juéde nàshì hěn zhèngcháng de ā (S. Lu, 32FPG, 3/11/08).

(We are originally Taichung people, having a Taichung accent is very normal. Or how would you feel? Actually I think those who think the opposite are more unusual. Like when we speak English, others told you, hey you have a Taiwan Mandarin accent, that is, people from different countries speak English, actually all have their own national accent, I think it’s very normal.)

Some speakers like Y. Huang and L. Hsieh have more positive attitudes toward the standard and they either consciously or subconsciously monitor their speech to sound more standard. Others like S. Lu show more positive attitudes toward their own vernaculars and do not attempt to change their accents. There are still others who hold neutral attitudes toward the standard and their vernaculars but fewer and fewer people told them that they have a Taichung accent. These speakers have gradually changed their accent because of the environment and the people with whom they interact. For example, P. Ho, a senior in Teachers College in Taipei, said people change their accent because they want to keep up with the mainstream-standard Mandarin. But she did not think it is necessary to keep up with the mainstream. She said one of her professors told them that everyone has an accent, and your accent represents your root. Although she did not purposely change her accent, P. Ho thought she gradually changed her accent because she constantly hung out with eleven northerners, mostly from Taoyuan and one from Taipei. She noticed that her speech has less terminal raising now. Similarly, C. Hsieh, a doctoral student in Taipei, said that she noticed that her accent has changed throughout the years.
Although many people told her that she had a thick Taichung accent when she first arrived in Taipei, she attributed her accent to her laziness to articulate clearly especially when she spoke fast. She said one of her professors actually suggested that she slow down her speech so that she could articulate more clearly. When asked why fewer people think she has a regional accent now, she responded in (40):

(40) yīnggāi shuō shì kěnénɡ, tīngdào biérén jiānghuà yǒu zuò yìxīē xiāoxiūzhènɡ, zhīshì zìjī bú zìjué, méiyǒu yǐshì de xiūzhènɡ, jìuxiàng, nǐ zài shànɡ yīnɡwén huìhuàkè, shànɡ jiǔ le nǐ jiānɡ yīnɡwén de yǒu diào kēnénɡ jiù yǒudiàn bùyíyang (C. Hsieh, 27FPG, 2/29/08)

(It might be because, I modified a bit after hearing other people talking, but I was not aware of it, I modified with my own awareness, it’s like, you are in your English conversation class, the longer you take the class, the more your English intonation may sound different.)

P. Ho and C. Hsieh’s cases agree with Thomas’s (1997) study that as speakers have more contact with other regional speakers in the migrating context, their new social network is more likely to result in a decline of their use of their regional features.

I have shown in this section that speakers’ different attitudes have an effect on whether they maintain or change their regional accents. Rather than assuming that people who moved to Taipei will change their accents to accommodate to the Taipei speakers and those who stayed in Taichung will not modify their accents, I have explored how speakers talked about their own accents to understand why they speak in certain ways. People have different ideas about how they talk, and there are still some people who are unable to articulate any ideas about their speech. For example, Y. Lin (26MCB, 6/18/08), who has lived in Taichung since he was born, said he does not even know what the Taichung accent is because he only interacts with Taichung people. When asked about how he felt when people told him he has a Taichung accent, he replied “wǒ jiù shuō, nǐ
tīng chūlái le ō, gōngxǐ nǐ” (I said, oh you can hear it, congratulations.) Since he cannot hear any difference in his own regional accent, he does not really care about how he talks.

4.10 Codeswitching styles and social meanings

As seen in previous sections and some extracts, it is very common for bilingual Southern Min people to codeswitch between Mandarin and Taiwanese. Some codeswitch to negotiate interpersonal relationships (Myers-Scotton 1993), whereas some codeswitch as a resource for the construction of interactional meaning (Auer 1998). On the other hand, many speakers commented that rather than codeswitching between Mandarin and Taiwanese, Taipei people tend to insert English words in their speech to show their superiority. Apparently, switching from Mandarin to English creates a certain effect for these speakers and therefore they prefer the English discourse markers over the Mandarin or Taiwanese equivalents. I found that some of my interviewees also tended to codeswitch to English in our interactions. Whether the speakers switch to English or Taiwanese, Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) view this linguistic behavior of shifting languages as acts of shifting identities in which speakers affiliate with or disaffiliate from particular social groups and reveal their search for their social roles. As Auer (1998:1) suggests, “code-switching has and creates communicative and social meaning,” in this section, I am interested in exploring the social meanings of switching to Taiwanese or English and how codeswitching provides a resource for speakers in their identity construction.
4.10.1 Switches from Mandarin to Taiwanese

The most frequent codeswitching is found in quoted or reported speech in conversation. Myers-Scotton (1993) suggests that speakers switch codes in quotations to preserve the language used by the original speaker. Many of the cases I found in the interview data can be accounted for in this way, especially when speakers reported what was said by older people, supporters of the green party, or those who belong to a lower socioeconomic class. On the other hand, Alfonzetti (1998) shows that speakers do not always intend to preserve the original language. Rather, they use a different language to depersonalize their point of view or to distance themselves from who said it and what is being said. However, Alfonzetti also suggests that researchers cannot state exactly whether the language of the quotation is original because it is unknown to us. I illustrate instances of codeswitching to Taiwanese in reported speech in the following extracts.

In (41) C. Chang switched to Taiwanese to quote her father, a working-class supporter of the green party. By using the Taiwanese phrase huan-á ‘hicks’ to describe the supporters of the blue party, C. Chang not only enunciated her father’s strong viewpoint to contrast those of the northern Mandarin speakers but also embodied the strength of his voice since the Mandarin equivalent xiāngxiārén ‘hicks’ is frequently used by northerners to describe southern working-class people who support the green party.

(41)  xiàng wōbà yēshì ā, wōbà jiūshuō zhīchí lán de shì khong e ,tā shuō, “he huan-á, kóng bái thíann” (C. Chang, 30FCG, 7/24/08).

(My dad is like that, my dad said supporters of the blue party are stupid, he said, “they are hicks, don’t listen to others.”)
In reported speech of one’s own words, in addition to preserving the original language, codeswitching can also function as the speaker’s strategy to signal solidarity or identity or redefine boundaries among speakers (Heller 1988). For instance, when F. Lin was asked by southerners whether he was from Taipei, he switched to Taiwanese not only to signal his solidarity but also distance himself from Taipei people who are stereotypically known for not being willing to speak Taiwanese. Lin said:

(42) hái shì huì gēn tāmén jiāng ba, “guā mǐ tāi-pak lāng, guā tāi-tiong lāng”, hái shì huí jiāng (F. Lin, 30MPB, 7/1/08).

(I would still tell them, “I am not from Taipei, I am from Taichung”, I still tell them”.)

Likewise, P. Lee, who is working at a governmental hospital near a military dependent’s village, switched to Taiwanese when she was asked whether she grew up in a military dependent’s village because of her poor Taiwanese language skill. P. Lee reported how she responded to the question in (43):

(43) wǒ shuō, “guā sī tāi-uān lāng, māsī kóng tāigí e”, jiū wǒ bù shì cóng zhōngguó dālù lái de, wǒ bù shì nàzhòng sānshībā nián cóng zhōngguó dālù táolái de (P. Lee, 26FCG, 3/3/08).

(I said, “I am Taiwanese, I also speak Taiwanese”, I am not from mainland China, I did not, flee from mainland China in 1949.)

As mentioned earlier, mainlanders are stereotypically associated with not speaking Taiwanese. P. Lee was mistaken as a mainlander at work because her Taiwanese does not sound natural and smooth. She switched to Taiwanese so she could disaffiliate from the mainlander group and legitimately proclaim her Taiwanese identity. By using different

---

31 A military dependent’s village is a community built after the KMT retreated to Taiwan. Its original purpose was to serve as provisional housing for the KMT soldiers and their dependents from mainland China.
languages, P. Lee also reemphasized the identity boundary between mainlanders and local people in Taiwan.

Codeswitching to signal familiarity or solidarity can also be found in speakers’ responses to my questions. This is what Gumperz (1977) calls the “we code”, usually the ethnically specific minority language that speakers associate with familiarity or solidarity. For example, when asked about her Taiwanese language ability, C. Ke switched to Taiwanese to prove not only that her language skill is competent enough to carry a conversation but also that she belongs to this ethnic group in (44).

(44)  **hó, kóng tôh tse guá tô ê kóng tsin e hó, guá tsin gāo kóng tâigí, zhēnde, wô de táiyû háisuán, yînggâi shuô bí qî, bêibûrên huijiâng duô le, bîqî nânbû yê hênhuí jiâng, bô bûntê (C. Ke, 31FPB, 7/7/08).**

*(Good, when it comes to this I would say really good, I speak Taiwanese well, really, my Taiwanese is, I should say compared to, northerners I am much better, compared with southerners I am also very good, no problems.)*

It is clear how C. Ke categorized northerners and southerners differently. Northerners were labeled as speaking broken Taiwanese and southerners were labeled as the opposite. By saying that her Taiwanese is as good as that of the southerners, C. Ke confidently suggested that her Taiwanese is indeed *very* good.

In addition to reported speech or intersentential switches, intrasentential codeswitching to Taiwanese is also found frequently to strategically create an interactional effect that speakers want to be perceived by their listeners (Woolard 2004). I argue that speakers codeswitched to Taiwanese strategically rather than switching to Taiwanese to fill the lexical gaps in Mandarin because they often repeated the same phrases in Mandarin. For example, when asked about the southern accent, S. Chuang first switched to Taiwanese then back to Mandarin:
Although he was referring to the Mandarin in the south, he first commented in Taiwanese to emphasize their thick Taiwanese-influenced accent then he repeated the phrase in Mandarin to distance himself from southerners. It is not surprising that speakers switch to Taiwanese when their comment is related to southerners because speaking Taiwanese does index southerners. In (46), on the contrary, T. Cheng switched to Taiwanese when he was commenting on Taipei:

(46) bēibù bǐjiāo duō, rénjiā shuō, ké gào a, yífù yàoràng ziji hēn “in”, míngmíng jiù shéme dōu būdōng, [...]qíshí táibēirén hēn kělián, jiù táibēiguó à, tāmen ziji yíguó, à biérén shéme dōu būshí tài míngxiān le, tāipakkok (T. Cheng, 22MCB, 6/20/08).

(The north has more, what people said, pretending knowing well, they want to make, themselves very “up-to-date,” actually they don’t know anything. […] Actually Taipei people are poor, Taipei Nation, they are a nation themselves, others are nothing, it’s too obvious, Taipei Nation.)

Here we see multiple voicing (Bakhtin 1981) in his switching among Taiwanese, Mandarin and English. T. Cheng first borrowed other people’s voice saying Taipei people are ké gào a, even though they always want to make themselves very “in”, an English word commonly used by youth in Taipei meaning “in the trend, trendy or up-to-date.” T. Cheng reaccentuated both voices and infused them with a new social meaning, perhaps to iconize Taipei people. He did not simply borrow the Taiwanese description in order to distance himself, on the contrary, switching to Taiwanese to describe Taipei people who frequently insert English words in speech creates an emphatic contrast - they think they know everything, but actually they don’t know anything because they don’t even want to
know Taiwanese. Later he switched to Taiwanese again to call them Taipei Nation to appropriate his voice for a pejorative purpose and this time he claimed his own voice by saying “it’s too obvious” instead of “what people said.”

I mentioned before that in reported speech, speakers tend to switch to Taiwanese to quote or paraphrase older people, supporters of the green party, or those who belong to a lower socioeconomic class. I also found instances within utterances where speakers switched to Taiwanese when they were referring to older people, southerners, or those who belong to a lower socioeconomic class. Additionally, I found that some speakers purposely switched to Taiwanese when they wanted to convey a negative comment. Being immersed in the dominant language ideology that treats Taiwanese as a low language, these speakers seem to use Taiwanese as a resource to express negative feelings. Table 4.2 lists some examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old people</th>
<th>kàn kū “complain”, ūng bō tāi-tsì tsò “have free time and do nothing”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low class</td>
<td>tsó-kang “worker”, kóng tāigí “speak Taiwanese”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southerners</td>
<td>lâm pōo “south”, puáh kâm-tsíng “bond with someone”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Examples of codeswitching in lexical words

In this section, I have explored how bilingual speakers use codeswitching for different purposes. Depending on the context, switching to Taiwanese can be used to affiliate with a center social group, distance oneself from a viewpoint, identify with the characteristics of certain people being mentioned, or express one’s feelings. Next, I examine the instances of codeswitching to English and the emerging social meanings.
4.10.2 Switches from Mandarin to English

Codeswitching to English is what Rampton (1995) refers to as *crossing*, meaning speakers switch to a second language associated with a group to which they do not belong. This kind of crossing has been identified as a strategy youth use to choose their own identities (Woolard 2004). Besides, since none of the speakers is a native speaker of English, instances of codeswitching to English are at a much lower frequency and all the instances are at the intrasentential rather than intersentential level. Moreover, among the 26 speakers that are found to codeswitch to English at least once, 16 migrated to Taipei and eight stayed in Taichung. When I examined the instances in detail, I found that both groups codeswitched to English to give examples of how Taipei people talk since it is the linguistic resource stereotypically known to be used by Taipei people. For example, in (47), T. Cheng stylized how his Taipei classmates codeswitch:

(47)  pìrú shuō, shéme hàn shéme, kělà **and** shéme, yíngyào zài, yíjùhuà lìmìán jiā yīngwén, **um I think**  (T. Cheng, 22MCB, 6/20/08).

(For example, what and what, coke **and** what, they purposely, insert English in a sentence, **um I think**.)

What is interesting is that when they did not stylize Taipei people, the two groups have different styles of codeswitching and each conveys different purposes. For the speakers in Taichung, the English words they insert in their speech seem to be formulaic expressions that are commonly used in Taiwan. The formulaic expressions I found in the interview data include *care, local, argue, sense, feeling,* and *meeting.* Some expressions are so popular that some people came up with Chinese words to represent the English
sounds. According to my interviewees, the word *feeling* has been pronounced as *fu* for the sake of ease of articulation and people started to write the Chinese characters 咪停 which sound similar to the words *meeting* on the Internet. When asked how the English words received their popularity, some people attributed the widespread use of these expressions to the media.

In contrast, people who migrated to Taipei do not limit their switching to those limited formulaic expressions. Instead, their switching to English is at a much higher frequency and a wider range of use of English vocabulary. They seem to form their own personal styles different from their Taichung fellows by their frequent use of English vocabulary. It is likely that they wanted to present themselves as someone with traits characteristic of Taipei or that they wanted to construct an identity as someone modern and cosmopolitan. I use L. Chang to illustrate how speakers use codeswitching to English to construct their identities. Chang is working at a global marketing company in Taipei.

