9-2016

Talk Shows and Language Attitudes: A Sociolinguistic Investigation of Language Attitudes Towards Taiwan Mandarin Among Chinese Mainlanders

Chun-Yi Peng

The Graduate Center, City University of New York

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!
Follow this and additional works at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds

Part of the Anthropological Linguistics and Sociolinguistics Commons, and the Chinese Studies Commons

Recommended Citation
https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/1510

This Dissertation is brought to you by CUNY Academic Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of CUNY Academic Works. For more information, please contact deposit@gc.cuny.edu.
TALK SHOWS AND LANGUAGE ATTITUDES:
A SOCIOLINGUISTIC INVESTIGATION OF LANGUAGE ATTITUDES TOWARDS TAIWAN MANDARIN AMONG CHINESE MAINLANDERS

By

CHUN-YI PENG

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Center Faculty in Linguistics in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

2016
This manuscript has been read and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in Linguistics in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Cecelia Cutler

Date

Chair of the Examining Committee

Dr. Gita Martohardjono

Date

Executive Officer

Dr. William Haddican
Dr. Michael Newman
Dr. Qing Zhang

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
ABSTRACT

Talk Shows and Language Attitudes:

A Sociolinguistic Investigation of Language Attitudes towards Taiwan Mandarin Among Chinese Mainlanders

By

Chun-Yi Peng

Advisor: Professor Cecelia Cutler

This dissertation looks at the effects of media exposure and language ideologies on Mandarin speakers’ acceptability judgments. Although there is a long-standing tradition against citing media exposure as a source of language variation, I show that 1) media exposure to a non-local perceptually salient variant can make people more likely to rate non-local linguistic features as grammatically acceptable, and 2) media exposure shapes people’s language attitudes—a new alignment of attitudes is emerging among the millennials on the mainland.

Data were collected through an online survey consisting of grammaticality judgments, matched-guise tasks, open-ended attitudinal questions, and demographic questions. The data show that the social prestige of Taiwan Mandarin (TM) may be waning, which can be ascribed in part to 1) social and economic changes on the mainland, and 2) the change of TM itself. Deviating from Mainland Standard Mandarin, TM is perceived by many millennials on the mainland as gentle, pretentious and emasculated, which embodies the dynamics of language ideologies: they vary both diachronically and synchronically.
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Preface

Growing up speaking Mandarin on an island roughly the size of Maryland, I had no idea how diverse Mandarin could be until my senior year in college. During that year, I studied abroad in Australia where, for the first time, I encountered speakers of other Mandarin varieties, and the contrast between my own speech and theirs allowed me to perceive these features as variables. One of the most salient features that I noticed was the preverbal placement of the *gei*-phrase in the prepositional path construction (see 1a). Many of my friends from northern China tend to use the *gei*-phrase preverbally, whereas I often use it postverbally. It sounded odd to me at that time because I had never heard of people from my generation using the *gei*-phrase preverbally, but I would not be surprised if my grandparents—who are from Mainland China—used that variant. Meanwhile, I was also told by a few students from China that I sounded like the guy on TV. I did not fully understand what it means to be ‘the guy on TV’, but I came to realize that what is ‘standard’ to me may carry different social meanings for people in another social context. My initial fascination did not fade away with time. Instead, it evolved into my master’s thesis project and then this dissertation.

(1) a. 我 等一下 给 你 打 电话 (Preverbal)
    Wo dengyixia [gei ni] da dianhua
    *I later to you make phone call
    ‘I will give you a call later.’

    b. 我 等一下 打 电话 给 你 (Postverbal)
    wo dengyixia da dianhua [gei ni]
    *I later make phone call to you
    ‘I will give you a call later.’
Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1. Research questions

The goal of this dissertation is to examine the effects of televised media on speakers’ perceptual preference for syntactic variables. I look in particular at whether exposure to Taiwanese TV programs might influence “standard” Mandarin speakers’ acceptability judgments of sentences containing these syntactic variables: the postverbal *gei*-phrase (see example 1) and completer marker *you* (see example 2). These two variables are often associated with southern varieties of Mandarin and considered ‘non-standard’ by (standard) northern Mandarin speakers.

In one of my previous studies, with a survey of 30 participants from different areas of China with different dialects, I found that at the production level, the placement of the *gei*-phrase is regionally conditioned (Peng, 2011). Northern Mandarin speakers prefer the preverbal over the postverbal *gei*-phrase, which is consistent with the placement in their home vernacular: northern vernaculars allow only for the preverbal variant. Speakers of the southern dialects (e.g. Min, Yue and Hakka) favor the postverbal variant for the same reason that southern dialects allow for only the postverbal *gei*-phrase. At the perception level, however, the two variants are usually judged to be equally acceptable, and the postverbal variant does not seem to stand out to the Northerners as a “southern variant” because many northern dialects also allow for this intra-speaker variation in their grammar.
The use of the Chinese aspectual morpheme *you* (marking completion) is another contact-induced variable commonly found in many southern Chinese dialects such as Wu (e.g. Shanghainese), Hakka, Min and Yue, and is also often used in Mandarin by speakers of these dialects (see (2a). However, the aspectual morpheme *you* is often exclusively associated by Northern Mandarin speakers with Taiwan Mandarin\(^1\) even though it is also widely used by other Southern Mandarin speakers on the mainland. Peng (2014) shows that northern Mandarin speakers prefer sentences without aspectual *you* (as in 2b), as opposed to *gei*-phrases where no preference is given to either the pre- or the postverbal variant. Although the post-verbal *gei*-phrases and the aspectual *you* are both contact-induced variables commonly observed in many southern varieties of Mandarin, they are perceived very differently by northern Mandarin speakers in terms of their acceptability and indexical meanings. The use of the aspectual *you* is often associated exclusively with Taiwan Mandarin (TM) whereas the postverbal *gei*-phrase either does not have a regional

---

\(^1\) In previous literature, Taiwan Mandarin (a.k.a. *guoyu*) is a term conventionally used to refer to the mainstream Mandarin variety spoken in Taiwan. Taiwanese Mandarin or Taiwanese accented Mandarin usually refers to the Mandarin varieties spoken with noticeable Taiwanese influence. This is stereotypically associated with members of older generations and less educated rural residents (Su, 2008).
association or is associated with southern speech in general. Such a disparity led me to explore what social factors contribute to the perceptual and indexical differences.

(2) a. 我 有 看 过 这 部 电 影   (Taiwan Mandarin)

    wo you kan guo zhe bu dianying
    I ASP see-ASP this-CL movie
    ‘I have seen this movie.’

b. 我 看 过 这 部 电 影   (Northern Mandarin)

    wo kan guo zhe bu dianying
    I see-ASP this-CL movie
    ‘I have seen this movie.’

Zhang (2005)’s seminal study on the Chinese yuppies in Beijing says a lot about the existing ideologies that northern Mandarin speakers have toward overseas Chinese varieties. She found that young professionals working for international companies in Beijing adopted non-local features (i.e. features from the Mandarin varieties spoken in Taiwan and Hong Kong) to project a cosmopolitan identity, which suggests that non-local features can, in fact, acquire new social meanings outside of their local context. Inspired in part by her findings, this dissertation delves into the question whether Northern Mandarin speakers’ attitudes toward TM have an effect on their acceptability judgments of these two variables.

The discussion of northern Mandarin speakers’ ideologies about overseas Mandarin varieties are entangled with their television viewing habits, as this is generally how speakers are exposed to overseas varieties. As much as the effects of televised media on language variation have been discounted in the literature of variationist sociolinguistics, it is clear that televised media has played a role in the formation of
ideology about overseas Mandarin varieties among Mainland Chinese since the 1970s, when cultural products (e.g. movies, TV programs, and novels) from Hong Kong and Taiwan began to seize the attention of the younger generation and present a cosmopolitan lifestyle to their audience (Zhang 2005). In my previous studies (Peng, 2011; 2014), media exposure emerged as a significant factor in accounting for the acceptability judgment results for the aspectual *you*.

Therefore, this dissertation aims to answer the following three questions: 1) Does televised media have an impact on speakers’ grammaticality judgments? 2) In addition to media exposure, do language attitudes play a role in the acceptability of second dialect forms? 3) What are the emerging social meanings of the two target syntactic variables?

The dissertation is organized as follows:

Chapter 1 introduces the major research questions and define the linguistic variables, as well as the reasons for choosing those two syntactic variables. My previous studies (Peng 2011) show that at the production level, the placement of the *gei*-phrase is regionally conditioned: the preverbal *gei*-phrase is predominantly used in the north, but moving down south, its dominance decreases and the postverbal *gei*-phrase appears as the dominant variant when it comes to the southernmost dialect areas (i.e. Min, Yue and Hakka). Such results prompt me to ask whether there are other syntactic variables that are similarly distributed, and aspectual *you* emerges as one of those variables.

Chapter 2 attempts to provide a historical account of how and why the *gei*-phrase is distributed the way it is. I review the sociolinguistic background of Chinese, as well as different varieties of Mandarin as linguistic outcomes of contact between local vernaculars and Mandarin. I explain how immigration from the north brought the old
colloquial Chinese to the south, and therefore the southern dialects today preserve more old features—including the postverbal *gei*-phrase—than their northern counterparts. Although at the production level, the geographical distribution of these two variables is clear, what determines the perception of these two variables remains unknown. Therefore, I turned to other social factors to account for the acceptability of these two variables.

Exposure to televised media, together with language attitudes, emerge as a significant predictor of MSM speakers’ acceptability of aspectual you and postverbal *gei*-phrase. Therefore, chapter 3 reviews recent literature on language ideologies, which are the beliefs and understandings that people have about the contextualized sociolinguistic value of a language. I use TM as an example to show the divergence of Mandarin and discuss the ideologies people have about this particular variety, as well as how people acquired such ideologies through televised media, and the role of media in language variation.

Debunking the myths about media and language, chapter 4 reviews the literature on the effects of media exposure, arguing that media exposure in fact can have an effect on individuals’ acceptability judgments. I look at the vicissitude of Taiwanese TV programs in mainland China how TM became a stylistic source for Chinese Mainlanders to index a different identity (see also Zhang 2005). Chapter 5 outlines the methodology, followed by data analysis (chapter 6) as well as results and discussion (chapter 7).
1.2. Defining the variables

1.2.1. Gei-phrase in the Path Construction

It is important to bear in mind that not all gei-phrases oscillate between the pre- and postverbal positions since there are various kinds of gei-phrases (see 3a and b). Thus, the goal of this section is to identify what type of gei-phrase allows for such internal syntactic variation. I will first present a brief overview of the grammatical functions of the gei-phrase and then narrow down to the target variable, which is the gei-phrase in the prepositional path construction.

In pedagogical grammar, the preverbal use of gei-phrases has usually been deemed as ‘standard’ by many Chinese teachers as most prepositional phrases appear preverbally in Beijing Mandarin. In terms of its argument structure, the preverbal gei is usually analyzed as a preposition that takes a beneficiary (Zhu, 1983). On the other hand, the syntactic nature of the postverbal gei-phrase has been analyzed from various perspectives, such as prepositional datives (e.g. Zhu, 1983; Her, 2006), serial verb constructions (e.g. Huang and Ahrens, 1999), and applicatives (e.g. Paul and Whitman, 2010). It is in part due to the fact that most of the prepositions in modern Mandarin are grammaticalized from verbs and, therefore, the line between verbs and prepositions has not always been entirely clear. Semantically, while the preverbal gei usually takes a beneficiary, the postverbal gei takes a recipient. Therefore, gei-phrases’ variability between the pre- and postverbal positions is highly contingent on the semantics of the verb.

---

2 Or ‘postobject’ in Her 2006.
(preverbal)

wo gei ni jie ben shu
I to you borrow CL book
‘I checked out a book (from the library) for you’

b. 我借本书给你
wo jie ben shu gei ni
I lend CL book to you
‘I lend you a book.’

Table 1 The categorization of Mandarin verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb types</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Double object</th>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. gei-obligatory verbs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[gei-IO-V-DO] [V-IO gei-DO] [V-gei-DO -IO]</td>
<td>dai (bring), xie (write), na (take), reng (toss), ti (kick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. gei-forbidden verbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>[V-IO-DO]</td>
<td>gao su (tell), wen (ask), hui da (answer), daying (promise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. gei-optional verb</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>[V-IO-DO] [V-IO gei-DO] [V-gei-DO -IO] [gei-IO-V-DO]³</td>
<td>Song (send), Gei (give), fu (pay), jie (lend), huan (return), fen (share)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 1, Chinese verbs can be categorized by the way they take complements (Lin, 2009): (a) verbs that obligatorily take the particle gei (i.e. the dative construction), (b) verbs that cannot take the particle gei (i.e. ditransitive), (c) verbs that optionally use the particle gei, and (d) non-ditransitive verbs. According to Lin (2009), gei-obligatory verbs are verbs that do not convey the meaning of transaction or transfer of possession to another party, such as xie (to write), na (to take), and dai (to bring). In Mandarin, these verbs usually do not require animate objects and the gei construction is

³ This will yield a benefactive reading, rather than a recipient reading.
necessary only if an animate object is involved (as in (3)). This type of verb usually allows for the pre- and postverbal oscillation of the gei-phrase and is thus the focus of this study.

(3) 他 写 了 一 封 信 给 我  

\[ ta \ \text{xié} \ \text{le} \ \text{yi} \ \text{fēng} \ \text{xīn} \ \text{gei} \ \text{wǒ} \]  
‘He wrote a letter to me.’

The second type is the gei-forbidden verbs (see (4)). These verbs cannot occur simultaneously with the preposition gei because they inherently embody the meaning of transfer and always take an indirect object without gei. Examples of verbs of this type are gaosu\(^4\) (to tell), huida (to answer), and daying (to promise). The third type is the gei-optional verbs as in (5). They can appear either with or without the preposition gei. Examples are song (to send), fu (to pay), and huan (to return). The fourth type is the verbs that do not allow a second object by any means, and it is therefore irrelevant to the discussion of this study.

(4) 他 告诉 我 一 个 秘密  (gei-forbidden verb)  

\[ ta \ \text{gaosu} \ \text{wo} \ \text{yi} \ \text{ge} \ \text{mimi} \]  
‘He told me a secret.’

\(^4\) The verb ‘gaosu’ (to tell) requires a personal object. Unlike English, where ‘tell’ can occur without a personal object as in ‘I tell a story’, Mandarin requires a personal object for the verb ‘gaosu’ (to tell). For example,  

\[ wo \ \text{gaosu} \ \text{ni} \ \text{yi} \ \text{ge} \ \text{gushi} \]  
‘I tell you one-CL story’
Of all four types of verbs, only the *gei*-obligatory type (type 1 in Table 1) allows for both pre- and postverbal placements of the *gei*-phrase. The other three types of verbs do not allow for such oscillation. Hence, the proposed study will focus only on verbs that require *gei*. These are usually verbs with which the semantic roles of benefactive and this type of verb allows for the pre- and postverbal oscillation of the *gei*-phrases. The goal of this dissertation is to examine if televised media, together with language attitudes, can be a factor in northern Mandarin speakers’ acceptance of the postverbal variant when their natural preference would be for the preverbal variant.

1.2.2. Aspectual *you*

Another syntactic variable often associated with Taiwan Mandarin is the use of the morpheme *you* as an aspect marker. In Taiwan Mandarin, *you* marks the perfective aspect, or completion of an action. Such a syntactic feature can be attributed to the substratum influence from Southern Min (a.k.a. Taiwanese) because many southern Chinese dialects (e.g. Min, Hakka, Yue) also allow for the use of *you* as a perfective aspect marker (Kubler, 1981). As shown in (6a), in Taiwan Mandarin, the morpheme *you* appears before a verb, marking the perfective aspect of the verb. Northern dialects, on the other hand, do not allow the use of morpheme *you* as an aspectual marker because in (6b), for example, the morpheme *guo* already marks the aspect of the verb.
(6) a. 我 有 看 过 这 部 电 影
    wo you kan guo zhe bu dianying
    I ASP see-ASP this-CL movie
    ‘I have seen this movie.’

     b. 我 看 过 这 部 电 影
    wo kan guo zhe bu dianying
    I see-ASP this-CL movie
    ‘I have seen this movie.’

In many southern varieties of Mandarin where aspectual \textit{you} is allowed, the aspectual \textit{you} can also be used to form a yes-no question with the A-not-A\(^5\) structure where A is usually a verb (e.g. (7b)) or an adjective in a regular yes-no-question. Again, as in affirmatives, all (7a-c) are natural to many speakers of southern Mandarin varieties, but (b) and (c) are more commonly observed among northern standard Mandarin speakers. As I will later reiterate in Chapter 5, the grammaticality judgment task will include the aspectual \textit{you} both in declarative and interrogative sentences.

(7) a. 你 有 没 有 吃 过 晚 饭
    ni you mei you chi guo wan fan
    you ASP-not-ASP eat ASP dinner
    ‘Have you eaten dinner yet?’

     b. 你 吃 没 吃 过 晚 饭
    ni chi mei chi guo wan fan
    you eat-not-eat ASP dinner
    ‘Have you eaten dinner yet?’

     c. 你 吃 过 晚 饭 没 有
    ni chi guo wan fan mei you
    you eat-ASP dinner not-ASP
    ‘Have you eaten dinner yet?’

\(^5\) A-not-A is one of the most common structures for yes-no questions in Mandarin where A is usually a verb or an adjective.
Cheng (1985) argues that you marks the simple past in Taiwan Mandarin. According to Cheng, in Taiwan Mandarin, you marks the past tense (8). In other words, TM makes the distinction between the simple past and perfective whereas in Beijing distinction has been neutralized (see 10). As to whether Chinese is a tensed or tenseless language is still often contested, it is not entirely clear if the morpheme you is a tense marker instead of an aspect marker. But what is clear is that the equivalents of aspectual you exist in many southern vernaculars, such as Hakka, Min and Yue, and as a result, Mandarin speakers from those dialect areas often use the aspectual you in their varieties of Mandarin. To test out substratum effect, the next section presents a pilot study of the perception and production of the pre- and postverbal gei-phrases with 30 participants from different dialect regions in China.

(8) Simple past

a. 牛肉 你 吃 了 没 有 (Beijing Mandarin)
   niurou ni chi le mei you
   beef you eat-ASP not-have

b. 牛肉 你 有 没 有 吃 (Taiwan Mandarin)
   niurou ni you mei you chi
   beef you have-to-have eat
   ‘Did you eat the beef?’

---

6 The ‘A-not-A’ construction is a commonly used structure for yes-no questions in Mandarin where A usually represents an adjectives or verb.
(9) Perfective

a. 牛肉 你 吃 了 没 有  (Beijing Mandarin)
   niurou ni chi le mei you  
   beef you eat-ASP not-have

b. 牛肉 你 吃 了 没 有  (Taiwan Mandarin)
   niurou ni chi le mei you  
   beef you eat-ASP not-have
   ‘Have you eaten the beef?’

1.3. Pilot study I

In support of the claim about the substratum influence, empirical data were collected through a survey (see Appendix I), which consisted of and was conducted in the order of the following sections: elicitation task, grammatical judgment test, and demographic questions. The elicitation task was geared to elicit the actual production of the target variants. The elicitation task was conducted in Mandarin, in the form of one-on-one, face-to-face interviews. There were 11 target sentences and 11 filler sentences as well as 2 picture description questions. This section was designed to elicit the following transitive verbs that are commonly used with the target gei-phrase: na (to take), zhun bei (to prepare), da dian hua (to call), ji (to send), dao (to pour), fa (to send), song (to take, to bring), dai (to bring), mai (to buy). In order to collect enough target variants for later analysis, a valid sample has to contain at least 5 target variants, including post- or preverbal gei-phrases. If an informant failed to produce at least 7 target variants, the sample would be seen as invalid and the informant would not be qualified for the remaining tasks. Thirty valid samples were collected out of 33 participants from different dialect areas of China. They were undergraduate and graduate Chinese students at Michigan State University. There were 6 TM speakers and 24 Mainland Mandarin
speakers. For the mainland Mandarin speakers, 8 were from the Northern dialect area, 8 from the Southern dialect area and 8 from the Southwest dialect area (Sichuan, Yunnan, and Guizhou province). The ratio of males to females in each subgroup is 1:1. All subjects were required to have received formal education in their regions of origin at least to the age of 16 in order to ensure that they had acquired idiomatic use of the Mandarin variety of their area.

Upon the completion of the elicitation task, participants proceeded to the acceptability judgment test, which aimed to elicit speakers’ judgments of sentences with pre- or postverbal *gei*-phrases. In the acceptability judgment test, the informants were asked to rate the written sentences on a scantron form on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being ‘extremely unnatural’ and 5 being ‘perfectly natural’. The ratio of targets to fillers was 1:3—20 targets consisting of 10 preverbal and 10 postverbal *gei*-phrases, and 60 fillers (i.e. sentences without the *gei*-phrase). All tokens and fillers were normalized at a length of 10-13 characters.
Figure 1. Regional breakdown of the percentage of the preverbal *gei*-phrases used (Peng 2011:54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect area</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% preverbal</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Total % preverbal elicited in each dialect region

Figure 1 shows the proportion of the preverbal *gei*-phrases out of all the target variants elicited. The percentile represents the percentage of preverbal *gei*-phrases each informant produced during the elicitation task. In general, high percentages of postverbal *gei*-phrases were elicited from the informants of the Northernmost dialect region, Northeast China: the informants from Shenyang (n=1), Tianjin (n=1) and Jinan (n=1) produced 100% preverbal *gei*-phrases. Moving south down to the Beijing area, the
postverbal gei-phrase started to emerge but the preverbal structure was still the primary structure elicited. The informant from Hebei produced 92% preverbal gei-phrases and the informant from Beijing produced 70% preverbal gei-phrases.

Continuing further south to the central part of China, to regions such as Anhui and Sichuan Province, an approximately equal number of pre- and postverbal gei-phrases were elicited, with the informant from Hefei (n=1) producing 64% preverbal gei-phrases, Nanjing (n=1) 66%, and Sihchuan province (n=8) 64% on average. In the Southernmost dialect area, the postverbal gei-phrase was the dominant structure elicited. An average of 48.9% preverbal gei-phrases were elicited among the 8 Southern informants. Finally, very few postverbal gei-phrases were elicited from Taiwanese Mandarin speakers. In general, there is a gradually decreasing preference for the preverbal gei-phrase moving from the North to the South.

The results of this preliminary study show that at the production level, the placement of the gei-phrase is highly regionally-conditioned (see Table 2). The data from the elicitation (production) task suggests that at the production level, substrate influence of speakers’ home vernacular is crucial in deciding the placement of the gei-phrase. Northerners showed significantly higher preference for the preverbal gei-phrase than their Southern counterparts (See Figure 1 and Table 2). Moving down south, the percentage of the preverbal gei-phrase produced drops significantly. The postverbal gei-phrase becomes the dominant variant in the southernmost dialect areas. This can be attributed to the fact that the major southern dialects of Chinese, i.e. Min, Yue and Hakka,

---

7 A caveat must be included here that although dialects can be generalized as a set of linguistic features, it is not to say that all speakers of a dialect adopt the complete set of the features (citation?), which accounts for the within each dialect area.
allow only for the postverbal *gei*-phrase while the northern dialects allow only for preverbal *gei*-phrase.

Table 3 The Wilcoxon rank-sum test:
Comparison between groups (Acceptability Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preverbal <em>gei</em>-phrases</th>
<th>Postverbal <em>gei</em>-phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1, b1</td>
<td>0.7105</td>
<td>a2, b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1, c1</td>
<td>0.8733</td>
<td>a2, c2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b1, c1</td>
<td>0.9159</td>
<td>b2, c2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, at the perception level, home vernaculars play a much less important role in judging sentences with pre- and postverbal variants. In the acceptability test, participants from the mainland did not show significant difference in judging the acceptability of pre- and postverbal *gei*-phrases. The postverbal *gei*-phrases are equally acceptable to participants across dialect areas. Although there are individual differences among the informants, no significant regional difference was found between groups on the Mainland. Taiwanese informants, however, actively preferred the post-verbal variant in the judgment task. This shows that these informants are only somewhat influenced by the Beijing standard language norms.

