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This study is an investigation of aspects of linguistic variation and change in the Mandarin Chinese spoken in Singapore. Most of the linguistic data comes from 46 recorded interviews with a range of Mandarin speaking Singaporeans.

The prescribed standard for Mandarin in Singapore is essentially the same as for Putonghua in China. The interpretation and status of this standard in Singapore is examined from the point of view both of those involved in prescribing and implementing it and of "laymen" speakers of the language.

It is suggested that there are de-facto target norms for Mandarin in Singapore which differ from the prescribed standard. A number of nonstandard features of phonology and grammar which are relatively invariant in the speech of almost all the informants are described. It is suggested that these are features of a general norm for speakers of Singapore Mandarin and that nonstandard features in Singapore Mandarin cannot be viewed simply as the results of interlingual interference and faulty
learning. Explanation for the adoption or not of standard features is sought in terms of their salience and social evaluation.

A number of nonstandard features which are highly variable in the data are also examined, broadly using the approach pioneered by William Labov for the investigation of linguistic variation and change. Five phonological and one grammatical variable are investigated, in four cases using a computer assisted variable rule analysis. Evidence is sought for linguistic constraints on the variation as well as relationships with the two modes within the interview situation ("talking" and "reading aloud") and with the speaker related factors of level of education, age, sex and mother tongue.

Findings for the speaker related factors provide evidence for sociolectal variation and for diachronic change towards standard variants. Evaluations by Singapore speakers of short recorded samples of Singapore Mandarin also point to the existence of socially marked variation. Some evidence is also presented for registerial variation. It is suggested that the development of these kinds of variation is to be expected in a "transplanted" language which is in the process of "indigenizing".

Finally, various interlingual phenomena are explored through analyses of four samples of "mixed" Mandarin. It is argued that linguistic behaviour in this area is
rather "unfocussed" and that it is often difficult to make clear distinction among categories of interlingual phenomena such as code-switching, code-mixing, borrowing and creolization.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Themes of this Thesis

This thesis is about what has happened and what may be happening to spoken Mandarin, which is basically a northern dialect of Chinese, in the multilingual environment of the Southeast Asian island state of Singapore. This will involve a number of related subthemes, the major ones of which may be characterized as language indigenization, language prescription and language contact.

1.1.1 Language Indigenization

Language indigenization or language nativization are terms which have been used to describe the processes of adaptation a language may undergo when it has been transplanted to a different cultural environment and has come to be used in an increasing number of contexts and for an increasing number of social purposes by speakers for whom it is not (or has only very recently become) a native language. Not surprisingly, English is the language which has received the most attention in this area, including studies of Indian English (e.g., Kachru
1976 and 1980), Nigerian English (e.g., Ubahakwe 1979), Filipino English (e.g., Llamzon 1969) and Singapore English (e.g., Platt and Weber 1980). Such studies have shown how these "transplanted" varieties of English have developed norms of usage quite distinct from those of the traditionally English speaking areas and also often quite distinct from the target norms which may continue to be prescribed in their educational systems.

As Richards (1979) points out, indigenized varieties will exhibit both categorical and variable features which differ from those of the parent language. Categorical features may account for the distinctiveness of a particular variety (e.g., "Singapore English" or "Indian English"). However, as the language comes to be used by more speakers, in a greater variety of contexts and for a greater variety of purposes, it may develop a range of sociolectal and registerial variation also quite distinct from such variation in the parent language.

Mandarin, too, is a language which has spread well beyond its "home" in Northern China. Although most speakers of Mandarin as a second language have as their mother tongues languages (or "dialects", see 1.2.2) much more closely related to Mandarin than, for example, Indian languages are to English, similar kinds of indigenization phenomena might be expected. Some work has begun on these "non-native" varieties of Mandarin (see references in Chapter Two) and there has already been a
certain amount of controversy over whether two standard norms rather than one norm for Mandarin should be recognized (e.g., Kratochvil 1973).

One theme of this study, therefore, will be to consider whether there has developed in Singapore a unique or distinctive variety of Mandarin and, related to this, whether Singapore Mandarin (or Singapore Huayu as we shall be calling it, see 1.2.1) may also have developed or be developing the kinds of sociolectal and registerial variation which might be expected of an "indigenized" language. Much of the investigation of such variation will broadly follow the quantitative approach pioneered by William Labov, originally for the study of linguistic variation and change in monolingual speech communities (e.g., Labov 1966, Labov 1972b).

1.1.2 Language Prescription

A second theme of this thesis concerns language prescription. In Singapore, language prescription has involved the vigorous promotion of the prescribed exonormative standard, based upon the speech of Beijing. It is the possible results rather than the processes of such language prescription that will be the major concern of this thesis. In other words, we will consider what evidence there is that speakers of Mandarin in Singapore may be moving towards the use of a variety or varieties of the language closer to the prescribed standard.
Possible motivations for this kind of diachronic change will also be considered, again taking into account the work of Labov (e.g., Labov 1963).

1.1.3 Language Contact

The third theme is that of language contact. A great deal of research has been carried out into language contact phenomena since Uriel Weinreich's *Languages in Contact*, published in 1953. A multilingual environment such as Singapore has provided and will no doubt continue to provide a rich field for the investigation of such phenomena (see, for example, papers in Afendras and Kuo eds. 1980).

The development of Mandarin in Singapore has inevitably been affected by contact both with the languages or dialects which are the mother tongues of most of its speakers and with the other languages (particularly English and Malay) spoken in the Republic. Although investigation of the origins of nonstandard features in Singapore Mandarin will not be a major theme of this study (i.e., this thesis is not primarily about language transfer or interference), some account will be taken of language contact phenomena. The patterning of some of the highly variable features in Singapore Mandarin will be examined for evidence of a relationship between the variation and the mother tongues of the speakers. A preliminary investigation into borrowing, code-
switching, code-mixing and related phenomena in Singapore Mandarin will also be undertaken.

1.2 Some Terms and Definitions

1.2.1 Mandarin, Putonghua, Guoyu and Huayu

_Mandarin_ will be used as a cover term for i) the Mandarin or Northern Chinese (Beifang) dialects which are spoken natively in China and include the dialect of Beijing, and ii) the variety or varieties of Chinese known as _Putonghua_ ("Common Language" or "General Language") in China, _Guoyu_ ("National Language") in Taiwan and _Huayu_ ("Chinese Language") in Singapore. The prescribed standards for Putonghua, Guoyu and Huayu are all based upon, though not identical with, Beijing dialect (see Chapter Six). When varieties of Mandarin spoken in either China (apart from the Northern Chinese dialects), Taiwan or Singapore are specifically referred to, the terms Putonghua, Guoyu and Huayu will be used respectively.

1.2.2 Dialects of Chinese

Following normal usage in sinology (and in China and Singapore) the term _dialect_ will be used for any variety of Chinese other than Putonghua, Guoyu or Huayu. This implies nothing about the linguistic status of a variety
so labelled, although it may say a great deal about its social or sociolinguistic status.

In referring to Chinese dialects, the commonly accepted groupings and labels will be used (controversies concerning the classification of Chinese dialects need not concern us in this thesis). These are the i) the Mandarin dialects (see 1.2.1 above), which may be further subdivided into the Northern (Huabei) group, the Northwestern (Xibei) group, the Southwestern (Xinan) group and the Jianghuai or River dialects group; ii) the Wu dialects (including Shanghainese); iii) the Xiang (or Hunanese) dialects; iv) the Gan (or Jiangxi) dialects; v) the Kejia (or Hakka) dialects; v) the Yue (or Cantonese dialects) and vi) the Min dialects, which may be further subdivided into Minbei (or Northern Min) dialects and Minnan (or Southern Min) dialects (for further information on the classification of Chinese dialects see Ramsay 1987 or Li 1973). In general, only the Mandarin, Cantonese (Yue) and Minnan dialects will concern us in this thesis. In addition, following normal Singapore usage, the term Hokkien will be used to refer to the variety or varieties of Minnan dialect spoken in Singapore, of which the standard form is the speech of Xiamen (Amoy). Other Minnan dialects spoken in Singapore that will be referred are Teochew (Chaozhouhua in Mandarin) and Hainanese (Hainanhua or giongzhouhua in Mandarin, sometimes also referred to as "Hailam").
1.2.3 Prescribed Standard and Norm

The term *prescribed standard* will be used to refer to a variety of a language which has official status or sanction and the use of which is prescribed by political, educational and/or linguistic authorities. In this thesis, prescribed standard will be distinguished from *(de-facto)* norm which will be used to refer to forms of linguistic behaviour which are widely shared by speakers and/or are considered appropriate (in particular contexts) by most speakers. Where a particular feature appears to be generally regarded (as opposed to just by the prescriptivists) as a valid target feature for Singapore speakers to adopt, it will be referred to as a target feature and so part of a target norm.

Following Le Page's terminology, norms may also be focussed, i.e., where there is great deal of regularity and shared linguistic behaviour or diffuse, i.e., where there is much less regularity and shared linguistic behaviour (Le Page 1978).

1.2.4 Zi and Yunmu

The term *zi* will be used instead of the rather clumsy "morpho-syllable" to refer to this basic structure of Chinese phonology and grammar. Where the written forms of *zi* (often called "characters") are specifically referred to, the term written *zi* will be used. The traditional term
yunmu (often translated as "rhyme") will be used in preference to "final" to refer to all phonetic features of the syllable after the (optional) initial consonant. The term (syllable) final (consonant) will therefore be reserved for the last phonetic segment of a syllable.

1.2.5 Other Terms and Conventions

Other terms will be defined if necessary when first introduced. Phonetic transcriptions (within square brackets) follow the conventions of the International Phonetic Alphabet (Revised to 1979). Phonetic transcriptions of the Beijing Mandarin pronunciation generally follow those of Professor M.A.K. Halliday (see Appendix One), which form the basis of his phonological analyses of the Mandarin syllable (Halliday 1959 and 1985). These transcriptions have been followed primarily because they give an amount of phonetic detail not generally present in other transcriptions, including phonetic variation. However, they have also been checked against samples of standard pronunciation as represented in the Chinese Conversation cassette tapes recorded at the Beijing Languages Institute (published by Commercial Press, Beijing 1982) and the speech of several students from Beijing studying in Australia and New Zealand. Note that in the phonetic transcriptions of Mandarin [b], [d], [g] etc. represent consonants with early voice onset (i.e., voiced on release) and [p], [t] and [k] etc.
represent consonants with late voice onset (i.e. voiced after "aspiration").

Underlined transcriptions are in *Hanyu Pinyin Zimu* (or just *Pinyin*), the official Chinese system for romanizing Putonghua. Quotations of sentence length or above from Chinese sources or from the recorded interviews are given in Pinyin in the body of the text and in written zi in Appendix Seven.
NOTES

1. Throughout this thesis, the term register (adjective: registerial) will be used to refer to language variation according to context and use. Sociolect (adjective: sociolectal) will be used to refer to variation according to the social identity of the user. For a succinct overview of the differences between registerial and dialectal (including sociolectal) variation see Halliday and Hasan (1985:43).

2. Although by no means all such speakers. Many of China's minority nationalities speak languages unrelated or only distantly related to Chinese. See Ramsay 1987.

3. No attempt will be made in this thesis to elucidate the linguistic relationships between Singapore Huayu and the variety or varieties of Mandarin spoken in Malaysia. Given the great similarities between the two countries in ethnic, linguistic and, until comparatively recently, educational backgrounds, it is not surprising that the Mandarin spoken in both countries should share many characteristics. However, no systematic data on Malaysian Mandarin is at present available.
CHAPTER TWO

THE PRESENT STUDY AND PREVIOUS SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDIES OF CHINESE

2.1 Approaches to the Study of Variation in Chinese

The present study of variation and change in Singapore Huayu inevitably draws upon earlier studies of Chinese, particularly those whose which come within the scope of what is generally called "sociolinguistics". Such studies have taken a number of different approaches, all of which have relevance to the study of Huayu in Singapore.

Singapore Huayu is a variety of Mandarin, and we may thus wish to elucidate its relationship with other dialects of Mandarin spoken in China as well as with varieties of Putonghua and Guoyu. In other words, we might want to adopt the perspective of dialectology or dialect geography.

On the other hand, we may wish to investigate patterns of sociolectal and registerial variation in the language, and the relationship between such variation and linguistic change. In other words, to take the quantitative approach to linguistic variation that has
characterized much work in sociolinguistics over the last two decades.

However, unlike English in New York and Norwich, or Mandarin in Beijing, Huayu in Singapore is a "transplanted" variety and it is learned as a second (if not third or fourth) language by most of its speakers. We might therefore wish to view the development of Huayu in Singapore from the perspective of *language contact* and look for evidence of *language transfer features*. Alternatively, recognizing that the prescribed standard for Huayu in Singapore is essentially exonormative, our concerns might be primarily pedagogical, aiming to describe the "mistakes" or deviations from the prescribed standard in the speech of Singaporeans in order to help them master a more standard like variety.

Each of these approaches has something to offer to the study of Huayu in Singapore. However, no single one of the approaches seems entirely adequate for the purposes of the present study.

2.2 Dialectology in China

During this century, a tremendous amount of work has been done on Chinese dialects. This has included both linguistic descriptions of particular dialects and general surveys of dialects. Published reports, in particular the *Hanyu Fangyan Gaiyao* (Outline of Chinese
Dialects) by Yuan Jiahua et al (1960), the Hanyu Fangyin Zihui (A Dictionary of Dialect Pronunciations) (Beijing Daxue 1962) and the Hanyu Fangyan Cihui (A Dictionary of Dialect Words) (Beijing Daxue 1964), are invaluable resources for anyone working in the field. In the present study, such sources will be drawn upon in comparing features of Singapore Huayu with those of other dialects of Mandarin and in considering the "uniqueness" or otherwise of Singapore Huayu.

However, like dialectology in the West, at least until fairly recently, these studies have not paid much attention to variability in speech, other than geographical variability. Much of the information in the dialect surveys is, in fact, based upon the pronunciations of lists of written zi, and variation is usually noted only for those dialects which have distinct wen and bai strata in the phonology, i.e., where zi have both reading and "colloquial" pronunciations.

2.3. Studies of Linguistic Variation and Change in Native Speaker Varieties of Chinese.

Within roughly the last decade, work has begun on Chinese dialects using the approach to investigating linguistic variation and change pioneered by William Labov.

Bauer (1979) is a study of variation between final [ŋ] and [n] in the speech of a Hong Kong Cantonese informant.
[ŋ] is identified as the conservative variant and [n] the innovative variant. Bauer finds that the change is complete in syllables with low vowels and in progress for syllables with mid vowels. Bauer’s Doctoral thesis (Bauer 1982) investigates two more variables in Hong Kong Cantonese, syllabic [ŋ] ~ [m] (also reported in Bauer 1986) and initial [kʷo] ~ [ko], using data drawn from sociolinguistic interviews with 75 Hong Kong informants. In each case, the first (and Standard Cantonese) variant is identified as the conservative variant. Using the perspective of lexical diffusion (see Chen M. 1972 and Wang W.S.Y. ed. 1978), Bauer identifies the environments in which the innovations probably began. He also finds that, in the case of the first variable, the [k] variant is almost categorical in the speech of those under 35, and in the case of the second variable, the change to [n] is being led by young males.

Pan (1982) reports on a similar study of linguistic variables in Hong Kong Cantonese. This study also looks at variation between [kʷo] and [k] as well as between initial [n] and [l] and between initial [ŋ] and [ŋ]. In each case, the former of each pair is identified as the conservative variant. From quantitative analysis of data elicited in sociolinguistic interviews with two groups of informants, Pan finds that the group with the older mean age consistently used more conservative variants. He also finds evidence for stylistic shift, with both groups using a higher percentage of the conservative variants in
careful speech. Findings from a matched guise study of these variables also allow Pan to conclude that the conservative forms are perceived to be more prestigious than the innovative forms and that the direction of change is therefore away from the prestige standard.

Barale (1982) is a study of variation in the loss of the final nasal consonants [ŋ] and [n] and nasalization of the preceding vowel in Beijing Mandarin. The data comes from recorded interviews with 18 speakers and, as in the present study, is analysed quantitatively using a variable rule computer programme to investigate the effects of both social factors and linguistic environment on the variation. Barale finds that for both [n] and [ŋ] the nasalization is favoured by high front vowels and low vowels and that [ŋ] is more likely to be retained than [n]. She also finds that retention of the final consonants (identified as the conservative variant) is favoured by "professionals" more strongly than "workers".

Such studies are important contributions to the study of Chinese dialects. The present study will undertake similar quantitative investigations of phonological variation in Singapore Huayu, including several variables comparable to those investigated in the above studies (e.g., (ng) in Chapter Ten, (n) in Chapter Thirteen). However, there are also some important differences between this study and previous studies of
sociolinguistic variation in native speaker varieties of Chinese. Unlike Cantonese in Hong Kong and Mandarin in Beijing, Huayu in Singapore is the mother tongue of only a tiny minority of its speakers and, as we shall see, any change appears to be towards the prescribed standard variety. Thus, the possible effects of both language contact and of language prescription must also be taken into account. Moreover, in order to explore the possibility of a norm or norms distinct from the prescribed standard, it will be necessary to consider relatively invariant nonstandard features, as well as highly variable features.

Grammatical variation and change in Chinese has not yet been investigated using systematically gathered data and quantitative analysis (at least, as far as the present author is aware). However, occasional observations have been made which are of relevance to the present study.