Extract (48) is an example of her speech.

(48) yīnwèi wǒ yǐqián gōngzuò dào shíèrdiǎn yìhòu, érqìè *everyday*, bāokuò *weekend*, wǒ juède méiyǒu, rúguò gēn *IB* bǐ, jiǔshì gēn *investment banking* bǐ dehuà, shì méiyǒu bǐjiāo máng, yīnwèi wǒ yuànběn rúguò shuō zhǐdāng yánjù zhǔlǐ dehuà, wǒ yīnggāi huì jué de *boring*, měitiān zài nàbiān dǎ kēshūi (L. Chang, 26FPG, 2/28/08).

(Because I used to work till 12am, and *everyday*, including *weekend*, I think no, if compared with *IB*, compared with *investment banking*, I was not as busy, because I originally thought if I was only a research assistant, I would feel *boring*, I would doze off everyday.)

L. Chang codeswitched to English at the highest rate among all the speakers. In addition to *IB*, probably the technical term they use at her company, she also inserted words like

---

32 Although some people came up with Chinese words such as ‘咪停’ (pronounced as “mī tíng” in pinyin) to represent the English sounds such as ‘meeting.’ I still consider these expressions “codeswitching to English” rather than loanwords because of their limited use, mostly in online forums, and their lack of popularity.
everyday and weekend. Her style is similar to people’s impressions of how Taipei people codeswitch. They tend to insert frequently used English words or function words in their speech. When asked whether her colleagues also codeswitch, she said they tend to use English for the technical terms because they think it’s a “professional de biàoxiàn” (‘representation of being professional’). It seems that she was unaware of her codeswitching to frequently-used English words. So I asked her about her social network, she said she mostly interacts with Taipei friends because she lives in Taipei. She further said sometimes people identified her as someone from Taipei and were surprised that she came from Taichung because of her style. Constant interacting with her Taipei peers, L. Chang may subconsciously adapt to their ways of speaking. She might codeswitch intentionally to sound professional and cosmopolitan because she works at a global company and everyone is doing so. Since she has been living in Taipei and interacting more with Taipei people for eight years, she relates more to her Taipei friends and gradually sounds more like them than her home fellows.

4.11. Styling shift and Stylization

In the previous sections of this chapter, I have discussed speakers’ awareness and evaluation of different varieties of Mandarin. I have also explored regional difference in language choice and language practice along with different language attitudes and ideologies that influence the choice and practice. Additionally, I have illustrated how speakers use different linguistic forms to do identity work. These discussions provide an
overview of how different identities and ideologies interact with speakers’ linguistic behavior and practice. Here, I examine three extracts from a group interview with C. Lo and R. Hong. I especially focus on their styling shift and stylization. Before I begin, let me briefly introduce C. Lo and R. Hong. They have been friends since they were high school classmates in Taichung. After high school, they both moved to Taipei for college and have lived in Taipei for eight years since then. C. Lo is currently working at a German IT consulting company in Taipei and R. Hong is a graduate student at a national university.

The first extract illustrates their discussion of the Taichung accent.

(49) S.L: nà nǐ zhīdào táizhōngqiāng de tèsè shì shéme?
(Do you know the characteristics of the Taichung accent?)
C. Lo: yǒu, táizhōngqiāng de tèsè shì, huì mà rén (Ø)jiā hāi-á, biéde difāng dōu bù zhīdào(T1), shémeshi (T1) hāiá
(Yeah, the characteristic of Taichung accent is cursing others “bastard,” in other regions they don’t know, what “bastard” is.)
R. Hong: táizhōngqiāng hǎoxiàng(T1) shì(T1), wěiyǐn bǐjiào(T1), zhòng hái shéme ,hái shì shàngyáng?
(Taichung accent may be, terminal sounds more, stressed or, terminal raising?)
C. Lo: shàngyáng, shàngyáng ! (hyper-retroflex)
(Raising, raising!)
S. L: nǐ zěnme jiānghuà túrán biàn zhème biāozhǔn?
(Why do you suddenly speak this standard?)
C. Lo: shàngyáng ! (hyper-retroflex)
(Raising!)

In extract (49), C. Lo first took the floor to discuss his understanding of the Taichung accent. Instead of phonological features, C. Lo gave an example of the Taiwanese cursing word hāiá as the characteristic of the Taichung accent. He linked this
word to the Taichung accent because none of his northern classmates have heard of this cursing word. In the next turn, R. Hong seemed to disagree with him by suggesting that the commonly known feature of the Taichung accent be related to terminal sounds, but he was not sure whether it is more stressed or raising in terminal sounds even though both C. Lo’s utterance in the previous turn and his utterance in this turn already provide ample examples of T4 raising. Being a native speaker of this dialect, he did not have the full awareness of the local features. C. Lo, in the next turn, seemed to get a clue from R. Hong. Perhaps he has heard other people talking about the Taichung accent. C. Lo shifted his style from his local accent to the hyper-standard, replying “shàngyáng, shàngyáng!” Here, he stylized standard Mandarin by articulating the fourth tone very clearly and retroflexing both characters which he does not normally do in his spontaneous speech. Moreover, speaking standard seemed to give C. Lo a right to talk about local dialects. He playfully claimed his authority on this discussion by even curling his tongue back more to sound like standard Beijing Mandarin. What is interesting in this extract is that although C. Lo claimed that he knew more about the Taichung accent than R. Hong did, he could not illustrate the feature of T4 raising with concrete examples. A few turns after this extract, R. Hong took back the floor saying, “wǒ zuì xǐhuān jiăng biérén shuō, tāmāde! nǐ jiānghuà tàiběiqiāng!” (What I like to tell people most is “shit! You speak with a Taipei accent!) R. Hong clearly suggested that having any features of Taipei accent conflicts with a speaker’s Taichung identity.

In the next extract, R. Hong and C. Lo were listening to a speech sample of a Taipei female speaker. Again, C. Lo was playfully stylizing a Chinese teacher and R. Hong rebuked his behavior by challenging C. Lo’s Taichung identity.
R. Hong: zhè hǎoxiàng wǒ biăojiě de shēngyīn ō, tā shì bǔshí guówén láoshī, tā wèitáiběirén, yǐnwèi tā yǒuxiē nàge fāyīn shì zhuāng de, nàge zhòng(R) yīn hěn, ā wǒ zài tīng yícì

(This is like my cousin’s voice, is she a Chinese teacher? She is a fake Taipei person, because some of her pronunciations are pretending, the stress is very, let me listen to it again.)

S.L: nǐ biăojiě nălǐ rén?

(Where is your cousin from?)

R. Hong: wǒ táng jiě zhānghuà rén(R), wèntí shì(T1), tā shì guówén láoshī, tā yí ding yào xué zhēngyīn, duì.

(My cousin is a Changhua person, the problem is, she is a Chinese teacher, she must learn the standard pronunciation, yeah.)

C. Lo: tā shì guówén láoshī, tā yídìng yào xué zhèngyīn (hyper-standard)

(She is a Chinese teacher, she must learn the standard pronunciation)

S.L: nǐ xiànzài wèishi méi yào zhèyang?

(Why are you doing this now?)

C. Lo: yǐnwèi wǒ yà zhuāng guówén láoshī (hyper-standard)

(Because I am performing a Chinese teacher.)

R. Hong: kàn, lǐ sī–nǐ–sī tài-tiong-lâng a?

(Fuck, are you Taichung person?)

S.L: hǎo, zài tīng yícì

(Ok, let’s listen to it again.)

R. Hong: jiūshī rén(R) ā, háiyǒu dâ(T4), háiyǒu yízhī(R) yáng

(That is “person,” and “big” and “a sheep”.)

S.L: nǐ juède tā yǒu kěyì zài juănshé?

(You think she purposely retroflexed?)

R. Hong: hăoxiàng

(It seems.)

C. Lo: “ránhòu(T1)”

(“Then.”)

33 Changhua County is to the south of Taichung County.
R. Hong: dui a tā hěn ài shuō “ránhòu(T1), rán(L)hòu(T1)”
(Yeah, she likes to say “then, then.”)
C. Lo: ̀lʊ[lɔ]xiàn le ba (Taiwanese-accented)
(She revealed her true character huh.)

In (50), R. Hong suggested that the speech sample sounded standard because the stress fell in to the right place. Here, R. Hong subconsciously shifted his style to speak in a more standard manner when he was commenting about the speech sample. As we see from the first two turns, there is only one token of T4 raising and he purposely retroflexed two sounds zhong and ren which he normally either reduces the retroflexion or replaces with other consonants in his spontaneous speech. However, there was something wrong about the speech sample that he could not figure out. Although the speaker sounded like she is speaking standard Mandarin, she does not sound like someone from Taipei. Then C. Lo stylized standard Mandarin by playfully imitating what R. Hong had said in the previous turn. My interpretation is that C. Lo’s playful performance brought his ideological value associated with Chinese teachers who follow Beijing Mandarin as the model. Meanwhile, his playfully exaggerating style also mitigated his negative attitude toward those who try to speak standard Beijing Mandarin. It is also possible that he sounded hyper-standard to tease R. Hong who slightly shifted his style when he seriously commented on the speech. In the following turn, R. Hong switched to Taiwanese “kàn, lí sī-mǐ–sī tài-tióng-làng a?” (Fuck! Are you a Taichung person?). As mentioned earlier, the cultural values Taiwanese represents are as a characteristic of male speech and a language of solidarity or localness. By using Taiwanese, R. Hong clearly distanced himself from those who try to speak standard
Mandarin and related Taichung identity to sounding local. I interrupted them by playing the speech sample again. This time, R. Hong illustrated with examples where the speaker sounded standard. It seems that R. Hong’s reminder to C. Lo that Taichung people do not purposely try to speak standard has worked. C. Lo participated in this discussion and imitated the speaker’s articulation of the discourse marker ránhòu “then” with T4 raising. R. Hong agreed with him and further suggested that the speaker also articulated the lateral sound instead of the retroflex sound in ránhòu. Finally, C. Lo commented on the speaker with stylized Taiwanese-accented Mandarin. It is possible that he stylized Taiwanese-accented Mandarin to mitigate his criticism on the speaker’s fake accent or to distance himself from that Taipei speaker and embrace his local identity together with R. Hong after R. Hong rebuked him for not sounding like someone from Taichung. An interesting finding here is their ability to illustrate the nonstandard features. In the previous extract, neither was able to give a specific example of their regional feature. However, here they were able to pull out the nonstandard features from the speech sample. Since both of them have lived in Taipei for eight years, they might have more awareness of the Taichung accent than their fellows who stayed in Taichung do as long as they are given enough clues.

In this final extract, C. Lo shared two stories about Taipei people he met.

(51)  C. Lo: wǒ qián tiān qù (T1), yīge dìfāng chī fàn, yī ge tàishì liàolí diàn, ránhòu(T1), dui, ránhòu(T1), jiù yīge bàba gēn yīge xiǎohái zài nàbiān chī fàn, nà bàba kànqǐ lái sōng sōng de, “Steven chī(R) kuài yǐdiǎn ā, búyào zhè(R)me slowly.” (The day before I went to, a place to eat, a Thai restaurant, then, yeah, then, a dad and a kid were eating there, the dad looked unrefined, “Steven, eat faster, don’t eat this slowly.”)
R. Hong: táiběi de xiăohái, bāmā hěn xīhuān bāng xiăohái qū yīngwén míngzi, bù zhīdào(T1) wéishéme, “S” sann-siâu, méiyǒu zhōngwén míngzi ō?
(The kids in Taipei, their parents like to give them an English name, I don’t know why, what the fucking “S”, don’t they have any Chinese name?)

S. L: nà nǐ juédé tā de yīngwén fāyīn zěn yang?
(How do you think about his pronunciation?)

C. Lo: wǒ juédé bù zěnme yàng(T1), “Steven, búyào chī de nà me slowly, hurry up.”
(I think his was not very good, “Steven, don’t eat that slowly, hurry up.”)

R. Hong: duì, yóuqí nàzhǒng yuèxiăo de.
(Yes, especially those younger kids.)

C. Lo: Your father zhèng(R)zài děng nǐ.
(Your father is waiting for you.)

R. Hong: e nà wǒmen shàngcì(T1) zhăo fángzǐ nàge building.
(Oh, that building last time we were looking for housing.)

S.L: shéme?
(What?)

C. Lo: nà chāo hăo xiào(T1), nà jiào shéme míngzi ā?
(That’s so funny, what’s the name?)

R. Hong: Gina.
(Gina.)

S.L: shé me? nǐmén zài jiăng shéme?
(What? What are you talking about?)

C. Lo: jiū(T1)shì(T1), zhăo făngzǐ nǐ yàoqu bugāolán kàn mā, ránhòu bugāolán yìbăn dōu huí(T1) liú shéme liào tàitai wáng xiānshēng, tā liú Gina, ránhòu(T1), wǒmen dăqù(T1), “qǐngwèn shì(T1) Gina xiăojiē mā?” tā shuō” shì ā, um what’s up?” wǒ shuō “wǒmen zài(T1), bugāolán shàngmiàn kàndào nàge, o wǒmen kàndào nǐ yóuzài zū făngzǐ,” tăshuō, “o nǐ shì zài náli kàndào? shizài bulletin kàndào de mā?” wǒ shuō, “shì ā, ránhòu xiăngshuō zài náli xiăng qū(T1),” tā shuō, “o nǐ jiù wăngqián zōuguò yīge block, ránhòu
turn left zài wǎngqián zǒu bùjīu, ránhòu yǒushōubiān yǒuyīge building nà jiùshì wǒ xiànzài zhù de difāng.”
(That is, when you look for housing, you would check the bulletin board, then on the bulletin board usually you would see Mrs. Liao Mr. Wang things like that, she had Gina, then we called, “Is this Miss Gina speaking, please?” she said, “yeah, um, what’s up?” I said “we, saw that on the bulletin board, we saw that you are renting,“ she said, “oh where did you see that? Was it on the bulletin?” I said, “Yes, and I wonder where it is, I want to check it out.” She said, “oh, you walk till you pass a block, then turn left then you keep walking for a bit, then on your right hand side there is a building that is my place.”
R. Hong: chāo hăoxiào(T1), zhēnde chāo hăoxiào(T1)
(Super funny, really super funny.)