Table 4 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table: Acceptability of *gei*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sum Sq</th>
<th>Mean Sq</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Pr(&gt;F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>0.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.098</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 3, a, b and c stands for northern, southern and southwestern dialect areas, respectively. The number 1 and 2 standard for the judgment scores of the preverbal and postverbal *gei*-phrases, respectively. For example, a1 stands for northerners’ average judgment score of preverbal *gei*-phrases.
Table 4-1 Coefficients:

|                  | Estimate | Std. Error | Pr(>|t|) |
|------------------|----------|------------|----------|
| factor(Media)2    | -0.681   | 0.264      | 0.020*   |
| factor(Media)3    | -0.635   | 0.382      | 0.115    |
| factor(Age)2     | 0.035    | 0.220      | 0.876    |
| factor(Age)3     | -0.212   | 0.624      | 0.738    |
| factor(Age)4     | -0.655   | 0.555      | 0.254    |
| NI               | -0.024   | 0.036      | 0.520    |

At the perception level, media exposure, among other things, emerged as a predictor of speakers’ acceptability rating of *gei* (see Table 4). Table 4-1 breaks down media exposure into two different levels. A certain amount of exposure *does* contribute positively to the perception of postverbal *gei*, but exposure beyond that point no longer has an effect on the perception of postverbal *gei*. The systematic geographical distribution of the *gei*-phrase made me wonder if there are other variables which are similarly distributed. After an informal pilot survey, I found that aspectual *you* demonstrates a similar geographical distribution to that of the *gei* phrase. Aspectual *you* (see example 2) is a southern Mandarin variant shared by speakers from many southern dialect areas, such as Shanghai, Guandong, Taiwan, and so forth.

In a subsequent study, I duplicated the perception task from the previous study for both postverbal *gei* and aspectual *you*, in order to see if the two southern variants are perceived the same way by Northern Mandarin speakers (Peng, 2014). Using online grammaticality judgment data, I compared the effects of media exposure on postverbal *gei* and aspectual *you*. Data from the online grammaticality judgment task showed that

---

9 The number 2 represents the choice No.2 in the survey question—watching Taiwanese for no more than five hours a week.
10 A speaker’s level of acceptance for the postverbal *gei*-phrase is calculated as ‘the average rating of the preverbal *gei*-phrase- the average rating of the preverbal *gei*-phrase.’ The lower the value is, the more one like the preverbal *gei*-phrase. Thus a negative correlation coefficient suggests that higher Taiwanese media exposure correlates with a higher judgment value of the postverbal *gei*-phrase.”
aspectual *you* is perceived as more natural by speakers with exposure to Taiwanese TV program than speakers with no exposure, but no positive correlation between media exposure and the acceptability of *you* was found. In other words, more exposure to Taiwanese TV program does not coincide with more positive perception of aspectual *you*. For the postverbal *gei*-phrase, however, no effect was found, possible reasons being that 1) speakers were not aware of the fact that postverbal *gei* is also associated with TM, and 2) many northern Mandarin varieties allow for the variation in pre- and postverbal *gei*, so that there is a lower degree of awareness of *gei* as a non-local variable, especially in affirmative sentences. The results of these two pilot studies suggest that media exposure raises speakers’ awareness of the non-local form, but does not contribute to a more positive perception of the form, nor does more exposure give rise to higher grammaticality ratings of the form. This perhaps could be a long-term process and the initial stage involves raising awareness.

Interestingly, although both the post-verbal *gei*-phrase and aspectual *you* are contact-induced variables commonly observed in southern varieties of Mandarin, they are perceived very differently by northern Mandarin speakers in terms of their acceptability and social indexicality. Northern Mandarin speakers are usually either not aware or associate the postverbal *gei*-phrase with southern Mandarin varieties, whereas for aspectual *you*, it is almost exclusively associated with Taiwan Mandarin. With such awareness, media exposure plays the role of linking the linguistic feature with social attributes. I argue that media exposure on its own does not contribute directly to variation in perception, but rather bolsters the semiotic link between linguistic practice and ideologies. Following the third wave tradition in sociolinguistic studies, the present study
delves further into the emerging social meanings of the postverbal gei-phrase and aspectual you, drawing upon the notion of indexicality.

The concept of indexicality has acquired many slightly different meanings since Silverstein (2003). He terms an indicator in variation an “n\textsuperscript{th} order index”, which indexes a speaker’s membership in a population. However, if a linguistic form becomes a marker of social evaluation, it becomes an “n+1\textsuperscript{st}” order index. It should be noted that Silverstein’s use of the term indexical order does not imply temporal order. Order is in the sense of social order, referring to the relation among elements of a system (Hall-Lew 2011). However, scholars increasingly use the terms 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} order, and these terms have acquired slightly differing interpretations in the literature.

For example, Johnstone, Andrus and Danielson (2006) view indexical order as a progression from indicator (1\textsuperscript{st} order index) to marker (2\textsuperscript{nd} order index) to stereotype, where the distinction between different orders is the level of consciousness (Eckert 2008). Johnstone & Keisling (2008) interpret 1\textsuperscript{st} order indexicality as the correlation between a form and a social or pragmatic function that an outsider could observe, and 2\textsuperscript{nd} order indexicality as the act of linking first-order correlations to social attributes. For Foulkes et al (2010), first-order indexicality refers to the (objective) association of particular patterns of linguistic behavior with globally or locally meaningful social groups, while 2\textsuperscript{nd} order indexicality pertains to speakers’ subjective meta-linguistic knowledge of the social and communicative roles played by variable linguistic forms. Taken together, although there are various interpretations of indexicality, it is clear that n, n+1 is the same as 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} order since n = any number, and n+1 is that number plus 1. Secondly, it
seems that no one interprets the indexical order as a temporal phenomenon; it is generally always viewed as pertaining to levels of consciousness or awareness.

Building on the notion of indexicality by Silverstein (2003), it is arguable that aspectual *you* has taken on n+1st order indexicality, and postverbal *gei* is undergoing the process from nth indexical order to n+1st order indexicality (Silverstein 2003; Eckert 2008). Following Silverstein (2003), nth order indexicality is defined as the association of a linguistic form with a place or a group of people. For example, aspectual *you* has taken on first order indexicality since it is often exclusively associated with TM speakers by Chinese mainlanders. When the feature is taken to the next level and is associated with a range of non-linguistic aspects (e.g. low intelligence, laziness, educated elite status, etc.), the feature becomes a n + 1st order index.

Aspectual *you* appears to have taken on nth order indexicality because Northern Mandarin speakers associate it with TM speakers, but it is unclear whether they have associated the variable with attitudinal features (i.e. social meaning). It is possible that a feature like *you* has to achieve n+1st order indexicality before it can function as a stylistic resource for Northern Mandarin speakers. This is a process that may be underway for *you*, but it is also possible that, like many variables, it may never acquire social meaning, because, as Johnson and Kiesling (2008) and Liao (2008) point out, only a subset of first order features are invested with second order indexical meanings (see Johnstone and Kiesling 2008; Liao 2008). One of the goals of this study is to find out whether there are emerging social meanings for these two syntactic variables.

The geographical distribution of these two variables can be explained in part by the historical development and contact situation of the Chinese languages. In the next
chapter, I will give an overview of the Chinese language, and discuss how the contact situation contribute to the divergence of Mandarin varieties.
Chapter 2. Chinese: a sociohistorical overview

2.1. Historical background

The basin of the Yellow river is known as the cradle of Chinese culture as well as the origin of the Chinese language. Since the 1st century, immigrants from the north brought the northern dialects to the south and these dialects later on evolved into the present-day Min, Yue, Hakka dialects. Immigrants moved to the present-day Min area in the late 1st century. By the 7th century, the dialect had developed its own distinguishing linguistic features and was recognized as a distinct dialect. Evolved from the language spoken by the settlers who moved to the present day Hakka dialect area Hakka around the 7th century, the Hakka dialect had taken shape by around the 12th century (Yuan Dynasty). Yue, a.k.a. Cantonese, was brought by an influx of immigrants who moved into the present day Guangdong province in the late 11th century (southern Song Dynasty) after the Song lost control of northern China to the Jin Dynasty. Their dialect later on became the foundation of the Yue dialect (Zou & You, 2007:131-133). These three southernmost dialects (i.e. Yue, Hakka, and Min) were developed long before the emergence of the Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM), and therefore preserved and shared many historical features descended from the early colloquial Chinese.

While southern dialects retain more features from early colloquial Chinese, northern dialects have come to form the basis for MSM. Since most of the historical capital cities of China are in the north, the northern dialects have always had higher social prestige than their southern counterparts. It must be noted, however, that the written

---

11 Most of the historical Chinese documents were written in literary Chinese, which was only used by the educated and was rather different from the colloquial vernaculars.
language has always been different from the spoken language (constituting diglossia), and historical data presented in this paper (see (11)) are from the written language. In other words, modern southern dialects (e.g. Min, Yue, Hakka) preserve more historical syntactic structures of the spoken languages because they were less influenced by the written language. Thus, the postverbal *gei* and aspectual *you* are both preserved in modern Min, Yue, and Hakka dialects.

Although in modern Mandarin, Prepositional Phrases (PPs) can only occur preverbally, Li and Thompson (1976: 486) claims that the postverbal position was the dominant position for the prepositional phrases until the 15th or 16th century. However, He (1985) and Sun (1991) found that preverbal PPs made up about half of the uses of PPs in Old Chinese. In other words, in Old Chinese, PPs can be either pre- or postverbal, and there was no dominant position for PPs as a whole in Old Chinese. In Old Chinese, most of the prepositional dative constructions were headed by the preposition *yu* (see (3)), which is equivalent to English ‘to’ (Sun, 1991). *Gei* (to give) was only used as a verb before it underwent the grammaticalization process and became a preposition in early modern Chinese. Although there is no consensus as to what is the dominant form of PP in Old Chinese, it is clear that the postverbal PP was once prevalent and is preserved by the modern-day southern dialects (i.e. Min, Hakka, and Yue). In the next section, I discuss the “north and south” dichotomy of the modern day Chinese dialect system.

(10) \( V + D.O. + yu + I.O. \) (\( yu = \) the preposition ‘to’ in Old Chinese)
(11) a. 不 能 使 天 與 之 天下
   Bu neng shi tian yu zhi tianxia (V+IO+DO)
   Neg. can make heaven give 3rd world
   (the sovereign) cannot make heaven give him the throne.

b. 獻 之 於 天
   Xian zhi yu tian (V+DO+yu+IO)
   Present it give heaven
   ‘(Someone) presented him to heaven.’

c. 堯 以 天下 與 舜
   Yao yi tianxia yu shun (YI+DO+V+IO)
   NAME YI world give NAME
   ‘Yao gave the throne to shun.’

2.2. Today’s dialects

The first scientific classification of the Chinese dialects was proposed in 1937 by Li Fang-Kuei. This classification was based on a single criterion: the divergent development of Middle Chinese voiced stops into distinct phonemes in China’s spoken modern dialects (Norman, 2004:181). Based on Li’s study, Yuan (1961) proposed the following dialect groups: Mandarin, Wu, Xiang, Gan, Hakka, Yue (Cantonese), Min. Without rejecting this scheme, Norman (1988) proposed a new set of diagnostic features for categorizing the Chinese dialects that takes into account phonological, syntactic and lexical features. Ramsey (1989), in his book ‘The Language of China,’ adopts this classification and provides an atlas of Chinese dialect isoglosses (see Figure 1).
As shown in Figure 2, Han Chinese dialects are divided between the North and the South in the eastern coastal areas. The South has long been inhabited by the ethnic Han Chinese whereas the North is home to relatively more recent settlers who were assimilated by the Han people through frequent contact and intermarriage. Given that language change is a slow and gradual process, it is probably not surprising to find that the northern dialects are rather unified while the southern dialects are more divergent, especially in terms of their phonology and lexicons (Norman, 2004:20-26; Ramsey, 1989:183-186). The northern Chinese varieties, usually known as Mandarin dialects, are primarily spoken across the Yellow Plain and the Huangtu Plateau (i.e. the light grey area
in Figure 2). The dialect area extends all the way southwest across the provinces of Sichuan and Yunnan. They are relatively young compared to the southern dialects and therefore are phonologically more homogenous. Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM) is based on the speech of the educated residents of Beijing (Ramsey, 1989; Chen, 1999), but the fine line between MSM and the Beijing dialect is not always clear (see also Zhang 2005:439 for discussion).

The southern dialects—also referred to as ‘non-Mandarin dialects’ by Ramsey (1989: 21)—are spoken in the area southeast of the Yangtze River. Unlike northern varieties that are generally mutually intelligible, southern dialects are phonologically distinctive. Therefore, the southern dialect group is further divided into six subgroups. They are briefly introduced as follows, with a map (Figure 2) showing the geographical distribution:

- Wu (吳) dialect—spoken in the southeast costal area, around Shanghai and Zhejiang province
- Gan (贛) dialect—spoken in Jiangxi province
- Xiang (湘) dialect—spoken in Hunan province
- Hakka (客家) dialect—widely scattered form Sichuan to Taiwan
- Yue (粵) dialect (also known as Cantonese)—spoken in Guandong and Guangxi provinces as well as Hong Kong
- Min (閩) dialect—spoken in Fujian province and coastal areas of the South as well as Taiwan
It should be noted that the idea of ‘dialect’ in Chinese is somewhat different from that of American English dialects. American English dialects are generally mutually intelligible with one another, and so are most dialects of other well-studied languages.
such as German and French. However, speakers of different Chinese dialects—especially southern dialects—may not be able to understand each other at all. Phonologically, most southern dialects can be different languages. For example, speakers of a Min and Yue dialects would not be able to understand each other. In other words, in Chinese dialect terminology, the so-called “dialects” are defined on sociopolitical grounds not on linguistic grounds. The term “dialect” is used to refer to any regional vernaculars that are not Mandarin. Such being the case, are these regional vernaculars considered languages or dialects? From a linguistic point of view, the Chinese “dialects” could be considered different languages, just as French and Italian in the Romance language family (Ramsey, 1989). However, from a sociopolitical point of view, the Chinese vernaculars are considered one language because they are spoken by a single group with a common cultural heritage and, moreover, there is a single set of standards for the written language generally accepted by Chinese speakers regardless of their geographical locations (Ramsey 1989:16-18). There is also a commonly accepted standard spoken dialect: Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM). According to Zhang (2005:439), MSM takes the Beijing Mandarin phonological system as its norm of pronunciation and modern vernacular literary language as its norm of grammar.

2.3. Contact situation

Since Mandarin was stipulated as the official spoken language of the People's Republic of China (PRC) in the 1950s, the Chinese government has been active in promoting Mandarin, including the design and the promulgation of a new phonetic system, Hanyu Pinyin. By 2013, Chinese officials reported that about 70 percent of the
country’s population could communicate with Mandarin (Institute of Applied Linguistics, Ministry of Education, 2006). Currently, with Mandarin being the official language of the country, a so-called ‘standard Mandarin’ (or putonghua in Mandarin) is taught in school to people across the country. Thus, many Chinese speakers grow up speaking their local vernacular at home and Mandarin at school.

Since Mandarin was originally a Northern dialect, it is phonologically more familiar to people in the North than to those in the South. MSM is generally mutually intelligible with Northern dialects whereas Southern dialects are phonologically very different from MSM. In other words, many speakers of Southern dialects (e.g. Cantonese, Min dialects, Wu dialects, etc.) are either bilingual or have MSM as a second language. Schoolchildren in the south start learning standard Mandarin in the first grade. They use standard Mandarin in school and speak their home vernacular(s) outside school (Ramsey, 1989:29). Adults use their home vernaculars for local business and daily informal conversation. The strong influence of local vernaculars has had an impact on the way Mandarin is spoken in the south. As a result, Mandarin has developed into many varieties due to the substratum influence from the local vernaculars.

Substratum influence is the influence from one’s first language (i.e. the home vernacular) on a second language (Sankoff, 2003; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988:21), which in this case is the influence of a speaker’s home vernacular(s) on Mandarin. For many southern Chinese, given the bilingual situation of Mandarin and a distinctive vernacular, it can be inferred that southern Mandarin varieties vary from MSM to a greater degree compared to their Northern counterparts. In the next section, I will use
Taiwan Mandarin as an example of how a southern vernacular (i.e. Southern Min) exerts syntactic, phonological, and lexical influences on the Mandarin variety spoken in Taiwan.

2.4. Mandarin in Taiwan

Not until my mainland Chinese friends told me that sounded like ‘the guy on TV’, was I aware of the fact that I had an ‘accent’. I soon came to realize that what is ‘standard’ to me as speaker of Taiwan Mandarin may carry different social meanings to people in other social contexts. I was perceived as the guy on TV because for many Chinese Mainlanders, televised media is their primary access to Taiwan Mandarin which has some features that distinguish itself from other varieties of Mandarin, and these features are perceived differently by Chinese Mainlanders.

2.4.1. Sociolinguistic background

Taiwan is an island separated from the southeast coast of Mainland China by the Taiwan Strait. Statistics for Taiwan’s current ethnic distribution are unavailable and in any case ethnicity is difficult to determine in modern Taiwan because of extensive intermarriage. Huang (1995:319-353) reports that in the early 1980s the population was composed of four major ethnic groups, each of which has its own language, given in parentheses: 5% aborigines (Austronesian languages), 73.3% Southern Min (Southern Min) people, 12% Hakka (Hakka), and 12% Mainlanders\(^{12}\) (Mandarin). Except for the aborigines who have been on the island for several thousand years, the rest of the

\(^{12}\) Mainlander refers to Mainland Chinese immigrants who moved to Taiwan at the end of or after the Chinese Civil War in 1949.
population was originally from Mainland China. The Southern Min and the Hakka emigrated from the Southeast coast of China around 200 years ago, and the Mainlanders fled to Taiwan from various provinces of China after 1949 when the Mainland was taken by the Communists.

From the end of the Chinese Civil War in 1949 until 1987—when the Taiwanese government allowed limited family visits—Taiwan was disconnected from Mainland China. The political tension blocked contact between people on both sides, including correspondence or any means of telecommunication. Although the majority of Taiwanese and Mainland Chinese were geographically and politically isolated from one another, those living overseas were able to mix freely. More recently, the gradual alleviation of the tension has increased the contact across the strait. From 2008, negotiations began to restore transportation, commerce, and communications between the two sides.

Political relations between China and Taiwan are rather complicated. Though not widely recognized as an independent country internationally, Taiwan has its own president and government that are different and independent from those of the People’s Republic of China. To this day, Taiwan is still seen as a renegade province by the Chinese government (i.e. People’s Republic of China, PRC), even though many Taiwanese think of Taiwan (i.e. Republic of China, ROC) as an independent sovereignty. The relationship is referred to in English using the phrase ‘cross-strait relations’, a neutral term that avoids the legal or political status of their respective governments. In addition, due to the different political ideologies of the two governments, Taiwanese people can move more freely than Mainland Chinese between Taiwan and the Mainland for the
purpose of travel, academic exchange, and business, although it is becoming less and less the case.

Mandarin has been spoken in Taiwan for more than 60 years, and is now spoken by the majority (89.97%) of people in Taiwan (Ke 1991:5). The remaining minority includes the elderly who were educated under Japanese rule before 1945 (Kuo 2005). Mandarin has been taught in schools since 1945 when Taiwan was restored to China at the conclusion of World War II. Mandarin was promoted and even imposed by the government through school education on the local residents in Taiwan where the majority of the people spoke Southern Chinese dialects—Southern Min and Hakka. Mandarin was taught and learned as a second language for the second generation after the civil war. Because of the success of the Mandarin education in Taiwan, Mandarin has served as a lingua franca in Taiwan, and is the language not only of school, but of government, media and many everyday interactions (Teng, 2002:231). By the third generation, the boundary between the ethnic groups was no longer clear because of intermarriage between the groups, and Mandarin has become the dominant language on the island.

During the period of separation, Taiwan has developed a variety that is different from Beijing Mandarin. According to Cheng (1985:372), three forces have shaped Taiwan Mandarin: (i) a drift towards the features that are universal to Chinese as a whole; (ii) the tendency to borrow from local dialects or native languages; (iii) the tendency to adopt features that are simpler and more regular. Southern Min (i.e. Taiwanese), to a large extent, has contributed to the formation of Taiwan Mandarin (Cheng, 1985: 372;

---

13 Ke (1991:5)
14 After the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895), China ceded Taiwan to Japan under the Treaty of Shimonoseki in 1895.
Teng, 2002:233). Taiwan Mandarin, therefore, can be defined as a mixture of the linguistic structures of Southern Min and Mandarin (Teng 2002).

2.4.2. Linguistic features

TM has received much scholarly attention since Kubler’s (1981, 1985) pioneering work in which he identifies TM as the result of language contact between Mandarin and the local vernaculars in Taiwan, such as Taiwanese (i.e. Southern Min) and Hakka. He found that many phonological and lexical features of TM can be attributed to the substrate influence of these local vernaculars. Many subsequent studies on TM (e.g. Cheng 1985, 1997; Teng 2002; Tseng 2003; Kuo 2005) continue along this line and look more closely into the formation of this Mandarin variety as well as its divergence from MSM.

TM differs from MSM in its lexicon, phonology and syntax. For example, the following are some features of TM: (i) the retroflex sounds in MSM are realized as alveolar-palatal affricates or fricatives in TM (e.g. /tʂ/→/ts/, /ʈʂʰ/→/tsʰ/, and /ʂ/→/s/) (Kuo 2005), (ii) in (12), the structure of [gei+obj+complement] illustrates the innovative function and the grammaticalization of gei in TM, which is not observed in MSM (Lee, 2008), and (iii) example (13) shows that the morpheme you has developed the function of an aspect marker in TM (Tseng, 2003; Ling, 1991; Kubler C. C., 1981).

(12) 真是 有 給 他 驚訝
Zhenshi you gei ta jingya
Really have give it surprising
‘It made me surprised.’
These differences have likely arisen through two factors: Firstly, through substrate influence from local Taiwanese languages and dialects, and secondly through normal linguistic divergence due to a long period of social separation and Taiwan’s independent economic and cultural identity. Both are relevant to understanding how variation in the *gei*-phrase and aspectual *you* has come about, both in TM as well as in other mainland varieties of Mandarin.

TM has been influenced by local dialects such as Southern Min and Hakka. Kubler (1981, 1985) describes the Taiwan Mandarin variety as a linguistic outcome of language contact with preexisting local languages. He found that when speaking Mandarin, native speakers of Southern Min tend to substitute [ʂ] with [s], and to substitute [z] with [dz] before vowels. Syntactically, the use of *you/meiyou* (*have/ not have*) as auxiliaries in Taiwan Mandarin is said to be due to the influence from Southern Min (Kubler, 1985:162). Southern Min speakers are conscious of the correspondence between *bou* (not) in Southern Min (14a) and *meiyou* (not/ have not) in Mandarin (14b), and tend to translate word for word, creating the syntactic structure of (14c). (Examples are from Kubler 1985:162).

(14) a. 你 看見 他 了 沒有  (Standard Mainland Mandarin)

    ni kanjian ta le me you
    you see him-ASP not have
    ‘Did you see him?’
b. 你 有 看到 他 没有  (Taiwan Mandarin)
ni you kandao ta mei you
you have see him not have
‘Did you see him?’

c. 你 有 看见 他 不  (Southern Min)
Li u khua:ki: I bou
You have see him not
‘Did you see him?’

The lexicon of Taiwan Mandarin is also subject to the influence of Southern Min. Table 5 shows some examples of such. The equivalents of ‘bicycle’, ‘businessman’, and ‘to cook’ in Taiwan Mandarin employ the corresponding morphemes in Southern Min, instead of morphemes in MSM, although the morphemes are realized using Mandarin phonology.

Table 5 Lexicon Influence from Southern Min

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Mandarin</th>
<th>Southern Min</th>
<th>Taiwan Mandarin</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tsì ɕin ʈʂʰɤ/自行車</td>
<td>kʰ ta ʈɕʰja</td>
<td>tʂiau ta tʂʰɤ/腳踏車</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʂəŋ ɾəŋ/商人</td>
<td>ʈɕʰəŋ li lanj</td>
<td>ʂɤŋ i ɾəŋ/生意人</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsuɔ ɕɤn/做飯</td>
<td>tsu ʈʂʰaj</td>
<td>tSu tsʰaɿ/煮菜</td>
<td>to cook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.3. Attitudes toward the languages in Taiwan

Influenced by the so-called “third-wave”\textsuperscript{15} sociolinguistics studies, more recent studies look at the varying attitudes towards TM, either among TM speakers themselves (e.g. Liao 2008, 2010; Baran 2014; Su 2008) or among Mainland Chinese (e.g. Juan 2011). Aside from TM, the language politics and power relations of Taiwanese (a.k.a

\textsuperscript{15} See section 3.3 for a more detailed discussion on “third wave” sociolinguistics studies.
Tai-yu) and Taiwanese-accented Mandarin also receive scholarly attention (e.g. Wei 2008; Su 2009). Taken together, all these works serve to show that language ideologies are rather dynamic. They are constantly changing, and—to a certain extent—reflecting politics and socioeconomic status of the speakers in relation to the perceivers. Transitions of socio-political power often come with drastic change of language ideologies. Residents of the island have seen languages that were banned by one set of rulers but promoted by the next, and vernaculars marked backwardness in one period coming over time to signal all that is progressive. I will start the discussion with the example of Taiwanese-accented Mandarin (Taiwan Guoyu)\[^{16}\], a variety of Mandarin spoken by speakers who have a strong Taiwanese accent.