In an article in Zhongguo Yuwen, Chen Jianmin (1982) comments on the disappearance from Beijing speech of certain localisms in favour of more widely used Putonghua forms and, more interestingly from the point of view of the present study, notes influences from southern dialects on Beijing speech, including the use of the verb ㄠ "go" directly before a place name, the use (although still rare) of the positive perfective auxiliary ㄠ before the lexical verb in interrogatives and the occasional use of the comparative structure ㄠ.
All of these grammatical constructions are common in Singapore Huayu (see p.229, p.216 and Appendix Five). Such constructions have also been previously noted in the Mandarin of other speakers with a southern dialect background (especially the ぐ + PLACE and よ constructions, see references to Chao 1976 and Cheng 1985 below). However, it is interesting that they may now also be occasionally heard in Beijing speech, which is regarded as the basis for the standard language (see Chapter Six).

2.4 Studies of Language Contact

2.4.1 Native Speaker Varieties

A certain amount of work has been done on language contact phenomena in native speaker varieties of Chinese which are in contact with, or have been in contact with, other languages or other dialects of Chinese.

The collection of papers by Chao Yuen Ren entitled *Aspects of Chinese Sociolinguistics* (Chao 1976) contains a number of interesting observations. In the chapter entitled *Interlingual and Interdialectal Borrowings in Chinese* (originally published as Chao 1970), Chao looks at the processes of phonetic adaptation, (or phonic transfer) and of loan translation (or calque) in the borrowing of foreign words into Chinese. He also notes cases of structural borrowing, i.e., the borrowing of
structural features of a foreign language without either direct borrowing or translating of any foreign word, for example, the extension in use of the Mandarin beǐ + VERB construction to all contexts in which English would use the passive voice, or the use of the perfective particle le for all cases of reference to the past, where English would use the past tense -ed suffix. In this chapter Chao also distinguishes true borrowings from the mixing by bilingual speakers into their speech of foreign words which are not adapted to the phonology of the recipient language. He uses the term skipants to refer to the latter and in a subsequent chapter examines the phonology and grammar of such skipants in the speech of Mandarin speaking Chinese in America.

In the case of interdialectal borrowings, Chao similarly distinguishes true borrowings, which are used by native speakers of the recipient dialect, from the carrying over of features of their native dialect by speakers trying to speak another dialect. The pre-verbal use of the positive perfective auxiliary yǒu by Cantonese and Hokkien speakers who learn Mandarin as a second language he therefore does not consider a true borrowing.

Ts'ou (1975) looks at interlingual phenomena involving Cantonese and English and identifies five modes of linguistic assimilation: linguistic importations (including phonetic adaptations and loan translations); linguistic substitutions (the replacement of elements in
the recipient language by elements from the donor language; code-switching; bilingualism and residual interference. He proposes the hypothesis that these five modes correlate with phases in the progression of cultural assimilation.

Gibbons (1979a) is a phonological, grammatical and lexical description of the mixed campus language ("U-gay-wa") of students at the University of Hong Kong. U-gay-wa is predominantly Cantonese with English admixture, including a small "autonomous" element distinct from both source languages. In Gibbons (1979b), he suggests that the process which U-gay-wa is undergoing might best be described as koinéisation (Gibbon's 1979b will be further referred to in Chapter Fifteen).

The kinds of interlingual and interdialectal phenomena investigated in such studies are also to be found in Singapore Huayu. However, as will be argued in Chapter Fifteen, in samples of "mixed" or "Rojak" Huayu, it is not always possible to make neat distinctions among, for example, Chao's true borrowings, skipants and carryovers or between code-switching and the various kinds of borrowing.
2.4.2 Language Contact and Non-Native or "New" Varieties of Mandarin

Of more central relevance to this thesis are studies of varieties of Putonghua or Guoyu in areas where dialects very different from those of Beijing and closely related dialects are spoken.

Lehmann (ed. 1975) reports a number of observations made by a delegation of American linguists to China in 1974. They note a number of nonstandard variants in the Putonghua spoken in various parts of China, many of which are also to be heard in Singapore Huayu. Their observations are, of course, unsystematic. However, they provide some useful points of comparison between Singapore Huayu and varieties of Putonghua spoken in China and will be drawn upon at relevant places in this thesis.

Kubler (1981) is a study of the Guoyu spoken in Taiwan. Kubler's main concern is to account for nonstandard features in Taiwan Guoyu in terms of influences from Southern Min and to a much smaller extent from Japanese, English and Southern Mandarin. Many of the nonstandard phonological, grammatical and lexical features of Taiwan Guoyu noted by Kubler are also to be found in Singapore Huayu and throughout this thesis comparisons will be made between the two varieties of Mandarin, frequently drawing on Kubler's work.
Kubler's study takes the perspective of language contact, i.e., he is concerned to elucidate the mutual influences that the languages in contact (in this case primarily Southern Min and Mandarin) have on one another. Deviations from standard Mandarin in the Guoyu spoken in Taiwan are thus seen as the effects of language transfer. However, Kubler does also recognize that more than simply linguistic interference or "faulty learning" may be involved. He points out, for example, that Taiwan Mandarin is spoken not only by native Taiwanese (i.e., those whose mother tongue is Southern Min) "but also by the younger generation of mainlanders who have spent their childhood in Taiwan and are monolingual in Mandarin" (p.51) and that "even if they could reproduce the sounds of Standard Mandarin with complete accuracy, many Taiwanese would not wish to simply because they would sound 'different' from their compatriots" (p.59). This is a point that the present thesis will explore further in the case of Singapore Huayu.

Cheng (1985) is a grammatical comparison of Taiwanese Southern Min, Taiwan Guoyu and Beijing Mandarin. Whilst also basically a study of language contact, he goes further than Kubler in identifying three kinds of phenomena leading to differences between Beijing Mandarin and Taiwan Guoyu. Firstly, transfer of features from Taiwanese Southern Min into Taiwan Guoyu, secondly, adoption into Taiwan Guoyu of features which are simple
and regular and thirdly, a tendency for Taiwan Guoyu to favour what is universal in the non-Mandarin dialects of South China and to disfavour certain features of Beijing Mandarin which, he argues, are characteristic of Altaic languages. Several of the nonstandard grammatical features of Singapore Huayu that will be described in the present study, including uses of the verbal auxiliary you (with both past and non-past reference, see p.216 and p.224) and the qu/ lāi + PLACE construction (p.229), are also described by Cheng for Taiwan Guoyu and further reference to his work will be made in the relevant sections.

However, whilst the perspective of language contact is useful in explaining the origins of certain linguistic features, such studies do not address the question of sociolinguistic variation and cannot account for many of the changes a "transplanted" variety of a language may undergo as it comes to be used in a variety of contexts, for a variety of purposes by its "new" speakers.

2.5 Studies of Singapore Huayu

It has long been recognized that the Huayu spoken in Singapore or Singapore and Malaysia diverges in many respect from standard Mandarin. Png Poh Seng, in a paper published in 1967, noted many nonstandard features in the "Malayan pronunciation of Mandarin" which are also characteristic of the samples of Singapore Huayu recorded
in 1983 for the present thesis, including 也要 for standard 平 (p.208, this thesis), 为了 for (Chapter Nine); en and an for eng and ang (Chapter Eleven); 了, 了, and 了 for sh, ch and zh (p.186); l for initial r (Chapter Ten); l for initial n (Chapter Thirteen) and the use of a rusheng tone (Chapter Twelve). Png claims that there was at that time very little socially related variation in the pronunciation of Huayu in Malaya and Singapore (see quote p.75, this thesis) and his main concen is simply to list the major deviations from the standard language and give some examples. Nevertheless, he does distinguish between nonstandard features which are fairly general and those which are characteristic of speakers of particular dialect mother tongues, although some of his comments (e.g. that l for r is a rather infrequent deviation most characteristic of Hokkien and Teochew speakers) do not hold for the present data.

In a paper published two years later (Xie 1969), Xie Yunfei notes not only nonstandard features of pronunciation in Singapore Huayu, but also a number of lexical borrowings from Malay, English and the Chinese dialects spoken in Singapore as well as several nonstandard features of grammar, including the 去 + PLACE construction and the perfective 要 + VERB construction.

During the 1970’s and early 1980’s a number of articles appearing in journals such as Yuwen (published by the
Singapore Chinese Second language Teachers’ Society) and occasionally in the press continued to draw attention to nonstandard features in Singapore Huayu. However, such articles do not usually go beyond citing the most salient of the features already noted by Png, particularly those which may lead to the pronunciation as homophones zi which are heterophones in standard Mandarin. The assumption is generally that such nonstandard features are due to mother tongue interference and faulty learning. Such studies are, of course, pedagogically oriented, written for teachers or laymen, and their concern is to help Singapore speakers to achieve a more standard like pronunciation rather than to provide detailed linguist or sociolinguistic analyses. However, they do give a useful indication of what nonstandard features are most salient to teachers and speakers of Huayu in Singapore. A good example of this genre is an article published in Yuwen in 1976 which provides a list of oppositions that Singapore speakers need to master (these are: the initial consonants: zh v. z, ch v. c, sh v. s, n v. l and the yunmu ("rhymes", see p.7) i v. ü, an v. ang, en v. eng) and concludes by saying that:

Qíshí, zhídào háizimen shuò yì kǒu biāozhùn Huáyu, zhèng shì lāoshìde zérèn. Bìāozhùn Huáyu bìng bù yǐnggāi zhì shì guāngbóyúan huo móuxie zhūanyè
rénsìde zhūnānlìpìn. Wǒmen xīwàng zài réxínde tōngdàomènde nǔlìxià, wǒmènde Huàyǔ, néng yìtiāntiān zhāožhe biāozhùndé dàolù màijìn!

(In fact, it is the responsibility of teachers to lead children to speak standard Huayu. Standard Huayu is certainly not just the privileged property of broadcasters or certain specialists. We hope that with the hard work of our enthusiastic colleagues our Huayu can day by day stride ahead towards the standard!)

(Chen Y.Q. 1976:29. See Appendix Seven for version in written zi)

A less prescriptive view is expressed in an article by Wu Yuanhua, also published in Yuwen (Wu 1977), on lexical borrowings in both spoken and written Singapore Huayu. Wu gives many examples of borrowings from English, Malay, Tamil and Chinese dialects and notes that the processes of borrowing include both phonetic adaptation and loan translation (calque) as well as combinations of the two (see Appendix Six), but that unlike standard Mandarin, Singapore Huayu shows a preference for phonetic adaptation over loan translation. Wu does not deplore such borrowing but sees them as enriching the language:

Butòng yúyánde hūxiāng yìngxiáng shì zhèngchǎngde qíngxìng, yúyán yú yúyánde jiēchù shì shèhuì fāzhǎn
lishide birán jieguo. Zhe zhong jiechu ye biran yinqu yuyande ronghe, cong yuyande ronghe keyi kanchu wenhua jiaoliu. Xitеле cengjing qitu jin feichu xianzai Deguoyuzhongde wailaici, yi "chun Rierman yuci" zuowei Deguode yuyan, danshi tade zhezhong xiangfa, gen ta wangtu zhengfu shijiede yexin tong guiyu jin.

(For different languages to influence one another is a normal phenomenon, contact between languages is an inevitable result of the history of social development. Such contact inevitably also leads to linguistic blending, and in linguistic blending one can see cultural exchange. Hitler once planned to completely eradicate foreign borrowings from modern German in order to make "pure Germanic vocabulary" the language of Germany. But this plan, like his vainglorious ambition to conquer the world, came to nought.)

Lock (1982) provides an overview of the status and roles of Huayu in Singapore and, following the approach of earlier studies, lists and gives examples of the most salient divergences in pronunciation and lexis from standard Mandarin. It was, in fact, awareness of the inadequacies of this approach to describe and account for the range of variation and possible directions of change in Singapore Huayu that motivated the author to carry out the more systematic gathering and analysis of data that has led to the present thesis.
The most interesting and important studies of Singapore Huayu that have appeared to date are those of Chen Chungyu, a linguist working at the Chinese language and Research Centre of the National University of Singapore. Chen C.Y. (1982b) is a study of rusheng in Singapore Huayu, a feature to which Chapter Twelve of this thesis is also devoted. In the same year, Chen published a study of segmental features of Singapore Huayu pronunciation (Chen C.Y. 1982c, reprinted as Chen C.Y. 1986), many of which will be described in detail in Chapters Seven to Eleven and Chapter Thirteen of this thesis. Chen C.Y. (1984) is a study of certain lexical features in Singapore Huayu which are the result of influences from the southern dialects (see Appendix Six).

For her studies of features of pronunciation in Singapore Huayu, Chen recorded and analyzed the pronunciations of ten informants reading lists of zi. The ten informants were either students or administrative staff of the former Nanyang University and included two from each of the following dialect mother tongue groups: Hainanese, Cantonese, Hokkien, Hakka and Teochew. In a series of tables, Chen compares the percentages of "correct" readings of certain variable features in different phonological environments and by the five different dialect groups.
Like previous studies of Singapore Huayu, Chen's concern is essentially pedagogical, i.e., to describe the "mistakes" made by Singapore speakers as an aid to the teaching of standard Huayu. However, her work is the first to be based upon quantitative analyses of recorded data. Her study differs from the present study in that her data base is much smaller, only reading pronunciations are represented and only phonological environment and the informants' mother tongues are taken into account as possible constraints on the variation. However, throughout this thesis, comparisons will be made with Chen's findings wherever relevant. For convenience, all such references will be to the more accessible 1986 version of Chen's work, except for references to rusheng (Chen C.Y. 1982b has not been reprinted elsewhere).

Finally, Ng (1985) reports a study of the pronunciation of the retroflex (in the standard language) initial consonant $sh$ in the Huayu of 10 Singaporeans between the ages of 20 and 25, all currently pursuing tertiary education in Australia. The variable is identified as the presence or absence of retroflexion. Ng used a modified Labovian methodology to elicit five styles, ranging from "free speech" (the least careful or formal style, see 5.3.2 this thesis) to tongue twisters (the most careful or formal style). She found that the more careful the speech style, the greater the frequency of the standard retroflex variant. She also found that her female
informants had higher levels of the retroflex variant than males in all styles except the tongue twisters.

It is interesting that this same feature was found to exhibit no significant variation in the data used for the present study. Possible reasons for this difference in findings will be considered and it will be argued that, despite Ng's findings, such initial retroflexion has not yet become a feature of the Huayu of most Singaporeans, other than in certain atypical contexts (see p.141 and p.142).

Thus, previous studies have identified a number of nonstandard features of phonology, lexis and, to a lesser extent, grammar in the Huayu spoken in Singapore. However, in most cases, it has been assumed that such features are the result of linguistic interference and faulty learning. There has been no consideration (apart from occasionally in the case of lexis) of the possibility that there may be target or de-facto norms for Singapore speakers other than the prescribed standard. As far as the present author is able to ascertain, no study, apart from Ng (1985), has attempted any systematic investigation of sociolectal or registerial variation in Singapore Huayu, or has considered the possible directions of linguistic change and factors which may affect such change.
2.6 The Perspective of the Present Study

The studies of Chinese considered above fall into the following general categories: a) studies in the tradition of dialectology or dialect geography b) studies of phonological variables in native speaker varieties (such as Beijing Mandarin or Hong Kong Cantonese), broadly following Labovian approaches to data collection and analysis; c) observations (usually anecdotal) of grammatical and lexical changes in Beijing Mandarin and Putonghua; d) studies of borrowing, code-switching and related interlingual phenomena; e) studies of non-native or "new" varieties of Mandarin, such as Taiwan Guoyu, from the perspective of language contact.

All of these approaches have some relevance to the study of Huayu in Singapore. However, none of them would appear to be sufficient to address the complexity of the sociolinguistic situation of Huayu in Singapore. In taking the three perspectives outlined in Chapter One, i.e.: i) language indigenization, which involves the consideration of possible internal norms, the investigation of sociolectal and registerial variation and the consideration of the uniqueness or otherwise of Singapore Huayu; ii) language contact, which recognizes the influences on Singapore Huayu of other languages and dialects and iii) language prescription, which recognizes the role of the exonormative standard, the present study seeks to combine many of the features of previous
studies of variation in Chinese (including Singapore Huayu) and to some extent to go beyond them. The adoption of a narrower focus, whilst enabling greater depth in the study of one area, would risk losing sight of many of the most fascinating aspects of what has happened and is happening to Huayu in Singapore.
NOTES

1. This variation was also noted by M.A.K. Halliday in Beijing in 1947-1949 (see Appendix One). It may, therefore, be a comparatively stable variable.

2. To be more precise, the type of Southern Min "spoken in the environs of Taibei, Taiwan" (p. 3c). The Taiwanese Southern Min dialects are closely related to the variety or varieties of Southern Min spoken in Singapore and known as "Hokkien".