[…]
S. L: nà nǐ juéde wèishéme tài'bèirén bǐjiào yòng yīngwén?
(Then why do you think Taipei people use more English?)
R. Hong: yìfāngmiàn, gēn xiăoháizi, jiăng yīngwén, wǒ juédé yīnggăi shì yīnwèi, xiànzăi(T1) búshi yǒu zài tū shéme, shuāngyŭ jiăoyù mă? ránhòu(T1)
yìfāngmiăn dājiă būshi yēyào xiăoháizi yíng zài qǐpăodiăn shàng, suŏyĭ yào gănkuăi xué guójì yŭ yūyán.
(On one hand, with children, speaking English, I think perhaps it’s because, now aren’t people promoting, bilingual education? Then on the other hand people also want their kids to win at the starting line, so they need to learn the international language soon.)
R. Hong: zhè jiào “qiányǐmòhuà”
(This is called “change and influence unobtrusively and imperceptibly.”)
C. Lo: nǐde father zhèngzăi waiting for you
(Your father is waiting for you.)
R. Hong: jiū(T1)shi(T1), kènèng zài shēnghuóshàng rang tă duōting yidiăn yīngwén, wŏ zījĭ jiĕdú shì zhèyang
(That is, they may let them listen to more English in daily life, this is my interpretation.)
S.L: nǐ tīngdào huì făngăn mā?
(Do you have a negative feeling hearing that?)
R. Hong: wǒ juéde, kàn tsiok pēh-bák e!
(I feel, fuck! This is so stupid!)
C. Lo: wǒ juéde nàzhǒng zhōngyīng jiázá de māma zhēn de shì(T1)…
(I think those mothers who mix Mandarin and English are really…)
R. Hong: duì(T1), nǐ yàobùrán jiù quánjiāng yàobùrán jiù búyào jiāng
(Yes, you either speak it all [in English] or don’t speak it at all.)

Extract (51) can be divided into two parts, the first part before the ellipsis mark narrating the stories and the second part commenting on the codeswitching situation in Taipei. The first story is about a dad who codeswitched to English when he was talking to his son. Here C. Lo shifted between his normal style and his stylization of the dad. When he was describing the story, he appeared to have more tokens of vernacular speech, but once he started stylizing the dad, he put on another voice mixing with accented English and retroflexed Taipei Mandarin. Using the Taiwanese adjective sòng sòng “unrefined” to evaluate the dad, C. Lo clearly showed his stance - he disagreed with this linguistic behavior. R. Hong even cursed in Taiwanese to show his strong dislike of the dad’s behavior. It seems to me that R. Hong cursed pretty often when he expressed his strong opinion whereas C. Lo tended to express his attitude by playful performance. R. Hong then asked C. Lo to share another story of the seriousness and ridiculousness of the codeswitching situation in Taipei. He even purposely codeswitched to English in his third turn to tease about how funny he thought the story was. When C. Lo started the story, he first provided information on what the kind of addresses such as Mrs. Liao or Mr. Wang people generally leave on the bulletin board to tell his audience what comes next will be a
contrast. Similar to his first story, as the story proceeded, C. Lo constantly shifted between his own normal vernacular speech and a more standard one with a higher pitch to perform a Taipei woman’s voice. He made it clear that he was performing two personas in his stylization. When he was playing himself, he sounded more polite but more vernacular and once he shifted to the woman Gina, he sounded more laidback and frequently codeswitched to English. C. Lo’s ability to shift styles and stylize suggests that living in Taipei and interacting with different people have given him access to more linguistic resources which he constantly makes use of in his ongoing discursive practices.

In the second part of the extract, they participated in the discussion about why codeswitching is common in Taipei. Since they were involved in a more serious conversation, they tended to articulate more clearly and as a result their tokens of vernacular features decrease to the extent that only a few function words appear to show the feature of T4 raising. Though being more serious, they still used different linguistic resources to take their stances. For example, C. Lo still took his stance by means of playful performance. When R. Hong suggested that the reason that Taipei parents codeswitch to English when talking to their children might be because they want to influence the children unobtrusively. C. Lo commented “nǐde fāthēr zhèngzài wāitīng for you.” Although he did not explicitly show his attitude here, his playful stylization of the Taipei dad implied that he disagreed that mixing English and Chinese together in a sentence is a good influence on the children if the parent wishes to promote bilingual education. R. Hong, once more, shifted to Taiwanese and cursed to explicitly express his negative attitude toward the phenomenon. By speaking Taiwanese together with cursing,
he seemed to construct a tough guy persona so that he could not only disalign himself from the Taipei people but also made his comment stronger.

In this section, I have discussed how the speakers shift their styles and stylize others to construct their identity and express their stancetaking. I do not intend to provide a generalization of how Taichung speakers interpret the meaning of variation in linguistic forms or how ideologies are contested and shaped. Rather, I analyze their discursive practice to illustrate that speakers constantly use language resources available to them to construct their fluid identity and shape their ideology.

4.12 Conclusion

This chapter has investigated how speakers construct their identities, how their ideologies are formed and how their identities and ideologies influence their language practice. I began this chapter with a discussion on the concept of the North/South contrast and how speakers situated themselves as Taichung people in the discourse of North/South. Next, I discussed “big Taipei-ism,” the ideology that is often mentioned in the interviews to provide background knowledge of how speakers interpret or contest the dominant ideologies in Taiwan. The remainder of the chapter focused on the linguistic aspect. I discussed how and why speakers have different interpretations, awareness, and evaluations of different varieties of Mandarin, including their own. The interviews suggest that speakers’ situated sociopolitical contexts, family language practices, and personal experiences all play an important role in their attitudes, awareness and ideologies about language. To get a broader macro-level ideological picture of their
linguistic behavior, I also explored language ideologies of English and Taiwanese and the social meanings of codeswitching to English or Taiwanese in a Mandarin context. Finally I illustrated with ample examples how speakers understand different linguistic resources and constantly use the linguistic resources available to them such as codeswitching, style-shifting and stylization to reflect their ideologies and construct their identities.

The forty speakers all grew up in Taichung and their ways of speaking all contain features of the Taichung accent, though to a different degree. Although these speakers came from the same speech community that is characterized by the unique Taichung accent, they do not simply represent one homogeneous group with one simple understanding of their own accent, other varieties of Mandarin and other languages. I have demonstrated in this chapter that the reason they speak the way they do now is intertwined with different complex factors rather than a simple factor like region. Through their thoughts addressing issues like their language use and choice and their evaluations of speakers of different varieties of Mandarin, I have shown that social network, family language practice, social identity, language attitudes as well as dominant language ideologies and gender ideologies all play a role in how they speak now. Located in this understanding of the macro picture, the next chapter will explore the micro-level patterns of variation. I will begin with the linguistic and social constraints on patterns of variation and then discuss how the macro-level attitudes and ideologies have an impact on the micro-level variation.
5. WHEN REGIONAL MEETS THE STANDARD: 
CONSTRAINTS ON VARIATION IN TAICHUNG MANDARIN

5.1 Introduction

In earlier chapters, I gave an acoustic description of two well-known Taichung 
features and presented how Taichung speakers talk about their regional accent. In the 
previous chapter, Y. Lai mentioned that she was proud of the song “tái zhōng qiāng 
(‘Taichung accent’)” that the band “Sunshine Boy” made because the song has many 
features of Taichung accent that resonated with her. The beginning of the lyrics illustrates 
the two features of concern here:

台中腔 台中腔 我熱愛台中腔
Táizhōngqiāng, táizhōngqiāng, wǒ rèi táizhōngqiāng
(\[ɻɤ\] pronounced as \[lɤ\])

“Taichung accent, Taichung accent, I fervently love the Taichung accent”

有沒有 有沒有 打電話過來
Yǒu méi yǒu, yǒuméi yǒu, dǎ diànhuà guòlái
(Pitch raised in the final position)

“Have-not-have, have-not-have, give a phone call”

台中腔 台中腔 我熱愛台中腔
Táizhōngqiāng, táizhōngqiāng wǒ rèi táizhōngqiāng
(\[ɻɤ\] pronounced as \[lɤ\])

“Taichung accent, Taichung accent, I fervently love the Taichung accent”

有沒有 有沒有 你給我打電話
Yǒu méi yǒu, yǒuméi yǒu, nǐ gěi wǒ dă guòlái
(Pitch raised in the final position)

“Have-not-have, have-not-have, you give me a call”
Usually tones are not heard in Chinese singing because music notes also make use of pitch, but the band purposely elongates and raises the pitch of the music notes in the words *guòlái* to illustrate terminal raising. Additionally, the retroflex /ɻ/ is pronounced as [l], e.g. *lèài* instead of *rèài*. Although features of the Taichung accent have been widely mentioned by linguistically naïve people, they have not been explored through linguistic analysis. This chapter explores the internal and external linguistic factors that constrain the patterns of variation in Taichung Mandarin. Furthermore, I also investigate linguistic changes in situations of dialect contact by comparing the linguistic behavior of two groups of Taichung speakers, one consisting of speakers who live in Taichung and the other consisting of those who grew up in Taichung but moved to the capital Taipei after high school. Using VARBRUL, I present quantitative analyses of tonal variation (high-falling T4 raised to realize as leveling T1) and r/l variation (retroflex approximant /ɻ/ realized as lateral [l]). Finally, I discuss the social meanings of the two linguistic variables and suggest how they trigger or fail to trigger accommodation by speakers migrating to Taipei.

### 5.2 Tonal variation

As mentioned in the Methods Chapter, it is unrealistic to code every single occurrence of T4 since Mandarin is a tonal language with only four basic tones and a neutral tone. Therefore, I coded about 50 consecutive tokens of T4 from a randomly selected section in each topic from each speaker, yielding around 200 tokens per
speaker. In case of extremely frequent words such as the discourse marker ránhòu, I only coded two or three tokens per topic from each speaker. The data set yielded a total of 8162 tokens of words in the dictionary forms of T4. Table 5.1 shows the overall distribution of T4 realized as a high-falling T4, or raised to realize as a leveling T1. In the Taichung group, almost half of the tokens were realized as T1 (46.4%), whereas in the Taipei group, less than a quarter of the tokens were realized as T1 (22.7%). It is clear that the Taichung migrants to Taipei have accommodated to the Taipei norm to some extent. The result agrees with previous studies on adult dialect acquisition that show that when speakers of one dialect are in prolonged contact with another dialect, they may lose features of their native dialect and make changes in their linguistic behavior (see Bowie 2000; Evans 2004; Huffines 1986; Thomas 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Rising realization (T1)</th>
<th>Falling realization (T4)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taipei</td>
<td>915 (22.7%)</td>
<td>3118 (77.3%)</td>
<td>4033 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taichung</td>
<td>1915 (46.4%)</td>
<td>2214 (53.6%)</td>
<td>4129 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1 Patterns of tonal variation among local Taichung speakers

Before I discuss the group of migrants in detail, I first present the patterns of variation among local Taichung speakers to gain a general picture of the linguistic behaviors of the local speakers. Four linguistic factors (utterance position, topic, grammatical function and preceding tone) and five social factors (gender, age, political orientation, interview type and occupation) were coded. Using VARBRUL analysis, three

---

34 I coded the tokens 5-8 minutes after each topic started.
social factors (gender, age and political orientation) failed to reach statistical significance at the .05 level and were excluded from further runs. The rest of the factors significantly constrained T4 raising among local Taichung speakers. Table 5.2 displays the overall constraint ranking. As shown in the table, linguistic factors outrank social factors and utterance position is the strongest favoring factor affecting the likelihood of raising of T4 to T1.

Table 5.2 Overall constraint ranking on T4 raising among local Taichung speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Utterance position</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Linguistic/stylistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Preceding tone</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 shows in detail the linguistic factors that emerged as significant in a step-up step-down analysis in GoldVarb. The fact that utterance position is the strongest favoring factor agrees with Wu’s (2005) study and the public’s general perception that Taichung speakers tend to raise T4 in final positions of intonation units. Besides, both the current study and Wu’s study suggest that initial position of intonation units and phonological utterance disfavor T4 raising. However, the results show that medial positions of intonation units also strongly favor T4 raising, which differs slightly from Wu’s study. One possible explanation is that Wu excluded higher-frequency words that are generally changed to T1 in fast speech while I included them because higher-frequency words in the Taipei norms are generally realized as the dictionary forms and I observed that some speakers did realize the higher-frequency words as T4.
In terms of style, Wu found that the occurrences of T4 raising in casual speech (interviews) are higher than in careful speech (reading of a word list and a passage) because speakers tend to become more serious in careful and monitored speech. Similar to what Wu noticed in her participants, when my speakers were asked to read a passage, they thought their pronunciation was being tested and therefore they paid more attention to the text. As shown in the table, passage reading strongly disfavors T4 raising (.189). Since the speakers were unaware that the Taichung accent was my research target, topics brought up in the interviews generally favor T4 raising. As the topic became more serious, the speakers tended to move toward the Taipei Mandarin standard. Some speakers tended to get on their soapbox when they talked about politics, and thus, politics was neutral (.505).

Table 5.3 Linguistic factors influencing T4 raising among local Taichung speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% realized as T1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utterance position</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial or phonological utterance*</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Casual conversation</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passage reading</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>Discourse markers</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Function words</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content words other than nouns and verbs</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nouns or verbs*</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>2347</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceding tone</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T4,T1, T0 or Ø*</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>input</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>4129</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 is the application value, Log likelihood = -2090.917, Chi-square/cell = 1.2550, *Factors that did not differ significantly from one another have been combined. All factor groups are significant at p < .05.
As for grammatical function, both discourse markers and function words (adverbs, conjunctions and prepositions) strongly favor T4 raising, with discourse markers being the strongest favoring factor. The result is not surprising as discourse markers and function words are both high-frequency words. For example, in the Academia Sinica Balanced Corpus of Mandarin Chinese, the discourse marker ránhòu ‘then’ and jiūshì ‘that is’ are found 2631 and 966 times respectively and the function words kěshì ‘but’ and yīnwèi ‘because’ are found 2532 and 5000 times respectively, whereas the verb jiānghuà ‘speak’ and the noun qiāngdiào ‘accent’ are found only 259 and 13 times respectively.\(^{35}\)

Although not conducted in a Mandarin context, Bybee’s (2002) study of t/d deletion shows that t/d deletion occurred more in high-frequency words. Bybee suggests that high-frequency words are more prone to sound change than low-frequency words.