The past 100 years have seen Taiwan's series of dramatic political transformations, many of which have been accompanied by equally dramatic linguistic reversals. Mandarin was first mandated in Taiwan as an official language in 1940s when the Nationalist (a.k.a. KMT) government retreated to Taiwan after the Chinese Civil War. At the time Mandarin was learned and used by many children of Taiwanese speakers, and the use of Taiwanese or other home vernaculars was strictly prohibited at school. Many of these children grew up speaking Mandarin with a strong Taiwanese influence on their Mandarin phonology and lexicon. The so-called Taiwanese-accented Mandarin had been socially stigmatized for a long time, often associated with a rural and less-educated identity. The ability to speak ‘standard Mandarin’ was highly recognized.

---

\[^{16}\] Note that Taiwanese-accented Mandarin discussed here is a cultural stereotype; it does not refer to the national dialect of Mandarin spoken in Taiwan, which is termed “Taiwan Mandarin” in linguistic research.
However, for the past two decades, with the transition of political power and the anti-China ideology permeating Taiwanese society, the social connotation of Taiwanese-accented Mandarin has been upended. Thanks largely to Taiwan’s former president (in office 2000-2008), Shui-bian Chen, who was a speaker of Taiwanese-accented Mandarin, and who constantly code-switched between Taiwanese and Mandarin in his public addresses, Taiwanese and Taiwanese-accented Mandarin had become a potent political tool to project a distinctive Taiwanese identity as well as to identify with the locals (see Wei 2008:40-42). The languages that used to mark backwardness have been elevated as part of the so-called Taiwanese or local identity, distinguishing the Taiwanese identity from the Chinese one, and therefore these languages surged in terms of their local social prestige and attractiveness. Instead of a rural identity and lack of education, they started to assume more positive social meanings such as being down-to-earth and amiable.

The dynamics of language ideologies is not only observed within the local speech community, but also across speech communities. Many sociolinguists have looked beyond local speech communities to explore how non-local linguistic features acquire new situated local meanings. Many studies found that TM—despite being a non-standard variety—is not socially stigmatized among Chinese Mainlanders (e.g. Zhang 2005; Ling 1991). In fact, TM is subject to rather positive attitudes among many Mainland Chinese (see Zhang, 2005). TM has for some time been perceived by many MSM speakers to be a variety that indexes a hip, cosmopolitan identity (Zhang 2005). This variety is also considered to be “cool” and desirable by millions of Chinese youth who watch variety shows featuring Hong Kong and Taiwanese pop stars (Zhu 2008:103). The formation of
such connotations can be traced back to the 70s when China opened the door to the overseas Chinese communities.

China’s continuing economic reform since the late 1970s has heralded many drastic social, cultural and ideological changes. As the country embarked on the path of market-fundamentalism and embraced the value of a free economy, the Chinese diaspora (i.e. Chinese living outside of Mainland China) fueled this transformation. Their investment contributes the greatest portion of foreign direct investment in Mainland China and many Chinese managers from overseas serve to bridge the communication gap between the local market and Western investors (Yeung, 2000:91; Zhang 2005).

When China opened up its booming economy to the world, cultural products (e.g. pop music, films, and TV dramas) from overseas Chinese communities such as Hong Kong and Taiwan seized the fledgling pop culture market due to their linguistic and cultural proximity (Zhang, 2005; Zhu 2008; Gold 1993). The Communist Party strictly control cultural production and government propaganda permeates cultural production at every level. Under strict censorship, the content of mass media in Mainland China often addresses ideological themes such as patriotism, socialism, modernization, and so on (Gold, 1993). On the other hand, songs and TV programs from Hong Kong and Taiwan speak more to the younger generation by expressing feelings about dreams, personal identity, romance, one-sided or forbidden love, and ‘trivial’ things in life. To many young Chinese mainlanders, these cultural products represent a prosperous modern cosmopolitan lifestyle and a new urban identity (Zhang 2005:437).

Linguistically, the prevalence of films and TV dramas from Taiwan and Hong Kong has also triggered many lexical and phonological changes in Mainland Mandarin,
such as use of neutral tone in a weakly stressed syllable, the use of adverb màn instead of tíng for ‘rather’, and the use of měiméi to refer to ‘pretty girl’ (Zhang 2005; 2012). These phonological and lexical features all index a new urban lifestyle. However, as China is ascending in its political and economic power, people’s attitudes toward Taiwan Mandarin are also changing, especially for the millennials. Unlike their parents’ generation, the millennials on the mainland grew up in affluent Chinese metropolises, surrounded by abundant exposure to both Chinese-made and international television programs. As will be discussed later in Chapter 4.4, when the millennial participants were asked to list their favorite three television programs, the number of Chinese-made TV programs has exceeded that from Taiwan and Hong Kong. Taiwan and Hong Kong are no longer their primary feeding source of television programs and other cultural products. As a result, Taiwan seems to be losing its social prestige. In the next chapter, I will first review the theoretical frameworks pertaining to language ideologies and then discuss then formation of such social connotations in the Chinese context.
Chapter 3. Language ideologies, identity, and style

3.1. Language ideologies

Language ideologies are central to the study of linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics. There has been growing attention to the role of ideologies in relation to language and society (e.g. Silverstein 1979; Blommaert 1999; Coupland and Bishop 2007; Irvine 2001; Kroskryty 2000, 2004; Schiefflin, Woolard and Kroskryty 1998). Language ideologies are the beliefs and understandings that people have about the sociolinguistic value of a language in a certain socio-cultural environment (Irvine, J., & Gal, S., 2000; Giles & Niedzielski, 1998; Preston, 2003). They are the social connotations imposed on a language or variety when people map their understanding of linguistic varieties onto people, or more specifically, the style of people (Giles & Niedzielski, 1998). Because of the ideologies that people have about different languages and varieties, languages are often perceived “with an attitude”. For example, one may associate certain features with social attributes such as cosmopolitanism, stylishness, coolness and so forth. Language use—like other kinds of social behavior (e.g. clothes, music consumption…, etc.)—is socially evaluated.

One the main goals of this study is to better understand Chinese mainlanders’ ideological perceptions of TM. In sociolinguistics, the matched-guise test is a widely used technique to determine the true feelings of an individual or community towards a specific language, dialect, or accent (e.g. Buchstaller 2006; Campbell-Kibler 2011; Loureiro-Rodrigueza, Boggessb & Goldsmithc 2012). This experiment was first introduced by Lambert (1960) to elicit stereotypes or attitudes held by bilingual French
Canadians towards English and French. In a typical matched-guise test, participants listen
to guises in two or multiple languages that are apparently made by different speakers. Not
knowing that the guises in different languages are in fact made by bilingual speakers,
participants are then asked to rate the speakers in terms of personality traits such as
leadership, sense of humor, intelligence and sociability and so on. Such a method proves
to be effective in soliciting and measuring people’s stereotypes toward a language or a
group of people. The test has also been adapted in written form. Buchstaller (2006) used
guises with written stimuli to elicit British people’s attitude towards quotative ‘like’
produced by a 17-year-old working-class woman from Newcastle. Her findings suggest
that stereotypes attached to linguistic features do not necessarily transfer to new speakers
when those features are borrowed. Attitudes are re-evaluated and re-created by speakers
of the borrowing varieties (i.e. British English in her case), and these borrowed features
are often ascribed new situated meanings that differ from their old contextualized
meanings. Such implications are consistent with Zhang’s (2005) finding on Beijing
Mandarin that non-local features can be given new local meanings and become a new
stylistic source (see my discussion in Chapter 3.3). What is also interesting is that while
the U.S. is the location be like is most frequently associated with, only one-third of the
responses associate be like with the U.S. Although it has been claimed that be like spread
from American English—especially Californian English—into other varieties, British
speakers do not seem to perceive it the same way. Similarly, even though the use of
postverbal gei-phrase in Mandarin is predominately used in the south, this feature does
not stand out to northerners as a southern variable. In other words, people’s beliefs about
a linguistic feature’s regional association can be very different from the feature’s actual origins.

In addition to matched guise studies, sociolinguists have also devised various kinds of activities for measuring language attitudes. Preston (2003) devised a map exercise in which respondents from different parts of the country are asked to rate the correctness and pleasantness of the speech of each state on a map, in order to better understand how American English dialects are perceived differently across the U.S. by non-linguists. The results suggest that language attitudes are, in fact, highly contextualized. The same area can be perceived very differently by people of different origins. In terms of pleasantness, for instance, the northeastern area was rated highly by people from Michigan but was disfavored by people from Alabama (see Figure 4 Figure 5). On the other hand, the South was favored by the people from Alabama, but was disfavored by those from Michigan.
Figure 4 Means of ratings for language "pleasantness" by Michigan respondents for US English (on a scale of 1-10, where 1=least, and 10=most pleasant) (Preston 2003:59)

Figure 5 Means of ratings for language "pleasantness" by Alabama respondents for US English (on a scale of 1-10, where 1=least, and 10=most pleasant)
What this map exercise reveals about language attitudes is that one language or variety can have different social meanings in different cultural contexts. Who sounds “pleasant” seems to differ between Michigan and Alabama respondents, showing that the formation of language ideologies is not determined by a single individual but a collective contribution. The next section addresses how individual ideologies contribute collectively to the formation of registers.
3.2. Registers of language

According to Agha (2004:24), a register is “a linguistic repertoire that is associated, culture-internally, with particular social practices and with persons who engage in such practices.” It can be understood as native speakers’ metapragmatic stereotypes that come from language users’ evaluative attitudes towards variant forms (Ferguson 1994:18, cited in Agha 2004). In other words, a register is a social regularity that relies on native speakers’ metalinguistic ability to make evaluative judgments about variants. A single individual’s metapragmatic activity does not suffice to establish the social existence of a register unless confirmed in some way by the evaluative activities of others. A register grows in social domain when more and more people align their self-images with the social personae represented in such messages (Agha 2005). When a distinct form of speech comes to be socially recognized as indexical of speaker attributes by a group of language users, it is enregistered with these particular speaker attributes.

Enregisterment can be understood as the process by which a set of linguistic features become associated with social attributes (Agha 2005; Johnstone 2009). It draws on lay awareness of and ideologies about dialects—also known as sociolinguistic reflexivity—to link speech repertoires with metalinguistic labels, such as upper-class women, formality, politeness, etc. Such associations are metalinguistic in nature since they tell us something about the properties of linguistic forms. Johnstone (2009:160) describes enregisterment as the process by which “a set of features associated with an accent can come to be represented collectively in the public imagination as a stable register.” For example, a place-linked register is typically called a ‘dialect’, and an
enregistered dialect embodies cultural values associated with the area (Remlinger, 2009:119).

TM is a enregistered dialect that has many characteristic linguistic features such as aspectual *you* and postverbal *gei*, but obviously the trajectory of these two features is not the same with respect to the process of enregisterment. As mentioned in the previous chapter, aspectual *you* is firmly enregistered with TM speakers but postverbal *gei* is not. Therefore, this dissertation aims to look at TM from northern Chinese mainlanders’ perspective to see whether these two syntactic variables are also given social meanings commonly associated with TM. Given that languages and language varieties can have a range of social meanings, many “third wave” sociolinguistic studies focus on the social meaning of variables and view styles as directly associated with identity categories (Eckert 2012). In the next section, I explain the idea of third wave sociolinguistics and how this dissertation follows the third wave tradition by investigating the emerging social meanings given to the syntactic variables associated with Taiwan Mandarin by northern Mandarin speakers.

3.3. The three waves of variation studies

Eckert (2012) views sociolinguistic studies of linguistic variation as rooted in one of three loosely ordered waves. The first wave looks at the relationship between language variation and demographic categories, such as economic and social class, age, and ethnicity (e.g. Labov 1972). The second wave explores the relationship between variation and local, participant-designed categories. Second wave studies often uncover local
meanings assigned to these demographic categories. From the perspective of the first and second wave studies, identity is viewed as a stable construct. People and their language use are usually defined by gender, class, ethnicity, geographic origins, and other traits.

Building on the results of the first and second wave studies, third wave studies focus on the social meaning of linguistic variables. Style becomes the focus of this so-called “Third Wave” of variation studies, under which linguistic variables with social meanings contribute to the construction of a particular style (Eckert 2012). According to Eckert (2000:1), linguistic style is ‘the locus of an individual’s internalization of broader social distribution of variation.’ In sum, style not only reflects but also constructs a particular social identity, and can ultimately motivate language variation (Irvine & Gal, 2000; Giles, Coupland & Coupland 2001; Coupland 2007). Many third wave studies have explored the social meanings attached to linguistic features (e.g. Podesva 2007; Campbell-Kibler, 2007; Zhang, 2005). I will come back to the identity dimensions of style in later analysis (see section 6.5).

Notably, most third wave ‘language and identity’ studies are done in the contexts of North America and Europe. Little research has been done in the context of East Asia. China, as a rapidly changing society, provides fertile ground for studies of this kind. Zhang (2005)’s Chinese yuppie study is one of the pioneering studies to look at Chinese from the third wave perspective. Her study shows that young Chinese professionals working for international companies in Beijing constructed a cosmopolitan “yuppie” identity by using phonological features often associated with Hong Kong and Taiwan Mandarin. For example, Zhang views the realization of a neutral tone as a full tone in a weakly stressed syllable as a cosmopolitan variable. This phonological feature is mostly
ascribed to the Chinese varieties spoken in the southern cities because many speakers of southern dialects (e.g. Cantonese, Shanghainese and Min) have very limited use of neutral tone when speaking Mandarin. For many young professionals in Beijing, this feature has been assigned social meanings different from its old contextualized meanings and has become a stylistic resource in the new local context (i.e. the workplace Beijing in Zhang’s study) to project a cosmopolitan identity. Zhang also identifies several local variables that index other local Beijing identities: rhotacized syllable finals (‘smooth operator’, see example (15)), the interdental realization of dental sibilants (‘alley saunterer’ variable), and the use of neutral tone in a weakly stressed syllable (‘yuppie’).

(15) Smooth operator

ZHÉ [tʂɿ] (standard), zhèr [tʂɿɿ] (smooth operator)
Mùbiāo [mupiau] (standard), mùbiāor [mupiau] (smooth operator)
Xuéshēng [ɕyeʂʂəŋ] (standard), xuéshēng [ɕyeʂʂəŋ] (smooth operator)
Huāshēng [huaʂʂəŋ] (standard), huārēng [huaɿɿŋ] (smooth operator)

Zhang (2005) compared two groups of managerial-level working professionals, one group working for prestigious international companies (i.e. the yuppies) and the other working for state-owned enterprises. Working for international businesses engages the yuppies in what Zhang calls a “transnational Chinese linguistic market.” It is a market imbued not only with Mainland Standard Mandarin but also other Mandarin varieties spoken in places like Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, and so on. As discussed in section 2.4.3, linguistic features associated with these overseas varieties are often perceived by many Mainland Mandarin speakers to index a hip, cosmopolitan identity (Zhang 2005). Such ideologies, as a result, motivate yuppies to adopt these “cosmopolitan features” to construct a new yuppie identity. Conversely, the results of Zhang’s study suggest that
young professionals working for state-owned companies used features identified as local to Beijing significantly more often than employees working for international companies did.

Zhang (2005) draws upon the construct of a linguistic market proposed by Bourdieu (e.g. Bourdieu & Potaski 1976; Bourdieu 1977, 1991) to account for such sociolinguistic variation. A linguistic market is defined as a symbolic market where linguistic exchange takes place. Languages are conceptualized as products that have different symbolic values, and these values of languages are socially determined. People who speak the legitimate language, or a language with the state-authorized standard possess the most valuable capital and set the norm against which other varieties are valued. In other words, socially desirable linguistic forms are worth more than socially stigmatized forms, and as speakers of these languages, we are both producers and consumers of linguistic capital. Linguistic practice can be thought of as an exchange of our linguistic capital in part of a larger symbolic domain where social and economic conditions come into play. That is to say, the exchange of linguistic capital is socially and economically conditioned. The projection of the “yuppie” identity hinges on the new situated meaning given to certain linguistic variables as well as the socioeconomic status of the users of these variables.

Building off of these concepts, this dissertation aims to explore the new situated social meanings of specific linguistic variables (i.e. postverbal gei and aspectual you) for MSM speakers. The next section reports on the results of a pilot study conducted by the author using a matched-guise test to validate previous claims about attitudes towards Taiwan Mandarin among northern Chinese speakers.
3.4. Pilot Study II

In order to elicit northerners’ attitudes towards TM, a matched-guise study was conducted with 43 participants from northern China, aged between 20-25. If a participant was living in the US at the time of the study, (s)he must have not left their place of origin for more than 2 years. During the task, participants listened to eight speakers reading the same passage, with four speakers from the northern dialect area (2 males and 2 females), and four from Taiwan (2 males and 2 females). People with similar voice qualities were carefully chosen for the recording so as to reduce the potential for respondents to attune to voice quality rather than the dialect features in question. Participants were asked to rate the speakers according to a series of adjectives (see appendix for the 25 adjectives) derived from classic matched guise studies (Lambert et al 1960) by selecting the personality traits that they think are associated with each voice they heard. In order to make the adjectives culturally relevant, I adapted the adjectives based on stereotypes that Mainland Chinese speakers have about different varieties of Chinese. The attitude score is calculated as follows:

attitude score= (number of positive traits selected)-(number negative traits selected)

Table 6 Paired sample statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results (Figure 6 and Table 6) show that the participants associate Taiwanese speech with significantly more positive personality traits than they attributed to Mainland speech. TM was judged more favorably than MSM by the participants, which confirms my hypothesis that TM—though a non-standard variety—is a seemingly prestigious variety. However, the interpretation of these personality traits hinges much on personal preference and other more complicated factors. For example, what does it really mean to be “traditional” “cutting edge” “soft” and “tough”? Are those traits necessarily positive or negative? Can these personality traits be grouped into broader categories that allows for a more general understanding of the social and indexical meaning of TM? In order to answer those questions, we need to take a closer look at how and under what contexts these ideologies are formed. Since the majority of Chinese Mainlanders (including the participants of this study) do not have face-to-face interaction with TM speakers, I posit
that much of Mainlanders’ ideological perception of TM stem from the media representations of Taiwanese people. To unpack these personality traits, in the next section, I will how characters and gender ideologies are represented in media, especially in the context of East Asia.

3.5. Media representations of gender ideologies in East Asia

Getting a sense of how Taiwanese people are represented in the media is pivotal to the understanding of the formation of Chinese mainlanders’ ideologies about TM. The majority of the literature on mass media looks at non-fictional, less scripted genres as the venue of investigation as language use is often considered more spontaneous and “authentic” in those genres compared to narrative media (Queen 2015:160). It might be true that characters only exist in the narrative or the fictional context, but the embodiment of the character is real (Queen 2015:160). The characters’ language patterns, costumes, gestures, facial expressions are linked to the broader language ecology of human communities, reflecting the boarder demographics of the community where the character inhibits. Such linage is known as characterization.

The goal of characterization is to achieve individual distinctiveness. It generates stereotypical but unique ideas about the character and the group of people that the character is representing. Language becomes part of characterization through its connection to the social attributes that we might broadly consider the character’s “identity” (Queen 2015:155). Similar to the concept of characterization is the notion of iconicity. Irvine and Gal (2000) describe iconization as “the socio-symbolic appropriation of a linguistic form not merely as an index or marker of a group, but as an iconic
representation of the intrinsic qualities of that group” (Gal and Irvine 2000, cited in Deumert, forthcoming). For instance, women are associated with certain language forms or behavior patterns, and these forms and behavior patterns not only represent the identity of women but also the social qualities thereof. Whether the character in narrative media truthfully represents the ‘real identity’ is central to the issue of authenticity (Bucholtz 2003; Coupland 2003; Queen 2015), which is often concerned with the realness of the language used in narrative media. In what follows, I will first discuss different types of narrative media across Asia-Pacific and then narrow down to how the images of Taiwanese are represented and perceived in narrative media.

Taiwanese idol dramas in general feature modern urban romance of college students or young professionals. These dramas provide their mainland audience with a window into the image of Taiwanese people and further generate ideologies about what Taiwanese people should be like. As Lippi-Green puts it (1997:133, cited in Queen 2012), ‘the mass media plays a major role in the communication and transmission of social values, and the propagation and defense of national culture.’ I will, therefore, start the discussion by looking at the media representation of gender ideologies in the context of Asia-Pacific.

Many recent studies of language and gender in the Asian-Pacific context (e.g. Lin & Tong 2008; Hiramoto & Teo 2014; Chen & Kang, 2015) revolve around the Confucianism traditions, under which women are expect to be conformists and be selfless and supportive of their men. Many of these traditional and stereotypical features are realized in the female characters of Kung-Fu movies (Hiramoto & Teo, 2014). Many female Kung-Fu practitioner—also referred to as nuxia in Chinese—are portrayed in a
way that conforms to the Confucianism values. They usually play a supporting role to the male practitioners in the films even if they are no less capable of fighting the evil or protecting themselves.

The Korean Wave (*hallyu*) has taken East Asia by storm with its dramas presenting an image of modern Asian women that strive to balance between traditional virtues and cosmopolitan living, despite the hardship and adversity they encounter in life (e.g. Lin & Tong 2014). Although often portrayed as tender and humble, the female antagonists in these dramas reject the blind acceptance of all Confucianism’s traditional gender values. Instead, they are empowered to adapt qualities of modern western femininity such as ‘strong’, ‘independent’ and ‘tough’ (Lin & Tong 2014). Korean dramas represent women on the traditional side of the spectrum who aspire to acquire the western modernity.

On the opposite end of the spectrum from traditional Confucian values lies the well-enregistered category of ‘Kong girl’, a type of materialistic girl who abandons tradition value and embraces capitalism and materialism with open arms (Chen & Kang 2015). The ‘Kong girl’ identity has been widely discussed online because it disrupts Confucianism’s social norms for Asian women. The origins of the Kong girl stereotype appears to have been sparked by an angry Hong Kong girl’s online post in 2005 about her boyfriend not paying for snacks on a date. The discussion later on went viral, and the girl’s sense of entitlement together with her ostentatious and demanding persona becomes the demeanor indexical of the so-called ‘Kong girl’ stereotype.

Similar to Korean dramas, Taiwanese idol dramas often depict women’s aspirations to have it all—to achieve both career and family success. It should be noted
that in Taiwanese idol dramas, there is usually a meek and caring male friend that the female antagonist can fall back on after heartbreak. This type of ‘good man’ is often feminized and seldom expresses his masculinity, (Fiske 1989, cited in Lin & Tong 2014) and it is this ‘good man’ stereotype that typifies media representations of Taiwanese guys for many Mainland audiences.

In a nutshell, media representations of Taiwanese young men and women contribute much to mainlanders’ stereotypes of Taiwanese women as cosmopolitan and Taiwanese guys as meek and emasculate. To further the discussion of Chinese Mainlanders’ ideologies toward TM, I collected both quantitative and qualitative data with matched-guise task and open-ended questionnaire, respectively (see Chapters 6 and 7). Although it is clear that individuals’ ideological perception of a language and the speaker thereof is subject to how it is portrayed in media, whether media can influence the production and grammatical perception of language. In the next chapter, I will look at the theoretical frameworks of media influence on language, and how televised media may have contributed to the formation of such ideologies.
Chapter 4. Televised media and sociolinguistic change

4.1. The debate

The effect of media exposure on language variation has always been a contentious issue in sociolinguistics. The traditional view in variationist sociolinguistics is that media play very little role in systematic language change (Labov 2001:228, Chambers 1998). However, this view has become increasingly unsatisfactory as sociolinguists begin to look at media and language change from a new perspective.

Many variationist sociolinguists discounted the homogenizing effect of televised mass media for what seemed like two obvious reasons: 1) continuing diversification of non-standard English dialects (Labov 2001:228, Chambers 1998), and 2) lack of live social interaction between the television and its audience. The popular prediction that broadcast media would instigate widespread standardization was refuted by the rigorous maintenance of local dialect diversity found in many sociolinguistic studies (Labov 2001:228, Chambers 1998). The traditional view is that exposure to standard language does not seem to cause people to give up their own dialects. As Trudgill (1986:40) put it “the point of the TV set is that people, however they watch and listen to it, do not talk to it (and even if they do, it cannot hear them!” Speech accommodation only happens in face to face interaction.