3. In references to articles in Chinese, the romanization of the author's name will be given in Pinyin (i.e., according to the Mandarin pronunciation) except where a romanization according to a dialect pronunciation is included in the article referred to.
CHAPTER THREE

HUAYU IN SINGAPORE

3.1 Introduction

Mandarin or Huayu is one of the four official languages of Singapore, the other three being English, Malay and Tamil. It also often described as the "mother tongue" of Singaporeans of Chinese ethnicity. However, the true mother tongues (i.e., languages first learned in infancy) of the vast majority of Singapore's approximately two million Chinese Singaporeans are a number of southern Chinese dialects. The 1980 census gives the following breakdown of Singapore Chinese by dialect group: Hokkien 43.1%, Teochew 22.1%, Cantonese 16.5%, Hainanese 7.1%, Hakka 7.4%, Foochow 1.7% and several others all below 1%. Of these dialects only Hokkien and Teochew are generally considered to have a fairly high level of mutual intelligibility. It should be noted, however, that the percentages refer to membership of sub-ethnic groupings for which language labels are used and do not necessarily represent the mother tongues actually spoken by all members of a particular group. In Singapore, dialect group membership is an official category inherited from one's father irrespective of what languages or dialects the family may actually speak at home. However, the
figures do give a fair idea of the range of Chinese dialects spoken as mother tongues in Singapore and their relative numerical strengths.

As well as being an official language, Huayu in Singapore is a language of everyday use and, for over half a century, has been a major medium of education. However, the status and roles of Huayu in Singapore have undergone great changes over the years and the present period in particular is a period of rapid change and sociolinguistic realignment. In order to understand the linguistic changes which may be taking place in Singapore Huayu, it is necessary to know something of the history of the language in Singapore and of its present status and roles.

Section 2 of this chapter will therefore review the history of Huayu in Singapore, Section 3 will look at available information on its present status and roles, Section 4 will consider some influences on the linguistic development of Singapore Huayu and Section 5 will outline the major dimensions of variation in the language today.

3.2 The History of Huayu in Singapore

3.2.1 Pre-Mandarin Times

At the time of the founding of the British settlement of Singapore in 1819, there were said to be a small number
of Chinese engaged in the cultivation of pepper and gambier, as well as about 100 Malays, and a few families of Orang Laut (literally "sea people") (Marriott 1923). However, the ancestors of the vast majority of today's Chinese Singaporeans are later immigrants from China. By 1901, the population of Singapore had risen to 220,344 and by 1921 to 425,912 of whom 317,491 (74.5%) were Chinese. This remains roughly the proportion of Chinese in the population today.

The migrants came mainly from the southeastern provinces of Guangdong and Fujian, a region of China in which dialect differences are particularly great and complex. Social groupings along dialect lines were of very great importance in colonial Singapore and Malaya, including secret societies (of great importance in the 19th century, at least), clan and village-of-origin associations, and the dialect group or huiguan (also spelt "huay kuan" and "wui kun") associations (Freedman 1957). Such organizations provided the majority of the immigrants from China with their primary sense of identity, security and allegiance. Chinese of one dialect group may have some awareness of a degree of likeness with members of other dialect groups, but on the whole the different groups often tended to regard one another as foreigners or even enemies (Purcell 1967).

Huiguan associations, such as the Hokkien Huiguan founded in 1860, became particularly important and
influential institutions throughout the colonial period. They assisted needy members, carried out religious duties, helped in settling disputes and provided a social focus for their members. There was also economic specialization along dialect lines from the earliest days of Singapore and this persisted until quite recent times with, for example, the Cantonese being dominant among the artisans and restaurateurs and the Hokkiens dominant among the merchants (Neville 1969).

Until at least the 1920's, and for much longer in many cases, language use does seem to have been by and large coterminous with dialect group membership. For many Chinese living in Singapore and Malaya knowledge of their home dialect and perhaps the dominant dialect of the area (if this was different) would have been sufficient for most purposes and contexts. However, it became increasingly common for Chinese Singaporeans, especially men, to speak several dialects (Murray 1971). According to Ts'ou (1980), dialect diglossia was imported from China, with the H (high) varieties - usually the speech of the regional capitals or cultural centres - used for the local opera form, religious ceremonies, public speeches and education, and the L (low) varieties - usually originally local, rural forms of speech - used with family and friends. However, given the social composition of the immigrants (mainly of uneducated, peasant background), it is unlikely that the H varieties were widely known or used.
Some use was also made of Malay, especially the simplified so-called "Bazaar Malay", for inter-ethnic communication, although it is difficult to know how widely. English was restricted to a small elite, many of whom (apart from the colonial British, of course) were members of the Straits Chinese or Peranakan community whose roots in the area go back to long before the establishment of Singapore by the British (see Clammer 1980)

Prior to 1900, education in Chinese in most cases meant learning by rote the Chinese classics in "traditional" schools (see Purcell 1967:225 for a description of such schools) or attending one of the few Chinese medium schools organized by christian missionary groups (Doraisamy ed. 1969). In both these types of school, Chinese dialects were the media of instruction.

3.2.2 The Introduction and Spread of Guoyu

The years 1900-1919 were a period of rapid expansion and "modernization" for Chinese education in Singapore, including the opening of night schools for adults which pioneered the use of Guoyu ("National Language" or Mandarin, later to be called Huayu) (Doraisamy ed. 1969). However, it was not until the 1920's that, influenced by the National Language Movement in China, there was a widespread movement by Chinese schools in Singapore to
adopt Guoyu as their medium of instruction. By 1930, nearly all Chinese schools in Singapore were using Guoyu as their medium of instruction (Murray 1971), although one of the informants for this study reports receiving some primary education through Cantonese in a Singapore school as late as the end of the 1930's.

The introduction and spread of Guoyu through the Chinese schools cut across the dialect group loyalties dividing the Singapore Chinese community and was associated with the growth of Chinese nationalism and political activism among Chinese in Singapore, generally directly influenced by events in China such as the May Fourth Movement and subsequent anti-Japanese agitation. As Murray (1971) puts it: "The unifying effects of Mandarin across Chinese speech-groups - not simply as a lingua franca amongst the younger generation but as a cultural and political symbol - would be hard to overemphasize" (p.62).

This fact was not lost on the colonial authorities. They were particularly worried by the influence of China over Chinese schools. Curricula, trained teachers and textbooks all came from China, and the Guomindang Government of China continued the Imperial policy of regarding education of the Nanyang Chinese as its direct concern. In 1920, the colonial government introduced a bill to control schools and teachers through registration, followed by an amendment in 1925 which, among other things, empowered the Director of Education
to refuse to register a teacher and to make provisions to punish an unregistered teacher who continued to teach. These ordinances were passed despite vigorous opposition from sections of the Chinese population. In addition, in 1923, grants-in-aid were introduced for Chinese schools provided they were willing to submit to inspection. However, one purpose of such grants was to "encourage and assist the education of Chinese-speaking children through the medium of their own domestic dialect or dialects which they understand" and the teaching of Guoyu was not to be grant earning (quoted in Doraisamy ed. 1969:88-89).

In the event, few Chinese schools applied for such grants and through the 1920's and 1930's Chinese medium education continued to be supported mainly by the Chinese community itself. The orientation towards and political influence from China also continued, as did the colonial governments attempts to exert control over the schools (for details see Doraisamy ed. 1969 and Wilson 1978).

By the time of the outbreak of the Pacific War (1941), roughly half of all Chinese children in Singapore between the ages of 5 and 14 were enrolled in school (60,000 of an estimated 120,000), almost two thirds in Chinese (i.e., Guoyu or Huayu) medium schools (Murray 1971). However, whilst Chinese medium education was a force for unity among a Chinese population divided along dialect
group lines, the schism between the Chinese medium educated Chinese and the English medium educated Chinese had grown and hardened. Whilst the Chinese medium schools looked to China for their curriculum, their trained teachers and textbooks, the English medium schools "focussed attention on England, Europe and the British Empire" (Wilson 1978:29). Unlike Chinese medium education, English medium education, which was now beginning to cater for more and more "sinkeh" (Mand: xinke - migrants from China) as well as Peranakan, was strongly supported by the colonial administration and generally neither Guoyu nor Chinese dialects were taught in such schools. This linguistic and cultural division was compounded by economic divisions, as the English educated group were increasingly able to gain access to more prestigious positions in government, commerce and the professions (Wilson 1978).

3.2.3 From the End of the Japanese Occupation to Self Government

An indication of the spread of Huayu (or Guoyu as it was then still usually called) in both Singapore and Malaya by the end of the Japanese occupation and its political significance is given by Purcell. He writes that:

Mandarin became also a kind of political badge. An observer returning to Malaya after the Japanese occupation was bound to be impressed by the progress
the movement had made among the leftists. They all spoke Mandarin of a sort and were unwilling to speak their own dialect. 

(Purcell 1967:233).

In the post war period there was a great demand for education and Chinese schools in Singapore "sprang up like mushrooms" (Doraisamy ed. 1969:90). During the 1950's, the politicization of Singapore Chinese youth through these schools became a mass phenomenon (Murray 1971). It is not necessary here to consider the possible contributions of communist influence, anti-colonial sentiments and educational and economic grievances to the unrest (see Murray 1971:83ff). However, it is clear that at least some of the opposition was directed at what was felt to be a threat to Chinese education from the government's attempts to control the schools and to strongly support English medium education. The Ten Years Programme of 1947, an attempt to deal with the problems of a fragmented educational system, promised increased financial support for "vernacular" education which would lead eventually to universal free primary education through the media of Chinese, Malay, Tamil or English. Nevertheless, in practice, the main thrust of colonial policy remained the encouragement of the English stream, which it saw as producing an English educated elite with loyalties directed towards Singapore (Gopinathan 1974). However, events such as the mass Chinese student demonstration against the National Service Act in 1954
and the Hock Lee bus riots of 1955 convinced the government that something more had to be done about Chinese education.

In 1955 an all-party committee to look into Chinese medium education was appointed by the first largely elected (25 out of 32 seats in the Legislative Assembly) government of Singapore. The following year, the Committee recommended, among other things, the adoption of the principle of equality of treatment for all streams (i.e., Huayu, English, Malay and Tamil), the use in all schools of common and nationally-oriented curricula and the encouragement of bilingualism at primary levels and trilingualism at secondary levels. These recommendations were on the whole welcomed by the Chinese community (Gopinathan 1974).

Lee Kuan Yew was a member of the All-Party Committee and after the victory of the Peoples Action Party in the 1959 election, the principles of the report became the basis for later developments in Singapore's education system, although the principle of trilingualism was quietly dropped after Singapore's withdrawal from Malaysia in 1965 (Malay would have been the third language for most students of Chinese ethnicity).

The rise of the PAP was due largely to the party's espousal of an anti-English educated, anti-colonial ideology and the ability of its originally mainly
English educated leaders to mobilize the Chinese educated in their support. Lee Kuan Yew provides a fascinating example of the political significance of language, particularly Huayu, in this process. Lee was educated almost entirely in English, having attended the elite Raffles College in Singapore and Cambridge University in England. Returning to Singapore he studied both Hokkien and Huayu and in the elections campaigned in both of these languages. As Murray (1971) puts it "Although Hokkien would have been sufficient to reach most of the Chinese masses, Mandarin was vital to establish his political and 'ethnic' credentials with Chinese youth" (p.86).

3.2.4 The Decline of Chinese Medium Education

Paradoxically, however, the next few decade saw the intensification of a trend that had begun in the years before Singapore gained internal self governance (full independence did not come until 1965 after the separation from Malaysia) - the decline in Chinese medium education in face of competition from the English stream. From 1956 to 1964, there was a constant decline (with the exception of one year) in primary one enrolments into Chinese stream schools and a constant increase (again with the exception of one year) in primary one enrolments into English stream schools (Doraisamy ed.1969:98), although Murray estimates that it was not until 1962 that primary one enrolments of Chinese children into English stream
schools finally outnumbered those enrolling in the Chinese stream (Murray 1971:97-98). The drift away from the Chinese stream into the English stream continued through the 1960's and 1970's and by 1976, 86.06% of total primary one enrolments (all ethnic groups) were into the English stream and only 13.75% into the Chinese stream (Straits Times 26/2/1977).

This decline may have been due partly to increasing access to English medium education. However, more important was the perception by parents of the greater opportunities for educational and economic advancement offered by an English medium education.

The high point of Chinese medium education in Singapore can perhaps be seen as the establishment in 1956 of a Chinese medium university - Nanyang University. Until then, tertiary level education had been available only in English and, prior to 1949 at least, graduates from Singapore's Chinese middle schools had had to go to China to further their education, as the English medium University of Singapore was virtually closed to graduates of Chinese stream middle schools (Murray 1971). Nanyang University was very much a Chinese community venture. In 1953 a founding committee was created led by the Singapore millionaire Tan Lark Sye. A popular fund raising campaign raised money by contributions from hawker, trishaw drivers, taxi drivers and coolies as well as from businessmen such as Tan, and the site for
the university in the west of the island was donated by the Hokkien Huiguan.

The fate of Nanyang University is perhaps symbolic of the fate of Chinese medium education as a whole. In 1959, the Nanyang University Ordinance was passed giving legitimacy to the university. However, because of doubts about the university's academic standards the government did not recognize NU degrees for nine years.

In the tradition of the Chinese medium middle schools, a high level of political activity continued among the student body at Nanyang University until at least the middle 1960's, the most public expressions being the 1964 rioting between students and police, after NU student leaders and graduates were arrested for "pro-communist activities", and the 1965 lecture boycott and demonstrations.

In 1975, the Government and the Nanyang University council begin a policy of increasing the use of English as a medium of instruction and by 1977, almost all subjects were being taught in English. However, the university continued to draw the bulk on its students from Chinese stream middle schools and the language and cultural environment on the university's Jurong campus remained firmly Chinese. In 1978, Lee Kuan Yew claimed in an address to the Historical Society of Nanyang University that since 1960 when Singapore University
began admitting Chinese stream students Nanyang University had lost the cream of its Chinese medium students. A significant number had also gone abroad to study. This had led to a lowering of standards at the university.

In the same year, the Joint Campus scheme was launched under which first year Nanyang University students attended classes together with students of Singapore University on the latter university's campus. Finally, in 1980, following the recommendations of the Dainton Report, Nanyang University was merged with the traditionally English medium Singapore University to form the National University of Singapore.

3.2.5 Increasing Study of Huayu as a Second School Language

Along with the decrease in the numbers of students receiving their education through the medium of Huayu as a first school language, there was an increase in the number of students learning Huayu as a second school language, as bilingual policies were implemented. It should be noted here that in the Singapore context, first language always means the major language of instruction in school and second language always means the second language studied at school. Neither term, of course, tells us anything about what other language or dialects a student may have learned before attending school nor do
they necessarily indicate which language a person is most proficient in.

A requirement was introduced in 1966 that a second language should be studied throughout the four years of secondary school. The second language would be English in Chinese medium schools and normally Huayu for ethnic Chinese students in English medium schools. This particularly affected the English stream. Previously, Huayu had been only an optional subject in English stream schools and usually studied for only two years (Murray 1971). Subsequently, oral and written examinations in the L2 were made part of the Primary School Leaving Examination and in the Singapore-Cambridge General Certificate of Education Examination. However, a compulsory pass was not required.

The next step was an increase in the exposure time for the second language and its use as a medium of instruction in certain subject areas. By 1968, Science and Arithmetic were taught in English in most Chinese (and other non-English stream) primary schools (Gopinathan 1974) and Civics and History were taught in the "mother tongue" (Huayu, in the case of ethnic Chinese students) in English medium schools. In 1972, an increase was announced in exposure time for the second language at primary level and, according to Gopinathan (1974) exposure time had already reached 42% by 1974. In 1974 also, a new subject - Education for Living - integrating
Civics, History and Geography was introduced in the lower primary classes to be taught entirely in the "mother tongue".

There were, however, difficulties in implementing some of these policies and the results were not always as the planners had hoped. A persistent problem was the lack of suitably qualified teachers. In 1971, for example, the teaching of History at primary 3 level through Huayu in English medium schools was discontinued due to a shortage of teachers able to teach it and the fact that the students' level of Huayu was judged as not sufficiently high for them to learn history through it. According to the 1979 Goh Report (see 3.2.6 below), "If examinations were to be taken as the best available instrument in gauging the competency level of the pupils in a subject, then more than 60% of the pupils do not attain the minimum competency level in one or both languages".

Thus, by the latter half of the 1970's it was clear that the outlook for Chinese medium education was bleak. However, many more students than before were learning Huayu as a second school language and the amount of exposure such students were getting to Huayu had increased greatly, although the results were not always satisfactory.
3.2.6 The Goh Report and the End of Chinese Medium Education

The so-called "Goh Report" of 1979, i.e., the report on education by a team of systems engineers under Dr. Goh Keng Swee, set the pattern for developments in Singapore education in the 1980's. The report recommended that the first three years of primary school (from 6 years old) would concentrate on language learning, with every child being taught English and their "mother tongue" (i.e., Huayu in the case of those identified as ethnically Chinese). At the end of primary 3, pupils would be put into three streams on the basis of examination results and intelligence tests: (i) the "Normal Bilingual Stream" in which pupils would continue to study two languages and finish their primary education in 6 years; (ii) the "Extended Bilingual Stream" in which pupils would also continue to study two languages but would be expected to take an extra one or two years to complete their primary education and (iii) the "Monolingual Stream" in which pupils would study only one language and at the end of their primary education proceed to vocational training. The recommendations originally proposed that that the language of instruction in the monolingual stream should be the pupils "mother tongue". However, after a good deal of parental opposition, it was announced in 1981 that the language of instruction of ethnic Chinese monolingual stream pupils would be switched from Huayu to English on a voluntary basis. A large proportion of such pupils did
in fact switch, leaving only 33% in the monolingual Huayu stream.

Pupils from the two bilingual streams would be again channelled into three streams for secondary education on the basis of their results in the Primary School Leaving Examination. Those entering the "Special Bilingual Stream" would take both English and Huayu at first language level. Those entering the "Normal Bilingual Stream" would take English at first language level and their "mother tongue" at second language level. Those entering the "Ordinary Stream" would take English as a first language and their "mother tongue" at a lower level of difficulty (called L3), with the expectation that they should be able at least read the local news and write simple sentences in their second language.