Finally, in the environment of the preceding tone, T3 favors T4 raising and T2 slightly favors T4 raising, whereas neutral tone (T0), T1, T4 and null preceding tone (Ø) all disfavor T4 raising. The result is different from Wu’s finding that the high-rising T2 is the leading role affecting T4 raising. Wu suggested that T4 raising occurs most frequently when T4 is preceded by the high-rising T2 and the high-level T1 due to assimilation of the ending pitch value “5” in 35 (T2) and 55 (T1) that brings the supposed tone value of T4 from 51 to almost a value of 55 as the high-level tone. However, the pitch value of tones does not remain the same among different varieties of Taiwan Mandarin. Su (2004) found that while Taipei speakers indicate a clear distinction of T2/T3 contour, T2 contour in Taichung tends to change to mid-falling, gradually merging with T3. For example, in the following sentence wǒ háiméi chī wūcān ‘I haven’t eaten lunch’, the word háiméi

\(^{35}\) I did the word frequency count in the Academia Sinica Balanced Corpus of Mandarin Chinese at http://dbo.sinica.edu.tw/SinicaCorpus/index.html
‘haven’t’ would be realized as háiměi by Taichung speakers. If this is the case, then T4 raising should not be explained as the result of assimilation. Rather, mid-falling tones (pitch contour=31) are suggested to favor T4 raising. It is possible that Taichung speakers raise T4 when preceded by mid-falling tones on the basis of ease of articulation. When speakers perceive the character as the high-falling T4, they raise the tone value from “1” in 31 to a value of 5 and just remain level at the value of 5 instead of moving more muscles to articulate fully the pitch contour of 51.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% realized as T1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>Group interview</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-on-one interview</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>3116</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>2116</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>input</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>4129</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 is the application value, Log likelihood = -2090.917, Chi-square/cell = 1.2550. All factor groups are significant at p < .05.

In terms of social factors, the picture appears to be simpler compared with linguistic factors. Only interview type and occupation significantly affect the likelihood of T4 raising. Studies have suggested that the presence of peers may influence the quality of the linguistic interviews (Bayley 1996; Cukor-Avila & Bailey 2001; Labov 1969). As Table 5.4 shows, group interviews favor T4 raising while one-on-one interviews disfavor it. When I interviewed an individual speaker, they tended to become more serious because they felt they were being tested. One participant K. Lu told me that she felt as if she was in a formal interview where she had to watch out her wording. On the contrary, in a group interview where speakers knew each other since one introduced the other to have
the interview together, speakers tended to be more relaxed and sometimes they would even talk over each other. Therefore, it is not surprising that group interviews elicited more frequent vernacular features.

Turning to occupation, students (.549) are more likely to show T4 raising than working people (.463). Working professionals generally need to present themselves with certain formality and have contact with wider varieties of people due to their working environment, whereas college life tends to be simpler and the social network which students are in tends to be denser. As Chambers (2003) notes, the linguistic marketplace for employment that requires need to talk with others usually pushes the speaker towards a more standardized tongue. Therefore, it is not surprising that working professionals used vernacular features less frequently than students.

5.2.2 Patterns of tonal variation among Taichung migrants to Taipei

Since all the speakers moved to Taipei after high school, their age is positively correlated with their length of stay in Taipei. Therefore, I coded length of stay instead of age in the Taipei group. The three subgroups under the length of stay group in Taipei are 2-4 years, 7-9 years and more than 10 years. I acknowledge that male working professionals need to serve military service ranging from one year and one month to one year and ten months, and their length of stay in Taipei may be shorter than the female speakers at the same age if they served their term outside Taipei. However, since length of stay was coded with ordinal values rather than numerical values, the length of military service should not affect the overall result. Additionally, after I cross-tabulated the length
of stay factor and the occupation factor, I found empty cells for some combinations. For example, speakers who have stayed in Taipei for less than four years are not likely to be working professionals since they have not graduated from college. Similarly, speakers who have stayed in Taipei for more than ten years are unlikely to be students unless they are doctoral students (of whom I had none in my study). Therefore, the length of stay group and the occupation group were combined into a single factor group. The rest of the coding scheme follows the Taichung group, four linguistic factors (utterance position, topic, grammatical function and preceding tone) and three other social factors (gender, political orientation, and interview type) were coded. Using VARBRUL analysis, all the factors show significant effects for the T4 raising among Taichung migrants to Taipei.

Table 5.5 Overall constraint ranking on T4 raising among the migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Utterance position</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Occupation/Length of stay</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preceding tone</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Political orientation</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 displays the overall constraint ranking. Similar to the results of the Taichung group, linguistic factors still outrank social factors and utterance position is still the strongest favoring factor affecting the likelihood of raising of T4 to T1. While political orientation and gender fail to reach significant result at the .05 level in the local Taichung group, they contribute to a significant effect on T4 raising in the migrant group.
Moreover, the collapsed factor group occupation/length of stay is the strongest favoring social factor affecting T4 raising.

Table 5.6 Linguistic factors influencing T4 raising among the migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% realized as T1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utterance position</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial or phonological utterance*</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>Discourse markers</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Function words</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content words other than nouns and verbs</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nouns or verbs*</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Casual conversation</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passage reading</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceding tone</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T4, T1, T0 or Ø*</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>2356</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>input</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>4033</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 is the application value, Log likelihood = -1557.672, Chi-square/cell = 1.2899, *Factors are conflated. All factor groups are significant at p < .05.

Table 5.6 gives a detailed description of the linguistic factors that emerged as significant in a step-up step-down analysis in GoldVarb. Although utterance position is still the strongest factor group, the migrants show a much lower rate of T4 raising than local Taichung speakers. Furthermore, unlike the public perception that T4 raising tends to occur in final position, this group has almost identical favoring probability weights in final and medial positions of intonation units and the medial position even has a higher rate of application than the final position. The result suggests a binary opposition between initial or phonological utterance and the other two factor groups. That is, initial position
or phonological utterance still strongly disfavors T4 raising while final position has lost its leading status in favoring T4 raising in dialect contact situation.

Regarding the grammatical function group, although the application rates generally are much lower for the migrant group than for the Taichung group, discourse markers and function words still strongly favor T4 raising and content words remain strongly disfavoring factor groups. Within the topic factor group, casual conversation still has the highest weight at .701, followed by language at .596 while politics is still neutral and passage reading still strongly disfavors T4 raising as the speakers paid the most attention when they were required to read a scripted passage. Similar to the local Taichung speakers, the migrants show less frequent T4 raising when talking about politics than about language. The result is to my surprise because I assumed that they would be more aware of their vernacular features when they talked about language-related issues. One possible explanation is that many of the speakers either are unaware of T4 raising as a feature of the Taichung accent or have heard of it but could not freely control the feature. However, they did tend to articulate more clearly when they addressed serious political topics. As a result, their tones would fall into the prescriptive pattern more frequently. Finally, similar to the result of the preceding tone factor in the local Taichung group, T3 favors T4 raising and T2 slightly favors T4 raising, whereas neutral tone (T0), T1, T4 and null preceding tone (Ø) all still disfavor T4 raising.

In terms of social factors, while only interview type and occupation have an effect on T4 raising in the local Taichung group, more social factor groups contribute to the effect on T4 raising in the migrant group. Table 5.7 displays the results in detail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% realized as T1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation/Length of stay</td>
<td>Student (2-4 years, 20-22 yr old)</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student (7-9 years, 25-27 yr old)</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working (7-9 year, 25-27 yr old)</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working (10 years +, 30-32 yr old)</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>Group interview</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-on-one interview</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political orientation</td>
<td>Green (DPP)</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue (KMT)</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>input</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>4033</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 is the application value, Log likelihood = -1557.672, Chi-square/cell = 1.2899, All factor groups are significant at p < .05.

As Bowie (2000) found in his study that the amount of time one is surrounded by a second dialect would have an effect on the degree one accommodates to the new dialect and thus loses the native feature, the occupation/length of stay group has a strong effect on the degree to which the speakers lost the feature of T4 raising. The younger student group has the highest weight (.678) as these speakers moved away from Taichung for the least amount of time. The older working group is the strongest disfavoring group (.395) as they have resided in Taipei for the longest period. The older student group realized T4 raising at a higher rate than the working group at the same age range. It seems reasonable as most of the students have a denser social network than working professionals. For example, many of the students expressed their difficulty to enter the “Taipei circle” and most of their friends are from Taichung or southern cities and some also joined the Taichung alumni association in college and told me they hung out most of the time with
their peers since they all lived at the dormitory and they felt more comfortable interacting with their Taichung peers.

Similar to the result in the local Taichung group, group interviews still favor T4 raising whereas one-on-one interviews disfavor it in the migrant group. Even though the interviews were conducted in Taipei, the fact that both the interviewees and the interviewer were originally from Taichung helped create a relaxing atmosphere in group interviews. For example, in one group interview, F. Liu and I found out that her junior high school classmate was the younger brother of my friend at graduate school because her friend mentioned the brother’s name.

While the political orientation group did not yield a statistically significant result for the local Taichung group, the factor group shows a very interesting result in the migrant group. The DPP supporters favor T4 raising whereas the KMT supporters disfavor T4 raising. It seems too simple to assume that the DPP supporters insisted on keeping their local features while the KMP supporters were willing to accommodate to Taipei Mandarin as Taipei is traditionally considered a “deep blue” city. When I further analyzed the interview data, I realized that linguistic behavior is not directly related with political ideology. Rather, speakers’ social network and their language attitude indirectly link their pattern of speech with their political ideology. For example, Y. Liu, a junior at National Taiwan University, supports the blue party. Compared with C. Hsiao, who was also a junior in college and a blue supporter but has lived in Taichung since she was born, Y. Liu’s application rate of T4 raising is 36 percent, 20 percent lower than the rate of C. Hsiao at 56 percent. Y. Liu proudly told me that sometimes when she introduced herself, people thought she graduated from Taipei First Girls High School, the most prestigious
high school in Taiwan. Unlike other Taichung migrants who still hang out with their peers because they could not enter the “Taipei circle” or dislike Taipei people’s “big Taipei-ism” ideology, Y. Liu said she gets along well with Taipei people because they all think she is also from Taipei. She commented on Taipei people as follows:

(52) ㄉㄢjiā dōu shuō táiběirén bijiāo lěngmò, kěshì wǒ juède háihào, fānér hěnduō shìhòu shì táiběirén gěi wǒ hěnduō bāngzhù (Y. Liu, 20FPB, 6/24/08).

(People all think that Taipei people are cold and detached, but I think they are ok. On the contrary a lot of times, Taipei people help me a lot.)

When asked who she hung out with more often in Taipei, Y. Liu replied, “wǒ rènshì de dōushì lán de la, yàobùrán, yīnggāi huàbùtóujī (All I know are blue [supporters], otherwise, we may be at loggerheads)”. The fact that Y. Liu was proud of being mistaken as someone from a prestigious high school in Taipei shows that she wanted to assimilate into the Taipei way of speaking. Furthermore, by interacting more with her Taipei blue peers, she gradually adapted to their ways of speech. For example, her frequent codeswitching to English is very representative of Taipei style. Later in the interview when I asked Y. Liu if she preferred any pseudonym for the study, she suggested me to use “Lily” because everyone calls her Lily. Her cosmopolitan style definitely made her sound more like Taipei people than her home fellows.

S. Lu, whose application rate of T4 raising is the same as Y. Liu’s at 36 percent, shows a different story. S. Lu, a 31 year-old green supporter who has lived in Taipei for 13 years, told me that people told her she had a Taichung accent when she first moved to Taipei. I asked her if she thought she still had the accent, she replied “nánbùchēng nǐ zài táibēi zhù shínián jì huì biānchéng táibēirén ma? (Could it be said that you become a
Taipei person after living in Taipei for ten years?” Her comment tells that she did not consciously try to assimilate to the Taipei accent. She further explained:

(53) wǒ búhuì tèbié xiǎngyào qù jiāozhèng wǒde zhōngwén, guóyǔ, wǒ búhuì xiǎngyào jiāngde gēn wáishènggrén yǐyàng zìzhèngqiāngyuán de guóyǔ (S. Lu, 31FPG, 3/11/08)

(I don’t particularly want to correct my Chinese, Mandarin, I don’t want to speak like, Mainlanders, the Mandarin in which each character has the right tone and the intonation flows smoothly.)

It is interesting that S. Lu particularly mentioned that she did not want to sound like a Mainlander since Mainlanders are typically considered as the “deep blue” supporters.

Regarding local ways of speaking such as codeswitching to English, S. Lu expressed her dislike for this linguistic behavior. She commented on codeswitching to English in the following:


(I met one, he knew I was an English major. One year he went to Boston, came back from a short study at Harvard. Then he kept talking to me in English, I said, “why are you doing this?” He said, “you know,” then I said “know what?” out of his mind (in Taiwanese). I think that is really, actually that kind of people has a sense of superiority that is so full of themselves.)

As someone who was born and grew up in Taichung, S. Lu did not want to speak like Taipei people or Mainlanders, nor did she desire to adopt the Taipei cosmopolitan style of speaking. In fact, she constantly codeswitched to Taiwanese because she thought some Taiwanese expressions are more vivid. She did not mind being associated with localness and disliked those migrants who claim to be local Taipei people after living in Taipei for several years. Therefore, it is not surprising that her rate of T4 raising is much higher than
the rate of C. Ke, another 31 year-old female who has also lived in Taipei for 13 years (rate of T4 raising at 9%).

Finally, gender is another social factor that affects the degree of T4 raising in the migrant group. Unlike the general trend that women tend to assimilate to the standard language, the female group here slightly favors the vernacular T4 raising (p=.537) while the male group disfavors it (p=.461). When I examined the interview data, I found that the favoring or disfavoring of T4 raising is associated more with how speakers want to present themselves than with how they performed gender. For example, as the son of a lawyer, L. Hsieh associated speaking standard Mandarin with being clever and having keen judgment and said he constantly monitors his speech (see extract (38)). His rate of T4 raising at 10 percent suggests that he has largely adapted to the standard variety.

Similarly, Y. Wang, a 31 year-old lawyer, monitored his speech because he needed to present himself well in front of his clients. He commented on his speech in (55):

\[(55) \text{wǒ bù zhī dào zhè shì yīn wèi, dì qū guān xì, háishì shùō, yīn wèi nǐ gèn kě hù jiāng huà, jiū shūō, hāoxiàng yào jiāng de zhèng shì yì diǎn, yǒu shí huò jiāng huà shāng qiāng diào shǎng hùi, tè bié zǔ yì, dàn jiù hòu, biàn shùō, bèn lái zhī yòu zǎi shè jiao chǎng hé, dān shì bào hòu lái, jī shì zài xià chǎng hé, kěn néng jù shì huí biān chéng zhè ge yàng zì (Y. Wang, 31 MPG, 7/27/08)}\]

(I don’t know if it’s because of, the region, or, because of my career, it has become a habit. At first, because when talking to clients, I mean, maybe want to speak more formally. Sometimes, when speaking, I would pay particular attention to the accent. But later, it became, originally only at social occasions, but till later, even if in private occasions, I may, become like this too.)