However, others argue that television audiences can also accommodate to the speech on TV (Bell, 1991). Audience membership implies approval of the communicator’s style because the audience has the power of choice. A mismatch between the communicator and audience would not be long-lived. Many more recent
studies (Stuart-Smith, 2006, 2007, 2013; Carvalho, 2004; Sayer, 2014) have also found that exposure to non-standard dialects via televised media can, in fact, have an effect on people’s attitudes towards certain dialects, or the speakers thereof. It is also possible that exposure to televised media can lead people to adopt new linguistic features to serve as a useful stylistic source, especially when these new features are not socially-stigmatized. This, in turn, can contribute to linguistic variation.

The fact that languages have become increasingly diverse often serves as counter-evidence against broadcast media’s homogenizing effect on language convergence. Convergence has been defined as a strategy of adopting to an interlocutor’s verbal or nonverbal features (LaFrance 1985; Giles, Coupland, and Coupland 1991). Language convergence is often believed to happen in face-to-face live interactions when interlocutors accommodate each other’s speech patterns. The notion of convergence is often juxtaposed with that of divergence because they are usually viewed as two opposite types of communicative behavior, but they are, in fact, not necessarily mutually exclusive phenomena (Giles, Coupland, and Coupland 1991). Divergence is a communicative strategy to differentiate, in order to assert one’s identity or to differentiate between one another. It can be either verbal or nonverbal. In Bourhis and Gile’s study (1977), their Welsh informants emphasized their Welsh membership by broadening their Welsh accent when their ethnic identity was threatened by a very English-sounding speaker. As a tactic to maintain integrity, distance, or identity, both convergence and divergence may shift the language toward a prestigious or stigmatized variety. In this dissertation, I argue that the effects of media on language cannot be categorized as either convergence or divergence. The audience will not adopt all the features their hear from the televised media, but rather,
only features useful for projecting a new identity and these features are often assigned new situated meanings. Instead of taking this process as either convergence or divergence, it should be conceptualized as a process of bricolage in which variables from different sources are combined to construct new social meanings (Eckert 2008). As Zhang (2005) points out in her Chinese yuppie study, young working professionals in Beijing adopt non-local features to project a new social identity as opposed to wanting to sound like or ‘pass’ as someone from elsewhere. The audience only picks up certain features that can be used as a stylistic source (Stuart-Smith 2006, 2013). These are usually features that have been assigned social meanings with which the speakers can project a different persona.

Other than adopting a different style to project a new social identity, what is also commonly observed with broadcast media is stylization. Stylization is the development of culturally familiar styles that are not associated the current speaking context, using linguistic features to mimic or put on another’s identity. Stylization often takes place in specific communicative contexts and at specific linguistic or semiotic levels, where its effects are created and experienced much more locally. It can also be viewed as a process of “de-authentication” that involves performing noncurrent-first-person personas (Coupland 2011). For example, Coupland (2001) looks at data from English-language national radio broadcasts in Wales. In the morning light entertainment show The Roy Noble Show, the hosts play with the monophthongal and diphthongal variants of (ou) and (ei), where monophthongal forms are considered “nonstandard.” These two phonological variables serve as a stylistic and semiotic resource for the host to be linked to Welshness. Stylizing, on the other hand, is the use of both linguistic and non-linguistic
features to construct his or her own social identity. As I will show in Chapter 4.4, some Chinese TV show hosts on the mainland participate in both styling and stylization by using linguistic features associated with Mandarin varieties spoken in Hong Kong and Taiwan.

I argue that both styling and stylization on broadcast media should not be simply categorized as convergence or divergence, but rather, broadcast media plays the role of assigning social meanings to certain linguistic features, and these features can become stylistic resources for styling or stylization in which viewers will maintain most of their own linguistic features while adopting some new features from the TV programs they watch. In support of my arguments, I will use grammaticality judgments and qualitative data to discuss that through televised media, some syntactic features have been assigned new situated indexical meanings while some have not, since none of the existing studies on media exposure have looked at grammaticality judgment data.

4.2. The spread of innovation

Most of the arguments against the effect of broadcast media on language variation are based on the evidence that exposure to Standard English through broadcast media has not standardized the English language (e.g. Milroy & Milroy 1985; Chambers 1998, Labov 2001). Most sociolinguists adhere to the idea that English language diffuses over time and develops into various social and regional dialects catalyzed by social factors in various local speech communities. Most of these studies (e.g. Milroy & Milroy 1985; Chambers 1998, Labov 2001) were done in social contexts where the standard

---

17 See Chapter 3.3 for a more detailed discussion on linguistic style.
variety is usually associated with social prestige while the non-standard is socially stigmatized—in other words, where the non-standard varieties are not likely to trigger variation, either.

The story can be different if a non-standard variety has the prestige. Naro’s (1981) study of spoken Brazilian Portuguese showed significant positive correlation between the use of subject/verb agreement and reported exposure to popular dramas, motivated by the desire to relate to the surrounding higher socioeconomic culture. Another study of Brazilian Portuguese by Carvalhos (2004) found no significant correlation between media exposure and the spread of innovative palatalization from Brazilian to Uruguayan Portuguese, but her informants attributed the spread of palatalization to Brazilian television shows. Carvalhos claimed that this process was indirectly accelerated by broadcast media exposure. Although in both studies, there is not enough evidence to show the causal effect of media exposure on the production of certain linguistic features, it can serve as a secondary factor at the perception level. Stuart-Smith et al (2013) investigate the rapid proliferation of TH-fronting and L-vocalization in Glaswegian English with respect to exposure to a London-based TV soap drama. Their findings suggest that popular TV dramas can act as additional accelerating factors in linguistic change. Again, due to the absence of live interaction, how exactly media exposure interacts with language use is subject to debate, but evidence has shown that, at the perception level, media may play a role in raising awareness of innovative forms (e.g. Naro 1981) or accelerating linguistic change (Carvalhos 2004; Stuart-Smith 2013).

Broadcast media may have, in some way, contributed to the global spread of the ‘global linguistic variant’ quotative be like (e.g. ‘she was like, no way!’) among teenagers
across English-speaking countries. The rapid propagation of the quotative *be like* among teenagers across continents in such a short period of time points to the role of broadcast media in linguistic diffusion. The underlying assumption about the spread of this innovative linguistic form is due to broadcast media (Buchstaller 2014). This account presupposes that adolescents across continents do not have the opportunity to have live interaction with each other, and therefore broadcast media is a possible conduit for the global propagation of innovative quotatives (Buchstaller 2014). However, since the effect of media—especially television—on language use is still controversial, Buchstaller (2014) suggests that broadcast media may be seen as a possible source for the spread of attitudes, stances, and ideologies, given that the effect of media consumption on the non-linguistic social behavior of consumers has been empirically attested (Strasburger 1995:13; McQuail 2000:436).

Another possible account follows from the theory of speech accommodation (Trudgill 1986; Giles 1979; Giles, Coupland & Coupland 2001). Since mass communication differs from face-to-face communication in that the audience is deprived of recipients’ reactions (Bell, 1991), it would be far-fetched to argue that the audience would accommodate to what they hear from the broadcast media. However, the accommodation can take place in the reverse direction. Bell (1991) argues that as speakers often accommodate not to an interlocutor’s actual speech but to what they believe to be the interlocutor’s speech, mass communicators are also presenting content materials catered to the audience because mass communicators are always seeking approval from the audience (Giles 1973; Giles and Powesland 1975; Bell, 1991). Therefore, mass communicators often present a favorable image of the broadcast content.
to their audience, in the hope of generating positive attitudes of the recipients towards the broadcast content. In other words, broadcast media, to a certain extent, contribute to the ideology necessary for linguistic divergence.

Sayers (2014:203) proposes an epistemological model for researching media influence on language change. He argues that media engagement—or a creative and emotionally involved process—plays the role of an ‘innovation broadcast’ between discontinuous speech communities (see Figure 7). Mediation is viewed as a prior step to broadcast. It is a term developed to describe the way nonstandard vernaculars are (re)produced in media texts (Coupland 2009; Sayers 2014). In other words, when TV characters adopt features from TM, TM is entering media texts through mediation. Then these features are broadcast to the audience which is the potential adopting speech community in Sayers’s model. The ovals in the diagram represent language inventory. The dotted background represent social network through which diffusion occurs. The social network is denser within speech communities than the outside. The dots do not permeate either the media texts or the processes of mediation and broadcast. Again, this model—as well as the studies on media influence—is not to suggest the idea of “blanket transmission from media source to passive speakers/viewers” (Sayer, 2014), nor is it to say that the homogenizing effect of media will make people talk more alike. The goal of the studies mentioned above and of this dissertation is to reexamine from different perspectives the potential effects of media on linguistic as well as social attitudes towards language. In the next section, I discuss a paradigm shift in relation to the issue of media effects on language change.
While the effects of media on systematic language change have been highly contested among variationist sociolinguists, linguistic anthropologists and discourse-oriented sociolinguists have started to look at media from a rather different perspective. Specifically, the shift has been from mediation to mediatization, moving from mediated communication to the interrelation between media and social change. I will begin the discussion with the concept of sociolinguistic reflexivity (Agha 2007:14).

Much scholarly attention has been given to the effect of media on sociolinguistic reflexivity (e.g. Agha 2007; Rampton 2009; Staehr 2014). Rampton (2009) has argued that people’s linguistic practices are increasingly reflexive, reflecting a rising awareness of linguistic variation in the age of mass media. Sociolinguistic reflexivity refers to native speakers’ metalinguistic awareness and ability to articulate socially appropriate language use. Such awareness is formulated and disseminated in social life and become available.

Figure 7 Sayer's hypothetical mediated innovation model
for use in interaction by individuals (Agha 2004). As a result, mass mediation oftentimes leads to heightened sociolinguistic reflexivity (Coupland 2007; 2009; 2014).

Mass media draw upon individuals’ previous semiotic experience to reinforce the recognition of the link between linguistic features and social personae (Agha 2007). In other words, mass media plays the role of facilitating the formation and dissemination of register (or the process of enregisterment) that connects communicative signs to other non-linguistic signs (Agha 2007). The dissemination of a register relies on the circulation of messages through either face-to-face interaction between people or other more indirect forms of communication.

Androutsopoulos (2014) introduces the notions of sociolinguistic change and mediatization to broaden the theoretical scope for the study of media and language variation. Variationist sociolinguists have traditionally examined the influences of social factors on systematic language change. More recently, many scholars (e.g. Jaffe, 2009, 2011; Agha 2011) in linguistic anthropology have conceptualized mass media and language variation as part of a “mutually constitutive process” (Coupland, 2014) and have proposed the notion of mediatization, which grapples with the changing relationship between language and society. For Agha (2011), mediatization is the “institutional practices that reflexively link processes of communication to processes of commoditization.” Mediatization is simply a narrow special case of semiotic mediation. Mediatization links communication to commodities. Agha suggests that mediatized experiences are preceded by non-mediatized ones. Mediatized representations of cultural practice presupposes prior acquaintance with that practice. Such experience, or semiotic encounters, will be subsequently invoked in real life (Agha 2011). In the following
sections, I detail this paradigm shift in relation to the study of media and language variation.

4.3.1. From mediation and mediatization

The effects of media on language change have been largely overlooked in early sociolinguistic literature but have received increasingly more scholarly attention in the context of globalization (e.g. Blommaert 2012). Instead of looking at the effects of media on systematic language change, sociolinguists (e.g. Coupland 2009a), as well as linguistic anthropologists (Hepp, 2014), have begun to look at the changing relationships between language and society and is the role media plays in this process of change. As a result, the foci of many recent studies have shifted from media to mediation and finally to mediatization (Androutsopoulos 2014).

The concept of mediatization has been discussed by a plethora of scholars in both linguistic anthropology and communication studies (Agha, 2011; Hepp, 2014; Kristiansen, 2001). While the precise definition of mediatization varies, it is concerned with the role of media in societal change. The focus of research shifts from systemic language change to sociolinguistic change. Rather than looking at specific linguistic features, recent studies focus more on language practices, such as the interaction between language use and language ideology in the process of change.

Mediation refers to the cultural, material, or semiotic conditions of any communicative action (Androutsopoulos 2014). According to Hepp (2014:50), mediation is the process of mediating meaning constructions. Mediatization, on the other hand, “reflects how the process of mediation has changed with the emergence of different kinds
of media.” In other words, mediatization is concerned with role of media in the process of socio-cultural change. In a nutshell, mediatization is a type of socio-cultural change; it focuses on the influence of media on social behavior. Kristiansen (2014) elaborates further on the distinction between mediation and mediatization to theorize between the direct and indirect influence of media on spoken language. He defines mediation as written representation of a language and mediatization as “the process of language being invested in the power and value hierarchies which support and are supported by the technologies and institutions of mass media communication.”

Following such a paradigm, German linguists Holly and Puschel (1993:148-152) point out four types of influence of television on contemporary German:

1. **Popularization of the standard variety:** in the second half of the twentieth century, the spread of electronic mass media promoted the passive and then active competence of standard language across the German-speaking area and accelerated dialect leveling.
2. **Awareness of other (non-standard) varieties:** Through media representations, audiences gain access to regional and social dialects of German and thereby increase their awareness of non-standard varieties of language even in the absence of interpersonal contact to their speakers.
3. **Norm tolerance in spoken standard language:** the relaxation of norms of public usage that can be observed on television may act as a model for tendencies of norm relaxation in spoken language.
4. **Multiplication of linguistic trends:** Television can act as a multiplier and intensifier of neologisms and linguistic fads, which may have their origin in interpersonal language use but are disseminated via broadcast. Holly and Puschel argue that television discourse intensifies rather than creates linguistic innovations. (Cited in Androutsopoulos 2014:13)

Although it is still unclear how media exposure influences a speaker’s choice of variants, it is obvious that media leads to heightened meta-cultural and sociolinguistic
reflexivity, including awareness and different ways of speaking (see also Agha 2007; Buchstaller 2014). Television viewers who have media exposure to non-local linguistic features may later incorporate these features into their stylistic repertoires in innovative ways (Carvalho 2004, Stuart-Smith 2013; Buchstaller 2014). As shown in my previous study, northern Mandarin speakers with exposure to Taiwanese TV programs show higher acceptance of the use of aspectual you, a linguistic feature commonly ascribed to TM. In addition, it is noteworthy that although the aspectual you is also used by speakers of other southern varieties of Mandarin, it is usually exclusively associated with TM by northern Mandarin speakers, the primary reason being that MSM is the standard norm stipulated to be used in broadcast media (Zhang 2012)18, and therefore other southern varieties are not frequently heard through broadcast media. TV programs from Taiwan, on the other hand, are usually watched online, which in turn becomes the primary access to the aspectual you as well as other southern features. The aspectual you is therefore perceived as a feature exclusively associated with Taiwan Mandarin. This suggests that broadcast media not only raises the awareness of linguistic innovation but also shape audience’s perception in terms of who the users are what social meanings the innovative feature is associated with. However, what remains unclear is that exposure to Taiwanese TV programs does not raise the acceptance of the postverbal gei-phrase, possible because northern Mandarin speakers allow for the intra-speaker variation of both pre- and postverbal gei-phrase, even though the preverbal form is more often used. Building on Holly and Puschel’s findings regarding contemporary German, I will show in the discussion section that these four types of influence of television also hold true for Mandarin Chinese.

18 More background information in section 4.4.
4.3.2. From language change to sociolinguistic change

The variationist approach to the effects of media exposure is to operationalize media exposure as an independent variable whose influence on language can be studied in terms of phonological or syntactic variables. However, attempts to establish the correlation between independent and linguistic variables have not always been very successful because the role of media in language change cannot be established by looking at the correlation between media exposure as measured by watching habits and the production (or perception) of linguistic variables alone (see Stuart-Smith 2010). Therefore, more recent research has changed the scope of study from language change to sociolinguistic change. It is a change of theoretical paradigm that moves the focus from systematic language change to sociocultural change. Sociolinguistic change can be understood as a broad set of linguistic changes with significant social implications (Androutsopoulos, 2014). Coupland (2009a; 2014:74) proposes five inter-related dimensions of sociolinguistic change: social norms, language ideologies, discursive practices, cultural reflexivity, and media(tiza)tion. Coupland (2014) suggests that social norms have been a focus in sociolinguistics and the overarching question for this line of research is what is considered “proper” speech. What is “proper” represents the social norm and ideologies people have about their speech. The shift of social norms is central to the study of social or sociolinguistic change. Discursive practices emphasize “practice” rather than “speech sound”. The interface between discursive practices and language ideologies is a prolific line of study in sociolinguistics. Variationist sociolinguists have sometimes argued that shifting language ideologies are the driving force behind language change. Thus, the study of the interface between ideologies, norms and practices is
central for understanding the dynamics of language change. In fact, language change can also trigger shifting ideologies. The circular relationships between language change and shifting ideology are the central concerns of cultural reflexivity, which grapples with issues such as from whose perspective or how social change is acknowledged and in what socio-cultural context the change occurs. In addition, technological change is another important aspect of social change. The study of media(tiza)tion explores technological change that involves new discursive literacy and practices.

These shifts in theoretical paradigm all point to the fact that the effects of media on language cannot be fully understood only by looking at the correlation between media exposure and certain linguistic variables. Stuart-Smith (2013) points out that studies in cognitive psychology on media influence suggests that interaction with media is contingent on individuals’ existing experience of the real world and on their social cognition (Berkowitz 1984, Bargh et al. 1996, Gunter 2000), and psychological engagement with media, or attention paid to media, is much more important than simply being exposed to it (Gunter 2000:163). Therefore, it is important to take into account the concept of ‘media engagement’, using qualitative engagement data to complement the quantitative data on exposure.

Without rejecting the traditional variationist paradigm, this dissertation will take into account both quantitative (i.e. grammaticality judgments) and qualitative data (i.e. an attitudinal questionnaire, see section Chapter 5) to examine both media exposure and media engagement.
4.4. Televised media in Greater China

Many studies in both sociolinguistics and mass communication draw upon the idea of the cultural-linguistic market to account for the sociological impacts of shared languages, overlapping culture and even intertwined history across geographic boundaries in a larger context (e.g. McAnany and Wilkinson 1996; Sinclair and Cunningham 2000; Zhu 2008:102; Zhang 2005). The cultural-linguistic market is a symbolic and transnational marketplace where language and culture constitute valuable forms of capital (Bourdieu 1977). The post-Mao economic reforms in China have encouraged the emergence of such a marketplace and the flourishing of many cyber technologies. These allow the content of news and entertainment to be increasingly market-driven and reduce the barrier between international media and Chinese Mainlanders (Fong, 2009). Given the cultural and linguistic proximity between China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, many on-line television programs from Hong Kong and Taiwan have bridged social differences and satisfied curiosity but have also one-sidedly portrayed the lifestyles of the other two sides.

Hong Kong dramas have a well-established tradition of featuring either martial arts or individuals struggling their way up in the business world (Zhu 2008:105). Moving further in the cultural-linguistic market, media producers in Hong Kong decided to dub their Cantonese language media products into Mandarin in the 1990s. Ever since then, the Mandarin varieties spoken in Hong Kong and Taiwan (often jointly known as gang-tai) are perceived by many Mainlanders as the same variety, even though Cantonese is still the dominant language in Hong Kong. Taiwanese dramas (a.k.a. idol dramas) target the younger generation by featuring teen idols and romance in modern high school or college
settings. One such drama, *Meteor Garden* (2001) was an enormous success, even in the Chinese-speaking communities in Southeast Asia. The story was about a seemingly unpromising romance between an ordinary-looking girl from a working-class family and a good-looking guy from a wealthy family bridging the gap of social class. Many of the lines or even linguistic features used in the drama were picked up by teenagers and became part of the everyday speech of many young people at the time (Zhu, 2008). One example is Starr’s (in progress) study of affective sentence-final particles used in Taiwanese drama, which I will discuss in more detail in section 6.5.

In addition to dramas, Taiwanese variety shows are also popular among youth in China. Though broadcast in Taiwan, the Taiwanese variety-comedy talk show, *Kang Xi Lai Le* (*Here comes Kang Xi*19), had been enormously successful and popular among Chinese speakers in many countries since its premiere in 2004. Though recently ended in January 2016, this weekly show featured interviews with some of the most popular celebrities from Chinese-speaking communities across Asia (i.e. China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and Malaysia). The chemistry and conflicting styles of the two hosts achieve the paradoxical effect of complementing each other and presenting a unique sense of humor. The hosts’ styles of speaking were considered cool and were emulated by many in their youth audience and even by other variety show hosts on the Mainland until the Chinese government mandated the use of standard Mandarin in domestic variety shows in 2006 (Zhu 2008).

---

19 *Kang* and *Xi* are the initial characters of the names of the two hosts. The combination of the two characters is also the name of a Chinese emperor from the Qing dynasty.
It was brought to the attention of the Chinese government in late 1990s that MSM has been “contaminated” by other Mandarin varieties. In an effort to “protect the purity and standard of the national language”, Chinese governments at both central and local levels promulgated a series of laws and regulations to keep MSM from the influence from other languages or local vernaculars. In October 2000, China passed the “Common Language Law” to make MSM (a.k.a. Putonghua) the one and only language used in all broadcast media (Zhang 2012). In 2003, radio and television broadcasters were also required to take the Putonghua proficiency test to make sure they have ‘standard’ pronunciation. In April 2004, the top government broadcasting authority launched the “Purification Project” to purge the broadcast media of linguistic elements pernicious to Chinese youngsters, including all the ‘non-standard features, codeswitching between Mandarin and other foreign languages, and style-shifting with Hong Kong and Taiwan accents (Zhang 2012). Mandarin varieties that are considered non-standard have almost never been aired on the national broadcast media. This provides its audience with an interesting but biased view on how people actually talk across the Greater China Region. For example, aspectual you is a feature shared by many southern varieties (e.g. Taiwan Mandarin, Shanghai Mandarin, and Guangdong Mandarin), but for many northern Mandarin speakers it is only exclusively associated with Taiwan Mandarin because they have only heard of it through the Taiwanese TV programs online. Not only do they associate that feature with Taiwan Mandarin speakers, but most possibly also with the social attributes ascribed to Taiwan Mandarin speakers, as I will show later in the results section.
The sociological impact of broadcast media is significant and transnational. Through broadcast media, an intended image or stereotype about a certain group of people seeps into an audience’s mindset, and ideologies about the group of people as well as their dialect are generated unconsciously at the same time. A linguistic form that indexes a place or a group of people is referred to as an \( n^{th} \) order indexical (Silverstein 2003; Eckert 2008). For example, the use of the Chinese morpheme *you* as an aspectual marker is often associated with TM. It is therefore a \( n^{th} \) order index. When the feature becomes associated with a range of non-linguistic social attributes (e.g. low intelligence, laziness, educated elite status, etc.), the feature becomes a \( n+1^{st} \) order index. For example, Ling (1991:34) found in her study that TM was associated with being “soft, wealthy, and elegant,” while MSM was associated with being “natural, reliable, and kind.”

Phonological and lexical features from TM and MSM are associated with different social stereotypes and personality traits. This illustrates the concept of \( n+1^{st} \) indexicality. More recent work suggests that Southern varieties of Mandarin are entering the speech of some young professionals in Mainland China. Fourteen years after Ling’s study, with China having become one of the world’s most important emerging economies, Zhang (2005:431) observed that Chinese young professionals working in foreign companies in Beijing now speak a ‘new variety’ of Mandarin, which is characterized as a mixture of Mandarin, English, Cantonese, and expressions from TM: the reason being that all these languages index a modern, metropolitan identity. To this point, features from southern varieties (especially Hong Kong and Taiwan) have been taken to index a certain category (i.e. ‘yuppie’ in Zhang’s study) instead of just a stereotype. These features have become what Silverstein has termed \( n+1^{st} \) order indexes (Silverstein 2003; Eckert 2008).