At pre-university level, the medium of instruction would be English, although a second language would still be compulsory and a pass in the second language would be necessary for entry into university.

These recommendations made no explicit mention of the remaining Chinese medium schools. However, in late 1983 it was announced that all pupils in Singapore schools would take English as their first language by 1987 (Straits Times 22/12/83). One reason given was that only 260 pupils had enrolled for the 1984 Chinese stream.
primary one intake. This was less than 1% of the total enrolment of 38,000.

However, the Special Assistance Plan Schools or the "Super Schools" arrangement was to continue. This was a plan, announced in 1978, to preserve the best of the traditional Chinese medium schools. The SAP schools are special bilingual schools which offer both English and Huayu at first language levels, i.e., the "Special Bilingual Stream" recommended by the Goh Report.

The era of Chinese medium education in Singapore is thus now finally at an end. English is to be the first (school) language of all Singapore students, with only the roughly 8% "high flyers" identified by the Primary School Leaving Examination being given the opportunity to also study Huayu at first language level. However, more students than ever before are now learning Huayu as a second (school) language.

3.2.7 The Speak Mandarin (Huayu) Campaign

One major counter current to this demise of Chinese medium education has been the Speak Mandarin Campaign. The official aims of the campaign, launched by the Prime Minister in 1979, are to make Huayu the common spoken language among Chinese Singaporeans - both English educated and Chinese educated - and to eventually
eliminate entirely the use of Chinese dialects in Singapore. As Lee Kuan Yew put it:

We should try within 5 years to make all the young, those in school, in university and who have just finished school or university to drop the use of dialect, speak in Mandarin, unless it is to their grandparents.

In 10 years, we should be able to get Mandarin established as the language of the coffeeshop, of the hawker centre, of the shops. Of course, together with English.

(Straits Times 24/11/79)

The major targets of the campaign were identified as the "English educated and the less-educated among the Chinese Singaporeans" (The Mirror 15/12/79), with the Chinese educated expected to take a leading role in the creation of a Huayu speaking environment. Noss (1984) distinguishes three official arguments in support of the campaign: the educational argument, essentially that speaking a Chinese dialect at home puts an unnecessary extra burden on a child who must study two other languages—Huayu and English at school; the practical argument, that Huayu can be the lingua franca among the Chinese, and the cultural argument, that Huayu can transmit the Chinese cultural heritage. Within the "cultural argument" can perhaps also be identified two
related but slightly different arguments. Firstly that Huayu can be (as it has long been in Singapore) a symbol of "Chineseness", that speaking Huayu is part of what it means to be Chinese. Secondly, the "pollution" argument, that Singaporeans need their "mother tongues" to provide them with the "cultural ballast" necessary to ward off noxious influences from the West. It is very interesting to contrast the symbolic value of Huayu as exemplified in some of the arguments put forward in this area with its value in earlier decades. Whilst Huayu is still used as a symbol of "Chineseness", the association in the present campaign is with Confucianism, "traditional Asian values", respect and loyalty rather than anti-colonialism, Marxism and revolution. For example, in a forum (in Huayu) on the campaign with journalists from the Chinese press Lee Kuan Yew claimed that his world view had changed since he had learned Chinese and that:

The relations between man and man are not new. It is a problem as old as man's history. How a society organises itself; how courteous a man should be - all this reasoning, as well as its philosophical basis, is very valuable.

If you translate it, you lose all its sense of genuineness. Some people say this is Confucian thinking, but there is much content in Confucianism which is of great help in solving our present problems and could be our guiding compass.
The relationship between the ruler and his officials may be an old idea but it has its principles. The relationships between father and son, husband and wife, among brothers and friends - these same principles have been passed down over some 4,000 years in the same language.

(Translation according to the Straits Times 10/1/80)

Similarly, Minister Without Portfolio, Lim Chee Onn speaking at the launching of Speak Mandarin month in 1982 said:

...since Mandarin is the mother tongue of the Chinese, a knowledge of Mandarin is useful in the propagation of Confucianism to keep alive such traditional virtues as benevolence, love, loyalty and truthfulness.

(Straits Times 9/10/82)

It is not necessary here to try to assess this and the other arguments in favour of Huayu (see Newman 1986) or to chart the course of the campaign in great detail. However, in attempting to make some assessment of the present situation and likely future of Huayu in Singapore, it is necessary to take into account the intensity of the campaign, easily underestimated if one has no experience of such campaigns in a country in which
there is little public opposition to government initiatives and the government can mobilize considerable official and semi-official resources as well as the mass media behind its policies. As Harrison puts it: "The campaigning for Mandarin has not, as far as can be established, used sky-writing. To find such an omission has been difficult" (Harrison 1980). As it happens, the campaign has come close to sky-writing with its use of large slogan-carrying helium balloons (Nanyang Siang Pau 7/10/82). The following account, then, is not intended as an exhaustive description of the Speak Mandarin Campaign. Rather, it is an attempt to give an impression of the resources that have been and still are being mobilized in support of the campaign.

The campaign has been vigorously promoted on a number of fronts since its official launching by the Prime Minister in 1979. The campaign has also been very long lasting, even by Singapore standards. In 1981, after two years of the campaign, it was announced that in every year October was to be designated Promote Mandarin Month (Tuiguang Huayu Yue, Nanyang Siang Pau 6/10/81). A slightly different group is targeted each year. In 1981 the emphasis was to continue to be on "public places like coffeeshops, hawker centres, markets, restaurants and emporiums" (Sunday Times 4/10/81). In 1982, Chinese workers (Huázu gōngyǒu) were targeted (Nanyang Siang Pau 9/10/82) and in 1983, the focus was to be on hawkers (Straits Times 18/10/83).
Three general areas of activity can be identified: i) publicising the aims and rationale of the campaign; ii) organization of courses in Mandarin and iii) administrative measures in support of the campaign.

3.2.7.1 Publicity

The mass media have, of course, played a key role here. Activities of the campaign are fully covered, often on the front page with banner headlines. For example, soon after the launching of the campaign, the Nanyang Siang Pau devoted most of its front page to a report of a meeting organized by the Singapore Chinese Chamber of Commerce and Industry of 800 representatives of Huiguan and other bodies at which motions pledging support for the Campaign were passed (Nanyang Siang Pau 20/2/79).

Throughout the campaign, major speeches on the subject by government ministers (particularly Lee Kuan Yew) have been published in full in both the Chinese and English press (see also Platt 1985 for the reporting of the campaign in the English Language press).

The press, particularly the Chinese press, have also been active in other publicity activities. For example, thousands of posters with slogans such as "Speak more Mandarin and less dialects (duō jiǎng Huáyǔ, shǎo jiǎng fāngyán)" and "Use English between different
communities, use Mandarin with the Chinese community (ge zú zhì jiān yòng yīng yǔ, Huázu zhì jiān yòng Huáyǔ)" were printed and distributed by the Nanyang Siang Pau and Sin Chew Jit Poh to hawker, shopkeepers and taxi-drivers. The Ministry of Culture has also been involved in such activities, being reported to have distributed 400,000 posters, stickers, booklets and badges by October 1981 (The Mirror 1/10/81). Banners have also been put up at bus depots, and posters at bus stops, hawker (cooked food) centres, markets and such like public places.

Television has been important, particularly in broadcasting various forums and panel discussions, the two most notable being one in English in 1979 led by Lee Kuan Yew and one in Huayu the following January in Mandarin, also led by Lee. Television has also been used to advertise the campaign, most notably by broadcasting between programmes short dialogues showing people using Huayu in public places such as hawker centres, post offices and on buses.

Forums and panel discussions have also been organized at local level at various community centres and other institutions.

3.2.7.2 Teaching Huayu

Considerable effort has been put into organising various kinds of Huayu classes outside the normal school system.
Lessons in conversational Huayu have been broadcast on television and radio, and a Huayu course recorded on cassettes was said to have sold 10,000 in the first three weeks of going on sale (Straits Times 23/1/80). The Ministry of Culture devised a conversational Huayu course for civil servants, which all ethnic Chinese civil servants (except Peranakan) who had to deal with the public but could not speak Huayu were required to take (Straits Times 15/1/80). By May 1981, the first batch of 2,359 government officers were reported to have completed the course (The Mirror 1/10/81). Huayu classes were also organized by the People's Associations at various community centres and by July 1981, 1,062 people were said to have enrolled in such classes (The Mirror 1/10/81)

3.2.7.3 Administrative Measures

In 1979, all government ministries, departments and statutory boards were instructed to man their counters with Huayu speaking staff and Chinese officers were told to stop using dialects while on duty when speaking among themselves (Straits Time 25/9/79). It was subsequently announced that proficiency in Huayu would be taken into account in the promotion of Chinese civil servants (The Mirror 15/12/79). Taxi-drivers of Chinese ethnicity were also required to pass an oral test in Huayu in order to get their licences (Straits Times 1/10/79).
Following the beginning of the Speak Mandarin Campaign, the Singapore Broadcasting Corporation agreed to step up its reduction in dialect radio programmes and by 1982, only short news bulletins and certain traditional cultural items such as provincial Chinese operas were still using dialects. The commercial network, Rediffusion was at first a little slower in reducing dialects and in 1980 the Ministry of Culture announced that Rediffusion would have to renew its licence every year instead of every ten years, as the Ministry had "drawn up guidelines for more use of Huayu over Rediffusion and its serious implementation would be a condition for renewing the broadcasting station's licence." (Straits Times 13/6/80). In 1982, Rediffusion announced that it intended to achieve 97% Huayu in its Chinese broadcasts by the end of the year (Straits Times 26/11/82).

Television channels were also required to phase out dialect programmes. An announcement in late 1979 that the very popular Hong Kong Cantonese serials would in future be dubbed into Huayu provoked a considerable amount of public opposition, which was aired particularly in the English language press (e.g., Straits Times 2/11/79). However, the policy was implemented.

3.3 The Roles and Status of Huayu Today

Huayu in Singapore today is clearly in a critical transitional phase. On the one hand, with the end of
Chinese medium education its traditional speech community - the Chinese educated - will continue to shrink and eventually disappear. On the other hand, there are the increasing emphasis on the requirement of a second school language (Huayu for the ethnic Chinese) and the now almost decade long efforts of the Speak Mandarin campaign to popularize the everyday use of the language by Chinese Singaporeans.

It is, unfortunately, hard to confidently assess present trends as much of the available data is somewhat unreliable. Some of the evidence that will be considered below is inevitably either anecdotal or self report, and in many cases not based upon representative samples. Even the data from the most comprehensive survey, the 1980 census, must be treated with caution. The census was carried out less than one year after the start of the Speak Mandarin Campaign and it is possible that informants might have been tempted to exaggerate the extent of their use of the language. Moreover, there is also the danger that responses will be couched or interpreted in terms of pre-determined categories. For example, Le Page writes that "The enumerators also tell me that the later questions about who spoke what language to whom were frequently either answered by one member of the household for everybody, or sometimes discussed in what was clearly their normal mixed code by several before they came up with an answer couched in terms of a specific 'language' or 'dialect'" (Le Page 1984:120).
Nevertheless, current trends in the use of Huayu in Singapore will be crucial to the future of the language in the country, and this section will review such evidence as is available and can be used, albeit with caution.

3.3.1 Huayu in Schools

The changing status of Huayu in education has already been considered. In future, English will be the first (school) language of the vast majority of Singapore's school population, with Huayu as the second language of those designated as of Chinese ethnicity. However, this does not mean that English will necessarily be the dominant language (i.e., language they are most proficient in) of all these students. For example, several informants in the present study claimed that they spoke Huayu "more fluently and naturally" than English, despite the fact that their secondary education had been entirely in English (see p.128). There is also evidence that the education system, particularly at primary levels, is an area in which the Speak Mandarin Campaign has been particularly successful. Singaporeans or visitors returning to Singapore after a few years away are often quite surprised to hear primary school students or students in the lower years of secondary school speaking Huayu quite naturally to one another where previously they would have expected to hear dialects or
English being used. In many primary schools, particularly those in some of the new towns, the playground appears to have become an almost entirely Huayu speaking environment and the students in such schools are very often much more fluent in Huayu than in English. Principals and staff (particularly senior or older staff) at such schools will sometimes even privately complain that the Speak Mandarin Campaign has "gone too far" and that the teaching of English in their schools is being seriously undermined. In some cases, non-ethnic Chinese parents have removed their children from such schools for this reason\(^2\). As such primary school students move up through the system, the linguistic environment higher up the system will clearly also be affected. Already in 1983, several English stream educated informants expressed to the author their surprise to find on returning to their traditionally English medium secondary schools that pupils were using Huayu in contexts in which only English and / or dialects would previously have been used.

### 3.3.2 Huayu as an Intra-Ethnic Lingua Franca

Hokkien has long been the dialect most widely understood by Chinese Singaporeans, and indeed by Singaporeans of all ethnic groups. According to a 1978 Survey Research Singapore survey quoted in Kuo (1980), Hokkien was understood by over 75% of the population and by 97% of the Chinese ethnic group, although according to the 1980 census, Hokkiens make up only only about 43% of the
Chinese population of Singapore. Similarly, of the sample of 46 used for the present study, 8 or 17% claimed to be able to speak Hokkien at least "quite well", although it was not the language they had first learned in infancy (see p.125).

On the face of it, Hokkien seems to be the obvious choice for a lingua franca among the Chinese. However, its low status precludes Hokkien from being an appropriate choice in many more public or formal contexts. As a "dialect", Hokkien is not regarded as a "proper language". Moreover, a form of Hokkien has developed incorporating a number of loan words and expressions from the other dialects and languages. This variety of Hokkien is known as "Rojak Hokkien" ("rojak" is a kind of local salad, see Chapter Fifteen) or simply "Singapore Hokkien" and has been much deplored. Indeed, one of the reasons for the Speak Mandarin Campaign was given as the fear of such a "creolized" language becoming a common language in Singapore, with, for example, comparison made to the "valueless" creole of Mauritius (e.g., Forum with Lee Kuan Yew reported in the Straits Times 10/1/80). Thus, whilst we might expect Hokkien to persist as a lingua franca in those domains in which the L(ow) language (following the usage of Fishman 1971) might typically be used, for example hawker centres, markets, coffee shops, among friends and the like, it is in the more public or formal domains that an increased use of Huayu might be
expected. However, it is in such domains that it is often in competition with English.

It is not easy at this stage to get a clear picture of trends that may be emerging. Huayu tends to be quite widely used in certain types of stores, particularly the chain of Chinese emporiums, and in certain localities, for example markets in Jurong where a large number of Chinese workers from Malaysia (who may be less conversant with Hokkien and English) live and work. However, English seems to be more widely used in places such as the fashionable shopping centres along Orchard Road. In hawker centres, dialects together with English and Malay (the latter language particularly, of course, at Malay foodstalls) seem to be holding their own, despite a great deal of effort directed towards stallholders by activists of the Speak Mandarin Campaign. However, school students have sometimes been observed taking the initiative in using Huayu with hawkers. It is also the writer's experience that if the customer uses Huayu at Chinese foodstalls, in most cases the hawker is able and willing to reply in Huayu, although some of the Huayu terms for local foods as recommended by the Mandarin Standardization Committee (see Chapter Six) are felt to be very awkward and will not always be understood. Similarly, taxi drivers are generally able and more than willing to use Huayu if the passenger uses it first and the chance of having a sustained conversation with a Chinese taxi driver is indubitably higher if Mandarin is
the language used than if English is the language used. In 1981, it was announced that 97% of Chinese taxi drivers in Singapore could speak Huayu (Sunday Times 20/9/81).

A report prepared by Dr. Eddie Kuo of the National University of Singapore on surveys of language use in coffeeshops and restaurants carried out for the Ministry of Culture by the Chinese press (Nanyang Siang Pau and Lianhe Zaobao) in 1981, 1982 and 1983 seemed to show no clear increase in the use of Huayu over the three years. Many customers who claimed that they could speak Huayu apparently did not use Huayu in such establishments and the findings suggested that there had in fact been a decline in the use of Huayu by customers between 1982 and 1983. Overall, the use of Huayu by customers in coffee shops and restaurants was reported to be low, the majority of customers (70%) claiming that dialects were generally used (The Use of Mandarin in Restaurants and Coffee Shops: a comparison of 1981, 1982 and 1983 surveys by Eddie C.Y. Kuo, as quoted in Anderson 1985). However, as with most of the data presently available, these findings must be treated with caution as they are based upon interviews of customers and workers carried out mainly by secondary and university students and, as Dr. Kuo admits, the survey was not based upon a random sample and the results may not be strictly comparable from year to year (The Sunday Times 23/10/83).
Huayu may be making headway in some more formal domains. The Chinese Chamber of Commerce and Industry, some huiguan and other Chinese-based institutions now use mainly Huayu in conducting meetings and Huayu can be heard more in governent and quasi government organizations which deal with the general public. However, it would be rash to claim that Huayu has already become the major *lingua franca* among Chinese Singaporeans.

3.3.3 Television and Radio

Radio and in particular television are likely to have a great influence on the maintenance and possible spread of Huayu. According to 1980 statistics, 90% of Singaporeans aged 15 and above lived in homes with at least one television set and about 65% of them watched some television in an average day (Straits Times 14/9/80). In 1981, 9 out of the 10 most popular television programmes were in Huayu, with the last surviving Cantonese serial - *The Brothers* - topping the list. Such Hong Kong made programmes have continued to be very popular in Singapore, despite now being dubbed into Huayu.