Y. Wang attributed his accent change to two reasons. First is that living in Taipei may have made him speak more standard since he was constantly surrounded by Taipei Mandarin. Second is that his career as a lawyer required him to present good language skills in front of his clients. Since he constantly tried to speak more formally at work, he
gradually constructed his own serious speaking style even when he was off work. His rate of T4 at 11 percent suggests that he has lost the vernacular feature to a large extent.

5.2.3 A comparison of patterns of tonal variation between the local Taichung group and the migrant group

I have discussed findings for each group in previous two sections. Table 5.8 presents the parallels between the local Taichung group and the migrant group. As the table shows, overall the migrant group has the rate of T4 raising at 22.7 percent, far outstripped by the local Taichung group at 46.4 percent. The analysis finds that migrants do undergo changes in their T4 raising upon constant exposure to Taipei Mandarin, though the individuals make changes at different rates due to different social factors. However, looking at the parallel findings for the linguistic factors (utterance position, grammatical function, topic and preceding tone), we find that both groups display similar systematic results in the factor values assigned to linguistic constraints, which suggests that the two groups belong to the same speech community (Guy 1991). The findings for social factors reveal a more complicated picture. Although these speakers are members of the same speech community, they position themselves differently with regard to Taichung features. Therefore Taichung features such as T4 raising appear at different rates in their speech. It seems too simple to explain the results by the correlations between the use of T4 raising and social categories. For example, the stories of Y. Liu (see extract 52) and S. Lu (see extracts 53-54) show how they deploy different linguistic resources to construct or reinforce the social categories to which they belong. Furthermore, the linguistic behavior of L. Hsieh (see extract 38) and Y. Wang (see extract 55) suggests that pre-determined
social categories such as gender may not be as meaningful as speakers’ view of their identity in explaining their own linguistic production.

Table 5.8 Comparison of tonal variation between the local Taichung group and the migrant group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Taipei</th>
<th>Taichung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor group</td>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Weight %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterance position</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>.665 27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>.661 31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial or phonological utterance*</td>
<td>.141 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>.883 44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Function words</td>
<td>.712 35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content words other than nouns and verbs</td>
<td>.476 20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nouns or verbs*</td>
<td>.329 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Casual conversation</td>
<td>.701 34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>.596 26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>.459 18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passage reading</td>
<td>.246 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceding tone</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>.657 40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>.518 28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T4, T1, T0 or Ø*</td>
<td>.439 14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation/Length of stay</td>
<td>Student(2-4 years, 20-22 years old)</td>
<td>.678 29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student (7-9 years, 25-27 years old)</td>
<td>.488 26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working (7-9 year, 25-27 years old)</td>
<td>.417 19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working(10 years +, 30-32 years old)</td>
<td>.395 16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>Group interview</td>
<td>.573 25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-on-one interview</td>
<td>.426 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political orientation</td>
<td>Green (DPP)</td>
<td>.582 27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue (KMT)</td>
<td>.416 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.537 24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.461 21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>.135 22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 is the application value, *Factors are conflated. All factor groups are significant at p < .05.
5.3 (r) and (l) in Taichung Mandarin

Regarding the (r) variable, all the tokens realized as lateral [l], retroflex approximant [ɻ] (represented as (r), hereafter) or retroflex fricative [ʐ] (represented as (R) hereafter to contrast the Taiwan variant) were coded, yielding 2466 tokens. Retroflex approximant and retroflex fricative tokens were recoded as one factor group because of “knock outs” in many of the cells in the retroflex fricative group. As I mentioned earlier, Taiwan Mandarin has lost some quality of retroflexation and therefore not many speakers realized the Beijing retroflexed variant [ʐ] which is articulated with the tip of the tongue fully curled up in spontaneous speech. Table 5.9 shows the overall distribution. The local Taichung speakers realized (r) as lateral [l] at 36 percent whereas the rate of lateral realization for the migrants to Taipei is 26.2 percent, about 10 percent lower than the local Taichung group. Regarding the rhotics realization, the migrant group has the rate of 14.1 percent which outstrips by far the local Taichung group at 4.7 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Lateral (l)</th>
<th>Retroflex approximant (r)</th>
<th>Retroflex fricative (R)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taipei</td>
<td>337 (26.2%)</td>
<td>768 (59.7%)</td>
<td>182 (14.1%)</td>
<td>1287 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950 (73.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taichung</td>
<td>424 (36%)</td>
<td>700 (59.4%)</td>
<td>55 (4.7%)</td>
<td>1179 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>755 (64%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure a good fit between the model and the data, a decision was made to exclude four speakers from each group because their rhotic behavior differed from the target population or their application value of (l) realization was zero. The final data set
totaled 1981 tokens and was analyzed with GoldVarb. Table 5.10 shows the overall distribution. As the table shows, now lateral realization in the local Taichung group (32.8%) only exceeds the migrant group by 6 percent. Compared with the result for T4 raising, the result for lateral realization seems to show only slight difference between the two groups.

Table 5.10 Overall distribution of (r) and (l) for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Lateral (l)</th>
<th>Retroflex approximant (r)</th>
<th>Retroflex fricative (R)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taipei</td>
<td>282 (26.8%)</td>
<td>644 (61.2%)</td>
<td>126 (12.0%)</td>
<td>1052 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>768 (73.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taichung</td>
<td>305 (32.8%)</td>
<td>605 (65.1%)</td>
<td>19 (2.0%)</td>
<td>929(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>624 (67.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1 Patterns of r/l variation among local Taichung speakers

Again, I first present the patterns of variation among local Taichung speakers to gain a general picture of the linguistic behavior of the local speakers. Four linguistic factors (topic, following segment, the frontness of the finals and grammatical function) and five social factors (gender, age, political orientation, interview type and occupation) were coded. Using VARBRUL analysis, two linguistic factors (following segment and the frontness of the finals) and one social factor (occupation) failed to reach statistical significance at the .05 level and were excluded from further runs. The rest of factors show statistically significant effect for [l] realization among local Taichung speakers. Additionally, a series of cross-tabulations found interactions between age and gender; therefore, the two factor groups were recoded as one factor group.
Although the grammatical function group yielded a significant result, I excluded it for further runs in order not to distort the big picture. The result of the grammatical function factor group is shown in Table 5.11. When I took a closer look at the data, I noticed that the nouns or verbs factor group consists of about 78 percent (722 out of 929 tokens) of the tokens while the two strongly disfavoring factors only occupied a small number of tokens. Additionally, when I ran the log likelihood test for the factor group, I found that the difference between the nouns or verbs factor and the function words factor is not significant, which suggests about 93 percent of the tokens (868 out of 929 tokens) were in one group, resulting in too much overlap between the input and the factor value for reliable analysis (Guy 1988). Therefore, I made a decision to discuss the result separately from the other factor groups. The table shows that (r) was realized as [l] at the highest rate (35.9%) when the words are nouns or verbs. This result supports Bybee (2002)’s hypothesis that the high frequency of use makes the production of high-frequency words more automatic and therefore less subject to conscious inhibition. In all the interviews, the word rén ‘person’ has the highest frequent occurrence since it can be combined with different words to form multi-syllabic compounds such as rénjīā ‘people,’ tâiwānrén ‘Taiwanese,’ qīnrén ‘family’ and wàishēngrén ‘Mainlanders.’ For example, among the 91 tokens in K. Fu’s interview data, 31 are compounds with the word rén. Therefore, when speakers pronounce high-frequency words such as rén, they are more likely to realize the words in their conventionalized pronunciation, in other words, in their vernaculars. Since the word rén occurs so frequently in the interviews, it is not surprising that the nouns or verbs group has a higher rate of [l] realization. Discourse marker ránhòu ‘then’ is another high-frequency word; however, it strongly disfavors [l] realiztion.

36 Table 5.19 shows that K. Fu’s rate is [l] realization is 63%.
realization. The reason is because the (r) variable in ránhòu has gradually changed to the nasal realization as nánhòu due to assimilation.\(^{37}\)

<p>| Table 5.11 The rates of [l] realization among the grammatical function factor group |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% realized as [l]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammaratical function</td>
<td>Nouns or verbs</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Function words</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content words other than nouns and verbs</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse markers</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12 displays the overall constraint ranking excluding the grammatical function factor. Surprisingly, social factors outrank linguistic factors and political orientation is the strongest favoring factor affecting the likelihood of (l) realization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Political orientation</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age/Gender</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{37}\) It would be worthwhile to run the frequency analysis for rèn and ránhòu since I suggest that frequency maybe an important factor; however, the analysis is beyond the scope of this dissertation and worth exploring in future research. In Academia Sinica Balanced Corpus of Mandarin Chinese (http://dbo.sinica.edu.tw/SinicaCorpus/index.html), the noun rèn and the discourse marker ránhòu are found 5000 and 2631times respectively, whereas other words that contain the (r) such as lìrú ‘for example’, tūrán ‘suddenly’, and tōnrán ‘natural’ are found 1348, 639 and 108 times respectively.
Table 5.13 gives a detailed description of the linguistic factors that emerged as significant in a step-up step-down analysis in GoldVarb. In terms of the topic factor group, similar to the result for T4 raising, casual conversation is still the leading favoring factor while passage reading still disfavors vernacular use. The language/politics factor shows a lower rate of [l] realization at 36.5 percent than the rate of the casual conversation factor at 46.6 percent. This is probably because of the seriousness of the topics and the attention speakers paid to their own speech when they were commenting on accent related topics. For example, K. Fu commented on the Taichung accent in extract (56).

(56)  wǒ táizhōnggrén(l) jiùshì hūnzhāo shème jiào táizhōngqiāng ā, wǒ shì fēn bùqǐngchǔ de nàgerén(l) ā, wǒ shì ā, wǒ chéngrén(l), kuàilè, kuàirè(R), fēn bù tài qǐngchǔ (K. Fu, 27MCG, 2/21/08)

(I am a Taichung person(l) so I don’t know what the Taichung accent is, I am the person(l) who can’t tell the difference, I am, I admit(l), happy, almost hot(R), I can’t really tell.)

While K. Fu was aware of his inability to recognize the Taichung accent, he did recognize his difficulty pronouncing the rhotics. Although he realized the first three tokens of (r) as the lateral, he was able to pronounce the full retroflexation when he consciously paid attention to the word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% realized as [l]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Casual conversation</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language or politics*</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passage reading</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Factors are conflated. Log likelihood = -500.327, Chi-square/cell = 1.1717, All factor groups are significant at p < .05.
Table 5.14 Social factors influencing [l] realization among local Taichung speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% realized as [l]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political orientation</td>
<td>Green (DPP)</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue (KMT)</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age/ Gender</td>
<td>30-32 yr old, Male</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-27 yr old, Male</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-32 yr old, Female</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-22 yr old, Male</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-22 yr old, Female</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-27 yr old, Female</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>One-on-one interview</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group interview</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Log likelihood = -500.327, Chi-square/cell = 1.1717, All factor groups are significant at p < .05.

Table 5.14 shows the social factors that have an influence on [l] realization. Among them, political orientation surprisingly has the strongest effect on the favoring of [l] realization. I am hesitant to suggest that the green supporters favor the vernacular use while the blue supporters disfavor it as this kind of statement sounds subjective. Since [l] realization is the influence of Taiwanese on Mandarin in Taiwan as Taiwanese only has the lateral phoneme [l] rather than the retroflex (r), I decided to examine how speakers talked about their language practice, especially their Taiwanese ability. I found that the speakers with a higher application rate of [l] realization tend to come from lower socioeconomic class families in which Taiwanese is the dominant language in the home. Many of these speakers said that Taiwanese is their first language and they did not learn Mandarin until they went to school. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the DPP tends to attract lower socioeconomic class supporters because the party promotes Taiwanese identity and local Taiwanese nationalism. As more DPP supporters consider Taiwanese to be their first language or use Taiwanese as their dominant language in the
home, their Mandarin is more likely to be influenced by their Taiwanese and therefore their [l] realization is at a higher rate than that of the KMT supporters.

Age/gender is another important social factor that affects [l] realization. The oldest age groups (both the male and the female groups) favor [l] realization while the three younger age groups disfavor it. This can be explained by different historical contexts in which the speakers grew up. In extract (23) in Chapter Four, S. Chuang, a 31 year old teacher, suggested that in his generation only his Mainlander classmates could speak standard Mandarin because their Mandarin was not influenced by Taiwanese. S. Chuang’s parents were born before the KMT government took over Taiwan and Taiwanese is not only their dominant language but also the language they used to teach their children. He started schooling during the time of martial law when Taiwanese children were still punished for speaking Taiwanese. G. Ho, born in the same era as S. Chuang, codeswitched to Taiwanese very frequently during the interview. When asked how he thought his Mandarin was, he replied immediately “wǒ shì táiwān guóyǔ (I speak Taiwanese Mandarin)” (G. Ho, 31MCG, 7/27/08). Located in this historical context, these speakers speak more fluent Taiwanese. Therefore, their higher rate of [l] realization shows the influence of their dominant language on their Mandarin. On the other hand, the youngest group disfavors [l] realization. Although this group started schooling several years after the lifting of martial law and they were no longer punished for speaking Taiwanese, many of the speakers in this generation consider Mandarin to be their first language and claim that they do not speak fluent Taiwanese. As a result, they show a lower rate in their [l] realization.
The 25-27 year-old female group shows a much lower rate of [l] realization (29.1%) than their male counterparts (42.8%). Similarly, the 20-22 year-old female group shows a slightly lower rate of [l] realization than the males. One explanation for the females disfavoring of [l] realization is the social meaning of Taiwanese or Taiwanese-accented Mandarin. As discussed in Chapter Four, the dominant ideology presents Taiwanese as the language of the traditional and local (Baron 2004) and Taiwanese-accented Mandarin as unrefined (Su 2005). We see that male students in Baron’s study consider it inappropriate to use Taiwanese when females are present, students in Su’s study associate refined disposition with femininity and correct ways of speaking, and L. Hsieh suggested that females tend not to speak Taiwanese-accented Mandarin because they care about their self image (see extract 38). Because of all the negative social meanings the dominant ideology attributes to speaking Taiwanese or Taiwanese-accented Mandarin, it is not surprising that women disfavor [l] realization, a feature that is considered typical of Taiwanese-accented Mandarin. On the other hand, T4 raising is typically considered as a regional feature rather than a feature of Taiwanese-accented Mandarin. Since T4 raising is associated less with negative social meanings, the Taichung female speakers may feel less subject to avoid the use of T4 raising and therefore, their patterns of T4 raising reveal a different picture than their patterns of [l] realization.