---

20 See the discussion on indexical order in Chapter 1.3 (pp. 28-20).
However, the dominance of these television shows is dynamic and so are people’s ideologies or attitudes towards the shows; they wax and wane with the economic and political power of the corresponding region where these television programs are produced. As China continues its ascendance as a global political and economic powerhouse, Taiwan’s economy overall has been stagnant, including its plateauing television industry. A quote from the CommonWealth (TianXia) magazine in Taiwan well summarizes the impasse of the television industry in Taiwan:

一一年統計，該年台灣的電視台共引進中國戲劇一五一部，韓劇七八部，韓劇播出時數佔比更逼近四成。台灣自製戲只剩四十九部。台灣影視產業不僅被韓流拋得愈來愈遠，台灣人才也成為中國市場起飛的引擎。台灣一集都一百多萬台幣（製作費），不到四、五十萬人民幣。有時候在內地，給一個大牌的片酬就四、五十萬這麼多了，怎麼拍戲？所以大家會出走，很可憐。


In 2011, Taiwan’s television market imported 151 Chinese dramas and 78 Koreans dramas. Korean dramas even took up almost 40 percent of the total airtime. There were only 49 self-made Taiwanese dramas remaining. Taiwan’s TV industry has been left behind by the Korean Wave (Hanliu). Many talented Taiwanese television professionals had left Taiwan to provide momentum for the takeoff of the Chinese television market. The production budget is about 1 million NTDs, which is below 40 to 50 million RMBs, but on the mainland 40 million RMBs is only the remuneration paid to an A-list celebrity. That is why people left.21

The downturn of Taiwan’s TV industry seems to go along with the ideological reversal of TM and MSM. It is speculated that MSM will ascend to the status commensurate with this political and economic power and, in turn, with this new status of importance, develop new social meanings for its linguistic features in the Chinese

21 When italics occurs, it is the translation by the author.
linguistic marketplace. In the next chapter, I describe the methodology used for data collection in support of the claim.
Chapter 5. Methodology

This dissertation aims to examine the interrelation between media exposure, language attitudes and acceptability judgments, or more specifically how exposure to Taiwanese TV programs—together with language attitudes—affect Chinese northerners’ acceptability judgments of aspectual you and postverbal gei. In addition to acceptability, I also delve into the ideological perceptions of the two syntactic variables as well as the attitudes toward TM in general. This section details the methodologies used to answer these questions, including an acceptability task, a matched-guise task, an attitudinal questionnaire, and a demographic questionnaire.

5.1. Subjects

For the present study, native Northern Mandarin speakers were recruited online through Wenjuan.com, a China-based survey website, which provides paid data collection service. Participants were paid RMB 50 after their responses were validated by manually looking at each participant’s answers, IP address and response time. It is a counter-balanced research design, and each participant is randomly assigned to one of two groups (A or B). There were 100 participants in each group (N=200). Data were collected through an online survey[^22], which consisted of the following sections: grammatical judgment test, matched-guise task, open-ended attitudinal questions, and demographic questions.

[^22]: http://www.wenjuan.com/survey
5.2. Procedure

5.2.1. Acceptability judgment task

Participants were first asked about their dialect backgrounds. Only people of northern dialect background were guided into the grammaticality judgment task. The acceptability judgment portion of the survey uses a between-subjects design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the two groups (i.e. Groups A or B), so that the results would not be affected by lexical items or pragmatics. Participants in both groups are presented with the same lexical items, but the variants were swapped.

In this task, participants were asked to rate sentences with the target variables on a scale of 1 to 7. There are 40 sentences in total, with 10 for the *gei* variable (i.e. 5 preverbal and 5 postverbal), 10 for the *you* variable (5 with the aspectual *you* and 5 without), and 20 fillers of varying levels of acceptance. A regression analysis was conducted to examine if there was a correlation between the amount of media exposure to Taiwanese TV programs and the level of acceptability to the variables associated Taiwan Mandarin.

5.2.2. Matched-guise attitude task

Following Buchstaller’s (2006b) study of attitudes toward quotative ‘be like’, I adopt a matched guise with written stimuli in order to control for phonological variables that trigger regional associations. If the matched guise carrier material contains variables that trigger regional associations, the informants might react to these and might therefore be biased in their judgments (Buchstaller, 2006b). When testing for attitudes towards
certain features as opposed to attitudes toward the variety in general, it is important to control for the lexicalization (or textual carrier) in which the target feature occurs. Therefore, as in the grammaticality judgment task, participants will be randomly assigned to two different groups, with same lexicalization but different variants (i.e. swapping the stimuli tokens between texts in the two groups). The written stimuli were presented in the form of a dialogue where the target variables appear densely throughout the dialogue. Each participant was presented with four short dialogues, two for the gei variable (pre- and post-verbal) and two for the you variable (with and without you).

All four dialogues consisted of a conversation between two friends. In one of the dialogues, for instance, the two friends were talking about inviting a friend to a movie where the gei variable occurs repetitively (see appendix). Participants in both groups A and B saw the same dialogue except the variants were swapped. After reading each dialogue, respondents were asked to rate the written utterance on 11 personality traits such as “rustic” or “refined” on a 5 point Likert scale (0: not at all, 5: very). These traits are chosen based on Zhang (2005) (e.g. cosmopolitan, business-like) and Su (2008)’s (e.g. refined) studies, as well as what I—as a native speaker of TM—perceived to be the common ideologies northern Mandarin speakers hold about Mainland and Taiwan Mandarin. The traits were presented on a 5-point scale with binary opposite poles (e.g. 1=rustic……5=refined) (see appendix).

For each dialogue, the participants were also asked to identify where they thought the speaker was from after rating all the personality traits. This is due to the fact that the ratings of the personality traits represent only how the participants think of the variables but not how they think of the people who actually use those variables because the
participants may have different opinions about who or what varieties the variables are associated with. This question will serve to pinpoint the speech community the northern Mandarin judges associate the variable with, as well as making the connection between the attitudes and their corresponding speech community.

A similar concept was also pointed out in Preston (2005:52)’s perceptual dialectology study. If one submits a voice from New England to Californian judges, and the voice is judged to be ‘intelligent’, ‘cold’ and ‘fast’, one can conclude that Californians judged the voice sample that way. One cannot conclude, however, that this is what Californians believe about New England voices, for the majority of the judges might not agree the voice is from New England, or Californians may not have a concept of “New England” speech.

Kristiansen’s (2001) research on language variation and change in Denmark shows that subconscious or ‘covert’ attitudes can be better predictors of linguistic behavior than conscious or ‘overt’ language attitudes. The matched-guise task described above measures the covert language attitudes, and an attitudinal questionnaire was also employed to measure individuals’ overt language attitudes.

5.2.3. Attitudinal questionnaire

The design of the grammaticality judgment task follows the variationist tradition, which conceptualizes media exposure as an independent variable whose influence on language can be studied in terms of phonological or syntactic variables. However, some scholars also argue that the effects of broadcast media on language variation cannot always be scientifically established because the correlation between linguistic variables
and media exposure is usually either not found or interpreted as not causal (e.g. Stuart-Smith 2013; Androutsopoulos 2014). Androutsopoulos (2014) suggests that the assumption that media exposure can be directly correlated with subsequent social behavior is now viewed as unsatisfactory and, as a result, the idea of media exposure has been replaced by ‘media reception’ or ‘media engagement’ (e.g. Stuart-Smith 2013).

Therefore, in order to understand the participants’ engagement with Taiwanese TV programs, the attitudinal survey in this study asked the participants the following questions for qualitative analysis:

a. Who are your favorite celebrities?
b. Who would you like to be if you could become one of the celebrities you like?
c. What do you think of Taiwanese TV shows?
d. Do you talk about those TV shows with friends?
e. Is watching TV one of your main leisure activities?
f. How do you think of ________ ‘s talk? (list a few iconic Taiwanese people here)
g. Do you participate in the online discussion of any Taiwanese TV shows? If so, what website/app/social media do you use?
h. How do you think of Taiwan Mandarin?

Additionally, in order to obtain an overall understanding of Chinese Mainlanders’ attitude toward Taiwanese TV programs, I also explored the venues (i.e. fan page, douban.com., Chinese social media…, etc.) where media engagement takes place. Social media can be the loci of these conversations about TV programs and provide useful information for a more complete analysis.
5.2.4. Demographic questions

The demographic questions are mostly concerned with participants’ television-viewing habits as well as other social factors that may influence the adoption of linguistic variants, such as gender, age, age at onset of TV viewing, and social networks. Participants will also be asked explicitly about their attitudes towards Taiwan Mandarin.

5.3. Data analysis

The data analysis focuses on the contrast between the attitude scores for the Taiwanese variants and for the Mainland variants, and correlate that with the grammaticality judgment score. For each participant, the following three scores were calculated:

(8) \[ \text{standardized judgement score} = \frac{\text{judgment score} - \text{filler mean}}{\text{filler's standard deviation}} \]

(9) \[ \text{media exposure} = \text{frequency} \times \text{duration}^{23} \]

(10) \[ \text{Attitude score} = \text{Taiwan Mandarin} - \text{Mainland Mandarin} \]

To measure the effect of attitudes and media exposure on judgments, a series of mixed effect linear regression model was fit with the judgment score as the dependent variable and media exposure and attitude score as predictors.

\[^{23}\text{Frequency is defined as hours/day, and duration is defined as the number of years of watching Taiwanese TV shows.}\]
There is a large number of participants (n=147) who reported not watching any Taiwanese TV programs. In order to avoid strong floor effect, I divided the participants into three subgroups based on the amount of exposure. People with no exposure to Taiwanese TV programs were categorized as one group, and the remainder was divided into two groups: moderate and extensive exposure (N=87). The numbers of participants for the moderate and extensive group are 47 and 40, respectively. The random effect model looks at the effects of language attitudes and other social factors on each exposure group.

In order to examine whether any broader generalizations can be made about people’s attitudes toward TM, a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was conducted to group the personality traits. PCA converts a set of observations of possibly correlated variables into a set of linearly uncorrelated variables called “principal components.” These components help to pinpoint the personality traits that are most relevant to the linguistic variables and reveal the social meanings attached to these variables. The principle components (i.e. the grouped personality traits) were then fed into the random effect model for regression analysis.

The mixed effect model focuses on the effects of the predictors—attitude, exposure, gender etc.—that are central to this study, abstracting away from variation noises introduced by "random" fluctuations, i.e. the effects of different subjects and different lexicalizations (items). The "random" effects in the model—item and subject—are therefore not analyzed experimentally. The goal of the analysis to factor out these effects in arriving at an estimate of the "real" predictors. Finally, a post hoc analysis of
the qualitative data together with the online posts in social media was conducted to supplement the quantitative matcher-guise data on language attitude.

**Model fitting**

The following model is fitted using STATA:

\[ Y_{ij} = \alpha + U_i + \beta_1 \cdot \text{Age} + \beta_2 \cdot \text{Gender} + \beta_3 \cdot \text{Media Exposure} + \]
\[ B_4 \cdot \text{Attitude Factor 1} + \beta_5 \cdot \text{Attitude Factor 2} + \beta_6 \cdot \text{Attitude Factor 3} + W_{ij} \]

where \( Y_{ij} \) denotes the outcomes of the syntactic variable *gei* or *you* for the subject \( i \) and the item \( j \) (i.e. acceptability token). \( \alpha \) represents the intercept for the entire sample. \( U_i \) is the subject-specific random effect that captures the deviation from the sample average. \( W_{ij} \), in contrast, represents the item-specific residuals, which is a random effect for item in addition to the random effect for subject. Note that \( U_i \) is based on the assumption that it is normally distributed and is centered on 0. This model specification in effect partitions the error term into individual-specific random effect consistent across the 5 items and item-specific residuals. Therefore, this model can account for individual heterogeneity regarding the outcomes (each individual participant has a specific intercept, \( \alpha + U_i \)) as well as random fluctuation of each item.

This data structure allows for random effect modeling because of its hierarchical structure. The five items are nested within a subject. Since the items tend to correlate within individuals, robust estimator for standard error calculation is used.
Chapter 6. Results and discussion

6.1. Overall distribution of the variant

The goal of this section is to provide an overall snapshot of the distribution of the variants. Two-tailed t-tests were conducted in order to test the hypothesis that 1) sentences with aspectual you were judged to be less acceptable than those without aspectual you, and 2) the preverbal gei-phrases were judged better than its postverbal counterpart. The t-tests (see figure 8) confirm the expectation that the standard forms, in general, are judged to be significantly more acceptable (“better”) than the non-standard forms. The preverbal phrases receive higher acceptability judgment scores than the postverbal ones (t(234)=5.665, p<0.001), and sentences without aspectual you are also judged to be more acceptable than that without aspectual you (t(234)=14.91, p<0.001).

In what follows, I will draw upon multiple regression to answer the question as to what social factors best predict who would like the non-standard forms better and who would not.
6.2. Principle Component Analysis

As discussed earlier in chapter 5.3, in order to pinpoint the personality traits that are most relevant to the syntactic variables, I draw upon Principle Component Analysis (PCA) to convert possibly correlated features to linearly uncorrelated ‘principle components.’ PCA suggests that the 12 personality traits can be divided into three groups:

Component 1: +gentle, +polite, -tough, and +cosmopolitan,

Component 2: +sincere, +reliable, +humorous, and +low-key, and

Component 3: +fashionable, +young, and +business-like.

‘Refined’ is removed from the analysis because it is not strongly related to any of the three components (see table 6). ‘Cosmopolitanism’ is not a strong factor either: although it gravitates towards ‘politeness,’ it is also somewhat related to youthfulness (see table 6). Component 2 here bears on the ‘good man’ stereotype featured in some Taiwanese
dramas as discussed in section 3.4. The ‘good man’ identity is often feminized and seldom expresses his masculinity.

PCA groups correlated personality traits into major attitudinal components that are not linearly correlated to each other. These attitudinal factors were later fed into the mixed-effects model (see section 6.3) to pinpoint the personality traits that are most closely related to the linguistic variables. This will identify the social meanings (i.e. the three major components) that are most closely attached to the target syntactic variables (i.e. postverbal gei and aspectual you).

Table 7 Principle Component Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough</td>
<td>-.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitan</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td>.830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous</td>
<td></td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low key</td>
<td></td>
<td>.568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 5 iterations.
Table 7 shows that three ‘principle components’ emerge as a result of the PCA. Below I will discuss each component and situate them in the larger social context. Bear in mind that most of the participants are college students attending schools in northern Chinese metropolises such as Tianjin and Beijing where skyscrapers, five-star hotels and luxury shops have become commonplace. They witness the explosive growth of the Chinese economy. Unlike their parents’ generation, Taiwan and Hong Kong no longer represent a cosmopolitan lifestyle for many of these millennials growing up in northern Chinese cities. Given the context, we can now better situate the three “principle components” categorized by the PCA:

Component 1: +gentle, +polite, -tough, and +cosmopolitan

Component 1 characterizes the way of communication among the urban middle class. As education is becoming increasingly accessible in urban China, +Gentle, +polite, and -tough seem to invoke a polite, well-educated, cosmopolitan persona that embodies urban valence (attractiveness).

Component 2: +sincere, +reliable, +humorous, and +low key

As the Chinese economy is rapidly booming, the tradition social values have been drifting away from modesty to ostentation. What is often portrayed in mass media is the lifestyle of the ultra-rich, such as the Canadian-made reality TV show Ultra-Rich Asian Girls, which features China’s Rich Second Generation living in Vancouver, Canada. These girls represent a highly enregistered social identity, and quantifiers such as showy, money-driven, and aggressive have become the demeanor indexicals (Goffman 1956; Agha 2007, cited Chen and Kong 2015) of this type of social identity. On the contrary,
the past decade saw Taiwan’s relatively slow or even stagnant economic growth. With relatively smaller poverty gap and much less competition for economic opportunities within the island, Taiwanese have developed what many Chinese mainlanders would perceive to be a sincere, reliable, and laidback temperament.

**Component 3: +fashionable, +young, and +business-like**

Component 3 refers to a modern youthful identity often associated with coolness and style. It is similar to Component 1 in the sense that both components pertain to a cosmopolitan lifestyle, but they also differ in that component 1 is more relevant to verbal communication whereas component 3 is more about non-verbal behavior.

In the next section, I fed these three components into the mixed-effect regression model as three Attitudinal Factors to test which factors, together with media exposure, can better predict the acceptability judgment results.
6.3. Mixed-effects regression

The goal of the mixed-effects regression analysis is to factor out random fluctuations caused by different subjects and lexical items. To test my hypotheses, in what follows, I look at the interaction effects between media exposure and Attitudinal Factor 2 (AF2: sincere, reliable, humorous, and low-key) to see whether they reach the significance level at $p < .05$. In this mixed effect regression model (see Tables 7 and 8), media exposure is treated as a categorical variable. Participants are divided into three groups based on their self-reported amount of exposure to Taiwanese TV programs: no exposure (N=147), moderate exposure (N=47), and extensive exposure (N=40). The model examines the effects of social factors (i.e. attitudes, gender, and age) on acceptability scores in each group.

Based on the results of PCA, the 12 personality traits are grouped into three principle components (see section 6.2). Each component is treated as a separate variable (i.e. three Attitudinal Factors) in order to further pinpoint what personality traits are more closely related to the target syntactic variables, or have stronger effects on the acceptability scores. These three components were fed into the mixed-effects model to see which components best predict the acceptability judgment results. For both postverbal gei and aspectual you, Attitudinal Factor 2 (sincere, reliable, humorous, and low-key) emerged as the factor that best predict the acceptability judgment results.

Table 8 shows the results for postverbal gei. The ANOVA table is the results of the mixed-effects linear model with the judgment score as the dependent variable and media exposure and attitude score as predictors.
As shown in Table 8, AF2 seems to be the only factor that has an effect on the acceptability judgments. Surprisingly, for participants with no exposure to Taiwanese TV programs, AF2 is positively correlated with the acceptability judgment results. For all the other groups with exposure to Taiwanese TV programs, no significant results were found. The results are plotted in Figure 9.
As shown in Figure 9, for postverbal *gei*, the interaction between exposure and AF2 does have an effect on the acceptability rating. Random effects and AF2 (i.e. sincere, reliable, humorous, and low-key) have a significant effect on the acceptability ratings of the no exposure group, $p=.021$. The interaction between media exposure and AF2 shows a significant effect on the acceptability ratings. In Figure 9, each line represents a group with a certain level of exposure to Taiwanese TV programs. The blue line represents the group of participants with no exposure to Taiwanese TV programs. The red line represents participants with moderate exposure, and the green line represents participants extensive exposure. The horizontal axis represents the acceptability ratings of the postverbal *gei*-phrase, and the vertical axis represents the scoring of AF2. For those who have no exposure to Taiwanese TV programs, acceptability ratings of postverbal *gei* increase as the scores of AF2 increases. In other words, the higher the score the participants give to the four personality traits in the category of AF2, the more acceptable the postverbal *gei*-phrase is to them. However, for those who have moderate to extensive exposure to Taiwanese TV programs, no significant effect of language attitudes were found to be statistically significant (the red and green lines in Figure 9). That is to say, in the case of postverbal *gei*-phrases, when the participants have exposure to Taiwanese TV programs, language attitudes and acceptability ratings are not statistically correlated.
In the case of postverbal *gei*-phrases, since most northern Mandarin varieties allow for both pre- and postverbal variants, the postverbal *gei*-phrase may not come across as a non-local feature to many MSM speakers. In fact, many northern Mandarin varieties still allow for intra-speaker variation between the pre- and postverbal *gei*-phrases, which may explain why exposure to Taiwanese TV programs does not affect the acceptability of the postverbal *gei*-phrase in their grammar. That is to say, if a feature is
not perceived as a non-local feature, media exposure is less likely to have an effect on
the acceptability of such a feature. Another possible account is that attitudinal factors
may not have much effect on these individuals’ language use or perception.

Other previous studies (e.g. Meyerhoff and Niedzielski 2003; Stuart-Smith 2007;
2013) also found that attitudinal factors may not always be strong factors in affecting
speakers’ language use and perception, and they are not always positively correlated with
the amount of televised media exposure. For example, Stuart-Smith (2006) found that
engagement with London-based TV does not lead to a positive evaluation of Cockney
accents. In fact, London accents received mixed evaluations, while the innovations (i.e.
th-fronting and l-vocalization\(^{24}\)) themselves were considered by participants as ‘pure
Glaswegian’ (Stuart-Smith 2007: 12). Subsequent reanalysis of the data (Stuart-Smith et
al. 2013) has shown reduced significance of attitudinal factors. Stuart-Smith et al. (2013)
found that attitudinal factors emerged as the weakest of the four main theoretical
categories.

Therefore, I postulate that the effects of the attitudinal factors are weakened by
other social factors, as the postverbal *gei*-phrase is not a salient non-local feature for
many MSM speakers, and, therefore, MSM speakers do not often associate the postverbal
*gei*-phrase exclusively with TM. In other words, the postverbal *gei*-phrase is not a
perceptually salient non-local feature for MSM speakers, and therefore the effects of
attitude towards TM on acceptability are not strong. However, the results for aspectual
*you* are rather different, as aspectual *you* is a perceptually salient non-local feature. In
what follows, I will discuss the results for aspectual *you*.

\(^{24}\) Th-fronting and l-vocalization are typically associated with associated with the Cockney dialect of London.
Table 10 Mixed effect model for *you*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>(95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Exposure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (vs. None)</td>
<td>3.008</td>
<td>6.876</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>(-10.47 - 16.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive (vs. None)</td>
<td>-0.579</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>(-3.396 - 2.238)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudinal Factor 1</strong></td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>(-0.232 - 0.519)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Exposure × Attitudinal Factor 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate × Attitude Factor 1</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>(-2.094 - 2.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive × Attitude Factor 1</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>(-1.381 - 0.341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude Factor 2</strong></td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>(-0.214 - 0.341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Exposure × Attitudinal Factor 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate × Attitude Factor 2</td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>(-1.593 - 0.956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive × Attitude Factor 2</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td><strong>0.025</strong></td>
<td>(0.09 - 1.346)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude Factor 3</strong></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>(-0.299 - 0.259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Exposure × Attitudinal Factor 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate × Attitude Factor 3</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>(-2.553 - 1.114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive × Attitude Factor 3</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>(-0.628 - 0.503)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>(-0.61 - 0.363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>(-0.086 - 0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>(4.026 - 7.474)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 is the ANOVA table for the results of aspectual *you*. Consistent with my previous hypothesis, media exposure, together with relevant language attitudes, has an effect on the acceptability judgment results ($p=.025$). Table 8 also shows that neither media exposure nor language attitudes independently has a significant effect on the acceptability judgment results. AF2 appears to be the only ‘principle component’ that has an interaction effect with media exposure on the acceptability judgment results. In summary, it both takes extensive exposure and relevant attitudes—AF2 in this case—to see the interaction effect on acceptability judgment.
Figure 10 shows the combined effects of media exposure and AF2 on a chart. Each line represents a group with a certain level of exposure to Taiwanese TV programs. For example, the green line represents the group of participants with extensive exposure to Taiwanese TV programs. The horizontal axis represents participants’ acceptability ratings for aspectual *you*, and the vertical axis represents participants’ scoring of AF2. For the group with extensive exposure to Taiwanese TV programs, the acceptability ratings for *you* are positively correlated with speakers’ language attitudes towards TM: the higher the attitude score, the higher the acceptability ratings for aspectual *you* (see Figure 10 green line). For the groups with moderate to no exposure, language attitudes alone do not have a significant effect on the acceptability ratings of *you*. The results suggest that aspectual *you* behaves rather differently from postverbal *gei* in relation to media exposure and language attitudes. Again, media exposure or language attitudes do not independently have an effect on the acceptability judgment ratings of aspectual *you*, but the interaction between media exposure and language attitudes shows an effect on the acceptability ratings of aspectual *you*. The results are consistent with my hypothesis that neither media exposure nor language attitudes alone has an effect on acceptability ratings, but the interaction of the two does affect speakers’ acceptability judgment results.

Similar to the results of postverbal *gei*, AF2 (i.e. sincere, reliable, humorous, and low-key) also emerges as a significant predictor of the acceptability ratings for *you*. AF2 together with media exposure shows a significant positive effect on the acceptability ratings of *you*. In other words, the subjects of this study associate AF2 with aspectual *you*, which for many Chinese northerners is salient feature strongly associated with TM.
The results suggest that when the non-local variable is salient to MSM speakers as in the case of aspectual *you*, media exposure together with language attitudes can affect their acceptability judgments of this variant. In sum, media exposure and language attitudes make non-local features more acceptable if the features are already salient to the individuals (e.g. *you*). However, if the features are not salient to the individuals as non-local features, media exposure and language attitudes do not exert a significant influence on the acceptability of the variant (e.g. *gei*).

Figure 10 Adjusted prediction of aspectual *you*
Table 11 Adjusted prediction of aspectual *you*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>(95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Exposure</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>(-0.214 – 0.341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Exposure</td>
<td>-0.255</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>(-1.503 – 0.994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Exposure</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>(0.217 – 1.347)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I argue that media exposure together with language attitudes increases individuals’ awareness of non-local linguistic features. In the case of the postverbal gei-phrase, speakers are not aware that it is associated with Taiwanese Mandarin since it is ubiquitous in many of the southern varieties. Therefore, the pre- and postverbal gei phrases are judged to be equally natural. On the other hand, speakers are fully aware that aspectual *you* is exclusively associated with Taiwanese Mandarin. With such awareness, media exposure plays a role in constructing the link between the variable and the social attributes. Therefore, the acceptability ratings of aspectual *you* are positively correlated with AF2 for the individuals with exposure to Taiwanese TV programs as compared with individuals with no exposure. The results suggest that media exposure on its own does not contribute directly to variation in the perception of variants, but the interaction between media exposure and language attitudes seems to promote people’s acceptance of the non-local linguistic form.