3.3.4 Huayu in the Home

The most comprehensive source of data on language use in the home is the 1980 census, which included questions on what languages or dialects are spoken in the household
and what principal language or dialect ("by definition the one he used most frequently but not necessarily exclusively") an individual uses at home with various family members. The relevant findings for the Chinese ethnic group are set out below.

**Table 3.1 Private Households where the Head of Household is Chinese by Languages Spoken**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages Spoken</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mono-lingual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huayu</td>
<td>8.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>29.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teochew</td>
<td>13.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>13.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Chinese dialects</td>
<td>6.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>0.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.05 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages Spoken</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-lingual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huayu and Chinese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialects (without English)</td>
<td>12.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huayu and English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with or without dialects)</td>
<td>3.8 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two or More Chinese Dialects 3.4 %

English and Malay 0.3 %

English and Tamil 0.003 %

English and Non-official Languages 0.02 %

Other Combinations 0.4%

Total No. of Households: 318,209 (100%)

Source: 1980 Census of Population, Release 8, Table 81

This indicates that, not surprisingly, Chinese dialects are dominant in homes. However, whilst slightly more households claimed to be monolingual in English than monolingual in Huayu, the total claimed use of Huayu either alone or combination is 24.7 %, compared to only 12.6 % for English.
Table 3.2 Chinese Aged 5 Years and Over by Principal Language Spoken to Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huayu</td>
<td>7.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>40.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teochew</td>
<td>20.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>16.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Chinese Dialects</td>
<td>10.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total individuals: 898,092 (100%)

Households with no parents are excluded

Source: Census of Population 1980, Release 8, Table 10

Table 3.3 Chinese Aged 5 Years and Over by Principal Language Spoken to Siblings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huayu</td>
<td>12.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>35.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teochew</td>
<td>16.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>12.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Chinese Dialects</td>
<td>7.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>14.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total no. of individuals: 868,564 (100%)

This excludes cases where are no brothers or sisters in the household.

Source: Census of Population 1980, Release 8, Table 10
This indicates that both Huayu and English are more likely to be used with siblings than with parents. This is hardly surprising, as the younger generation are likely to have received more education and therefore more exposure to these languages than the older generation. Tables 3.4 and 3.5 are even more interesting (note that these tables include all ethnic groups).

Table 3.4 Persons Aged 5 Years and Over by Age Group and Principal Language Spoken to Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>5-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-39</th>
<th>40 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huayu</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Dialects</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Population 1980, Release no. 3, Table 8.2
Table 3.5 Persons Aged 5 Years and Over by Age Group and Principal Language Spoken to Siblings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>5-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-39</th>
<th>40 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huayu</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialects</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: as for table 4 above

This indicates a definite trend for those in the younger age groups to use Huayu both with their parents and each other. Although dialects still predominate, more of the 5-14 age group claimed to use Huayu than English to both parents and siblings and fewer claimed to use English to siblings than those in the 15-24 age group. This may well
be a result of the increased emphasis in primary schools on language learning in general and, in particular, the increasingly widespread use of Huayu in many primary schools.

3.3.5 The Future for Huayu in Singapore

Ten years ago, the future for Huayu in Singapore looked very bleak. Chinese medium education was on its last legs and there seemed no role for Huayu in a society in which English was the major language in the public domains of commerce, industry, government, law, education and so on and, among the Chinese, dialects were well entrenched in the private domains of the home, among friends and so on. However, much has happened in the last ten years. Even if all the posters, slogans, speeches and so on may turn out to have little lasting effect on patterns of language use among adults, particularly in private domains, there is evidence that a substantial portion of the generation of Chinese children who have begun their primary education since the late 1970's are growing up using Huayu rather than dialects among themselves and perhaps developing greater proficiency in Huayu than in English. Today, predicting the future sociolinguistic profile of Singapore is not so easy as it seemed ten years ago.
3.4 The Linguistic Development of Singapore Huayu

3.4.1 Development of a "Chinese Educated" Norm

As we have seen, until quite recently the vast majority of speakers of Huayu in Singapore were products of Chinese medium education. Huayu became for many a language of everyday use as well as a medium of instruction at school. It also had political and cultural significance and was felt to be part of what it meant to be Chinese. It is among this group that a distinct Singapore Huayu or Singapore / Malayan Huayu developed.

The mother tongue dialects of the majority of learners of Huayu in Singapore inevitably influenced the way they spoke the language. Certain lexical items and grammatical patterns in Singapore Huayu are probably in origin calques of expressions in one or other of the southern dialects (for example, the *you+Verb* constructions, see 7.3.1 and 7.3.2). Some of the pronunciation features of Singapore Huayu can also be traced to influences from southern dialects, though often less conclusively (see, for example, 12.13).

Another possible influence on the development of Singapore Huayu was the Mandarin pronunciation of the early teachers. As we have seen, for most of the first three decades of the history of Huayu in Singapore, China was the main source of trained teachers for the Chinese
schools. However, many of these may have come from areas in which the Mandarin pronunciation was quite different from the standard Beijing pronunciation. As Purcell, referring to the period of the 1920's and 1930's, notes: "Kuoyu was taught with varying success. Many of the teachers came from provinces in China where the Mandarin spoken was not pure" (Purcell 1967:223). Thus, many of the features of Singapore Huayu can be argued, with equal plausibility, as originating in interference from southern dialects, such as Hokkien and Cantonese, or from non standard dialects of Mandarin (see, for example, rusheng 12.13).

The other languages spoken in Singapore and Malaya (as it then was), especially Malay and English also provided elements for Singapore Huayu. Malay tended to supply words peculiar to the local environment and /or Malay culture and English supplied mainly words in the area of technology (particularly transport), government and the legal system.

The variety of Mandarin that developed was, however, not just a hodge podge of language transfer features. Graduates from the Chinese middle schools and later also from Nanyang University provided speech models of a de-facto educated norm and Singapore Huayu seems to have developed into a reasonably focussed (to use Le Page's 1978 term) variety. For example, in an article published in 1967, Png Poh Seng notes many of the same nonstandard
features of the Huayu spoken in Singapore and Malaya as are described in the present study and states that:

The subjects from whom the examples have been derived range from school pupils to workers, shopkeepers, merchants, teachers and university graduates. It is interesting to note that with few exceptions (comprising mainly those who have studied in China, including Taiwan) the difference in Mandarin pronunciation between, say, a local university graduate and a shopkeeper is not very marked... It reflects among other things, the relative absence of social classification in the schools attended by the Chinese educated group in Singapore and Malaya.

(Png 1967:47)

This may be an exaggeration. However, as has been outlined earlier in this chapter, until fairly recently speakers of Huayu in Singapore were nearly all products of a very similar education in which Huayu was the major (and in some cases virtually the only) medium of instruction and communication. Chinese medium education tended to promote loyalties and values quite different from those promoted by English medium education. Moreover, the graduates of Chinese medium middle schools or from Nanyang University often found themselves at a disadvantage in the job market when compared to graduates from English medium secondary schools or the University of Singapore. The Chinese educated were thus in many
ways a distinct group with Huayu as their badge of identity and solidarity. It is therefore perhaps not surprising that the Huayu spoken by this group should exhibit less variation and have a more focussed norm than may be the case with the Huayu spoken in Singapore today.

Another possible reason for the relative homogeneity of the Singapore Huayu in earlier decades is that the great concern to acquire a more standard Beijing-like Mandarin is a relatively recent phenomenon. According to several informants, in the Chinese medium schools until quite recently, the teachers progressively used more and more Huayu in the classroom until the students were able to use the language themselves. The students simply imitated the pronunciation of their teachers. Prior to the introduction of Hanyu Pinyin romanization (see below), there seems to have been little attempt to systematically teach the phonetics of the Beijing pronunciation, although the Zhuyin Fuhao (see p.145) was sometimes taught and used mainly for reference purposes.

At least two factors have affected this picture of a relatively focussed Singapore Huayu speech community. One is increased range in those learning Huayu and the other is an increasing concern with the exonormative Beijing based standard.
3.4.2 A Changing Speech Community

The changes in the education system outlined above have meant that the "Chinese educated" as a distinct group is disappearing and that the proportion of Singaporeans learning Huayu as a first school language has become smaller and smaller and the proportion learning it as a second language has become greater. This, together with the recent pressure on those adult Chinese who do not know the language to learn it, has resulted in a great deal of variation among Chinese Singaporeans in their exposure to, proficiency in and use of Huayu. The Singapore Huayu speech community today is very much what Saville-Troike calls a "soft shelled" speech community (Saville-Troike 1982). This inevitably has an effect on the degree of variation in the language.

3.4.3 Contending Norms

Efforts to promote the prescribed standard for Singapore Huayu have, in effect, set up a contending norm for Singapore speakers. The standard for Huayu in Singapore has always been exonormative, i.e., has always been essentially the same as for Guoyu (later Putonghua) in China. However, as mentioned above, the Huayu that developed in Singapore had a de-facto norm that differed from the prescribed standard in various respects. The great concern about the gap between the way Singaporeans spoke Huayu and the prescribed standard seems to be a
relatively recent phenomenon. The Speak Mandarin Campaign, in particular, has been concerned with promoting not only greater use of Huayu but also the use of a more standard variety of the language.

Measures taken to promote the prescribed standard have included the introduction and popularization of the Hanyu Pinyin system of romanization, the re-training of teachers of Chinese, the preparation of new teaching materials, the publicizing of standardized terms and the ensuring that models of "correct" pronunciation are presented over the air. Some of these measures will be briefly described below (greater detail on the prescribed standard and its status will be given in Chapter Six)

3.4.3.1 Hanyu Pinyin and the Promotion of the Prescribed Standard

The Hanyu Pinyin (or just "Pinyin") system of romanization of the standard pronunciation is now widely used in the teaching of Huayu in Singapore. This system recognizes distinctions not generally made by Singapore speakers, such as between retroflex and dental initials (7.2.1). It also does not recognize some distinctions which many Singapore speakers do make, such as between rusheng and non-rusheng zi (see Chapter Eleven). This, of course, does not necessarily mean that learners will adopt a more standard like pronunciation, particularly as, according to Bloom, Pinyin "is imposed on students in
Primary Four, long after they have become proficient in a Southern Chinese accent that deviates from that represented by Pinyin at several important points, so that the new spelling system comes across at first as a fresh and apparently arbitrary burden on the children rather than as an aid to learning" (Bloom 1986:382). However, since January 1981, Chinese pre-primary and Primary One students have had to at least get used to the Pinyin spellings and the Huayu pronunciations of their own names, as the Ministry of Education required that from January that year only Pinyin (and therefore Huayu and not dialect) versions of their names were to be used in school (Straits Times 6/3/81 and 16/3/81).

Efforts have also been made to promote the use of Pinyin outside the school system, as part of the Speak Mandarin Campaign. Booklets and posters giving the Pinyin names of foods were distributed to stallholders in hawker centres and markets (Straits Times 5/1/81) and it was made compulsory for Chinese stallholders moving into new markets to display menus in Pinyin (English translations optional). This involves not only spelling according to the standard pronunciation but also using the standardized Huayu names for local foods. The results of these efforts may be somewhat mixed. Many names of local foods are rather strange or even quite unrecognizable in Pinyin. As one stallholder was reported as saying, the change in name did not matter very much to hawkers and customers and that "Most of my customers still order 'bah
kut teh' (pork rib and tea) instead of rou gu cha.
(Straits Times 3/6/81). The Pinyin foodnames displayed on a stall photographed in the same article in fact had five mistakes in nine zi (Yapeng zhoucha cincai roukoucha for Yapeng zhufan xiancai rouguchua "Yaping pig's entrails, salted vegetables, pork rib tea").

3.4.3.2 The Prescribed Standard in Schools

Much effort has also gone into "improving" the pronunciation of teachers of Chinese in schools and presenting recorded models of the standard pronunciation. This will be covered in more detail in Chapter Six.

3.4.3.3 The Prescribed Standard in Broadcasting

Announcers of the Singapore Broadcasting Corporation are required to present a model of pronunciation as close to the standard as possible (for more details, see Chapter Six). Lessons on the standard pronunciation have also been broadcast on radio and television, often presenting in amusing ways the supposed misunderstandings that can arise if local Huayu pronunciations are used.

3.4.3.4 The Prescribed Standard in The Press

The press has also had a role to play in increasing awareness of the prescribed standard. This has included printing the lists of standardized terms for foods
recommended by the Mandarin Standardization Committee (Nanyang Siang Pau 24/8/80), lessons in Pinyin and occasional articles on common pronunciation mistakes. The press has also tried to encourage the belief that the development of a standard pronunciation is both a desirable and realizable goal for Singapore speakers. For example, three announcers of Radio Singapore were praised for having not been:

afraid to speak standard Mandarin, even though their peers showed scorn at their limitation [sic imitation] of the Beijing accent.

But, they knew they were doing the right thing and so, went ahead to work hard at it

Today, they are enjoying the sweet fruits of success. They speak good Mandarin to millions of listeners here and far beyond out national frontier, much to the admiration of those who scorned them during those trying years.

(Straits Times 15/10/79)

Thus, speakers of Huayu in Singapore are increasingly being exposed to and urged to adopt a standard variety different from the old de-facto "Chinese educated norm".
3.5 Some Dimensions of Variation in Singapore Huayu

We shall now consider what are likely to be the major dimensions of sociolinguistic variation in Singapore Huayu, in the light of the above discussion of the development and current status of the language in Singapore. An indication will also be given of which areas will be the main focii of this study.

3.5.1 Competition between the Prescribed Standard and De-facto Norm(s)

Competition between the prescribed standard and the de-facto norm or norms can be seen as the source of much variation in Singapore Huayu. As we have seen, Singaporean speakers are exposed to standard or very near standard varieties of Huayu in the mass media and to some extent through the education system, and are under increasing pressure to adopt the prescribed standard variety as a target norm. However, they may also be exposed to (and use) quite different varieties of Huayu in their interactions with other Singaporeans, including the variety used by even the most educated "Chinese educated" for decades. Much spoken Singapore Huayu exhibits a great deal of variation between nonstandard and standard (or near standard) features. It will be argued that some nonstandard features of Singapore Huayu may be giving way under pressure from the the prescribed
standard, whilst other nonstandard features show no sign of doing so, except perhaps in certain atypical contexts. In other words, a new de-facto norm for Singapore Huayu may be developing which will be a compromise between an earlier norm or norms and the prescribed standard.

Chapter Seven will identify and describe some of the nonstandard features which do not seem to be giving way in face of the pressure from the prescribed standard and Chapters Nine to Fourteen will look at patterns of variation in the occurrence of some of the most variable nonstandard features, some of which may be undergoing diachronic change towards the prescribed standard.

3.5.1.1 Linguistic Change, Salience and Social Evaluation

The notion of salience will be used in attempts to explain why some nonstandard features are subject to change whilst others appear not to be. Salience is a term used to refer to characteristics which make a particular linguistic feature more prominent than another. Trudgill (1986) places great importance on salience as a factor in inter-dialectal accommodation and imitation. The claim in the present thesis is that change in the direction of the standard variety is most likely to occur where the difference between a particular nonstandard feature and its standard equivalent is most salient. In the case of
phonological features, salience may be related to phonological status and phonetic distance. In other words, where phonological contrast is involved, the difference between two features is more likely to be salient to speakers. Similarly, the greater the phonetic distance between two features the more salient the difference is likely to be. The notion of salience will be used not only to try to explain why some nonstandard features are subject to change whilst others seem not to be, but also why some phonological environments seem to favour a certain variant more than other environments. It will be argued that a particular standard feature may be acquired first in environments in which it is most prominent or salient.

It may also be that differences at certain levels of language are likely to be less salient than differences at other levels. Thus, in general, speakers seem to be much less aware of grammatical differences between Singapore Huayu and the prescribed standard than of phonological and lexical differences.

However, awareness by speakers that a particular feature of Singapore Huayu diverges from the prescribed standard may not alone be sufficient to motivate them to adopt its standard equivalent. A further motivating factor may be social evaluation of the feature. If, for example, there has developed a generally shared evaluation of a particular standard feature as characteristic of "good
Huayu" or "educated Huayu" and of its nonstandard equivalent as characteristic of "bad Huayu" or "uneducated Huayu", then speakers may be more motivated to adopt the standard variant. On the other hand, as Trudgill (1986) points out, a feature may sometimes be "too salient". In other words, it may become a stereotype (see 3.5.3 below) and its adoption resisted. Thus, in the case of the present study, certain features of the prescribed standard seem to be perceived as stereotypical of Beijing Mandarin and as inappropriate for use when Singaporeans are talking to other Singaporeans. These are the kinds of social motivations for linguistic change which have been much investigated in (usually) monolingual speech communities by Labov (e.g., Labov 1963, Labov 1966) and others inspired by his pioneering work.