Finally, the interview type factor group reveals a contrary result from its effect on T4 raising. One-on-one interviews favor [l] realization (p=.549) whereas group interviews disfavor it (p=.370). When I examined the individual speakers closely, I found that among the five speakers whose interviews were conducted with the presence of their peers, four belong to the 20-22 year-old age group. As discussed earlier, speakers in this
age group show a lower rate of [l] realization because their Mandarin is less influenced by their Taiwanese. Since the youngest group dominates most of the population in the group interview factor, the application rate of [l] realization in the group interview factor is closer to the rate in the 20-22 year-old age group. It seems that the interview type factor does not affect the rate of the vernacular use in the (r) variable.

5.3.2 Patterns of r/l variation among the migrant speakers

Following the coding scheme for T4 raising, I recoded occupation and length of stay in Taipei as one factor group to avoid empty cells for certain combination. The rest of the coding scheme still follows the local Taichung group. Four linguistic factors (topic, following segment, the frontness of the finals, and grammatical function) and four social factors (gender, political orientation, interview type, and occupation/length of stay) were coded. Using VARBRUL analysis, three linguistic factors (following segment, the frontness of the finals and grammatical function) failed to reach a significant result at the .05 level and were excluded from further runs. The rest of the factors show significant effects for [l] realization among the migrant speakers. Additionally, a series of cross-tabulations found interactions between gender and occupation/length of stay; therefore, the two factor groups were recoded as one factor group. Table 5.1 displays the overall constraint ranking. Similar to the constraint ranking on [l] realization in the local Taichung group, here social factors still outrank linguistic factors. Besides, gender/occupation/length of stay instead of political orientation becomes the strongest favoring factor affecting the likelihood of (l) realization.
Table 5.15 Overall constraint ranking on [l] realization among the local Taichung speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gender/Occupation/Length of stay</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Political orientation</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16 gives a detailed description of the linguistic factors that showed significance in a step-up step-down analysis in GoldVarb. Topic is the only factor group that has an effect on [l] realization. Similar to the result in the local Taichung group, casual conversation is still the leading favoring factor while passage reading still disfavors the vernacular use. The politics factor shows a similar rate of [l] realization (33.2%) as the casual conversation factor (33.8%) and the two factors show similar factor weights so the two factors were combined. Language still has a lower probability weight and application rate probably due to speakers’ conscious attention paid to their speech.

For example, when asked if he was aware of the Taichung accent, R. Hong gave an example of ʰɛnʳê(R) ‘very hot’ and ʰɛnʳê(l) ‘very hot.’ Later when I asked him if he subconsciously changed his accent after he moved to Taipei, he replied in extract (55):

(55) méi yōu! hěnʳê(r) de shíhou wǒ háishi jiāng hěnʳê(l) ā
(R. Hong, 27MPG, 3/11/08)

(No! When it’s very hot(r) I still say very hot(l).)

R. Hong’s example of features of the Taichung accent and his response both show that even though he preferred the vernacular variant [l] he was aware of the retroflexed variant and was able to pronounce it if he paid attention.
Table 5.16 Linguistic factors influencing [l] realization among the migrant speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% realized as [l]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Casual conversation or politics*</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passage reading</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Factors are conflated. Log likelihood = -466.251, Chi-square/cell = 1.2814, All factor groups are significant at p < .05.

In terms of the social group, gender/occupation/length of stay has the strongest effect on [l] realization, which is different from the constraint ranking in the local Taichung group in which political orientation is the leading significant factor group. Table 5.17 shows the effect of social factors in detail. In the gender/occupation/length of stay factor group, the male working group and the male student group strongly favor [l] realization (p=.914, .718 respectively) whereas the rest of the groups, including all the female groups, strongly disfavor it and the application rate of [l] realization in the two male groups (65.1% and 43.6% respectively) greatly outstrip the rate in the other groups. As discussed earlier, the dominant language ideology links Taiwanese-accented Mandarin with unrefined disposition, working-class or countryside vernacular. It is not surprising that the female group would disfavor the vernacular [l] realization as gender ideologies in contemporary Taiwan expect women to have a greater degree of refinement than men (Su 2008). Furthermore, located in the capital Taipei which is widely recognized as the most cosmopolitan and modernized city in Taiwan, these female speakers may feel more subject to the evaluation of whether they are refined or not, and therefore they may tend to avoid features of Taiwanese-accented Mandarin because of its indexical value as localness. This explains why the difference in the application rates of [l] realization
between males and females in the migrant group is larger than the difference in the local Taichung group.

Table 5.1 Social factors influencing [l] realization among the migrant speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% realized as [l]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender/ Occupation/ Length of stay</td>
<td>Male, Working (10 yrs +, 30-32 yr old)</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male, Student (7-9 yrs, 25-27 yr old or 2-4 yrs, 20-22 yr old)</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female, Working (10 yrs+, 30-32 yr old)</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female, Student (7-9 yrs, 25-27 yr old or 2-4 yrs, 20-22 yr old)</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male, Working (7-9 yrs, 25-27 yr old)</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female, Working (7-9 yrs, 25-27 yr old)</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political orientation</td>
<td>Green (DPP)</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue (KMT)</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>One-on-one interview</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group interview</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Log likelihood = -466.251, Chi-square/cell = 1.2814, All factor groups are significant at p < .05.

Furthermore, similar to the result in the local Taichung group, the oldest speakers are more likely to use [l] realization even though these speakers have resided in Taipei for more than ten years. We see that the older male working groups use [l] realization at a much higher rate than other male groups and the older female group employ [l] realization at a slightly higher rate than other female groups. Interestingly, none of the younger working groups shows a higher rate of [l] realization than the student groups, but instead, they use [l] realization at the lowest rate among all the groups (9.6% and 2.9%
respectively). The result presents a very mixed picture here. Length of stay in Taipei does not seem to be the major influence on whether the speakers would accommodate to the standard retroflexed realization. The oldest group still shows the highest rate of [l] realization, probably because they already had a higher rate of [l] realization before they moved to Taipei due to the historical context in which they were located. Although located in the same historical context, the 25-27 student group and the 25-27 working group reveal a large difference in their application rates of [l] realization. When I examined the speakers in the working group, I realized that their less frequent use of [l] may be explained by how they wished to present themselves at work. In the 25-27 working group, Z. Lo, L. Hsieh and C. Lo all have very low rates of [l] realization at 3 percent, 7 percent and 13 percent respectively (see Table 5.20). Z. Lo is an English teacher at a high school in Taipei. When she was at Teachers College, she had to take a Chinese phonetics course in which students practice the standard pronunciation. Moreover, she acknowledged that it is her personal habit to speak with zìzhèngqiāngyuán ‘each character has the right tone, the intonation flows smoothly’ to create her professional teacher persona. L. Hsieh, who works at a governmental research institute, associated standard Mandarin with clever and keen judgments (see extract 38). Therefore, he tried to speak more standard because he desired to present himself as a clever person with keen judgments. Finally, C. Lo works at a foreign company as a consultant and his job requires him to travel constantly to give presentations to the clients. Since the standard variant is the linguistic capital in the market, these speakers, regardless of their working professions, consciously chose to use the standard variant [r] to construct a professional identity in their fields.
As for the political orientation group, similar to the result in the local Taichung group, the green supporters still favor [l] realization (p=.594) while the blue supporters disfavor it (p=.386). As mentioned earlier, DPP supporters tend to come from a lower socioeconomic class and Taiwanese is more likely to be their dominant home language. Therefore, their Mandarin is more likely to be influenced by their Taiwanese. These speakers may have already showed a higher rate of [l] realization than the KMT supporters before they moved to Taipei. I take Y. Wang, a 31 year-old lawyer, as an example. I have discussed Y. Wang in section 5.2.2 regarding his accent change in terms of T4 raising. Being a lawyer, he consciously paid attention to speaking more formally and clearly. During our interview, he also enunciated each word clearly at a moderate speed. This explains why he has a low rate of T4 raising. However, the fact that he only received input from Taiwanese before elementary school may have affected his ability to control his pronunciation of the retroflex (r) since the phoneme does not exist in Taiwanese. Although he paid conscious attention to his speech, pronouncing the retroflex (r) may be something beyond his control. This explains why his rate of [l] realization is still at a very high rate (74%). Language attitude is another possible explanation for why the green supporters have a higher rate of [l] realization. Among the nine speakers who claimed to support the green party, four of them were aware that they spoke the nonstandard variety of Mandarin but did not consider it necessary to consciously change their accent. C. Chuang and R. Hong even made fun of their own táiwān guóyǔ ‘Taiwanese Mandarin’ during the interviews. For example, R. Hong in extract (55) expressed that he still preferred the nonstandard variant even though he was aware of the
standard variant. When asked about the difference between him and his Taipei friends, he replied in extract.

(57)  wǒmén yì táikè zìháo ā, rúguǒ rénjiā shuō wǒ shì táikè, wǒ juéde zhè méi shéme ā, zhè hěnhǎo ā (R. Hong, 27MPG, 3/11/08).

(We [Taichung people] are proud of being taike ‘Taiwan guest,’ if someone said I am a taike, I feel it’s not a big deal, I think it’s good.)

Su (2005:239) discussed the stereotypical image of taike as “Taiwanese young men who wear silk, flowery shirts and fake brand apparel with dyed blond hair, speak either Taiwanese-accented Mandarin (or Taiwanese), and lead an aimless life.” Different from the dominant ideology that associates taike with negative social meanings, R. Hong shows a positive attitude toward taike. Compared with those who support the blue party, the green supporters tend to show a more positive attitude toward local culture and local characteristics. Therefore, they may show less enthusiasm for accommodating to the standard variant.

Finally, the interview type factor group reveals a similar result to its effect on [l] realization in the local Taichung group. One-on-one interviews favor [l] realization (p=.621) whereas group interviews disfavor it (p=.353). When I examined each speaker, I found that among the eight speakers who conducted group interviews, four were male green supporters and two were female green supporters. Since the male green supporters dominate the population in group interviews and both the male group and the green group have higher rates of [l] realization, the effect of the group interview factor is similar to that of the male group and the green group. Although the interview type shows a significant result, it seems that the presence of the peers does not increase the use of the vernacular variant [l].
5.3.3 A comparison of patterns of r/l variation between the local Taichung group and the migrant group

I have discussed findings for each group in previous two sections. Table 5.18 presents a parallel between the local Taichung group and the migrant group. As the table shows, overall the migrant group has the rate of [l] realization at 26.8 percent, 6 percent lower than the rate in the local Taichung group at 32.8 percent. The analysis finds that migrants do not undergo changes in their [l] realization to the standard (r) as much as their changes in T4 raising even upon constant exposure to Taipei Mandarin. While some factor groups display similar systematic results in the factor values assigned to linguistic constraints, which suggests that these speakers belong to the same speech community, the application rates of some other factors in the two groups seem to imply that the patterns of r/l variation is not as systematic as those of T4 raising. For example, the males in the migrant group show a higher rate of [l] realization than the males who did not move away. The younger group in the migrant group also shows a higher rate of [l] realization than the younger group in local Taichung group. Moreover, length of stay in a new dialect area is not necessarily positively correlated with the degree one will accommodate to the new dialect. We see from the result that the older speakers in Taipei have a higher rate of [l] realization than the younger speakers. In the next section, I will discuss of the social meanings of the two linguistic variables T4 raising and [l] realization and suggest how they trigger or fail to trigger the accommodation by speakers migrating to Taipei.
Table 5.18 Comparison of r/l variation between the local Taichung group and the migrant group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Factor group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Casual conversation</td>
<td>{0.626}</td>
<td>{33.6}</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>{0.515}</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>{0.540}</td>
<td>{36.5}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Occupation / Length of stay</td>
<td>Male, Working (10 years +, 30-32 years old)</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male, Working (7-9 year, 25-27 years old)</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>{0.653}</td>
<td>{42.8}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male, Student (7-9 year, 25-27 years old)</td>
<td>{0.718}</td>
<td>{43.6}</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male, Student (2-4 years, 20-22 years old)</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female, Working (10 years +, 30-32 years old)</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>{0.298}</td>
<td>{29.1}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female, Working (7-9 year, 25-27 years old)</td>
<td>{0.326}</td>
<td>{13.2}</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political orientation</td>
<td>Green (DPP)</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue (KMT)</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>One-on-one interview</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group interview</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] realization is the application value, All factor groups are significant at p < .05.
5.4 Táizhōngqiāng ‘Taichung accent’ and táiwān guóyǔ ‘Taiwanese Mandarin’

Some studies have shown that changes occur in an individual’s native dialect upon constant exposure to another dialect (Bowie 2000, Huffines 1986) whereas other studies provided counter examples showing that migrant adults may still have intact phonological systems of their native dialect if they identify themselves with the home region (Clyne 1992; Stanford 2008b). After discussions of the two linguistic variables, I arrive at a complicated and interesting finding. The analysis of the data suggests that internal constraints precede external factors in the realization of T4 as T1, whereas external factors play a more important role in the substitution of [l] for (r). Furthermore, while the migrant speakers show a great extent of losing the feature of T4 raising, their overall rate of [l] realization is slightly lower than the rate of the local Taichung group. It seems that changing T4 raising to the standard falling T4 is easier than changing the vernacular [l] to the standard retroflexed variant (r). The result resonates with Bowie’s (2000:136) suggestion that “not all linguistic features of any given dialect are equally open to change when its speakers are placed in constant exposure to another dialect.” I explain the difference in the results of the two linguistic variables in terms of their linguistic status and social meanings.

The most commented feature of the Taichung accent by non-linguists is probably T4 raising or “rising in terminal sounds” in the folk vocabulary. In the beginning of Chapter Three I discussed a video clip in which two Taichung speakers introduced the Taichung accent in terms of common usage. The speakers were criticized for not knowing the essence of the Taichung accent because the accent should be discussed in terms of its
unique intonation pattern. In Chapter Four, I showed that speakers frequently expressed their inability to perceive their “rising in terminal sounds” even though they are aware of their difference from Taipei Mandarin and have heard that the Taichung accent is well-known for its tonal change. Although Taichung speakers may not be able to identify specific linguistic features in their tonal pattern, they are able to perceive what the standard accent of Mandarin is. As many interviewees indicated, the Mandarin spoken by Taipei speakers tends to have the characteristic of \textit{zìzhèngqiāngyuán} ‘each character has the right tone, the intonation flows smoothly.’ Since T4 raising is widely considered to be a regional marker and the speakers have limited awareness of their T4 raising, this linguistic feature is more subject to change upon constant exposure to Taipei Mandarin, one of whose characteristics is that “each character has the right tone.” We see in extract (53) that S. Lu expressed no desire to correct her speech because she did not want to sound like Mainlanders who speak Mandarin with \textit{zìzhèngqiāngyuán}. Although her rate of T4 raising at 36 percent is higher than the average rate of T4 raising in the migrant group at 22.7 percent, the fact that her rate is lower than the average rate of T4 raising in the local Taichung group at 46.4 percent shows that she inevitably lost this vernacular feature to some degree after constantly interacting with Taipei speakers for over a decade.