A caveat must be included here that even though there is a correlation between media exposure and the judgment scores of sentences with aspectual *you*, correlation itself does not necessarily imply causation. The positive correlation between media exposure and the grammaticality judgment score is not proof that media exposure is the direct cause of favorable judgments of *you*. However, the data does suggest that media exposure, together with language attitudes, increases the acceptability of syntactic
variables that contrast with an individual’s own variety. In addition, there are methodological issues that need to be addressed: the actual representations of the two syntactic variables in televised media were not measured. Therefore, it is not clear exactly how frequently the two syntactic variables are represented in televised media, nor is it apparent how to quantify the actual exposure the participants had to the two syntactic variables.

6.4. Social meanings of the variables

In order to explore the social meanings attached to the two syntactic variables, I look at the differences in the ratings of each personality trait between 1) the post- and preverbal variants, and 2) the use and non-use of the aspectual you. Gaps were found between the ratings pertaining to various personality traits, and these personality traits emerged as potential social meanings for the target syntactic variables.

Tables 12 and 13 show the analyses of the social meanings of postverbal gei and aspectual you. In Table 12, drawing upon the attitudinal data from the matched-guise task, I examine the contrasts in the scores of each personality trait between pre- and postverbal gei, and selected the traits that had the greatest gap, which is shown in the ‘sum’ column. For postverbal gei, ‘gentleness’ emerged as a personality trait that was by far the most strongly associated with the variable. Exactly what it means to be ‘gentle’ in this cultural context will be discussed in more detail in section 6.5. The same procedure was carried out for aspectual you, and the results are presented in Table 13. Similar results were found for aspectual you: ‘gentleness’ and the reverse effect of ‘toughness’ (i.e. softness) emerge as the two personality traits that are most strongly associated with aspectual you.
In sum, ‘gentleness’ stands out as a social trait strongly associated with the you variable. Similar results were also found for the postverbal gei variable: ‘gentleness’ and ‘softness’ emerged as social qualities associated with the postverbal gei variable. These attributes can be largely ascribed to the stereotypical “babyish” style of many Taiwanese female celebrities. Influenced by young Japanese girls, many Taiwanese female celebrities stylize their speech with a childlike voice quality to index a type of youthful cuteness and femininity. Such images permeate through televised media among the mainland audience, and the ideologies have been carried over to some of the salient features (e.g. postverbal gei-phrase and aspectual you) of the variety. The findings of the study suggest that the social qualities associated with the target variables are in line with the general attitudes toward TM elicited from the qualitative data. In what follows, I capitalize on the concept of indexicality to analyze the ideological perceptions of TM and the two target syntactic variables.

---

25 See section 6.5 for a more detailed discussion of how femininity is mapped onto Japanese and TM.
Table 12 Traits associated with postverbal *gei*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>sum</th>
<th>mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you_A1 refined</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_A2 cosmopolitan</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_A3 low key</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_A4 business-like</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>you_A5 gentle</strong></td>
<td>234</td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_A6 polite</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_A7 young</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_A8 fashionable</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_A9 reliable</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_A10 tough</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_A11 humorous</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_A12 sincere</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Traits associated with aspectual *you*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>sum</th>
<th>mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gei_A1 refined</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gei_A2 cosmopolitan</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gei_A3 low key</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gei_A4 business-like</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gei_A5 gentle</strong></td>
<td>234</td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gei_A6 polite</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gei_A7 young</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gei_A8 fashionable</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gei_A9 reliable</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gei_A10 tough</strong></td>
<td>234</td>
<td><strong>-115</strong></td>
<td>-.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gei_A11 humorous</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gei_A12 sincere</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As discussed in section 4.4, when a linguistic form is associated with a place or a group membership, it is referred to as first order indexicality (Johnstone & Kiesling 2008; Eckert 2008). For example, aspectual you as has achieved first order indexicality because it has been exclusively associated with TM by many MSM speakers. And when the feature is taken to the next level to be associated with a range of non-linguistic aspects (e.g. low intelligence, laziness, educated elite status, etc.), it becomes a 2nd order index. I argue that aspectual you has also taken on n+1st order indexicality because the data suggest that aspectual you is also associated with the social qualities (e.g. soft and gentle) which are commonly attached to TM.

The postverbal gei-phrase, however, is a peculiar case. It has not achieved 1st order indexicality because MSM speakers are not aware that it is associated with TM speakers, but they have assigned it similar social meanings—gentle and soft. This is possibly due to the fact that even though the preverbal gei-phrase is the dominant variant in the north (Peng 2011), many northern Mandarin varieties still allow for the intra-speaker variation between the pre- and postverbal variants. Therefore, the postverbal gei-phrase does not stand out as a non-local feature as much as aspectual you to most MSM speakers, and consequently they are not aware that it is predominantly used by TM speakers. Only a few of them associate the postverbal gei-phrase with southern Mandarin varieties in general. Thus, the attitudinal gap between the pre- and postverbal gei-phrase (i.e. 60) is also significantly smaller than that between the use and non-use aspectual you (i.e. 107).

This section draws upon methods of implicit data collection and the quantitative data to examine the social meanings of the two target variables. In the next section, I will
look at the survey questions where participants were asked explicitly about how they think of TM, and to analyze the qualitative data, in order to unpack their attitudes towards TM.

6.5. Qualitative data analysis

To understand the effects of media engagement, I examine the qualitative data regarding people’s attitudes towards TM. Qualitative data reveal that TM has both positive and negative social connotations for northern Mandarin speakers. Those who have a positive perception of TM usually describe it as “gentle”, “soft” and “polite” in the qualitative questionnaire whereas those who perceive it negatively, it is described as “emasculated” (for males), “babyish” and “pretentious” (for females).

It is noteworthy that the notion of masculinity in the context of Chinese culture is rather different from that in the mainstream American culture where hegemonic masculinity is highly desired and honored (Connell 1995, cited in Kiesling 2004). Hegemonic masculinity is often embodied in the appearance of physical strength, independence, non-conformity, and a strict heterosexual identity (Carrigan et al 1985; Kiesling 2004). Distinct gender identities are constantly portrayed in the mainstream American mass media. Expressions of love and affection are usually associated with femininity. In terms of social qualities, attributes such as soft, gentle, and caring can come across as weak, dependent and effeminate (when displayed by men) in American culture. Campbell-Kibler’s (2011) study also found that masculinity is correlated with aloofness and messiness, while effeminacy is correlated with friendliness and neatness. On the other side of the spectrum is the notion of femininity, and how the notion of
femininity can be mapped onto languages has received much scholarly attention (e.g. citation). Many studies look at the ideological perceptions of linguistic features such as creaky voice (Yuasa, 2010), high rising terminals, and discourse markers such as ‘like.’ These features are commonly used by young women and are associated with femininity in American culture. Campbell-Kibler (2011) also found that /s/-fronting make speakers to be perceived as effeminate or gay-sounding (cf. Levon 2005).

In modern Chinese culture, however, the boundaries of gender identity are relatively more open and blurry. Even though it is somewhat influenced by mainstream Western media, modern Chinese culture does not impose on individuals a reigning definition of masculinity or gender identity. Interestingly, as conservative as Chinese culture is, one would be surprised to find that androgyny is a much more embraced idea in East Asia, compared to that in the mainstream American culture. Pop icons such as Li Yu-Chun (female, from mainland) and Wu Qin-Fung (male, from Taiwan) are widely known among the younger generation for their androgynous styles, such as girls with men’s hair styles and attire, or men singing in falsetto or female-sounding voices. To many young people, these androgynous styles index a young, nonconformist identity emulated by many millennials.
While androgyny is more embraced in Asian cultures in general, there are some interesting stereotypes within Greater China about the speech of people in different parts of the country. In what follows, I will look at broader historical conceptions linked to geographically situated groups. The hegemonic conception of masculinity even varies geographically within the Chinese speaking community, including TM speakers and other dialect groups. Having resisted the encroachment of outside invaders throughout history, the people of northern China are perceived to have a temperament that is generally bolder and more fierce than that of their southern compatriots. Therefore, northerners are stereotypically perceived to be more masculine, direct, uninhibited and tactless than their southern counterparts. Southerners—including TM speakers—are usually perceived to be more gentle, soft, and polite than Northerners as historically they were mostly agrarian and lacked a military. Such a dichotomy also falls along dialectal

---

26 Photo source: http://chrisroughan.webs.com/liyuchun.htm
27 Photo source unavailable
lines, which consequently gives indexical meanings to regional speech patterns. Southern speech in general is assigned the aforementioned attributes commonly associated with southerners, and so is northern speech.

Geographically situated in the south, Taiwan not only inherited many historical southern attributes but also acquired a Japanese flair, both linguistically and culturally. Taiwan—having been a dependent territory of Japan from 1895 and 1945—has been profoundly influenced by Japanese culture, especially its pop culture, such as anime, TV dramas and fashion style. Japanese cultural influence has been woven into the pop culture of Taiwan over the years. Many Taiwanese girls put on a babyish style to index youthful cuteness, sweetness and sometimes even femininity. This babyish style is rather similar and can be ascribed to the Japanese women’s ‘youthful cuteness’ style, also known as burikko performance. In Japanese, ‘burikko’ means ‘to pose, pretend, or act.’ The suffix ‘ko’ means ‘child’ or ‘girl’, and ‘burikko’ means ‘fake child’ or ‘phony girl.’ Burikko performance is a stylized and gendered vocal style that indexes a type of ‘youthful cuteness’ or, for some people, it exhibits feigned naiveté, which downplays and masks the adult femininity of the speaker (Miller 2004). Such a performance is often associated with traits such as falsetto voice, a glissando movement through a pitch range, nasalized delivery, and use of a baby-talk register (Miller 2004:151). Subsequent studies (e.g. Starr 2015) contrast the notion of ‘youthful cuteness’ with ‘sweet voice’ another type of stylized femininity in Japanese culture, proposing that multiple notions of femininity operate within Japanese popular culture. Linguistically, it has been shown that women who use phonation rather than voice onset time as a cue for the voiced/ voiceless
distinction are perceived to be more feminine (Kong, Yoneyama, & Beckman 2014). Speakers talking in sweet voice sound like they are smiling (Starr 2015).

Similar to Japanese burikko style, Taiwanese girls’ babyish style is also perceived by many Chinese mainlanders as bogus innocence. ‘Dia’ is a Chinese slang word that people to describe a babyish style or feigned femininity (e.g. 17g and c28). Such a style can be thought of as the Chinese equivalent of burikko style. Dia recurs frequently in participants’ responses to describe the sound of TM. This is how TM speakers are perceived by many Chinese mainlanders, whereas most TM speakers do not see themselves speaking in such a style. Such a performance of ‘cuteness’ come across as wishy-washy, dependent, clingy, and immature for many northern Mandarin speakers. Apparently, the concept of “cuteness” is given new situated meanings outside of its local context. In order to garner participants’ explicit responses and attitudes to TM, one of the survey questions asked “how does Taiwan Mandarin sound to you?” What follows summarizes some of the typical answers to the open-ended survey question:

(16)

a. ‘Slightly different, something wrong with the rhotic sound’
b. ‘normal, very polite’
c. ‘babyish(哆), they have bizarre grammar’
d. ‘Innocent and cute (萌萌哒)! Very recognizable, and I am often drawn to that accent when I’m talking to Taiwanese people. It takes a lot more effort compared to the Beijing accent because Beijing people slur their speech whenever possible.’

28 E.g. ‘she is very dia…’ or ‘she sounds really dia’.
e. ‘Very interesting. I have some friends from Taiwan and Hong Kong so I have a slight Gangtai\textsuperscript{29} accent. I think it sounds gentle and friendly.’

f. ‘It has its own character.’

g. ‘kind of babyish(宝贝), but sounds good’

h. ‘It has its own character. Some people might think it’s pretentious, but it’s only their regional features and we should respect that.’

i. ‘They talk differently even among themselves. I personally think it’s acceptable’

j. ‘A little weird. Not as smooth as northern Mandarin’

k. ‘I can’t understand it.’

l. ‘It feels awkward. Kind of influenced by the Southern Min dialect’

The data here substantiate the links between language and socio-cultural forms (Queen 2012). Various qualifiers were used in these examples (e.g. innocent, cute, babyish, normal, polite, gentle, friendly, unique, sounds good, pretentious, weird, hard to understand, and awkward). While attitudes towards TM seem to be rather heterogeneous, they can be roughly characterized as ‘youthful cuteness’ (e.g. innocent, cute, babyish, and pretentious), ‘deviation from the Beijing standard’ (e.g. unique, weird, hard to understand, and awkward), and ‘politeness’ (e.g. sounds good, polite, and friendly).

As discussed in Chapter 3.4, media representations of Taiwanese people may have contributed largely to the ideological perception of TM. Taiwanese idol dramas often feature love stories of a misguided innocent young girl who initially falls for the wrong guy in the journey of finding love but eventually realizes that the unnoticed ‘good guy’ has always been there waiting for her. Female characters often stylize in a babyish

\textsuperscript{29} Gangtai is an umbrella term used in Chinese to refer to any style associated with Taiwan and Hong Kong. In early days, films from Hong Kong are often dubbed by TM speakers. Therefore, it gives Chinese mainlanders the impression that Hong Kong and Taiwan speak the same variety of Mandarin.
(e.g. 17g), perhaps pretentious (e.g. 17h) way to index a type of youthful cuteness. Male characters, on the other hand, take on a meek, polite (e.g. 17b), gentle, and feminized image in order to speak to the vast female audience. On top of these gendered descriptions of TM, many participants address TM’s deviation from MSM. The qualifiers they use in their responses include: “normal”, “unique,” “sounds good,” “weird,” “hard to understand,” and “awkward.”

In summary, the qualitative data from the survey show that TM as a whole is perceived as soft, gentle, babyish, emasculated (for male speakers) by northern Mandarin speakers. This is consistent with the findings for aspectual you and postverbal gei in the matched-guisce task. In the matched-guisce task, when contrasting the attitudinal ratings (of the two variants) pertaining to various personality traits, softness and gentleness stand out as the social qualities attached to the two syntactic variables. It is noteworthy that these social qualities of TM as a whole are carried over to the lexical level where aspectual you and postverbal gei are perceived similarly. As for whether these attributes are socially attractive or not is subject to interpretation. In order to better understand the ideologies behind TM, these personality traits need further unpacking and given situated meanings. In what follows, I will group these personal thematically and discuss each group in turn to unpack the situated meanings of TM.

**Babyish and pretentious**

The survey data shows that in general, TM is perceived by many northern Mainlanders to be soft, gentle and polite, as in (18a) and (18c). On the flip side, however,
for many mainland northerners, Taiwanese girls seem to be affecting an accent and their speech is perceived as contrived. Many of them come across to some northern Mainlanders as babyish (e.g. 18c), pretentious, and poser-sounding (e.g. 18g, h). Most of these social qualities are associated with phonological or discursive features of TM. Starr (in progress) investigates the use of what she refers to as “affective sentence particles” in Taiwanese dramas. As in (17f), these particles—such as o (喲 / 哦), ei/ye (耶 / 欸), ma (嘛)—are usually the primary features that give TM the reputation of being soft, gentle and babyish among Chinese mainlanders.

(17)

a. 很嗲(dia)
   ‘Babyish’
b. 分场合。严肃的场合有点刺耳
   ‘Depending on the occasion. TM doesn’t sound proper in formal occasions.’
c. 娃娃音
   ‘Baby-sounding’
d. 常用吗”“呢”“耶等等语气助词
   ‘TM speakers constantly use particles such as o, ne, ye…, etc.’
e. 挺好听的
   ‘Sounds nice.’
f. 听惯了还好 刚开始嗲嗲的
   ‘It sounds babyish at first, but it grows on me.’
g. 太嗲 有点装
   ‘Too babyish. Sounds like a poser.’
h. 听起来太过于虚假了，不喜欢那种感觉，语气
   ‘Sounds pretentious. I don’t like how it sounds, or the tone.’
i. 嗲声嗲气
   ‘Babyish.’
j. 很可爱
   ‘Very cute.’

What is interesting is that although the quality of “gentleness” emerges as a key attribute for TM overall in the qualitative data, as well as for the individual linguistic
variables (i.e. aspectual you and postverbal gei). In the matched-guise task, gentleness is not a statistically significant predictor of the acceptability ratings for either of the variables in the random effect model. As shown in the data above, due to the duality of this attribute, gentleness has a contextualized meaning that can be interpreted either positively or negatively. For example, the use of affective sentence particles—such as o, ne, ye—can be perceived as either gentle and polite, or fake and pretentious. Therefore, it does not appear as a strong predictor for the acceptability ratings. On the other hand, descriptors like sincere, reliable, humorous, and low key—factors that emerged as significant predictors of acceptability ratings—are traits that receive mostly positive interpretation. Therefore, these traits are more likely to be positively correlated with the acceptability ratings.

**Gentle, polite and feminized**

In addition to the babyish style, gentleness and politeness are also characterizations of TM (e.g. 19a, b, h). Many respondents perceive TM as overly gentle and even emasculated for male speakers due, in part, to the sentence-final particles commonly used in TM to soften the tone. Unlike Taiwanese girls, guys do not stylize in a babyish way, but do use sentence-final particles as in (18d). Such perception, to a certain extent, also reflects the north-south dichotomy that Chinese southerners are often perceived as soft and gentle compared to their northern compatriots. The media representations of young Taiwanese men may have contributed to the perception of them
as effeminate, as they are usually portrayed as meek in many dramas targeting female audience.

(18)

a. 有点娘，但是感觉很有礼貌
   ‘Girly, but sounds very polite.’

b. 很有礼貌  很温柔  时尚
   ‘Very polite gentle and fashionable.’

c. 有些矫情
   ‘Somewhat pretentious.’

d. 做作
   ‘Pretentious.’

e. 很肉麻很做作
   ‘Mushy and pretentious.’

f. 喜欢听女生说台湾话，男生有点不习惯
   ‘(I) like listen to Taiwanese girls talk, but am not used to guys.’

g. 太软
   ‘Too soft.’

h. 很好听，很温柔
   ‘Sounds nice, very gentle.’

i. 好听，但男孩说的话缺少男子汉气概
   ‘Sounds nice, but guys sound emasculated’

“Nonstandardness”

In addition to the gendered description of TM, many respondents also comment on TM’s deviation from MSM (i.e. its ‘non-standardness’). Many of them describe TM as local- or vernacular-sounding (e.g. 20f, g), but somehow still intelligible for the most part (e.g. 20i). TM overall receives mixed evaluations. Some think of it as having its own character, while some refer to it as vernacular-sounding. A few of them also pointed out the drop of rhotic sounds in TM as the phonology of TM—to a certain extent—is influenced by southern Min (a.k.a. Taiwanese) which has no rhotic sounds.
(19)

a. 听起来不怎么标准
‘It doesn’t sound standard.’
b. 很有自己的风格。受方言影响但可以接受
‘It has its own character. It’s influenced by their local vernacular but it’s acceptable.’
c. 听着不舒服，很不能接受他们的腔调
‘It doesn’t sound comfortable. It’s unacceptable to me.’
d. 感觉也很有味道
‘It has its own character.’
e. 感觉有点怪，没有北方普通话听着顺耳
‘It sounds a little off, not as natural as northern Mandarin.’
f. 感觉很别扭 有种闽南味道
‘It sounds awkward, and has a taste of Southern Min.’
g. 婴儿的，地方语气很重
‘babyish, vernacular-sounding’
h. 不太习惯，感觉不如北方的好
‘I’m not used to it. It doesn’t sound as good as northern (Mandarin).’
i. 还好，能听得懂
‘It’s alright. It’s understandable.’
j. 和普通话相差很大
‘It’s very different from standard Mandarin.’

Even though the Mandarin varieties spoken in Hong Kong and Taiwan are two distinct varieties, these two varieties had been referred to collectively as Gangtai (literally, Hong Kong and Taiwan) accent by many MSM speakers as many Hong Kong TV series or movies—originally in Cantonese—were dubbed by TM speakers for many years. Until recently, the term “Gangtai accent” has gradually been replaced by ‘Taiwan accent’ as TM began to be recognized by an increasing number of MSM speakers as a distinct variety of Mandarin. For many Chinese Mainlanders who grew up watching Taiwanese TV programs in the 70s and 80s, Chiung Yao’s dramas and movies are the most iconic and representative TV programs of their time. Chiung Yao’s was one of the best-selling and prolific romance novelists whose works had been adapted to more than 60 TV series
and movies. On Tian-Ya forum, an online discussion forum used by more than 200 million, one user recalled that

(20) User: 娘三少 Responder on: 2008-7-7 21:23:59

The Mandarin used in Chiung Yao's series was quite different from what TM sounds like today. TM sounded pretty “standard” at the time.

Quote (21) from the online comment points out that TM spoken today has deviated from that in the 70s. TM spoken in the 70s was perceived as ‘standard’ or ‘close to standard’ for MSM speakers. The change of TM also account, in part, for the shift of attitudes towards TM. Examples (21) and (22) are another two excerpts of people commenting on the change of TM in televised media.


For those who glorify TM, don’t forget that they were just like us 20 years ago. In those days, Ma Jin-Tao—^together with other actors and actresses in Chiung Yao’s drama—spoke extremely standard Mandarin. Their Mandarin was as standard as ours. For example, Li Li-Qun sounds just like a northerner. His family is originally from the north. The actors and actresses of the older generation spoke pretty standard Mandarin, such as Kuo Shi-Xun.

---

30 Ma Jin-Tao is an icon actor in many of Chiung Yao’s dramas.
So let’s not talk about the older generation who came from China. Let’s talk about those who are born and raised in Taiwan. I think in the 50s, 60s and up until early 70s, actors and actresses spoke pretty standard Mandarin. They inevitably had a light accent because of the environment, just like on the mainland, the Mandarin on TV often has a Beijing flair. In those days, both men and women spoke with energy and you could hear them very clearly. Unlike the effeminate way youth speak today, men used to speak forcefully. Women spoke pleasantly and softly but never childishly. I think they are more pleasant to listen to than (us) Mainland Chinese women perhaps because we might come across as too hypercorrect\(^\text{31}\) and not gentle enough. But now, how they talk in those idol dramas is just unbearable.

In example (21), the author mentions some popular Taiwanese actors in the 70s whose Mandarin are just as standard as that on the mainland. And in example (22), the author complements the way Taiwanese actors talked in the 70s when TM was socially desirable, but the (s)he continues to criticize how actors and actresses talk in the modern-day Taiwanese idol dramas is simply unbearable. Both examples suggest that TM has been changing since the 70s and that, consequently, has led to changing ideological perception. It should also be noted that all the ideological perceptions and attitudes towards TM are generated through broadcast media, not through live interaction with Taiwanese, which shows that televised media exerts a strong influence on people’s perception of languages in the absence of live interaction.

\(^{31}\) Hypercorrect here means sticking too closely to a government-authorized standard and, consequently, lacking local flavor and character.
As TM is evolving, so are Chinese mainlanders’ attitudes toward it. This new alignment of attitudes stems from both the socio-economic change going on in China and from the changes taking place in TM itself. Although the analysis of the change in attitudes vis-à-vis TM over time falls outside the scope of this dissertation, the discussion of language attitudes toward TM must take into account the practice of styling (Coupland 2007) and crossing (Rampton 1999) of many young Taiwanese celebrities in mass media. In many Taiwanese idol dramas, young actresses stylize their speech in a way in order to be perceived as cute and innocent, which is often perceived to be childish, pretentious and poser-like. As a result, positive attitudes toward TM seem to have declined significantly among millennials on the Mainland compared with their parents’ generation.

As the Chinese economy is rapidly booming, Taiwan and Hong Kong are losing their economic advantage. Their dominance in Chinese pop culture, as a result, has also declined. An excerpt from a commentary in an online forum titled ‘Your Accent Determines Your Prestige’ on an online forum (Yen 2013) tells much about how Chinese millennials look at Taiwan Mandarin:

港台腔也好不到哪里，文化的发达程度终究仰赖于经济，众所周知，粤语文化，包括台湾流行文化的势头在这些年已经削弱了很多。现在内地娱乐圈的形势简单总结，二三流艺人说港台腔，一线艺人喜欢自诩文化正统，说标准普通话。倒是那些港台艺人，开始卷着舌头说普通话了。

Taiwanese and Cantonese pop cultures are on a downward trend as their economies no longer keep up with China’s development. Nowadays on the Mainland only B- and C-list celebrities put on a Gangtai\(^9\) accent... A-list celebrities speak standard Mandarin to index cultural orthodoxy... Celebrities from Taiwan and Hong Kong, on the other hand, have begun to curl their tongues when they speak Mandarin.\(^{32}\)

---

\(^{32}\) Retroflex is a salient feature of Mainland Standard Mandarin but people from Taiwan and Hong are stereotyped as not using retroflex consonants in their speech.
This assertion suggests that the social prestige of GongTai (Hong Kong and Taiwan) Mandarin is declining as MSM is gaining social prestige. The analysis of the qualitative data also suggests a new alignment of people’s attitudes toward TM among the millennials on the mainland. As shown in Chapter 6.3, more than half (147 out of 234) of the participants in this study do not watch Taiwanese TV shows, which implies that Taiwanese TV shows are no longer a major source of TV programs for the younger generation.