3.5.2 Proficiency Variation

As we have seen, Huayu is at least a second language for the majority of its speakers in Singapore and speakers differ greatly in the amount of formal instruction they have had in the language and in their exposure to and use of the language in their daily lives. Differences in levels of proficiency are therefore a dimension of variation which needs to be taken into account. Unfortunately, however, proficiency is a somewhat difficult concept to apply in the present study. We do not want to measure proficiency in terms of closeness of
approximation to the prescribed standard forms, as this ignores the possibility of contending target norms and sociolectal variation. Generally, in this study proficiency has been equated with fluency and communicative effectiveness in Huayu. Excessive hesitation and frequent and obvious mother tongue transfer are seen as possible symptoms of low proficiency in Huayu (although, of course, low proficiency need not be the only motivation for such types of linguistic behaviour). Speakers who exhibited such symptoms were therefore not included among the 46 informants from whom the bulk of the data for this study is drawn (see Chapter Five). However, this dimension of variation will be relevant in the investigation of language contact phenomena (especially in Chapter Fifteen).

3.5.3 Sociolectal Variation

This refers to linguistic variation which is related to aspects of the social identity of the speaker. Such sociolectal variation has been the focus of much work in sociolinguistics since Labov's study of the social stratification of English in New York (Labov 1966). This dimension of variation is, of course, closely related to the question of motivation for linguistic change (social evaluation) discussed at 3.5.1.1 above and to the question of language indigenization. In Singapore, sociolectal variation is likely to be multi-dimensional, with factors such as age, sex, class (which itself may
subsume various parameters), level of education, medium of education, parents' or siblings' media of education, mother tongue, dialect group membership (not necessarily the same as mother tongue, see p.133), religious affiliation and so on, all possibly related to differences in linguistic behaviour. In the present study, four of these factors will be investigated: mother tongue, level of education, sex and age group.

3.5.4 Registerial Variation

This is variation according to the social contexts in which the language is being used and the purposes for which it is being used (Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens 1964). In the process of indigenization in its new cultural context, Singapore Huayu may have developed forms of registerial variation different from those in the standard language.

There is, of course, frequently a close inter-connection between sociolectal variation and registerial variation, with certain social dialects being associated with certain registers (Halliday and Hasan 1985). Labov, in fact, distinguishes three kinds of linguistic variables, which he calls indicators, markers and stereotypes. Indicators show patterns of variation related only to the social identities of the speakers, i.e., they are involved only in sociolectal variation. Markers in addition show patterns of variation related to the
context of situation, i.e., they are also involved in registerial variation. Stereotypes are markers which are salient enough to members of the speech community to be overtly commented upon or imitated (Labov 1966, 1970, 1972b). In Singapore Huayu, we shall also find evidence for these three types of linguistic variable.

Speakers of Singapore Huayu inevitably differ greatly in the range of registerial variation they control. Speakers who use Huayu in a large number of contexts of situation are clearly likely to have a much greater range of functional variation in their Huayu (although not necessarily realised in the same way as in the Mandarin spoken by monolinguals outside Singapore) than speakers who use Huayu in only very restricted contexts of situation.

As most of the linguistic data for this study comes from a single register - that of the sociolinguistic interview - it will not be possible to investigate in any depth the extent to which Singapore Huayu may have developed unique forms of registerial variation. However, some use will be made of anecdotal evidence for a limited discussion of particular forms of registerial variation (14.6 and 15.8). Also, within the interview data, a difference in mode (the role language is playing in the speech situation, Halliday 1978) will be investigated, in this case the difference between "talking" and "reading aloud". This essentially makes use of Labov's notion of a
dimension of "style" which is "measured by the amount of attention paid to speech" (Labov 1972b:208), i.e., in careful, self monitored speech, there is likely to be a higher frequency of prestige phonological variants than in less careful speech and such variants are likely also to be associated with more formal contexts of situation. Registerial variation will also be touched upon in the investigation of the particle 了 (Chapter Fourteen).

3.5.5 Variation Related to Language Contact

Variation related to language contact may take a number of forms. Firstly, there are features which are variable in the speech of all or most speakers of Singapore Huayu, whatever their mother tongues. However, the patterns of variation may be related to differences in the speakers' mother tongues, indicating some kind of language transfer effect. For example, speakers with one mother tongue may use the standard variant significantly more frequently than speakers with another mother tongue. If the mother tongue of the first group has a feature similar to the standard variant, it can be hypothesized that this makes it "easier" for this group to acquire the standard variant. Such features may also be related to sociolectal and registerial variation, illustrating the "crossover" from interference feature to sociolinguistic marker that might be expected in an "indigenizing" situation (see, for example, the (û) variable, Chapter Nine).
Secondly, there are features that are much more sporadic in occurrence and can be much more directly attributable to language contact. Such language contact phenomena range from switching between Huayu and other clearly distinct languages or dialects (i.e., what is usually called "code-switching"), through various kinds of borrowing and calquing to varieties of speech which exhibit such a degree of convergence or amalgamation that one hesitates to label them as Huayu at all.

The occurrence of these kinds of language contact phenomena may often be related to the proficiency dimension. However, what are clearly language transfer elements can also sometimes be exploited by perfectly proficient speakers for the purposes of registerial variation (see 15.8).

The above language contact phenomena need to be clearly distinguished from what may be called substratum features (Robins 1980). These are features which may have originated in language transfer, but are now learned as part of a general norm for Singapore Huayu. Thus, for example, lack of retroflexion (both syllable initially and syllable finally, see Chapter Seven) in the Singapore Huayu of most speakers could be related to the lack of such a feature in the southern dialects spoken in Singapore. However, a non-retroflex variety is now learned by Singapore speakers as a general norm. Similarly, the $yōu$+VERB [non past] construction (see
7.3.2) may be calque of a Hokkien construction. However, it is now also part of a general norm for Singapore speakers, whatever their mother tongue may be.
1. *Fujian*, *Fukien* (or *Fukkien*) and *Hokkien* all refer to the same province and are based on the Mandarin, Cantonese and Hokkien pronunciations of the name respectively. Generally, only the first two terms are used in English to refer to the province, whilst *Hokkien* is used to refer to the Minnan (Southern Min) dialects of which the standard form is the speech of Xiamen (Amoy).

2. I am grateful to expatriate lecturers at the Singapore Institute of Education for much of this information.

3. As in any generalization, there is a danger of exaggeration here. As Benjamin (1976) remarks: "..Singaporeans can frequently argue, for example, about the supposedly different attitudes to life of the Chinese educated as opposed to the English educated, conveniently ignoring the fact that very many groups of siblings who continue to live in the same households are split along these lines" (p.121). This is so. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that at least until the 1960's there were real differences between the Chinese educated and English educated worlds. For example Lee Kuan Yew recalls:

we [= the mainly English educated founders of the PAP] drew up plans for the setting up of the PAP. Then one day in 1954 we came into contact with the Chinese-educated world.....We bridged a gap to the
Chinese-educated world -- a world teeming with vitality, dynamism and revolution, a world which the communists had been working for the past thirty years with considerable success.

(Quoted in Murray 1971:86-87)

4. Although this chapter was written before I had access to Trudgill (1986), his discussion of salience and dialect contact has been very useful in clarifying my ideas in this area.
CHAPTER FOUR

PROSODIC / SYSTEMIC PHONOLOGY AND VARIABLE RULE ANALYSIS

4.1 Prosodic / Systemic Phonology

The perspective provided by Professor M.A.K. Halliday's prosodic / systemic analysis of the Mandarin syllable (Halliday 1985), has been found useful in the description of certain phonological features of Singapore Huayu and in the interpretation of their patterns of variation. As prosodic / systemic phonology is not well known and, in particular, Halliday's 1985 analysis is not yet available in published form, some basic principles of prosodic / systemic phonology will be briefly reviewed and features of Halliday's analysis which are relevant to this study will be described.

As the name prosodic / systemic suggests, systemic phonology is a development from the approach generally known as prosodic analysis which is associated with the "London School" of linguistics and particularly with the name of J.R. Firth (see Firth 1948). It is beyond the scope of this thesis to provide a comprehensive account of either prosodic analysis or systemic phonology (for overviews of prosodic analysis see Robins 1957, Hill 1966 and Sommerstein 1977, for systemic phonology see
Prakasam 1972 and 1977, and Mock 1985). However, some basic principles of prosodic analysis and their development in systemic phonology will be outlined below.

4.1.1 Prosodies, Phonematic Units and Realizations

It has, of course, always been recognized that the "cutting up" of the phonic substance into minimal segments strung out in a linear sequence is a step in abstraction, albeit a useful abstraction for the development of phonetics and phonology. However, much phonological analysis (both structural and generative) has tended to take this segmentation for granted. This has sometimes required the exercise of a certain amount of ingenuity in phonological analysis and representation to account for what Sommerstein calls "feature smear" which "occurs whenever the same phonetic peculiarity, or set of closely related phonic peculiarities, are found in several successive segments over a domain clearly delimitable in phonological terms" (Sommerstein 1977:24).

In prosodic analysis, such "smeared features" may be treated non-segmentally and abstracted as prosodies. In other words, they may be treated analogously to the ways features of tone and intonation are regularly treated even in segmental phonologies. It is interesting that in recent years, phonologists in America have begun to develop very similar forms of non-segmental analyses (see, for example, Goldsmith 1979 and 1987).
It is also worth noting that the segmentation characteristic of much modern phonology does not always accord with native intuition, particularly in languages which do not have a long history of alphabetization. The Chinese syllable, for example, was traditionally divided into the shengmu -(optional) initial consonant - and the yunmu (sometimes called "rhyme" or "final") - everything else in the syllable. Thus, for example, a syllable such as guang (in the Pinyin transcription of Standard Mandarin) would be analyzed as g+uang. Even today, despite the widespread use in China of Pinyin romanization as a teaching aid, students still "spell" Chinese syllables (or zi) in this way, i.e., by first saying the shengmu usually followed by [ɔ] and then the yunmu and finally the whole syllable (see Ramsay 1987). The further segmentation of the yunmu of, for example guang, into a glide, nuclear vowel and final nasal stop is very much western inspired.

Prosodic Analysis recognizes various kinds of prosodies, although some more in theory than practice. In principle, any feature which is "smeared" or has implications beyond a single phonetic segment may be regarded as a prosody (Bendor-Samuel 1966). The major types which will concern us here are distributive and demarcative (or diagnostic) prosodies (Robins 1957).
Distributive prosodies are features which are realized continuously or discontinuously over a particular structure. There may thus be distributive prosodies of phonological structures such as the syllable, the foot and the tone group or of grammatical structures such as the word and the clause. This thesis will be concerned with prosodies only at the level of the syllable.

A demarcative prosody may be any feature which is diagnostic of a particular place in a structure (whether or not it is realized phonetically over more than one segment). The most common type of such prosodies described in the literature is the junction prosody which marks a boundary between two structural units, for example between two syllables or two morphemes. However, in principle any feature which marks a particular place in a structure (e.g., syllable initial, nucleus or final) can be treated prosodically (Firth 1948, Robins 1957).

In a prosodic analysis, phonetic elements which are "left over" once all prosodies have been abstracted (i.e., have no implications beyond a single segment or place) are known as phonematic units. Exponence or realization statements (the latter term is now generally preferred) link prosodies and phonematic units with the phonic substance, i.e., they give an explicit account of the phonetic realizations of the prosodies and phonematic units. It is worth noting that prosodic analysts have generally been concerned to account for the maximum
amount of phonic detail, i.e., their phonological analyses have generally been based upon much "narrower" phonetic transcriptions than phonologists of other schools.

Halliday's 1985 systemic analysis of the Mandarin syllable (described in greater detail below) dispenses entirely with phonematic units. That is, the phonetics of the syllable are generated entirely prosodically. This is achieved by making use of the notion of demarcative prosodies. Thus, for example, some of the selections in the PLACE system have no effect beyond one segment. However, they mark a specific structural place (the syllable onset) and can therefore be treated as prosodies of the syllable.

4.1.2 Polysystemicity

Prosodic analysis is polysystemic in that it recognizes that there may be different systems of phonological options for different grammatical classes, different strata of the lexis (for example, loan words and "native" words, Henderson 1951) and for different structural places. Moreover, there need be no identification between an option (or term) in one system and that in another system which has a phonetically similar realization. i.e., there is no "biuniqueness" requirement and complementary distribution is no grounds for grouping phonetic realizations into single units. Thus, for
example, the alveolar nasal stop which occurs finally in the Mandarin syllable need not be identified with the alveolar nasal stop which occurs syllable initially.

Systemic phonology is similarly polysystemic in that there are different systems for different structures and a phonetic realization of an option in one system is not identified with a similar phonetic realization of an option in another system. However, unlike in prosodic analysis, the systems are integrated into networks. Systemic phonology has not, so far at least, attempted separate analyses of, for example, different grammatical classes or different lexical strata, although there is, in principle, no reason why this should not be done.

4.1.3 Paradigmatic and Syntagmatic

It is sometimes said that prosodic analysis pays more attention to the syntagmatic axis and less to the paradigmatic axis than other approaches (see, for example, Lass 1984). This is true only in the sense that, unlike phonemic analysis, a prosodic analysis does not imply that all options in the phonology are open at each segment in a linear string. However, prosodic analysis and, even more explicitly, systemic phonology are, like systemic grammar in general, essentially paradigmatic in orientation. That is, the choice among features in a system is primary and syntagmatic relations are the
result of realizations of particular (paradigmatic) choices.

4.1.4 System and Network

Taking essentially the same approach to phonological analysis as prosodic analysis, systemic phonology in addition utilizes the techniques of systemic linguistics for the formal representation of systems and their integration into networks. This aspect of systemic phonology is not of direct relevance to this thesis. However, very briefly, a system is a set of mutually exclusive options or terms each with the same entry conditions (i.e., an option in a prior system). Systems are organized into networks such that systems of more abstract or less delicate options are prior to and provide the entry conditions for systems of more delicate options. As with prosodic analysis, options and combinations of options are linked to the phonic substance by statements of exponence or realization. A sample of Halliday's 1985 system network for the Mandarin syllable is given in Appendix Two.

4.2 Halliday's 1985 Systemic Phonological Analysis of the Mandarin Syllable

As Halliday's 1985 Systemic Phonological analysis of the Mandarin Syllable is not yet available in published form, its major features will be outlined here.
Both Halliday 1959 and Halliday 1985 are essentially prosodic analyses of the Mandarin syllable. However, the major differences in the latter work is that firstly, the phonetics of the syllable are accounted for entirely prosodically and secondly, the sets of paradigmatic options are represented as systems and integrated into a network using the techniques mentioned above.

4.2.1 The Phonetic Data

The phonetic data was collected in Beijing in 1947-1949. Some of this data is given in Appendix One.

4.2.2 Posture Prosodies

Examination of the phonetic quality of the vowels which are written a in Pinyin, reveals some regular patterns. Comparing syllables such as zhaο, zhai and zha, there are clear differences in the quality of the a:

\[ d\text{za} \quad d\text{zai} \quad d\text{za} \]

i.e., in segmental terms, the a can be said to be "conditioned" by or to "assimilate to" the quality of the following vocalic element.

On the other hand, if the a is preceded by an u or i as in zhua or jia, there is no such "conditioning" effect, other than some slight (and variable) fronting in jia.
However, if the a occurs between the two vowels, as in jiao and zhuai, the "assimilatory" effect is again present. For example:

Thus, the vowel nucleus is dominated by the syllable periphery, with regressive effects being stronger than progressive effects.

This pattern is paralleled in the nasal syllables, with the front nasal n having exactly the same "assimilatory effect" as i and the back nasal ng having exactly the same "assimilatory effect" as u. For example:

Thus, phonologically, ng and n can be regarded as nasal "equivalents" of final u and i. However, whilst there are no oral syllables such as *jiai and *zhuau, there are nasal syllables such as jian and zhuang. In these cases, the "assimilatory effect" on the a is even greater. For example:

In other words, the i and the n or the u and the ng are both "pulling" in the same direction.
Prosodically, the Mandarin syllable can thus be conceptualized as having a structure with a beginning at which certain effects take place and an ending with effects flowing backwards.

These initial and final movements or postures are symbolized as y, realized by fronting and raising; w, realized by backing and rounding and a, neutral i.e., neither of the other two.

These two systems of initial and final posture prosodies, each consisting of the terms y, w and a, entirely account for the quality of the vocalic nuclei of all syllables (not just those with low vowels exemplified above), with the exception of a three way opposition in height (see 4.2.4 below). Thus, for example, there is a perceptible phonetic difference between the vowel nuclei of jin [dʒin] and jing [dʒing] and between the vowel nuclei of zhen [cɛn] and zheng [cɛng], although these sometimes tend to get "edited out" in segmental analyses.

There are, however, some systematic gaps in the phonology. Most notably, there are no oral y-y or w-w syllables. In other words, in oral syllables either neutral (a) or shifting postures must be selected.
In segmental analyses (both phonemic and generative) of, for example, the syllables with a low vowel nucleus looked at above, an a phoneme or "underlying" low vowel is posited, conditioned by preceding and following segments (see Hartman 1944 and Cheng 1973a). However, this does not show so clearly the nature of the processes working in from the syllable margins. Moreover, the recognition of ng and n as nasal "equivalents" of u and i makes for a more economical analysis and accounts for more of the phonetic facts, for example, the tendency for rounding to persist throughout nasal syllables which have w postures initially and finally (e.g., zhuang [d2ŋj]) but for the rounding to start late or finish early in nasal syllables which have y initially or finally (e.g. jiang [d3ŋj] and zhuăn [d3kn]). Moreover, the characteristic "dipping" in vowel quality that occurs in syllables such as jing [d2ŋj] and zhun [d3kn] can be seen as a phenomenon of the transition from one posture to another.