The lateral [l] realization reveals a different story. As exemplified in Chapter Three and this chapter, Taichung speakers are more able to describe and demonstrate this feature but they may have no control over the feature in their spontaneous speech due to the extent Taiwanese influences their Mandarin speech. The more one’s Taiwanese influences his/her Mandarin, the more likely their [l] realization is resistant to change. We see in previous section Y. Wang consciously tried to speak more standard Mandarin
but failed to avoid the substitution of [l] for the retroflexed variant because his first language was Taiwanese. Another explanation for the great difference in individuals’ realization in their substitution of [l] for (r) is the social meaning of [l]. As I discussed earlier, [l] realization is the influence of Taiwanese on Mandarin and it is also stereotypically considered to be a feature of tâiwan guóyǔ ‘Taiwanese Mandarin.’ While tâiwan guóyǔ comes to index low-class, unrefined disposition, localness, and countryside, speakers who have more control over the feature may consciously reduce the feature to avoid being associated with the indexical values. We see in extract (36) Y. Huang avoided speaking nonstandard variants because she associated nonstandard variants with unrefined disposition. On the other hand, speakers who show positive attitudes toward Taiwanese or their own vernacular speech may regard it unnecessary to change their speech as their speech represents who they are. We see in extract (56) R. Hong preferred the nonstandard variant [l] over the standard retroflexed one because he took pride in being local.

I end this section with detailed descriptions of the linguistic behavior of the two groups. As Table 5.19 and 5.20 show, results of T4 raising display a more systematic pattern in both groups while results of [l] realization suggest a great individual difference in both groups. Moreover, it is interesting that social constraints outrank linguistic constraints in the r/l variation. The social meaning of substitution of [l] for (r) and speakers’ various language backgrounds may explain this lack of systematicity in linguistic constraints.
Table 5.19 Linguistic behavior of local Taichung speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Political orientation</th>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>% of T4 as T1</th>
<th>% of /r/ as [l]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y. Lo</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Lu*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Huang*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ho</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Hsiao</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Chang</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Cheng</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lee</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Chang</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Lai</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Chuang</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Lin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Tsai</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Cheng</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Chou</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ho</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Fu</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Chang*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lin*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Shih</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Speakers were excluded for the analysis of r/l variation
Table 5.20 Linguistic behavior of the migrant speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Political orientation</th>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Years in Tpe</th>
<th>% of T4 as T1</th>
<th>% of (r) as [l]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Ke</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Lo</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Huang*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Liu</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Liu</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lu</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Chuang</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Hsieh</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Chang*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ho</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Lin*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Tian*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Chou</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Hsieh</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tsai</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Wang</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Chuang</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Hong</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lo</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ho</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Speakers were excluded for the analysis of r/l variation

5.5 The impact of macro-level attitudes and ideologies on micro-level patterns of linguistic variation

I have discussed speakers’ attitudes and ideologies in Chapter Four and also detailed the patterns of linguistic variation in this chapter. Now it is time to go back to the question I raised in the introductory chapter: how do the macro-level attitudes and ideologies influence the micro-level linguistic variation?

In Chapter Four, I show that speakers reveal different degrees of awareness of the Taichung accent. Those who stayed in their home region tended to think everyone speaks the same, whereas those who migrated to Taipei were generally more aware of their
vernacular features. As illustrated in Table 5.8, the migrant speakers realized T4 raising at the rate of 22.7 percent, almost half of the rate by the local speakers. The result suggests that the more speakers are aware of their vernacular accents, the more likely they adapt to the standard norm and lose their vernacular features. Moreover, among the migrant speakers, some were aware of the accent but were not able to identify the features while some used or avoided the vernacular features to perform identity work. I take C. Tsai and R. Hong as examples. In Section 4.4, I show that C. Tsai linked T4 raising to localness while R. Hong particularly exaggerated his vernacular features when he wished to construct his local identity in his stylized performance. Because of their different attitudes toward the Taichung accent, R. Hong’s rate of T4 raising is at 34 percent, 12 percent higher than the average rate while C. Tsai’s rate of T4 raising is at 21 percent, slightly lower than the average rate even though he has only lived in Taipei for 4 years (see Table 5.20).

In addition to being more aware of the Taichung accent, the migrant speakers seem to be more able to use the target dialectal features, co-occurring with other linguistic resources such as codeswitching to English and stylization to construct their identities. Codeswitching to English has been considered a characteristic of Taipei ways of speaking. Some migrant speakers codeswitched to English to construct an identity as someone modern and cosmopolitan. As these speakers tended to adopt the Taipei style of speaking, they also gradually lost their local features and sounded more like Taipei people than their home fellows. Take K. Huang as an example, she was one of the 16 migrant speakers who frequently codeswitched in her interview. Additionally, she preferred to go by her English name in our email correspondence and interview. Her codeswitching and
preference in using an English name suggest the cosmopolitan identity she wished to project. Table 5.20 shows that her rate of T4 raising is at 12 percent and her rate of [l] realization is at zero percent. Moreover, her rate of (R), the Beijing retroflexed variant is the highest among all the speakers at 60.3 percent (41 out of 68 tokens of rhotics). Her use of the hyperstandard variant, low rates of vernacular features co-occurring with her codeswitching show that she did not want to be associated with localness. During our interview, she expressed the importance of having global perspective, which Taiwanese students lack. Besides, our interview was conducted two months before she headed for South America as a volunteer for Chinese teaching. Indeed, her linguistic behavior resonates with her thinking and action.

On the other hand, some other migrant speakers codeswitched to English or stylized to emphasize their non-Taipei identities. In Section 4.11, I examine how C. Lo used different linguistic resources to construct his non-Taipei identity. He codeswitched to English and used the standard variants or the hyperstandard variants (19 out of 39 tokens of his rhotics are (R), the Beijing variant) when he stylized Taipei people and then shifted to his normal style with the use of vernacular features to disalign from Taipei people when expressing himself. His style shifting explains his linguistic behavior in Table 5.20. Since he consciously stylized Taipei people, his rate of [l] realization is at 13 percent, lower than the average rate at 26.8 percent. Furthermore, although his rate of T4 raising (30%) is lower than the local Taichung group (46.4%), the fact that his rate is higher than the migrant group (22.7%) and that he playfully shifted styles and used different linguistic resources suggests his wished to construct his identity as non-Taipei and non-local.
Different language attitudes toward non-standard varieties of Mandarin also play a role in linguistic variation. While some speakers’ attitudes conformed to the dominant language ideologies that viewed nonstandard Mandarin as unrefined, others showed a positive attitude toward nonstandard varieties because they linked the vernaculars to local Taiwanese identity. This difference in attitudes is shown in the results of vernacular use by the blue supporters and the green supporters. In terms of the political orientation factor group, green favors both T4 raising and [l] realization. As I have discussed earlier, supporters of the two parties tend to have different language attitudes and their language attitudes indirectly link their pattern of speech with their political ideology. In Section 4.9, I show that the blue supporter L. Hsieh considered speaking nonstandard Mandarin to be unrefined and unclever whereas S. Lu, the green supporter denied the necessity to speak the Taipei norm even though she has lived in Taipei for 14 years. Their difference is reflected in their rates of vernacular use. In Table 5.20, L. Hsieh’s application rates of T4 raising and [l] realization are 10 percent and 7 percent respectively, whereas S. Lu’s rates are 36 percent and 17 percent respectively regardless of her long stay in Taipei.

Finally, dominant gender ideologies seem to have an effect on the pattern of variation in terms of the (r) variable. As discussed earlier, Taiwanese girls are subject to the evaluation of whether they have qìzhí ‘refined disposition’ or not (Su 2008). Indeed, in her recent study, Su (2009) found that females tend to judge the term tāikè/tāi (an adjective deriving from tāikè) more negatively than males do. Since females tend to disalign themselves from tāi because of its negative connotation as local and unrefined, they also tend to avoid Taiwanese-accented Mandarin such as the substitution of [l]
realization for standard (r). Table 5.18 shows that females in both the Taichung and the migrant group disfavor [l] realization while males in both groups favor it.

5.6 Conclusion

The results of T4 raising demonstrate orderly or “structured heterogeneity” (Weinreich et al. 1968: 99) of linguistic variation. Although the migrant group significantly reduced the rate of T4 raising because of prolonged contact with the Taipei norm and different sociopolitical contexts they are situated in, their patterns of variation are systematically constrained by the same linguistic and social factors that constrain the patterns of T4 raising in the local Taichung group. This suggests that regardless of the length of stay in another dialect, the migrant speakers still belong to the same speech community as the local Taichung people. It is true that their linguistic behavior is different from local people, but their use of T4 raising reflects their origin and these shibboleths “may even mark them as distinct from groups they even now identify with” (Tagliamonte & Molfenter 2007: 673).

With regard to the results of (r) variable, I have shown that speakers’ choices between the standard variant (r) and the vernacular [l] are dominantly constrained by social factors rather than linguistic factors and that the migrant speakers’ overall rate of substitution of [l] for (r) is only slightly lower than the rate of the local Taichung group regardless of their contact with the Taipei norm. The results suggest that the social history of the linguistic features and the speakers plays an important role in patterns of linguistic variation. Since the KMT government retreated to Taiwan and started to implement its Mandarin-only policy, the Mandarin spoken in Taiwan has differed considerably from
Beijing Mandarin primarily due to language contact with Taiwanese (Kubler 1985). Meanwhile, the Taiwanese language has also inevitably extended its influences on speakers’ Mandarin speech. The term tāiwān guóyǔ ‘Taiwanese Mandarin’ has emerged to refer to speaking Mandarin with a Taiwanese accent and the substitution of [l] for (r) is one of its features. Due to different family language practice, it seems that the more one’s Taiwanese influences his/her Mandarin, the more likely their [l] realization is resistant to change. On the other hand, during the DPP’s eight-year rule, the party invested largely in promoting local Taiwanese identity and many people begin to show positive attitudes toward localness. Since [l] realization is the influence of Taiwanese on Mandarin and it is also stereotypically considered to be a feature of tāiwān guóyǔ, the results also demonstrate that speakers with more positive attitudes toward local culture and local identities may show less enthusiasm to accommodate to the standard retroflexed variant.

As the title of my paper puts it (Liao 2009), “when regional dialect meets the standard—it’s not just about accommodation.” In this chapter, I have shown that migrant speakers did not simply abandon their native features and accommodate to another dialect. In addition to the constraints of linguistic factors, speakers’ linguistic behavior is also importantly influenced by the macro-level attitudes and ideologies.
6. CONCLUSION

In the introductory chapter, I stated that this dissertation seeks to understand the impact of the macro-level attitudes and ideologies on the social meanings of micro-level linguistic variation in the sociopolitical context of contemporary Taiwan by adopting the recent variationist approach that treats variation as social practice coupled with qualitative inquiry. To understand speakers’ attitudes and ideologies, I have drawn heavily on their voices in topics such as the North/South contrast, the Taichung accent, and language evaluations. I have also analyzed their discursive practices such as codeswitching and style-shifting and stylization and explored how the speakers employed different linguistic resources to construct their identities and how the social meanings of linguistic variables emerged in their discursive practices. Then, drawing on the understanding of the macro picture, I examined the use of two linguistic variables among a group of Taichung people who migrated to Taipei and compared their linguistic behavior with those who stayed in their home region. I found that the migrant speakers did not simply accommodate to Taipei Mandarin, but instead, the macro-level attitudes and ideologies found their way into micro-level linguistic variation. Furthermore, the analyses showed that different status and social meanings of the two linguistic variables also explain how they trigger or fail to trigger accommodation by speakers migrating to Taipei.

I have presented detailed data analyses and discussed the findings in previous chapters. Next, I will return to the research questions that I proposed in the Introductory Chapter to discuss the findings in response to these questions.
6.1 Revisiting the research questions

The two research questions I aim to answer in this dissertation are:

1) What are the constraints on patterns of variation in Taichung Mandarin? That is, how is linguistic behavior conditioned by internal linguistic constraints and external factors such as gender, age, political affiliation, length of stay in Taipei, and interview type?

The whole Chapter 5 analyzes and discusses the constraints on patterns of variation in Taichung Mandarin. As the factor weights in Table 5.8 and 5.18 demonstrate, choices between different linguistic variables by both the local Taichung group and the migrant group show “structured heterogeneity” (Weinreich et al. 1968:99-100). In general, both groups are constrained by the same linguistic factors in their patterns of tonal and r/l variation. For example, T4 raising is more likely to happen when the token of T4 occurs in the final utterance position, functions as a discourse marker, is preceded by T3 or when the speakers are engaged in casual conversation. Similarly, [l] realization is more likely to happen in casual conversation than in passage reading. As for external factors, although some factor groups do not display significant effects on the patterns of variation in the local Taichung group, the factor groups that have an effect on variation in both the Taichung and the migrant groups do show the same order of constraint ranking. For example, students are more likely to raise their T4 than working professionals and group interviews seem to favor T4 raising compared with one-on-one interviews. As for r/l variation, male speakers make greater use of [l] than female speakers, older speakers are
more likely to substitute /r/ for [l] than younger speakers, those who are affiliated with the green party tend to possess more [l] realization than those who are oriented toward the blue party, and one-on-one interviews seem to encourage the vernacular [l] than group interviews.

The summary of the findings looks simple and clear. However, as I have discussed in Chapter 5, there is no simple answer to explain these patterns of variation. I have argued that “coming from the same community Taichung” does not explain why these speakers behave certain ways. For instance, both T4 raising and [l] realization are vernacular features of the Taichung accent, but the reason “growing up in Taichung” itself alone definitely cannot explain why younger speakers tend to favor T4 raising whereas older speakers seem to possess vernacular [l] more. Similarly, as I have shown in Chapter 5, the reason “migrating to Taipei” alone cannot explain the linguistic behavior of the migrant speakers. One example is that the longer the migrant speakers stay in Taipei the more they lose their T4 raising; however, their length of stay in Taipei is not positively correlated with their loss of the vernacular [l]. Next, I turn to Research Question 2 to discuss other important factors that need to be considered for the patterns of variation in Taichung Mandarin.