Trends in TV show-viewing preferences have also been shifting over the past few decades. As discussed in section 4.4, there is an increasing number of high-quality and big-budget Chinese TV programs which are now rising in popularity and displacing the Taiwanese ones on the market. Inspired by their American or European counterparts, some of the reality competition programs include Chinese Idols, the Voice of China, and China’s Got Talent. Others are introduced from Korea, e.g. Where Are We Going, Dad? (爸爸去哪了?), and I’m a singer (我是歌手). These shows extrapolated from the proven success in their original countries and soon became huge hits in the fledging TV market of China. Even local productions, such as Running Man (跑男) and Happy Camp (快乐大本营), are also popular among the younger generations. These shows have appealed to the millennials on the mainland more than the Taiwanese shows, which some participants reported in the survey as boring, superficial and dry.

In addition to viewer’s attitudes, the qualitative data also show that media engagement has an effect on linguistic variables’ regional association. Data suggest that participants who list a Taiwanese TV show as one of their three favorite TV programs are more likely to associate aspectual you with Taiwan than those who are not. However,
such an effect was not observed for the postverbal gei, most likely because even though the preverbal gei phrase is highly preferred, most northern Mandarin varieties allow for intra-speaker variation between both pre- and postverbal gei-phrases. Therefore, the postverbal gei is not as salient as the aspectual you to the northern Mandarin speakers. In summary, media engagement has a significant effect on the linguistic variable’s regional association. Taiwanese TV programs leave the impression that aspectual you is frequently used by TM speakers, but mainland viewers overlook the fact that it is also often used by many speakers of southern Mandarin varieties. Therefore, aspectual you emerges as linguistic feature exclusively associated with TM.
6.6. Folk linguistics and changing ideologies

This chapter shows that TM is assigned rather different social meanings by TM and MSM speakers, which suggests that regional varieties of a language or dialects can receive disparate assessments. As cited earlier in section 3.1, Preston’s (2003) perceptual dialectology study, when asked to rate the “pleasantness” of the American English varieties in each state, his Michigan and Alabama respondents gave distinct answers. In Preston’s folk linguistics theory (as shown in Figure 13), there is an idealized, or extra-cognitive version of language that sets a norm against which other dialects or varieties are judged and assigned social value. Dialects are viewed—by ordinary people—as varieties that deviate from the norm, which, in this study, is the state-authorized Mandarin (a.k.a. Putonghua). According to “folk linguistics theory” speakers who are directly connected to this ‘idealized language’ speak what is perceived to be a truly correct form (the only “rule-governed” variety). If one goes too far from the correct form, bad language, error, or dialect arises (Preston 2003:63). Since this connection to the rule-governed language seems a natural one, many people find it difficult to understand why nonstandard speakers, persist in making “errors”.

Preston (2003) also contrasts his “folk linguistics” theory with the linguists’ point of view on dialect variation. In mainstream linguistic theory, deviation from the standard from is usually understood as internal to individual speakers’ human cognitive embedding, whereas in the folk linguistic theory, variation is viewed as external to human cognition. Linguists believe that each speaker has his/her idiolect, and these typologically similar idiolects make up a dialect, which constitutes part of a language. In
linguistic theory, one moves away from the concrete reality of language as a cognitively embedded capacity to construct a social identity or to index a certain style.

Figure 13 Folk and "linguistic" theories of language (Adapted from Preston 2003:64)

As discussed in chapter 3.2, the concept of linguistic style is crucial to study of sociolinguistic variation as it gives us the opportunity to witness linguistic change in progress (Labov 1966, cited in Rickford & Eckert 2001). I draw upon Coupland’s (1980, 2007) identity dimension of style to analyze Chinese millennials’ ideological perception of TM, viewing stylistic variation (e.g. burriko performance, or the babyish style) as ‘a dynamic presentation of the self’ (Rickford & Eckert 2001:4). Media representations of Taiwanese girls are firmly rooted in the babyish dia style. These young women employ this gendered performance to index a type of youthful cuteness and femininity—a modern female identity that is commonly portrayed in mainstream mass media. However,
such a performance receives disparate perception from the Chinese millennials’ standpoint. Using both survey and online data, I show that TM received mixed interpretations. Many millennials on the mainland often associate TM with being pretentious, poser-sounding and emasculated. Such a phenomena suggests that the social semiosis of language is, in fact, highly contextualized.

From the anthropological perspective, Irvine (1985) views style as ‘social semiosis of distinctiveness’, which links language differences with social meanings (Rickford & Eckert 2001:6). For Irvine, languages are assigned situated social meanings that characterize individuals. Linguistic features have no social value of their own; it is people’s underlying beliefs, presuppositions, stereotypes behind the language that constitute language attitudes (Preston 2003). Language ideologies are the beliefs and understandings that people have about the sociolinguistic value of a language in a certain socio-cultural environment (Irvine, J., & Gal, S., 2000; Giles & Niedzielski, 1998; Preston, 2003). They are the social connotations imposed on a language or variety when people map their understanding of linguistic varieties onto people, or more specifically, the style of people (Giles & Niedzielski, 1998; Coupland 2007).

Traditionally, sociolinguists view these social connotations as a fixed and rigid concept, as people were defined by gender, class, ethnic, geographic origins, etc., and so was their language use. However, in the context of globalization, with greater social and geographic mobility, identity becomes more fluid and dynamic. Much scholarly attention has been drawn to the situated practice of language users (e.g. Bucholtz 1996; Mendoza-Denton 1997; Eckert 2000; Zhang 2005). This section draws upon qualitative data to show the ideological perception of TM is also fluid: TM was perceived rather differently
in the 70s than it is now among Chinese mainlanders, and even many features of modern-day TM are assigned distinct social meanings by Chinese mainlanders than by TM speakers themselves. Contextualized social meanings of language vary both synchronically and diachronically.

6.7. Summary

This chapter draws upon both quantitative and qualitative data to examine the effects of media exposure and social meanings attached to the target syntactic variables as well as to TM in general. The examples of gei and you show that a non-local feature has to be salient enough to see the effects of media exposure. The postverbal gei-phrase is a non-local feature but not salient enough for the northerners to perceive, and therefore exposure to the feature does not change the perception of the feature. Aspectual you, on the other hand, is a salient non-local feature associated exclusively with TM and given extensive exposure, the ratings of certain personality traits (i.e. sincere, reliable, humorous, low-key and refined) are positively correlated with the acceptability ratings of the variable. These personality traits therefore emerge as the social meanings of the variable.

The qualitative data suggest that there is a new alignment of attitudes towards TM: TM appears to be losing its social prestige for Chinese millennials. The fact that more than half of the participants reported not watching any Taiwanese TV programs implies the decline of Taiwan’s cultural and media dominance, leading to a drop in TM’s social prestige among Chinese millennials. This change of attitudes may be ascribed to: 1) social and economic changes on the mainland, and 2) changes in TM itself. As Chinese economic and political power surges, the rising Chinese middle class is looking inward
rather than outward. For many millennials growing up in affluent urban China, the appeal of Hong Kong and Taiwan and their cultural products are giving way to local models of cosmopolitan lifestyle and identity.

Returning to the ideological links between the north-south dichotomy in China and their corresponding gender ideology (e.g. Southern Mandarin and seen as feminine, and MSM masculine), the rise of mainland economic power can also be tied to preference for more masculine and homegrown speech patterns and rejection of effeminate, girly speech styles linked to TM. Since TM constantly come across as babyish and overly soft to many millennials (see 19e, f, g), ideologically Chinese millennials appear to be gravitating towards homegrown speech patterns that are indexical of traditional masculinity, formality, and authority, as MSM is the variety used by the central government.

Discussions from the online forum also show that TM itself is changing as well. TM used to be perceived as ‘standard’ by many Chinese mainlanders in the 1970s, but because of the strong Japanese influence on Taiwanese pop culture, many young Taiwanese girls nowadays like to emulate Japanese girls’ burikko performance, a gendered speech act that indexes youthful cuteness and femininity. Such a performance is described by many northern mainlanders as ‘dia’, a Chinese slang word for a girly baby-talk register. For many Chinese mainlanders, TM has taken on n+1st order indexicality where TM is indexical of social qualities such as being gentle, babyish (i.e. ‘dia’) and effeminate. The findings showcase the dynamics of language ideologies in relation to both social and linguistic changes.
Chapter 7. Conclusion

This dissertation explores the effects of media exposure on individuals’ 1) acceptability judgments of non-local linguistic variables, and 2) ideological perceptions of a non-local variety (i.e. TM). As discussed in previous chapters, variationist sociolinguists have long rejected the possibility that media exposure can lead to language variation (Labov 2001:228; Trudgill 1986:40). However, this study has presented a new methodological approach to the study of media effects on language. I conducted an online survey consisting of an acceptability task, a matched-guise task, open-ended questionnaire and demographic questions. Drawing upon grammaticality judgment data, accompanied by PCA, this study shows that the effects of media on the perception of language can in fact be empirically established. PCA provides a quantitative approach to convert possibly correlated personality traits in the matched-guise task to three major “components”, which helps to identify the key personality traits that contribute to the media effects and further allow for a broader generalization of the social attributes linked to TM. Using acceptability judgment data from an online survey of millennial mainland Chinese respondents (N=231), I show that media exposure can make people more likely to rate non-local linguistic features as grammatically acceptable. I look in particular at the perception of two syntactic variables: the postverbal *gei*-phrase and aspectual *you*. The data show that the effects of media exposure and language attitudes are rather different when it comes to these two variables: extensive exposure to Taiwanese TV programs makes aspectual *you* more acceptable to northern Mandarin speakers, but for postverbal
gei—a feature that already exists in northern Mandarin speakers’ grammar—the same effects were not observed.

The different outcomes of the two variables suggest that media influence on acceptability judgments is rather complex and multifactorial: it takes an extensive amount of exposure, certain language ideologies, and perceptual saliency of the non-local variable to observe the effects. Quantitative data show that for individuals with extensive exposure to Taiwanese TV programs, ratings of certain personality traits and the acceptability of aspectual you are positively correlated. These personality traits include the following adjectives: sincere, reliable, humorous, low-key and refined, or what the PCA categorizes as Attitudinal Factor 2. These quantifiers—as discussed in Chapter 3.4—can possibly be tied to the media representations of Taiwanese in many Taiwanese dramas. The acceptability of postverbal-gei phrases is also associated with these traits, but the effects are rather different: for individuals with no exposure to Taiwanese TV programs, the acceptability ratings for post-verbal-gei are positively correlated with the scoring of the aforementioned personality traits (sincerity, reliability, etc.). In other words, the effects of media exposure can only be statistically established with non-local variables that are already perceptually salient to the individuals.

Note that in this study, media exposure is treated as a categorical variable rather than a continuous one, as there are too many extremes values (i.e. people who do not watch Taiwanese TV programs at all) in the data. Therefore, the results do not suggest that additional exposure contributes to a more positive perception of the variable. It would be simplistic to say that the non-local feature becomes more acceptable with more exposure. The effects of media exposure on individuals’ acceptability judgments are
rather complex. The effects are multifactorial, involving the amount of media exposure, language attitudes, and individuals’ awareness of or the perpetual saliency of the non-local feature (i.e. whether a feature stands out to an individual as a ‘non-local’ feature). In order for the media effects on acceptability ratings to be statistically established, there must be an extensive amount of media exposure, social meanings pertaining to the linguistic features, and individuals’ awareness of the non-local feature. With extensive exposure, a positive correlation can be found between the attitude scores and the acceptability ratings of the non-local feature. Meanwhile, more recent studies suggest that in order to fully understand the effects of media on language, it is critical to employ a qualitative approach that takes into account “media engagement” (Stuart-Smith 2010) or the level of emotional involvement with the contents. My data also show that media engagement has an effect on the regional associations of linguistic variables. Participants who listed Taiwanese TV programs as one of their favorite TV programs are much more likely to associate the use of aspectual you with TM.

Acceptability judgments aside, I further delve into the ideological perception of TM by Chinese Mainlanders, as well as how televised media and language attitudes play a role in shaping such perceptions. Following the “third-wave” sociolinguistic studies, this study turns to the subjects’ ideological perceptions of the two syntactic variables, as well as their corresponding variety—TM. In delving more deeply into the social and indexical meanings of TM, I argue that televised media not only provide access to the non-local variety, but also contribute to the formation of the ideologies towards it. It seems that the effects of media exposure and language attitudes are intertwined. I in turn
discuss the media representations of young Taiwanese people, and how they play a role in shaping the ideological perceptions of TM and the speakers thereof.

Exploring the social and indexical meanings of TM using qualitative data suggests somewhat negative attitudes towards TM are emerging at the same time as Taiwanese TV programs are losing their popularity and social prestige among the millennials on the Mainland. As Rong (2013) points out, the social status of a dialect/language variety is often closely tied to the socioeconomic status of its speakers. As Chinese society is rapidly transforming, mainlanders’ attitudes toward TM are also shifting. Among millennials on the mainland, the social prestige of TM appears to be waning due to China’s booming economy and TM’s deviation from what is perceived by Chinese mainlanders as ‘standard’. All of these trends ultimately point to a new alignment of attitudes towards TM. Recall that Zhang (2005) refers to Bourdieu’s (1977, 1991) notion of the linguistic market to analyze the symbolic resources that assign meaning to what Zhang calls “cosmopolitan Mandarin”—a supra-regional linguistic style consisting of a fluid set of linguistic features from both regional and extra-regional varieties (including MSM, Taiwan Mandarin, Cantonese, and English). The findings of this study suggests a decline of TM’s linguistic capital and rejection of effeminate, girly speech styles linked to it in favor of the more masculine and homegrown speech patterns associated with MSM.

Almost two decades after Zhang’s study on Chinese ‘yuppies’, this study shows that instead of cosmopolitanism, TM is now more closely associated with the effeminate, girly speech style, suggesting a diachronic change of attitudes toward TM. TM is

---

33 The fieldwork of her study was conducted between 1997 and 1998.
increasingly losing its social attractiveness and prestige as many Chinese millennials appear to be gravitating towards local speech patterns indexical of formality and authority. For the younger generation in urban China, the cosmopolitan image of Taiwan has been ebbing while China continues its ascent as a global political and economic powerhouse. It is speculated that attitudes towards MSM are beginning to align more with China’s considerable political and economic power, leading to the emergence of new social meanings for MSM in the Chinese linguistic marketplace.

Although it is not clear that one is the cause of the other, the ideological shifts of TM and MSM seems to go along with the downturn of Taiwan’s TV industry in terms of production budget and popularity. As discussed in Chapter 4.4, there seems to be an increasing number of high-quality and big-budget Chinese TV programs which are replacing the Taiwanese ones on the market. The prospects of China’s TV industry keep looking brighter, as there is an increasing number of Taiwanese TV producers and entertainers moving to China for bigger audiences and better economic opportunities. The shifting fortunes of Taiwanese and Chinese media in the process of socio-cultural change from the perspective of studies of mediatization, leads us to question whether or not these socio-cultural changes result in a reverse trend in terms of viewing habits—such as Taiwanese watching more mainland TV programming. Perhaps this offers an opportunity to explore whether these shifting viewing habits are having an effect on the attitudes of TM speakers towards MSM.

Social media seems to be the next venue of investigation for examining another dimension of language attitudes. Social media provide platforms for more spontaneous responses from the online community. Unlike with online surveys, data collected from
social media would be more reflective of what people’s authentic ideologies because people are not posting for research or other specific purposes. In addition to the online discussion forum that I examined in this study, another good venue of investigation would be video sharing websites such as tudio (土豆) or Youku (优酷) (i.e. the Chinese equivalents of YouTube) where people post comments about videos they watch. These platforms would allow us to look beyond geographic boundaries and into the discussions that many young people are participating in. How both televised and social media play a role in shifting attitudes—towards not only TM but also other varieties of Mandarin including MSM—is a potential area that merits further study.

One other prospective research topics related to the present study might be a broader exploration of the effects that mainland TV programming might have outside of China or in non-MSM speaking areas of the Chinese diaspora. Earlier this year (2016), Hong Kong’s major broadcasting company galvanized public outrage as it launched a channel entirely in Chinese with simplified characters. Many in Hong Kong expressed their concern at the ongoing "Mainlandization" of the city (online source). The influence of the Chinese media, along with the relationships between China and other Chinese speaking countries in Asia will continue to shape social and indexical meanings associated with MSM. With the expansion of China’s political and economic power, MSM will only continue to evolve and acquire new situated social meanings, and media—regardless of televised or social media—will play an increasingly important role in the formation and dissemination of language ideologies associated with it.

Televised media and programming aimed at millennials in particular has contributed much to the ideological perceptions of TM among mainlanders. Such
perceptions of TM are ideologically linked to other perceptions of speech styles, such as the *burikko* performance. Deeper analysis of mediatized styles like *burikko* and “the guy on TV” would help us build the semiotic link between ideologies and linguistic practice. What exactly are the linguistic features associated with ‘dia’, or the *burikko* performance of Taiwanese young girls? How does televised media facilitate the dissemination of the Japanese *burikko* performance, and how is such a speech style perceived and emulated by many young Taiwanese girls? By further exploring the semiotic link between ideologies and linguistic practice, we can begin to develop a more nuanced understanding of the longitudinal changes in attitudes towards linguistic styles associated with Taiwanese people (e.g. previously regarded as very standard, but now seen as phony, effeminate, etc.).

Following this trajectory, the gendered perceptions of TM also lead to a broader understanding of gender ideologies in East Asia. As discussed in earlier chapters, gender ideologies in East Asia revolve around a set of traditional values and expectations of Confucianism, but there are more and more nonconformists in East Asia that embrace western modernity and reject the traditional values, due in part to the influence of mainstream western media. For examples, both ‘Kong girl’ and ‘meek guy’ stereotypes reject the Confucius traditions but in very different ways: aggressive ‘Kong girls’ embrace materialism with open arms whereas ‘meek guys’ turn inward as they deviate from the norm. These modern social identities are—to a certain extent—linked to the linguistic practice. As the findings of this dissertation suggest, media helps to construct the semiotic link between ideologies and linguistic practice. Given the cultural proximity among East Asian countries, sociolinguists should look beyond geographical boundaries
to study the effects of media on language ideologies both within and independently of large scale social and economic changes, which will ultimately advance our understanding of the relationships between media and language ideologies in the context of East Asia.

Aside from the ideological perceptions of different Mandarin varieties, future studies should also look at the geographical distribution of Chinese dialectal features from a macro perspective, as traditional Chinese dialectology focuses primarily on the phonological and lexical features of individual dialects. Not many studies have looked at individual (phonological or syntactic) variables across different dialect areas, and therefore it would be interesting to see whether there are any other linguistic features—not only syntactic, but also phonological features (e.g. the use of the rhotic /r/, the replacement of the velar nasal with the alveolar nasal)—that have similar geographical distributions as the *gei*-phrase and aspectual *you*. Investigating the systematic distribution of dialectal features will provide an overall understanding of Mandarin varieties in relation to other non-Mandarin local vernaculars. Although the Chinese state has been promoting a single standard Mandarin since the 1950s, it is clear that Mandarin is still far from being monolithic as it is difficult—if not impossible—to stipulate linguistic practice, but among many other social factors that influence linguistic practice, media—in a variety of forms—will be playing an increasingly important role in connecting ideologies and linguistic practice.
APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Survey Questionnaire for Pilot Study I

This research aims to examine the use of respondents’ native language. There are three parts to this survey: an elicitation task section, an acceptability judgment section, and a map labeling section. They will be in the form of an interview, multiple choice questions, and a hand-drawn map, respectively. The questionnaire will not require you to provide any personal or confidential information. Please answer the questions honestly and to the best of your ability.

第一部分：誘發使用測驗  Part One: Elicitation Task

This is a one-on-one interview. You will be given several scenario questions, please answer the questions with complete sentences. (Note: Questions will not be presented to subjects in a written form.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | 你突然接到電話，你的朋友打電話來，需要一份文件的電子檔，他告訴你所有的資訊而且你願意幫忙寄這個電子郵件，你會跟他說什麼？
You get a call from your friend asking for a document by email. He tells you all the information you need and you are willing to help. What would you say? |
| 2.  | 今天下課之前，有個同學邀請你去他家吃飯，你沒有很想去，因為你想要跟家人多一點相處時間，你會如何回覆同學的邀約？
Right before you leave class, a friend invites you over for dinner. You don’t really want to go because you want to spend some quality time with your family. What would you say to your friend? |
| 3.  | 假設你的媽媽要你跟餐廳確認今晚的晚餐訂位，你會怎麼回覆她嗎？
I will explicitly tell participants not to use bang (to help) to increase the chance of using of AP structure. |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your mom is asking you to confirm the time and the number of participants for a dinner tonight at a restaurant. What would you say in response?</strong></td>
<td><strong>今天是畢業典禮，你跟你的好朋友即將分離，你想要對你的好朋友獻上祝福，你會怎麼跟你的朋友說？</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Today is Graduation Day. You are leaving your good friends. You want to give your best wishes to one of them. What would you say to him or her?</strong></td>
<td><strong>你需要一篇期刊論文作為你某項作業的參考資料。你知道你的朋友有這篇文章，你希望他可以把這篇文章用電子郵件發過來，你會怎麼跟他說？You need an article as a reference for an assignment. You know that your friend has the article and you would like him/her to email it to you. What would you say to your friend?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You get a call at home. It is from a relative. He is looking for your dad, but your dad is not at home. What would you say to the relative in response?</strong></td>
<td><strong>你在家裡接到一通電話，是一個親戚打來的，他要找你的爸爸，但是你的爸爸現在不在家，你會怎麼回答這位親戚？</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You are going to have a dinner with a bunch of friends, and you are all waiting for one last person. You happen to be the only one who has the person’s number. What would you say to the other people?</strong></td>
<td><strong>在上學的路上有人請你幫忙寫問卷，但是你已經快要遲到了，沒有辦法寫這份問卷，你會怎麼回答請你幫忙的人？</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Someone asks you participate in a survey on your way to school. You are almost late and won’t be able to help with the survey. What would you say in response to the person who asks for help?</strong></td>
<td><strong>你去好友家中做客，如果口渴了想要喝水，你會跟主人說什麼？</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your are a guest at a close friend’s house. If you feel like having a cup of water, what would you say to the host?</strong></td>
<td><strong>你的朋友約你下課後一起去吃晚餐聊天，但是你已經事先有其他安排了，你會怎麼回答？</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your friend wants to grab a meal with you after class, but you already have plans. What would you say in response?</strong></td>
<td><strong>你的媽媽要你聯絡一位久沒碰面且目前人在美國的遠親，但是你唯一有的連絡方式就是他的電子郵件地址，因此你會跟媽媽說？</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your mom wants you to contact a relative who you have not seen for a long time. However, the only contact information you have is his/her email address. What would you say to your mom?</strong></td>
<td><strong>在航空公司櫃檯，地勤人員告訴你，你原本訂的班機因為天氣因素取消了，並且他們重新為你安排了另一班班機，但是顯然地這個重新安排的班機你無法配合，你會如何跟地勤人員反應？</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At the check-in counter of an airline, the clerk tells you that your flight is cancelled due to the bad weather, and that they have already rescheduled another flight for you. Obviously, the rescheduled flight does not suit your schedule. What would you say to the airline staff?</strong></td>
<td><strong>一個在國內的朋友一直想要一個美國的名牌包包。你買下了這個包包當作她的</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>A friend back home has wanted an American brand name bag for a while. You would like to buy the bag for her as a birthday present. What would you tell her about the good news?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>You are attending a casual get-together with your friends, but you are late. Everyone is waiting for you. What would you say to apologize?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>You are visiting a friend at the hospital. He is in bed. He needs to take some medicine but the glass is empty. You feel like doing something to help. What would you say to him?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>You are visiting a friend that you know very well. He is going to pick you up at the airport. However, the flight is delayed for an hour due to a blizzard. You want to call the friend and let him know about the delay. What would you say on the phone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>You are going to have dinner with a friend after class, but you are not sure when your class will let out. You would like to keep in touch by text. What would you say to your friend before class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>You are talking with a friend. Your friend just said something that you do not understand. What would you say to ask him to explain?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Your friend comes to visit. He has a sore throat and starts to cough. You know you have some hot water available. What would you say to him?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>You are eating with your friends, but you have to leave early. What would you say to the other people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>You just met your friend and he forgot to take his jacket with him when he left. He called and told you that he will come back and pick it up. However, you are willing to drop his jacket off at his place. What will you will tell him?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Please describe the picture on the right with complete sentences. Feel free to use as many sentences as necessary.