There are other advantages in the prosodic analysis. Firstly, it can account in a more motivated way for "free" as well as "allophonic" variation. As the data in Appendix One illustrates, the least stable (i.e., showing most variation) syllables are those such as zhuăn and jiang, in which the initial and final postures are "pulling" in different directions (as compared, for example, to zhuang and jian). In other words, there is likely to be more variation in syllables in which there
is "tension" between the two forces exerted from the syllable margins.

Secondly, as shown in Appendix One, the nasal syllables have variants with no final stop. However, such variants of \( n \) syllables do not become homophonous with corresponding \( ng \) syllables, as the opposition is still present in the vowel qualities. In a prosodic analysis, the \( w \) and \( y \) postures are seen as realized in the vowel whether or not there is a following stop. However, in a segmental analysis, the differences in vowel quality are conditioned by the place of articulation of the final stop. Accounting for the contrast between these variants of \( ng \) and \( n \) syllables where there is no final stop therefore becomes less plausible and economical (see also 11.4.1).

4.2.3 The \( y \) Syllables

There are 19 syllables (21, counting two uncommon variants) in Mandarin in which the initial posture is high front and rounded (see Chapter Nine). It would be possible to account for these simply by adding a fourth term (\( \gamma \)) to the system of initial posture prosodies. However, there is a gain in generalization if they are analyzed as labialized versions of the set of syllables with high unrounded initial posture. In other words, if they are regarded has having simultaneously selected \( y \)
and ʷ initial postures. There are no oral syllables with initial ſ postures and final ʸ or ʷ postures. If posture is regarded as simultaneous selection of ʸ and ſ, this can be explained as observance of the restriction on oral ʸ-ʸ and ʷ-ʷ syllables. It also accounts for the quality of the vowel nucleus in syllables such as juan [ɥ̃源源] as opposed to the quality in syllables such as jian [ɥ̃源源]. The initial ſ posture in the former keeps the vowel low.

4.2.4 Height Prosodies

The other system of prosodies of relevance to this thesis is that of height, of which the terms are ₁ - high (tongue lowered by the minimum necessary to achieve a vocalic quality); ₃ - mid and ₄ - low.

4.2.5 Halliday's Analysis and This Thesis

This thesis is not "about" systemic phonology. However, the non-segmental perspective on the Mandarin syllable provided by the analysis has proved useful at a number of points. For example, the (ng) variable can be better understood as variable acquisition of a syllable final prosodic option (Chapter Eleven), the (ü) variable can be better understood in terms of the realization of initial posture prosodies constrained by other syllable prosodies (Chapter Nine) and constraints on the (r) variable are
better accounted for in terms of the prosodic configuration of the entire syllable (Chapter Ten).

The prosodic or systemic perspective also allows us to make a more fundamental generalization about Singapore Huayu. Much of the phonological variation and divergencies from standard Mandarin pronunciation can be seen in terms of a tendency for Singapore speakers to have variable and generally much weaker realizations of the strong y/y prosodic movements of Beijing Mandarin. This will be illustrated in discussion of the (ng) variable (Chapter Eleven). It is also exemplified in the lack of labiovelar glide after front consonants (7.3.6) and in the usual Singapore Huayu pronunciation of the Yunmu üan (7.2.4).

This general tendency of Singapore Huayu pronunciation can be seen against the background of the southern Chinese dialects spoken in Singapore, which are generally much more weakly prosodic than Mandarin. For example, the phonetic differences among the vocalic nuclei of Cantonese [sa:n], [sa:m] and [sa:y] and among the vocalic nuclei of Hokkien [sɛn], [sɛm] and [sɛŋ] are much smaller than between the two sets of nasal finals in Mandarin (as shown at 4.2.2 above).
4.3 Generative Phonology, Systemic Phonology and Variable Rules

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to embark upon a comparison of generative and systemic phonologies. However, a number of points do need to be noted. Both approaches agree in rejecting "linearity" and "biuniqueness". In other word, unlike structural phonemics, the abstract units of analysis do not follow a linear string corresponding to the phonetic segments. Nor is there a "biunique" relationship between phonological unit and phonetic realization. However, unlike Systemic Phonology but like structural phonemics, Generative Phonology is essentially a segmental phonology and thus non-segmental or "smeared" features are "placed" in a particular segment and their presence in adjacent segments accounted for by various processes of assimilation.

This has a number of consequences for the investigation of linguistic variation. William Labov and the "variationist" school have attempted to integrate their discoveries about linguistic variation into mainstream American linguistics; in other words to bring back the social and the diachronic into Chomsky's linguistic world of the "ideal speaker hearer" (Chomsky 1965) and to breach the rigid dichotomy of "competence" versus "performance". The concept of the variable rule was introduced by Labov (1969) and refined and extended in
Cedergren and Sankoff (1974) and elsewhere as an attempt to give a formal account for systematic linguistic variation. It was couched in the formalism of transformational generative grammar and generative phonology and was presented as a refinement of the concept of the optional rule. The arguments over whether such a probabilistic element can be legitimately introduced into TG theory (Kay and McDaniel 1979, Sankoff and Labov 1979) need not concern us here.

The basic formulation of a variable rule is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
  x & \rightarrow \langle y \rangle \mid \langle \text{feature 1} \rangle \mid \langle \text{feature 2} \rangle \mid \langle \text{feature 3} \rangle \\
  & \quad \text{etc.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The features of the environment within the angled brackets are mutually exclusive and may be ordered or ranked according to the extent to which they favour application of the rule.

This kind of formulation has a number of consequences. Firstly, it implies that variation takes place in one segment and is constrained by preceding and following segments. It also implies that related changes in other segments, for example in the backness of vowels preceding the consonant in a \([n] \rightarrow [n]\) rule are to be regarded as subsequent assimilations. This segmental bias is, of course, intrinsic to generative phonology and to most
other phonological models other than prosodic and systemic (and more recently autosegmental and metrical). A non-segmental approach, however, allows us to view a particular variable feature as extending beyond a single segment and as possibly constrained by the prosodic configuration of (at least) the entire syllable.

A related implication of the GP based variable rule formulation is that the form to the left of the arrow is to be taken as the underlying (in some psychological sense) form or as the earlier or "original" form, whilst the form to the right represents the surface or new form.

This assumption of directionality or process may be one we wish to avoid in particular cases. Le Page (1978), for example, points out that the kind of variable rule used by Labov (1969) to model copula deletion in varieties of Black American English - with the copula to the left of the arrow - and used by Sankoff and Labov (1979) to model variable t/d deletion - with the t/d to the left of the arrow - is not appropriate for modelling variable data such as that from speakers of Belize Creole. The Creole word has been completely uninflected for at least 200 years and rather than deleting inflectional endings, speakers could be regarded as adding them as they come under the influence of education. Similarly, they cannot be regarded as deleting the copula, as the basic Creole grammar has no copula.
This is somewhat analogous to the situation with Singapore Huayu, where the fairly recent promotion of a standard variety may be producing changes in earlier norms. In such a situation, we would not wish to assume that, for example, a particular standard variant was in any sense "underlying" or "original".

It should be pointed out that it is quite possible, as this study intends to do, to make use of the statistical techniques developed for variable rule analysis without necessarily working within the framework of TG grammar or Generative Phonology. As Sankoff and Labov (1979) point out:

Though the methodology of variable rules was motivated by and developed in conjunction with the project to incorporate variability in generative grammar, it would be a mistake to think that this methodology is logically tied to a particular grammatical formalism, or a particular domain of grammar such as phonology or morphology. Wherever a choice process is postulated in linguistic performance, especially choice which is conditioned by a number of cross cutting linguistic and / or extralinguistic factors, a variable rule analysis, which is after all a statistically general way for handling conditioned binomial variables of all types, can be fruitfully undertaken.

(Sankoff and Labov 1979:217)
The next section will explain how variable rule as a statistical technique has been used in this thesis.

4.4 Variable Rule Analysis of Variable Linguistic Data

The quantitative analysis of the variable linguistic data in this thesis uses the techniques of variable rule analysis, without, as mentioned above, implying a commitment to the theoretical construct of the "variable rule". The technique and the mathematical model involved has been well described in the literature (see Cedergren and Sankoff 1974, Guy 1975) and will only be outlined here.

The VARBRUL 2 programme written by David Sankoff is used in the analyses presented in Chapters Nine to Twelve. The programme uses a multiple regression technique for analysing variable data and searching for factors conditioning the variation. The advantage of the programme is that it estimates the effects of each of the conditioning factors independently of and controlling for the effects of all the other factors. It also allows testing for the statistical significance of any effect.

In a variable rule analysis, the variable is the variable linguistic feature under investigation. In this study, each variable consists of a nonstandard variant and its equivalent standard or standard-like variant. Factors are
the linguistic and non-linguistic (e.g., social characteristics of the speakers) features of the environment or context which are hypothesized to condition the variation. In other words, the contextual factors are the independent variables and the linguistic variable is the dependent variable. The factors are organized into factor groups consisting of mutually exclusive factors (e.g., factors of "age" or of "phonological environment"). The VARBRUL 2 programme yields a weighting for each factor. This represents a particular factor's contribution to the "application of the rule" relative to the other factors in the same factor group. In the analyses in this thesis, "application of the rule" means occurrence of the nonstandard variant. In each case, a weighting of above .5 indicates that the factor in question favours the "application of the rule" (i.e., occurrence of the nonstandard variant) and a weighting of below .5 indicates that the factor disfavours it. A weighting of 1.0 would indicate categorical occurrence of the nonstandard variant whenever the factor in question is present in the context and a weighting of 0.0 would indicate categorical non-occurrence (although the programme excludes such factors from the final results as "knockout factors").

An important part of the technique is significance testing. At the end of each run of the VARBRUL 2 programme a log-likelihood value is given. This measures
the goodness of fit between the data and the model constructed by the analysis. This allows us to test the statistical significance of the effects on the variation of individual factors and of whole factor groups.

To test the significance of a factor group, the analysis is run twice, once with and once without the factor group. The log-likelihood will normally be larger in the second run as there will be some loss of fit to the data. The significance of this difference is calculated by subtracting the log-likelihood of the first run from the log-likelihood of the second run and multiplying by 2. The result can then by looked up on a chi square table under the degrees of freedom equal to the number of factors in the group minus 1. As is usual in the social sciences, the significance level for rejecting the null hypothesis in the analyses in this thesis is set at 0.05 (i.e., where there is a 5 or less chance in 100 that the difference between the results of the two runs is random). A chi square result of above .05 does not, of course, prove that there is no relationship between the factors in the group and the variation. It simply means that we cannot assume with a reasonable level of confidence that there is a relationship.

Testing for the significance of individual factors is much the same. Two or more factors from the same factor group in the first run may be combined in the second run, the difference in log-likelihoods doubled and the result
checked on a chi square table under the degrees of freedom equal to the change in the number of factors in the group.

Such significance testing was a crucial part of the analyses of all of the variables described in Chapters nine to twelve. Factor groups were omitted and factors combined wherever it seemed "reasonable" to do so, i.e., where the differences in weightings in the initial runs were not great and combining factors made linguistic or social sense (e.g., where two factors identify two similar places of articulation or two adjacent age groups) and at each stage, significance testing was carried out. The object was to account for the variation with the minimum number of factors but with no statistically significant loss of fit to the data.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE INFORMANTS AND THE INTERVIEWS

5.1 The Informants

The aims of this study ideally require that the speakers from whom data is to be collected should be as representative as possible of the total population of Huayu speakers in Singapore and cover as many of the dimensions of social variation as might possibly be relevant to linguistic variation. However, practical considerations also require that the study should be within the resources of a single (unfunded) researcher. It has therefore been necessary to find a balance between representativeness and feasibility.

5.1.1 Pilot Study

Ten interviews with Huayu speaking Singaporeans were recorded for the purposes of a pilot study. The interviewees were colleagues and students at the National University of Singapore and "ordinary people" approached in a shopping centre and hawker centre (cooked food centre) in the Bukit Timah area. From the pilot study, the variable features to be focussed on in the main study were tentatively identified. The pilot study also made it
clear that it would be feasible to use "strangers" as informants. Most of those approached in the shopping centre and hawker centre appeared to show no reluctance to being interviewed. However, the pilot study suggested that changes should be made to the question schedule, in particular eliminating questions not seen to be relevant to the declared purpose of the interviews.

5.1.2 Initial Selection of Informants for the Main Study

The population to be investigated in this thesis may be defined as "residents of Singapore (including permanent residents of at least ten years standing who were born in Malaysia) who are proficient speakers of Huayu."

"Proficient" is, of course, rather a vague term. For the purposes of this study, any speaker able to use Huayu to give information and express opinions without excessive hesitation or switching to other languages or dialects was deemed to be proficient in Huayu. However, no attempt was made to draw a random sample of such speakers. Even given massive resources, this would have been difficult or impossible, as no list of "proficient speakers of Huayu" exists to provide a sampling frame from which a random representative sample might have been drawn. However, an attempt was made to select a group of informants who would encompass as great a range of relevant social variables as possible. This was done by taking advantage of the highly stratified nature of housing in Singapore.
Singapore is very much a city of flats. In 1981, about 69% of the population lived in Housing and Development Board (HDB) public flats and this was expected to rise to about 75% by 1985 (Singapore: Facts and Pictures 1982). The other categories of housing recognized in the 1980 census are bungalows, semi-detached and terrace housing, private flats, shophouses and attap or zinc roofed houses. Public flats are further sub-categorized into 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 room flats, which generally accord with differences in the income levels of the tenants (see Hassan 1977 and Yeh ed. 1975). Outside the public sector, occupants of private flats, bungalows and semi-detached houses tend to be in the higher income groups. In the absence of more detailed demographic information such as Labov had access to in his 1966 study (from the Mobilization for Youth Youth Survey, see Labov 1966), this provides the researcher with a convenient starting point for the selection of informants.

Two broad types of housing were identified. Firstly, 1, 2 and 3 room public flats (representing lower income housing) and secondly, 5 room flats, semi-detached houses and bungalows (representing higher income housing). A number of housing areas throughout Singapore were selected, including some older housing estates, newer housing estates, areas of fairly new suburban houses and areas of older houses nearer the city centre. Within the public housing estates, blocks were selected according to
whether they consisted mainly of 1, 2, 3 or 5 room flats. Within each block, every third floor was selected and every third door on a selected floor, with the exception of "point blocks" of 5 room flats (2 per floor) where 1 flat per floor was selected. In areas of semi-detached houses and bungalows, every third house was approached. Where the occupants were not Chinese or were unwilling to be interviewed, their immediate neighbours were approached.

5.1.3 Approaching Informants

The interviews were carried out in early 1983. In each case, the procedure was to present identification and to explain that the purposes of the research were to find out about language use in Singapore and what people thought about a number of language and educational issues and to discover what the Huayu Singaporeans ordinarily used was like. Whilst methodologically, it might have been preferable not to reveal that Huayu itself would be the object of research, it was necessary to include this in order to justify conducting the interviews in Huayu in cases in which the informants also spoke English, as English would have been the most likely language choice to use with an obviously foreign interviewer. In several cases, it was necessary to emphasize that although the researcher was from the university, he was not carrying out research for any official organization, would be taking the data overseas and would not record any names.
Within each household, an attempt was made to interview informants of both sexes and of different generations. What often happened was that the member of the household considered to speak the "best" Huayu would be pushed forward first. The researcher would later ask him or her to try to persuade more reluctant members of the household to participate.

5.1.4 Refusal Rates

Of households in 1, 2, and 3 room flats approached, about 25% refused to be interviewed, excluding non-Chinese households. Of households in 5 room flats, semi-detached houses and bungalows approached, the refusal rate was about 39%. The most common reason given for refusal was something like "We don't speak Huayu here" or "We don't speak Huayu well enough" (although this was sometimes said in Huayu and in most cases the researcher's initial approach using Huayu seemed to be understood), followed by something like "I'm sorry, it is not convenient just now". The difference between the refusal rates for the two groups may be partly due to the fact that in the 1, 2 and 3 room flats the doors were often open onto the balconies and it was easier to make a personal approach. With the other types of housing, doors were often closed and behind locked grills. It is more difficult to make out a case for entry to an invisible occupant looking through a spy hole. Households in both groups who did
admit the interviewer, however, were usually very cooperative and often extremely hospitable.

Getting a range of informants within households was inevitably difficult, particularly across generations. Partly this was because older potential informants were less likely to be proficient in Huayu, or at least less willing to expose their Huayu before younger and better educated family members.

Clearly, then, there is an element of self selection in the informants interviewed. The group consists of informants who were able and willing to participate in an interview conducted in Huayu, and contains relatively few informants with little education and above 50 years of age. However, this simply reflects the fact that such people are less likely to be proficient in Huayu.