2) How are macro-level attitudes and ideologies related to micro-level patterns of linguistic variation? That is, what are the relationships among identity, ideologies, linguistic practice, and speakers’ understanding of the social meanings of different linguistic variables?
Chapter 4 demonstrates that although the speakers all grew up in Taichung, their situated sociopolitical contexts, family language practices, social network and interpretations of dominant ideologies all play an important role in shaping their identities, language attitudes and ideologies. Those who migrated to Taipei might have different experiences of the so-called “big Taipei-ism” ideology which those who stayed in the home region do not experience and the experiences might influence how they construct their identities and to what extent they are willing to accommodate to Taipei Mandarin. Similarly, those whose family emphasizes Mandarin education at home would form different language attitudes toward vernacular features from those whose parents encourage Taiwanese education. Also, those who mainly interact with their Taichung peers might be less aware of the Taichung accent and therefore they tend not to have a negative attitude toward their vernacular use of Mandarin. Finally, those who agree with dominant language ideologies and gender ideologies might view vernaculars as unrefined whereas those who reject the dominant ideologies might consider speaking vernaculars to be constructing their local identities.

Chapter 5 shows that these speakers’ patterns for T4 raising and r/l variation reflect how their varied identities and ideologies form their different understandings of the social meanings of linguistic variables. Section 5.4 discusses the roles the social meanings of T4 raising and the vernacular [l] realization play in patterns of variation and section 5.5 addresses how macro-level attitudes and ideologies impact micro-level patterns of linguistic variation, which I will not reiterate here. To sum up, in addition to the internal linguistic factors that constrain patterns of variation, how these Taichung people speak the way they speak now needs to be understood in relation to their identities, ideologies,
linguistic practice, and understanding of the social meanings of different linguistic variables.

6.2 Significance of the dissertation

Sociolinguistic research in varieties of Mandarin, especially Taiwan Mandarin, is still very limited. As far as I know, this study is the first detailed sociolinguistic study of Taiwan Mandarin based on quantitative and qualitative analyses of the data. This dissertation is significant in several ways.

First, the study is an innovative attempt to examine the impact of macro-level structure such as attitudes, ideologies, and sociopolitical contexts on language variation and dialect acquisition. Taiwan is an island with a complex cultural and political history. Therefore, why some speakers use more regional linguistic features than others do and why some migrants accommodate more to a dialect different from their own than others do should be understood in Taiwan’s historically political context. As I demonstrated in my earlier study, in the context of drastic political change, new indexicality and language ideology may emerge (Liao, 2008). By integrating macro-level structure into sociolinguistic patterns, this study provides a more comprehensive account of language variation and dialect acquisition.

Second, the study contributes to the field of language variation in Taiwan by challenging the traditional variationist work in Taiwan. Nearly all the previous studies of variation in Taiwan Mandarin fall under the rubric of the ‘first wave’ (Eckert 2005) of variation studies, attempting to establish correlations between phonological variables and
predetermined social categories. In contrast, this study, drawing on Eckert’s ‘third wave’ of variation research that “seeks meanings that motivate particular variable performance” (30), sees variation as a resource in the construction of identities through social practice. Rather than treating the focal Taichung speakers as a homogeneous group who share the same social identity, I analyze how their different identities, attitudes and ideologies interact with their selection of linguistic resources. More broadly, as linguistic research on identity and style has become central within sociolinguistics, this dissertation provides the field of sociolinguistic variation a new setting to examine how linguistic resources such as varieties of Mandarin, Taiwanese, codeswitching to Taiwanese or English from Mandarin are associated with different social meanings and how speakers use the resources to construct different styles and identities in a broader context of sociopolitical change.

Moreover, Taichung has a special border-town status, in which identity construction is more fluid than in other northern or southern areas. However, the voice in the border is usually unheard and unresearched. As I discuss in section 4.2, scholarly work and media discourses pay most attention on North/South discourses and central Taiwan is usually left out or combined with the South as ‘zhong nan bu’ in the two-way dichotomy of North vs. Central and South. I have demonstrated in the study that many Taichung speakers claimed their Taichung identity and expressed how they resist being labeled as southerners in the north/south discourse and how different they are from northerners or southerners. It is clear that this underrepresented group has its own voice and serves as an ideal site for research. The findings of the study broaden our understanding of voice in
the border that is generally ignored when the contesting ideologies between the north and the south are so drastic.

In addition, this dissertation is significant for educators and researchers in the field of Chinese studies in two ways. First, the study provides a detailed understanding of how different linguistic features are associated with different social meanings. Rather than introducing one standard Mandarin to students, educators should be aware of different varieties of Mandarin and recognize the social meanings behind them. Second, this study analyzes linguistic practices at the micro level and language attitudes and ideologies at the current macro sociopolitical level in Taiwan. It offers researchers a more complete picture of contemporary Taiwan: its language, people and politics.

Finally, new directions in sociolinguistic research have come to analyze the social meaning of linguistic variables in local discourse contexts because “it is in interaction that these recourses gain social meaning” (Bucholtz and Hall 2005:586). The discourse analytic approaches employed in Chapter 4 allow me to examine how social meanings of linguistic features emerge in discursive practices. The qualitative findings in Chapter 4 add our understanding to the patterns of variation in addition to quantitative analyses using Varbrul methodology in Chapter 5. Combining quantitative rigor and qualitative methods, this dissertation contributes to a broader understanding of identity and language use. After all, language use, in all its complexity, cannot be understood within one single analysis.
6.3 Future directions

In the context of globalization, sociolinguists have been paying increasing attention to the people on the edge of social networks and focusing on heterogeneity and adaptiveness in addition to commonality and predictability (Johnstone 2004). Additionally, variationist sociolinguists have returned to the roots of the discipline (Labov 1963) and are again using techniques of qualitative analysis to find out how variation comes to happen in any particular case. However, this line of research is still very limited in the Chinese context. This dissertation focuses on two linguistic features of the Taichung accent, other commonly discussed features of the Taichung accent such as merger of T2 and T3 and heh-ah, the Taiwanese discourse marker, are both worth exploring to have a more thorough sociolinguistic picture of central Taiwan.

Furthermore, this study examines and compares the linguistic behavior of those who stayed in the home dialect area and those who migrated to the standard dialect area, it would be interesting to examine the people who migrate from the standard dialect area such as Taipei to a regional dialect area and explore their adaptiveness in the local community and their understanding of the local features.

Additionally, as China becomes one of the leading economic nations in the world, more and more Taiwanese people relocate to China for business purposes. In the context of the rapid globalization of Mainland China and Chinese diaspora, the linguistic behavior of the Taiwanese migrants and their identity construction in cities such as Beijing or Shanghai is worth exploring. Zhang’s (2005) study of Chinese yuppies in Beijing shows that those who worked in the international business sector tended to use
the full tone, a feature of Taiwan Mandarin, as a resource of constructing a new, cosmopolitan persona. It would be interesting to examine whether Taiwanese businessmen have similar or different linguistic behavior from the Beijing yuppies, to what extent Taiwanese speakers accommodate to the local dialect or maintain their native dialect, and what linguistic resources they employ to construct their identities in China.

Finally, while this dissertation combines both qualitative and quantitative methods to explore the linguistic behavior of the people on the edge of social networks (i.e. migrating from home region to another dialect area), the data were primarily collected through traditional sociolinguistic interviews. A more comprehensive study of language use in various situations such as natural-occurring conversation at work, between friends, or in different dialect areas can be conducted to examine their active use of different linguistic features and resources. With the data gathered from sociolinguistic interviews that provide information about how speakers think of their linguistic behavior, attitudes and identities, studies that incorporate natural-occurring data allow researchers to explore what makes variation meaningful to speakers. As Eckert (2000:1) suggests, “Ultimately, the social life of variation lies in the variety of individual’s ways of participating in their communities—their ways of fitting in, and of making their mark—their ways of constructing meaning in their own lives.”
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APPENDIX 1
Interview Schedule

- 語言
  - 你覺得各地講國語/中文腔調有不一樣嗎？
  - 你聽得出任何地方的腔調嗎？
  - 你覺得台北人和台中人腔調一樣嗎？
    （受訪者若提到『台中腔』）
  - 台中腔的特色是什麼？
  - 聽得出台中腔嗎？
  - 有被說過自己講話有腔調嗎？
    （若回答有）
  - 聽到別人說自己有台中腔時有什麼感覺？
  - 會想要改變自己的腔調嗎？你覺得你的口音有在改變嗎？
  - 家裡的語言習慣是什麼？跟父母？跟爺爺奶奶？跟兄弟姊妹？
  - 日常生活的語言習慣？跟朋友/同事？老師/上司/客戶？
  - 覺得自己的台語程度怎樣？
  - 什麼場合會使用台語？
  - 覺得自己英文程度怎樣？
  - 什麼場合會使用英文？
  - 你覺得各地的語言習慣有不一樣嗎？為什麼？
  - 你覺得各地台語程度有不一樣嗎？為什麼？
○ 有在街上聽到有人講英文嗎？什麼情況？

○ 台語和英語哪個比較重要？

○ 接下來我要請你聽四個人講話，之後我會問你一些問題，像是，他可能是哪裡人？哪個族群的？有沒有什麼口音？中文/國語講得怎樣？教育程度大概怎樣？覺得他台語程度怎樣？覺得他英文程度怎樣？你對這個人還有其他想法嗎？

○ 你覺得我是哪裡人？我講話有什麼口音或特色嗎？

● 政治

○ 你為什麼會支持藍/綠？

○ 家人會影響你的政治傾向嗎？

○ 台灣有藍綠對抗嗎？

○ 有的話，台中偏那個顏色

○ 你覺得哪些人比較傾向支持藍？哪些人比較傾向支持綠？

○ 藍綠有不同語言習慣嗎？

○ 你覺得台灣有分南北嗎？

○ 如果有分的話，台中在南北對抗的角色是什麼？

○ 台灣有族群對立嗎？有例子嗎？

○ 你覺得不同族群有不同政治傾向嗎？

○ 接下來我會給你幾個選項，你可以單選也可以複選，就選自己比較認同的選項。我覺得我是台灣人、中國人、閩南人、客家人、原住民、本省人、外省人。你覺得你比較認同哪一個或哪些？
• Language

  o Do you think people in different regions have different accents in Mandarin?
  o Are you able to tell any accents from any regions?
  o Do you think Taipei people and Taichung people speak the same?
    (If the participants mention “the Taichung accent”)
  o What are the features/characteristics of the Taichung accent?
  o Are you able to tell the Taichung accent?
  o Have people ever told you that you have an accent?
    (If the answer is yes)
  o How did you feel when people said you have a Taichung accent?
  o Do you want to change your accent? Do you think your accent is changing?
  o What languages do you use at home? With parents? With grandparents?
    With siblings?
  o What languages do you use in daily life? With friends/colleagues? With teachers/bosses/clients?
  o How do you think of your Taiwanese proficiency level?
  o In what occasions do you use Taiwanese?
  o How do you think of your English proficiency level?
  o In what occasions do you use English?
  o Do you think people have different language choices in different regions?
    Why?
- Do you think people have different Taiwanese proficiency level in different regions? Why?
- Have you ever heard people speak English on the street? In what situations?
- Taiwanese and English, which language is more important?
- Now I would like you to listen to four speech samples. I will ask you some questions after each sample. For example, where is the person from? What ethnicity? Does the person have an accent? How is the person’s Mandarin? How is the person’s educational level? How do you think of the person’s Taiwanese from listening to his/her Mandarin? How do you think of the person’s English from listening to his/her Mandarin? Do you have any other comments about this person?
- Where do you think I am from? Do I have any accent or characteristics when I speak?

- Politics
  - Why do you support blue/green?
  - Do you think your family influences your political orientation?
  - Do you think there are contentions/battles between blue and green?
  - If yes, which color do you think Taichung should be labeled as?
  - What kind of people tend to support blue? What kind of people tend to support green?
  - Do you think the blue party and the green party have different language choices?
  - Do you think Taiwan is divided into the South and the North?
o If yes, what is the role of Taichung in the south/north division?

o Are there ethnic conflicts in Taiwan? Any examples?

o Do you think different ethnic groups have different political orientations?

o Now I am going to give you multiple choices, you can choose one or more than one. Just choose the ones you identify with more. I think I am Taiwanese, Chinese, Southern Min, Hakka, aborigine, home-province, or Mainlander. Which one/ones do you identify with?
大地震满八週年了，真的是好快喔。那天的情景，至今仍然是每一幕都
令人难忘。我记得那一天我被隔壁邻居的噪音吵，忍受到1點才上床，上床前我
还想说，希望明天不要睡眠不足而迟到，结果还没睡熟，棉被还没开始热，地震
就来了。那时地震来的很猛烈，摇晃到我从床上跌了下來。先突然停電，然後我
听到水管破裂的聲音，然後，所有家具突然都倒了，地上全都是水。看情形不对，
我和室友就匆匆的往外面跑，很多人也都跑到外面了，大家都急著搜尋有收訊
的地方，要打手機报平安，但是竟然只有一個人的手機可以通。我急得像熱鍋上的
螞蟻，结果连续打了两个多小时才联络到台北的家人。地震那晚，大家对那个地
震都還心有餘悸，又怕有餘震，根本没有人敢待在室内，全部的人都在户外站了好幾小時，
到了天亮時才陸續回家睡觉。我一開始以为只有我們這边有地震，後
來看新聞才知道原来事態嚴重，921是台灣近十幾年來最大的天然災害，災區損
失惨重，繁忙的街道一夕间成了废墟，让不少人因此无家可歸。若問從小至今最
深刻的濒死经验，我想非921地震莫屬吧。那时的感觉，讓一向很容易入睡的我，
好幾個月無法安稳入睡。

It has been eight years since the 921 earthquake. Time really flies. What happened on
that day, is still very unforgettable till now. I remember that day I was disturbed by the
noise from the next-door neighbor. I tolerated until 1 AM before I went to bed. Before
going to bed I was thinking, ‘hope I won’t be late because of my lack of sleep.” However,
the earthquake came before I had fallen asleep or warmed my bed. The earthquake was
very violent then, I fell from the bed because of the shaking. First came the sudden black-
out, then I heard the water pipe was broken. Then all the furniture fell down. Water was
all over the floor. Thinking that something went wrong, my roommate and I ran outside
hurriedly. Many people also ran outwards. Everyone was anxious to find reception on
their phone, wanting to call to tell we were safe. But only one person’s cell phone had
reception. I was so fidgeting because of my deep worry. So I continued to try to call for
two hours before I finally reached my family in Taipei. The night of the earthquake,
everyone still had a lingering fear, and was also afraid of possible aftershock, no one
dared to stay indoors. Everyone stood outside for few hours. It was until sunrise that
people started going home to sleep. At first I thought the earthquake was only in our area,
and then I realized how serious it was after I read the news. The 921 earthquake was the
biggest natural disaster in the past decades. The disaster areas damaged a lot, and many
busy streets became ruins in one night. Many people even became homeless. If I were to
ask the most near-death experience, I think it must be the 921 earthquake. The feeling at
that moment made a heavy sleeper like me have hard time falling into sleep for several
months.

**Boldface**: Retroflex phoneme

□ : T4