Figure 14 Picture for Elicitation (1)

23. Please describe the picture on the right with complete sentences and guess who they might be talking to. Feel free to use as many sentences as necessary.

Figure 15 Picture for Elicitation (2)

第二部分：接受度測驗 Part Two: Acceptability Test

在本問卷當中，我們將會給予你一個特定情境。請根據情境，配合本身的使用習慣，在 1 到 5 的量表上，標選出這個句子聽起來對你的自然程度。請注意，作答時的思考方向為：「我會不會這樣說？這樣的說法自不自然？」請依個人語言使用習慣及直覺作答。1 表示這樣的講法聽起來非常不自然，自己從不會這樣使用。5 表示非常自然，完全可以接受，而且自己也可能使用類似的說法。請根據句子的標號在卡片上塗卡作答。

In this part of the survey, you will be rating sentences under a given context. Based on how natural they sound to you and what you would say in your everyday life, please rate the following sentences on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being extremely unnatural and 5 being perfectly natural. Please note that the criterion for this judgment is ‘how natural would the sentence sound in your own speech?’ Please respond to the sentences based on your personal

35 Photo source unavailable.
Scenario: In judging the following sentences, pretend you are talking to a close friend or a family member about something trivial. There is no stress or tension. You may use casual speech with informal language.

Filler Type: Lack of ‘ba’ where it is obligatory

1. 他水打翻了，衣服也溼了。He spilled the water and his clothes got all wet.
2. 我課本放進書包裡，才忘記帶。I put the textbook into my bag so that I will not forget to bring it.
3. 下午會下雨，出門時記得窗戶關上。It will rain this afternoon. Remember to close the window before you leave.
4. 他飯都吃完了，現在應該不餓了。He ate all the food so he is not hungry anymore.
5. 弟弟媽媽惹火了，被痛打一頓。My brother irritated my mom and was punished for it.
6. 他小孩打了一頓，氣終於消了。He was no longer angry after he punished his child.
7. 我已經明天的作業都寫完了。I have already done the homework for tomorrow.
8. 我下午上課的時候東西拿給你。I will give it to you in class this afternoon.
9. 吃晚餐的時候，我飯打翻了。I overturned a bowl of rice at dinner.
10. 姊姊洗碗的時候不小心碗打破了。My sister broke the bowl while doing dishes.
11. 不要把自己的想法加諸在別人身上。Do not impose your ideas on other people.
12. 他今天早上太匆忙，把衣服穿反了。He was in such a rush that he put his shirt on inside out.
13. 記得把下午要報告的資料準備好。Please get the materials ready for the presentation in the afternoon.
14. 媽媽把大哭的孩子一把抱住懷裡。The mother held the crying child in her arms.
15. 他把身上所有的錢都花光了。He spent all the money he had on him.
16. 我已經把耐心全部都用完了。I have run out of patience.
17. 突然來的大雨把衣服都弄濕了。The sudden rain drenched the clothes.
18. 他把所有的事情都搞砸了。He messed up everything.
19. 你竟然把明天要考試都忘記了。You even forgot that there is an exam tomorrow.
20. 明天一定要把期末報告寫完。I must finish my final paper tomorrow.
Filler Type: (Lack of)Verb duplication where it is necessary

1. 他跑步得很快，沒人追得上他。He runs so fast that no one can keep up with him.
2. 妹妹唱歌得很好，大家都愛聽。My sister sings so well that everyone likes to listen to her singing.
3. 我昨天考試得很糟糕，很不開心。I did very poorly on the exam yesterday so I was really unhappy.
4. 她寫字得很慢，功課都寫不完。She wrote so slowly that she couldn’t even finish her homework.
5. 弟弟吃飯得很快，一下就吃完了。My brother ate so quickly that he was finished in no time.
6. 他看書看得很累，快要睡著了。He was so exhausted from reading that he even fell asleep.
7. 我去日本過兩次，很喜歡日本。I have been to Japan twice and I like it a lot.
8. 他寫字在黑板上，跟大家說明。He wrote on the blackboard to make things clear to everyone.
9. 睡覺了三個小時，我還是很累。I still feel tired after sleeping for 3 hours.
10. 我寫作業了五個小時還沒寫完。I have been doing homework for 5 hours but haven’t finished yet.
11. 他上課上得很累，一回來就睡了。He went to bed as soon as he got back from the tiring class.
12. 路途中我們坐車坐了很久。It was a long journey.
13. 今天是周末，我睡覺得很晚。It is the weekend today so I woke up late.
14. 明天要上課，看電視不要看太晚。Don’t watch TV too late. You have to go to class tomorrow.
15. 爸爸看報紙看得很專心。Dad is reading the newspaper very intently.
16. 隔壁鄰居唱歌唱得很大聲。The neighbor is singing very loudly.
17. 爸爸每天都工作得很累。Dad is tired from working every day.
18. 他彈鋼琴彈得很好。He plays piano very well.
19. 媽媽打電話打得很開心。Mom enjoyed talking on the phone.
20. 她在房間練習鋼琴練習了很久。She has been practicing piano in her room for a long time.

Filler type: the use of topic marker suo

1. 這就是他所結婚的地方。This is where he got married.
2. 他是我所愛了三年的人。He is the person that I loved for 3 years.
3. 在那場戰爭中所死去的人太多。Too many people died during the war.
4. 這裡有我所懷念的一切。This place is all I long for.
5. 他所想的跟我不太一樣。What he thinks is different from what I think.
6. 他就是我所想要找的人。He is the person that I am looking for.
7. 明天就是他所出發的日子了。Tomorrow is the day he will set out.
8. 這就是他所生氣的原因。This is the reason he gets angry.
9. These are the problems that the government is most concerned with.
10. He died in that accident.
11. What we don’t see is the time he spent.
12. What he pays the most attention to is the amount of time you’ve spent.
13. I did not see that you care.
14. This is what I want to know.
15. Often, things are not as good as they may appear on the surface.
16. This house is what I have wanted for many years.
17. Tomorrow is the day you’ve long awaited.
18. What you don’t see is how much effort he puts in.
19. Are you sure that these are what you want?
20. Things are much different from what I thought.

Token 1: Preverbal PDC structure
1. Are you thirsty? I will get you a cup of water.
2. This world is unpredictable--have you purchased a health insurance package for your kids?
3. It is raining outside. I’ll get you an umbrella.
4. I went to his place for a meal, and brought some food with me.
5. I just emailed him. He will get back to me.
6. Little sister brewed mom a cup of tea.
7. I will text you later.
8. I have prepared a gift for you.
9. I wrote mom a card.
10. He invited me to a dinner and had me bring over some wine.

Token 2: Postverbal PDC structure
1. Grandma knitted me a sweater.
2. He will call me next week.
3. I will write you a letter tomorrow.
4. I will call you after class.
5. He gave me a call yesterday.
6. Dad bought a gift for me on his way back.
7. He sent me a postcard from the US.
8. Grandma gave me a red envelope on New Year’s
Day.
9. 我等一會兒發短信給你。I will text you later.
10. 媽媽買了一個新手機給弟弟。Mom bought a new cell phone for little brother.
Appendix 2 – Pilot Study II

第二部分：語言態度測驗
先前的研究顯示，我們可以透過一個人的聲音來判斷這個人的人格特質。在接下來的問卷中，你會聽到八個不同的人分別用自己的方言介紹紐約。請根據你聽到的聲音，猜想他們具有甚麼樣的人格特質。

Part 2 Match-guise task

In this part of the survey, you will hear 8 different voices, each of which associated with different personality traits. Please click on the play button on the website to hear the voice, and check the personality traits that you think are associated with the voice. Click as many as you think is appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan Mandarin</td>
<td>2 speakers</td>
<td>2 speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Standard) Mandarin</td>
<td>2 speakers</td>
<td>2 speakers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

纽约是美国人口最多的城市，也是全世界最大的都會區之一—紐約都會區的核心。逾一个世纪以来，纽约在商业和金融的方面发挥巨大的全球影响力。纽约是一座世界级城市，直接影響着全球的经济、金融、媒体、政治、教育、娱乐與时尚界，其中聯合國總部也位於該市，因此紐約也被公認為世界之都。

New York is the most populous city in the United States and the center of the New York Metropolitan Area, one of the most populous urban agglomerations in the world. A global power city, New York exerts a significant impact upon commerce, finance, media, art, fashion, research, technology, education, and entertainment. The home of the United Nations Headquarters, New York has been described as the cultural capital of the world.

Options:
前卫的, 商业的, 温柔的, 聪明的, 受良好教育的, 善良的, 礼貌的, 都会的, 心胸开阔的, 关怀的, 软的, 粗鲁的, 乡下的, 粗俗的, 无知的, 枯燥的, 无礼的, 爱炫耀的, 保守的, 传统的, 老派的, 不友善的, 官僚的, 直得信赖的, 讨人喜欢的

Cutting-edge, business-like, gentle (effeminate), intelligent, educated, kind, polite, cosmopolitan, open-minded, caring, soft/feminine, rough, rustic, unrefined, ignorant, dull, rude, showy, conservative, traditional, old-fashioned, unfriendly, efficient, bureaucratic, trustworthy, likable, self-centered, arrogant, humble (25 items)
Appendix 3 – Online survey for the present study

您好，

我是纽约市立大学语言学研究所的博士班学生彭骏逸，这份问卷是一个关于普通话的研究，共分为三部分：接受度测验、语音判读、及背景资料。本问卷大约费时 30 分钟，您所提供的答案将完全只做为研究之用，也不会要求您留下姓名。另外，为了感谢您的参与，在您回答完所有的问题之后，您将会得到 50 元人民币做为报酬。若您对本研究有任何的疑问与建议，也欢迎您与我联络(cpeng@gradcenter.cuny.edu)。

非常谢谢您参与作答。

Hi,

I am a PhD student in linguistics at the City University of New York. As part of my current project on Mandarin Chinese, this survey consists three parts: acceptability task, voice recognition, and demographic questions. The survey will take 30 minutes of your time. The answers you provide will only be used for research purposes. You will not be required to leave your name. In addition, you will receive 50 RMB for your participation upon completion of this survey. Please feel free to contact me at cpeng@gradcenter.cuny.edu if you have any questions.

Thank you for your time and participation.

第一部分：接受度测验

在本问卷当中，我们将会给予你一个特定情境。请根据情境，配合本身的使用习惯，在 1 到 7 的量表上，标选出这个句子听起来对你的自然程度。请注意，作答时的思考方向为：「我会不会这样说？这样的说法自不自然？」请依个人语言使用习惯及直觉作答，而不是你觉得怎么说才正确。1 表示这样的讲法听起来非常不自然，自己从不会这样说。7 表示非常自然，完全可以接受，而且自己也可能使用类似的说法。

Part 1  Grammaticality judgment task

In this part of the survey, you will be rating sentences based on how natural they sound to you and what you would say in your everyday life. Please rate the following sentences on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being extremely unnatural and 5 being perfectly natural. Please note that the criterion for this judgment is ‘how natural would the sentence sound in your own speech?’ Please respond to the sentences based on your personal use of the language and native speaker of Mandarin intuition, NOT what you think is correct.

The ratio of token to filler is 1:2. There are 5 tokens in each token type and 10 fillers in each filler type (N=40).
5 preverbal *gei*-phrases
5 postverbal *gei*-phrases
5 the use of *you* as aspectual marker
5 non-use of *you* as aspectual marker
10 filler type 1
10 filler type 2

**Note** (Counter-balance design: to show that 1) the preverbal *gei*-phrases are overall judged to be more acceptable than the postverbal ones, and 2) the use of *you* as an aspectual marker is judged to be less acceptable than the non-use of *you* as an aspectual marker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A (30 participants)</th>
<th>Group B (30 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘I will to you give a phone call’ (x5)</td>
<td>‘I will give a phone call to you’ (x5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Grandma knitted a sweater for me’ (x5)</td>
<td>‘Grandma to me knitted a sweater’ (x5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I <em>you</em> see-ASP this-CL movie’ (x5)</td>
<td>‘I see-ASP this-CL movie’ (x5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘You see-ASP this-CL movie ASP Q’ (x5)</td>
<td>‘You you-not-you see-ASP this-CL movie’ (x5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Token Type 1—**the postverbal *gei*-phrase

我 等一下 打 电 话 给 你  (Postverbal)

wo dengyixia da  dianhua  *gei ni*
I later     make phone call to you
‘I will give you a call later.’

11. 妈妈织了一条围巾给我。Grandma knitted me a scarf.
12. 他下星期会打电话给我。He will call me next week.
13. 我明天会写一封信给你。I will write you a letter tomorrow.
14. 我上完课以后打电话给你。I will call you after class.
15. 他昨天打了一通电话给我。He gave me a call yesterday.
16. 爸爸回来时买了一个礼物给我。Dad bought a gift for me on his way back.
17. 他从美国写了一张明信片给我。He sent me a postcard from the US.
18. 爸爸过年时包了一个红包给我。Grandma gave me a red envelope on New Year’s Day.
19. 我等一会儿发短信给你。I will text you later.
20. 妈妈买了一个新手机给弟弟。Mom bought a new cell phone for little brother.
Token Type 2—the use of you as an aspectual marker

我 有 看 过 这 部 电 影
wo you kan guo zhe bu dianying
I ASP see-ASP this-CL movie
‘I have seen this movie.’

你 有没有看过这部电影
ni you mei you kan guo zhe bu dianying
You ASP-not-ASP see-ASP this-CL movie
‘Have you ever seen this movie?’

1. 你有没有看过这部电影? Have you seen this movie?
2. 他以前有没有去过你家? Has he been to your place before?
3. 我以前有吃过这道菜。I have had this dish before.
4. 我六年前有去过美国。I have been to America six year ago.
5. 你有想过这个问题吗? Have you ever heard of this question?
6. 你刚刚有吃过晚饭了吗? Have you eaten dinner yet?
7. 他们平常有在照顾你吗? Have they been taking care of you?
8. 这道菜你有没有吃过? Have you had this dish yet?
9. 我前几天有来过这里。I have been here a couple of days ago.
10. 你有没有洗过澡? Have you showered yet?

Part 2 Matched-guise attitude task

第二部分：语言态度测验。先前的研究显示，我們可以透過一個人的声音來判断这
个人的人格特质。在接下来的问卷中，你会听到八一个不同的人分别用自己的方言介
绍纽约。请根据你听到的声音，猜想他们具有甚么样的人格特质。

Stimuli

Â (Aspectual you)

A：你晚上要不要看电影？找你那个好朋友一起吧！
B：你今天下午有没有看到他吗？他有没有跟你说他要不要去？
A：我今天下午有没有看到他，问他有没有看过那部电影，但是他说他有看过。
B：这样啊，那我们先去。你有吃晚餐了吗？我晚上给你带点宵夜过去吧。
A：不用了我已经吃点东西了。
A: Do you want to go see a movie tonight? Invite your friend to come with us!
B: Did you call him? Did he say anything or text you back?
A: I called him this afternoon and I asked him if he has seen the movie, but he said he has.
B: Then let’s not watch the movie then. Have you had dinner? I’ll bring you some late night snack.
A: No, thanks. I had something already.

(Aspectual you)
A: 你以前吃过这个没有? 看起来很好吃。
B: 我吃过，真的很很好吃。
A: 对了，他们告诉你了没？今天晚上有一个聚餐，你一起来吧。
B: 你去过那家餐厅吗？知不知道地址？
A: 我之前去过，但是不太记得了。你再告诉一次地址好吗？
A: Have you had this before? It looks pretty good.
B: I had it. It’s pretty good. I can bring you some later.
A: I’m going to celebrate a friend’s birthday in a little while. You should come with us.
B: Then, let me write him a birthday card. Have you been to his place? Do you want me to text you the address?
A: I’ve been there before, but I don’t remember how to get here. Could you send me the address?

B1 (Gei)
A: 天气这么冷，我拿件外套给你吧！
B: 没关系，不用麻烦了。我刚刚拿了一本书给老师，用跑的，现在不冷。
A: 还是我倒杯热水给你?
B: 好啊，谢谢！可以顺便拿张卫生纸给我吗？
A: 当然可以。我顺便拿点心给你好了。
B: 太谢谢你了！
A: It’s pretty cold. Let me get you a jacket.
B: It's okay. I just ran to give the teacher a book. So I’m not cold now.
A: How about a cup of water. (Literally: how about I pour you a cup of water?)
B: Sure. Thank you! Could you also get me a tissue paper?
A: No problem. I’ll also get you some snacks.
B: Thank you so much!
B2 (gei)

A: 今天晚上要不要来我家吃饭？
B: 好啊！我帮你带点菜过去吧，要不要多邀点人？
A: 你给戴铭打个电话，问他要不要来吧。
B: 嗯，他没有接，给他发个短信好了。
A: 他可能在给爸妈打电话。
B: 那看他会不会给我发短信。

A: Do you want to head over for dinner?
B: Sure! I’ll bring a couple dishes. Are you going to invite more people?
A: Yeah. Give Dai Ming a call and see if he’s coming.
B: Alright. He didn’t pick it up. I’ll text him.
A: He might be calling his parents.
B: Let’s see if he’ll text me back.

Personality traits

没气质的 Unrefined/ 有气质的 refined
土气的 乡下的 Rustic / 都会的 cosmopolitan
爱炫耀的 showy/ 低调的 Low-key
官僚的 Bureaucratic/ 商业的 Businesslike
粗野的 rough/ 温柔的 gentle
无礼的 rude/ 有礼貌的 Polite
老派的 old-school / 年轻的 trendy and cool
传统的 traditional / 前卫的 cutting edge
不可靠的 unreliable / 直得信赖的 Trust-worthy
温柔的 Soft / 强硬的 tough
无聊的 Dull/ 幽默的 Humorous
作做的 Pretentious / 真诚的 earnest

承上题，请问你觉得 A 最有可能来自哪里？
大陆 北方地区 大陆 西南地区 大陆 东南沿海地区 港台地区
Based off the dialog from question 48, where do you think person A most likely comes from?

a) The north  b) the southwest  c) the southeast d) Hong Kong and Taiwan

--

Part 3

Television-viewing habit

In this part of the survey, you will be asked questions about your television-viewing habit, including your attitudes toward Taiwanese TV programs.

Have you ever watched TV programs from Taiwan?

Yes  No
请问您总共有看过哪些台湾电视节目呢？（请以'月'为单位，如果为两年，请填'24'。）

How long have you been watching TV programs from Taiwan?

请问您观看台湾的电视节目的频率？（请填入每周多少分钟。例如，若每天收看两小时，则填入 120。）

How often do you watch TV programs from Taiwan?

_______________________

请问您何时开始有观看台湾电视节目的习惯?

_______________________

When did you start the habit of watching Taiwanese TV programs?

a. Before the age of 13  b. 13-18  c. 19-24  d. 25-30  e. older than 31

你是否曾经停止观看台湾的电视节目超过六个月?

a. 未曾停止观看  b. 6-12 个月  c. 12-18 个月  d. 18-24 个月  e. 超过 24 个月

Have you ever stopped watching Taiwanese TV programs for more than 6 months? If so, for how long?

a. No  b. 6-12 months  c. 12-18 months  d. 18-24 months  e. more than 24 months

请根据您观看的频率列出下列台湾电视节目类型的种类

a. 综艺节目  b. 谈话节目  c. 戏剧  d. 实景节目  e. 其他(请说明)

Please rank the types of Taiwanese television shows based on how often you watch them

a. variety shows  b. talk shows  c. dramas  d. reality shows  e. others (please specify)

请按照顺序列出您最常收看的三个台湾电视节目

1. _______  2. _______  3. _______

Please list the 3 Taiwanese TV shows that you watched

1. _______  2. _______  3. _______
态度测验

谁是你最喜欢的台湾艺人？
如果你可以成为一位明星，你最想要成为谁？
你喜欢台湾的电视节目吗？
你会和朋友聊台湾的电视节目吗？
看电视是不是你主要的休闲活动之一吗？
你喜欢看康熙来了吗？
你喜欢徐熙娣(小S)的主持风格吗？
你会在网路论坛讨论台湾的电视节目吗？如果会的话，你最常使用那个网站？

Attitudinal questionnaire

a. Who are your favorite celebrities?
b. Who would you like to be if you could become of the celebrities you like?
c. What do you think of Taiwanese TV shows?
d. Do you talk about those TV shows with friends?
e. Is watching TV one of your main leisure activities?
f. How do you think of Xu Xi-yuan’s style? (list a few iconic Taiwanese people here)
g. Do you participate in the online discussion of any Taiwanese TV shows? If so, what website/app/social media do you use?

第四部分：基本数据
以下部分为基本资料问题，包含性别、年龄、以及您的方言背景，以方便我们分析社会要素对于语言改变所产生的影响。

Part 4 Demographic questions
The following questions serve to understand your personal background including gender, age, TV viewing habit, and dialectal background in order to analyze the influence of social factors on the variation of language.

性别：男  女

Gender:  a. male   b. female
请问您的年龄为？_______
Age: ________

请根据平常的交友习惯回答下列问题。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>完全同意</th>
<th>大部分同意</th>
<th>部分同意</th>
<th>大部分不同意</th>
<th>完全不同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我平常接触的人大多来自台湾</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我工作的同事/学校同学有很多台湾人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我居住的小区有许多台湾人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我在休闲的时间常常跟台湾人接触</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我常常参加有很多台湾人的社团/宗教活动</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the following questions based on your personal contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Mostly agree</th>
<th>Partially agree</th>
<th>Mostly disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of my contacts are from Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work/study with Taiwanese people a lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many Taiwanese in the neighborhood where I live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hang out with Taiwanese people a lot in my free time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often attend social/religious events with Taiwanese people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

请问您来自哪一个方言区？

① 北方方言区  ② 西南方言区  ③ 吴语方言区  ④ 赣语方言区
⑤ 湘语方言区  ⑥ 客家方言区  ⑦ 粤语方言区  ⑧ 闽南方言区
What dialect area in China you are from:

a. Northern dialect area
b. Southeastern dialect area
c. Wu dialect area
d. Gan dialect area
e. Xiang dialect area
f. Hakka dialect area
g. Yue dialect area
h. Min dialect area

Which of the following sentence sound more natural?
You eat dinner not-you
You eat-ASP dinner not-you

Which of the following sentence sound more natural?
I to you send you text
I send text to you
Appendix 4 – Mixed effect regression model specifications

3.1 Step-up model building procedure for \( \textit{gei} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Specifications</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random effects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4677.221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random effects + Attitudinal Factor 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4675.728</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random effects + Attitudinal Factor 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4675.144</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random effects + Attitudinal Factor 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4678.988</td>
<td>0.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random effects + Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4678.341</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random effects + Age</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4678.263</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random effects + Exposure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4680.233</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Random effects + Attitudinal Factor 2) + Gender</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4676.485</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Random effects + Attitudinal Factor 2) + Age</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4675.650</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Random effects + Attitudinal Factor 2) + Exposure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4677.542</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Random effects + Attitudinal Factor 2) + Exposure + AF2 X Exposure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4680.212</td>
<td>0.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Random effects + Attitudinal Factor 2) + Gender + AF2 X Gender</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4678.204</td>
<td>0.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Random effects + Attitudinal Factor 2) + Age + AF2 X Age</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4676.933</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Random effects + Attitudinal Factor 2) + Exposure + Age + Exposure X Age</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4681.513</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Step-up model building procedure for *you*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Model Description</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level I</strong></td>
<td>Random effects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2390.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random effects + Politeness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2392.654</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random effects + Meekness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2390.804</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random effects + Youthfulness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2392.676</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random effects + Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2392.224</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random effects + Age</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2389.641</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random effects + Exposure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2392.701</td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level II</strong></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age) + Politeness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2391.226</td>
<td>0.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age) + Meekness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2389.013</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age) + Youthfulness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2391.039</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age) + Gender</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2391.219</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age) + Exposure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2391.193</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level III</strong></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age + Meekness) + Politeness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2391.002</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age + Meekness) + Youthfulness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2390.073</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age + Meekness) + Gender</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2390.122</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age + Meekness) + Exposure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2390.407</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level IV</strong></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age + Meekness + Exposure) + Meekness X Exposure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2391.361</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Random effects + Age + Meekness + Exposure) + Gender</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2392.037</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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