5.1.5 The Sample of University Graduates

In the course of doing the fieldwork in this way, it became clear that insufficient interviews would be recorded with informants at the "very top" end of the level of education scale. It was necessary to get such samples by recruiting through networks. Seven of the nine university graduates in the sample were therefore recruited in this way.
5.1.6 Selecting the Final Sample

Altogether 97 interviews were recorded. However, during transcribing and coding, it became necessary to reduce the sample size in order to be able to investigate in detail a number of linguistic variables within a reasonable time limit. The final selection of 46 recordings was selected on the following grounds:

i) Recordings that were of poor quality were not used. Very often this was because a television had been left on in the same room, occasionally it was because of excessive traffic or other noise from the street.

ii) Recordings in which the informants were very unresponsive were regarded as unsuccessful interviews and were not used. In a few cases, informants limited each response to a few words.

iii) Recordings of interviews in which many people took part were discarded. The interviews were often carried out with other family members and friends present. Inevitably, in some cases, many people responded to the questions and became involved in the discussions, and from the recordings it is not always possible to sort out who is who.

iv) Recordings in which the informants spoke with great hesitation and/or switched often into English or a
Chinese dialect were not used. Such recordings often did not yield sufficient data in Huayu and the informant did may not have been a sufficiently proficient speaker of Huayu.

v) Recordings in which the informant had lived in Singapore for less than ten years were not used.

vi) Recordings in which the informant’s mother tongue was anything other than Cantonese, Hokkien or Huayu were not used. This was in order to reduce the number of "mother tongue" factors that would have to be taken account of in the analysis of the linguistic variation. Cantonese and Hokkien were the most numerous of the mother tongues represented in the sample of 97 (the third largest was Teochew) and the two dialects belong to different dialect groups and so any differences in language transfer or "interference" might be expected to be clearer than with two more closely related dialects (such as Hokkien and Teochew). Inclusion of all the mother tongues represented would have meant many more factors, some identifying only one or two informants.

Recordings of informants with Huayu as mother tongue were included despite the fact that there are only 3 such informants. These are informants whose (originally dialect speaking ) parents chose to use only Huayu with their children from the beginning. It was felt that such
informants might provide interesting samples of a variety of fully indigenized or mother tongue Singapore Huayu.

5.1.7 Characteristics of the Final Selection of Informants

The final selection of informants includes 22 residents of the 1,2 and 3 room public flats housing type and 24 residents of the 5 room flats, semi-detached houses and bungalows housing type. There are 26 males and 20 females. Their ages range from 15 to 56 and their educational levels range from nil to university graduates (for more details see Appendix Three).

Thus, the final selection of informants contains several dimensions of variation in social identity which can be investigated for sociolectal variation.

5.1.8 Linguistic Profile of the Informants

As mentioned above, the final sample of informants was restricted to those who claimed either Hokkien (23 informants), Cantonese (20 informants) or Huayu (3 informants) as their mother tongues (i.e., first languages learned infancy). However, the range of languages and dialects the informants claimed to speak illustrates patterns of individual multilingualism typical of Singapore.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Quite Fluently</th>
<th>A Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teochew</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hainanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foochow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghainese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the language in addition to Huayu known by the largest number of informants is English. Cantonese was spoken "quite fluently" by 9 informants for whom it was not a mother tongue, and Hokkien was spoken "quite fluently" by 8 informants for whom it was not a mother tongue. None of these findings are surprising. One would expect English to be well known in view of its role in the education system and pre-eminent role in Singapore as a whole. Hokkien is the majority Chinese dialect in Singapore and plays the role of an informal lingua franca. Cantonese, also, is to some extent a lingua franca and has a certain status from its connection with
Hong Kong, particularly through Hong Kong pop songs, films and television programmes (very popular and much watched on video now that the Singapore Broadcasting Corporation is required to dub them into Huayu).

The breakdown of first school languages of the informants illustrates the difficulty of any longer dividing Chinese Singaporeans into distinct "Chinese educated" and "English educated" groups.

Table 5.2 Numbers of Informants by First School Languages

- Huayu at both primary and secondary levels: 20
- Huayu at primary level, English at secondary: 8
- English at both primary and secondary levels: 9
  - Huayu at primary, both Huayu and English at secondary: 1
  - Huayu at primary, no secondary: 5
    (in one case, primary education not finished)
  - Primary education in Cantonese: 2
    (in one case, with "a little Huayu" and primary education completed, in the other case only three months primary education)
No formal education at all: 1

The informants were also asked which language they spoke most fluently and most naturally.

Table 5.3 Numbers of Informants by Languages / Dialects
Claimed to Speak "Most Fluently" and "Most Naturally"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huayu</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teochew</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total is greater than 46 as some informants claimed to use most naturally and to be equally fluent in more than one language or dialect. In such cases, the combinations were as follows:

- Dialect mother tongue + Huayu: 13
- Dialect mother tongue + one other dialect: 4
- Dialect mother tongue + English: 2
- Dialect mother tongue + Huayu + English: 1
- Dialect mother tongue + Huayu + Malay: 1
Thus, excluding the 3 informants who were brought up with
Huayu as their mother tongue, 17 claimed to be equally as
fluent in Huayu as in their mother tongue and 4 claimed
to be more fluent in Huayu than in their mother tongue.
It is also worth noting that of the 24 for whom Huayu was
the first language of education throughout, 15 claimed
Huayu as the language or one of the languages they were
most fluent in. On the other hand, of the 9 for whom
English was a first language of education throughout,
only 2 claimed English as a language they were most
fluent in and 1 claimed Huayu. Of the 8 for whom Huayu
was the first language of primary education and English
the second language, 5 claimed Huayu as a language they
were most fluent in and none claimed English.

This illustrates that one cannot always make simple
assumptions about a Singaporean's likely proficiency in a
particular language simply on the basis of his or her
first school language. A good example of this is an
informant who is the only one in his family to have
attended an English medium school. All his siblings have
attended Chinese medium schools and they all speak Huayu
to one another at home. Consequently, he is much more
proficient in Huayu than in English.
5.2 Factor Groups and Factors used in the Analyses of Linguistic Variation

In the analyses of linguistic variation presented in Chapters Nine to Fourteen, the factor groups relating to characteristics of the speakers are as follows:

**Age**

**Level of Education**

**Mother Tongue**

5.2.1 Age

Age factors were included in order to investigate the possibility of linguistic change in progress. In other words, data on apparent time is used as evidence for real time (Labov 1966). The factors in this group are as follows:

1. 15 - 20
2. 21 - 30
3. 31 - 40
4. 41 - 56

The youngest informant is 15 and the oldest is 56.

5.2.2 Level of Education

A more fine grained measure of social status was needed than the crude division according to two broad types of housing. A level of education hierarchy is easy to
operate and is based upon information that informants were generally happy to give. It was far less easy, for example, to gain reliable information on individual and family incomes.

Level of education appears also to be a measure of social status very relevant to the present study of linguistic variation. Education is greatly valued in Singapore society and is a source of social prestige as well as occupational advancement. Moreover, the terms "educated" and "uneducated" are quite commonly heard in relation to the ways people speak, and mastery of the official languages (particularly English and Huayu) is taken as a mark of an educated person.

Some indication of this can be seen in the judgements of samples of spoken Huayu made in the evaluation tests (Chapter Eight). The judges showed themselves willing to use labels such as "educated" and "uneducated" about the speakers and to estimate, generally quite accurately, the speakers' likely levels of education. It is also worth noting that a hierarchy of speakers based upon the means of judgements about their likely levels of education gave exactly the same ranking as a hierarchy based upon the means of judgements about their likely occupational status. This indicates that level of education might correlate quite closely with other measures of social status (see p.241).
The factors in this group are as follows:

1. **Not Completed Primary** (or just <Primary)

2. **Completed Primary**

3. **Completed Lower Secondary** (this means either 3 years secondary education in the former Chinese medium school system or 4 years in the English medium school system. Two students currently studying in secondary 4 are included under this category)

4. **Completed Upper Secondary** (this means 3 years of upper secondary in the former Chinese medium system or 2 to 3 years "pre-university" in the present system)

5. **Completed Post-Secondary Training** (in the case of informants in this study, this means either polytechnic courses or teacher training)

4. **Completed a University Degree**
   (One university student who had not yet graduated was included in this category)

As with all the factor groups in the analyses, factors in this group have been combined wherever reasonable with no
statistically significant (at the 0.05 level) loss of fit to the data. This is particularly important in the case of the factor <Primary, as it identifies only 3 informants. The variable rule programme can cope with this, provided that co-linearity is avoided, which it is in this case (i.e., the 3 informants identified by the factor <Primary are not also uniquely identified by a factor in another factor group). However, it is unsatisfactory to have a factor identifying only 3 informants. Wherever possible, therefore, the factor <primary has been collapsed with (at least) the factor primary. However, where this has not been possible, the weighting for the <primary factor has been treated with caution and the raw scores for the 3 informants involved looked at separately.

5.2.3 Mother Tongue

The factors in this factor group refer to the language or dialect which the informants claim to have learned first in infancy. They are as follows:

1. Cantonese
2. Hokkien
3. Huayu

As explained earlier, the factor Huayu identifies informants whose parents chose not to use their home dialects with them from the earliest age. These
informants claim to know very little or nothing of their ancestral dialects. While it is useful to have informants with this background in the sample, the factor identifies only 3 such informants and findings must therefore be treated with some caution. In each case, the raw figures for these informants will be looked at separately.

5.3 The Interviews

All interviews were conducted by myself. No attempt was made to conceal the fact that the interviews were being recorded. However, this was kept as unobtrusive as possible by taping a small microphone to the folder containing the reading lists and other documents. The interviews were all carried out in the informants' homes and range in length from about half an hour to over one hour.

5.3.1 The Question Schedule

The basic question schedule for the interviews is given in Appendix Four. The schedule is divided into three parts. Part one consists of questions designed to elicit information relevant to the interviewee's social identity (age, education, occupation, income, marital status etc.) and information on the informant's language repertoire and language use (i.e. which languages / dialects they usually use with whom in which contexts). Part two
consists of questions which seek to elicit the informant's attitudes and opinions on such topics as what is the best or most correct Huayu and who speaks it, the success or otherwise of the Speak Mandarin Campaign, the desirability of banning dialects from the mass media, the usefulness of knowing Huayu in Singapore and so on.

Part three of the interview consists of "word lists" or common two zi expressions containing phonological features to be investigated in this study, followed by "minimal pairs", i.e., pairs of zi, some of which are differentiated in the standard pronunciation only by the features to be investigated, as well as some pairs which are homophonous in the standard language but may not be in the southern dialects or some varieties of Singapore Huayu.

5.3.2 The Recorded Interview and Registerial or Stylistic Variation

The recorded interview has been a procedure much used in sociolinguistic research since Labov's 1966 study. It has the advantage of getting clear recordings from one informant at a time, who can be placed in terms of certain social variables. It can also enable variations in topic or field and in the effects of different participants to be controlled for (particularly when a single interviewer is used for all interviews, as in the present study).
However, as has been often pointed out (see, for example, Milroy 1980, Chapter Two), the sociolinguistic interview may be quite unsuitable for gathering certain kinds of data. As Milroy points out, the recorded interview is an institutionalized register (or "speech event" as she calls it) in our culture. This is equally the case in Singapore. For example, recorded interviews are regular features in such radio programmes as *Meiri Zazhi* ("Daily Magazine"). Such a register is associated with a tenor characterized by maximum distance or minimum solidarity between informants, i.e., in Labov's terms a context in which a more "formal" or "careful" speech style (Labov 1966) might be expected. The elicitation in a recorded interview of language appropriate to less formal contexts is not easy.

Labov and other researchers using his techniques have been very aware of this problem, particularly in view of their concern to study the "vernacular" (see, for example, Labov 1966 Chapter Four and Milroy 1980:23-24). Techniques developed by Labov in order to elicit a range of styles, including the most informal, spontaneous and unmonitored style, involve having the interviewee perform different tasks (e.g., recounting personal experiences, reading wordlists). In order to elicit the most informal end of the range, researchers do such things as manipulating the topics of the interview so that the interviewee might become more emotionally involved in what he or she is saying (and thus less "careful" about
speech) and leaving the recorder running when participants change (i.e., where there is speech with a third person).

Some of these techniques were tried in the present study, with varying degrees of success. The question schedule for the pilot study included questions designed to elicit personal narratives from the interviewees, including one modelled on Labov's famous "Danger of Death" question (Labov 1966) and questions designed to get the speaker talking about the area he or she lives in and its advantages and disadvantages or the ways it has changed over the years. These were not particularly successful. Whilst understanding why I should want to question them on their educational and linguistic background and seek their comments on a range of language and educational issues, many informants were puzzled at why I should want to ask these other questions. The "Danger of Death" question, in particular, provoked little response. Perhaps Singapore is not such a dangerous place to live in as New York! It is also likely that this is a culturally inappropriate question for an "outsider" to ask.

Inclusion of such questions not obviously relevant to the stated purposes of the interview also made the interviews over long, as it was felt necessary to retain all the other questions pertaining to the interviewee's social identity, language repertoire and language use as well as
questions designed to elicit attitudes and opinions towards various aspects of Huayu in Singapore.

Nevertheless, there was some success in moving away from the institutionalized register of the recorded interview. The researcher explained that he was a student and that the recordings were purely for personal research. The question/answer structure of the formal interview was avoided as far as possible. The question schedule was memorized and was used very flexibly. Every effort was made to encourage the interviewee to continue talking (even if not directly related to the questions) by giving feedback, prompting and inserting follow up questions. Fortunately, such is the high profile that matters of language have in Singapore that many of the interviewees had quite clear and definite opinions they seemed anxious to express (perhaps the fact that the interviewer was an "outsider" was an advantage in this case). The recorder was also left running during interruptions (e.g., telephone calls, see p.374) and, where possible, after the end of the interview had been marked in some way (usually by my thanking them for their time) when there was a tendency for interviewees to turn the tables and start questioning the interviewer.

Inevitably, some interviews were more successful than others in this regard. In some cases, informants were very interactive and appeared to become very involved in what they were saying. In particular, moves away from a
more formal definition of the context by the informant were often marked by greater frequency of modal particles and tags which require feedback or reaction from the interviewer. For example (such features are underlined):

Informant. ... Huáyu hǎ, dào xiànzáí a, jiù shì shuō, hái yóu qiántú la. Búguó hó, jiānglái, wǒ kàn háishì hui tāotái, suírán nǐ hui jiǎng húayú...zhǐ shì nǐ hui jiǎng ma, gēnbèn nǐ dōu méiyǒu xíe, hǎo? Nǐ hui jiǎng, nǐ bú hui xíe, měige rén dōu hui jiǎng ma, bú hui xíe, zúi zhúyào shì xíe, jǐashì nǐ bú hui xíe déhuà, nǐ hui jiǎng dōu méiyǒu yòng, duì ma? Nǐ kàn jièshāng, yíge lìzi lái jiāng, jièshāngde zǎopài, nà xíe jiěmíng hǎ, gēn...huǒzhe shì qu nà yíge bùmén, hùoshì qu airport nà biān, hái bù shì yòng yīngwén dōu ma?

Interviewer. fēijīchāng bù shì yòng huáwéi ma?

Informant: méiyǒu, méiyǒu, xiànzáí zài Changi Airport méiyǒu le, dōu shì yòng yīngyǔ dōu. Húayú hái shì, jiānglái hui bei tāotái, suǒyì shì zhèi yang jiǎng a, húayú, húayú nǐ hui jiǎng, bú hui yòng yě shì méiyǒu yòng, shì ma? Zhéige shì hěn zhòngyàode yíge wèntí.

[See Appendix Seven for version in written zi]
Informant: Huayu up to now, so to speak, still has a future. However, in the future, I think it will be pushed out. Although you can speak Huayu...you will be able only to speak it but not write it, eh? You will be able to speak it but you won't be able to write it, everyone will be able to speak it but not write it. The most important is writing. If you can't write it, being able to speak it is no use, right? You see in the streets, for example, street signs, street names, and... or if you go to a department, or to the airport, isn’t it English that is mainly used?

Interviewer: Isn’t Chinese used at the airport?

Informant: No, No. At Changi Airport not any more, they all use mainly English. Huayu is, in the future will be pushed out. So I say, if you can speak Huayu but cannot write it, it is useless, isn’t it? This is a big problem.

No systematic and quantifiable linguistic differences were found between the first two parts of the interview, the first part where the informants answered questions relevant to their social identity and language repertoire and the section in which the informants were encouraged to express opinions on a number of issues. There is,
however, sometimes a quantifiable difference in the informants behaviour on some of the phonological variables between the "talking" sections of the interviews and the "reading aloud" sections of the interviews. In terms of register, this represents a difference in mode, i.e. related to the role of the language in the situation (Halliday 1978). Taking Labov's notion that the "reading aloud" mode forms a context in which the maximum amount of attention is paid to speech and in which more "prestige" variants are likely to be elicited (Labov 1970), a \textit{mode} factor group consisting of the factors \textit{talking} and \textit{reading} is used in the variable rule analyses (Chapters Nine to Twelve).

5.3.3 The "Outsider" as Interviewer

The language of a recorded interview reflects in its tenor (using the term following Halliday 1978) the relationships among participants just as any other text or piece of discourse does. Much attention has been paid in the literature to the likely differing effects of having an interviewer who is an "outsider" and having an interviewer who is an "insider" (see, for example, Douglas-Cowrie 1978). In the present study, the interviewer as a non-Chinese and a non-Singaporean is most definitely an outsider.

It is necessary to consider how this might effect the language elicited. General observation suggests that
many (particularly younger) speakers of Singapore Huayu when talking with speakers of more standard varieties of Mandarin from outside Singapore are able to use certain standard phonological features they would not normally use with other Singaporeans. Evidence suggests, however, that the variety of language used by the interviewer might be a crucial factor in eliciting such variants. For example, Ng (1985) in a quantitative study of use of retroflex initials by 10 Singaporean students elicited a much higher percentage of retroflexes than in the present study (see 7.2.1). However, as Ng herself puts it:

When a Singaporean speaks to another Singaporean in a non formal conversational situation, relatively fewer retroflexes are used. In this experiment, the Singapore Mandarin interviewer deliberately used retroflexes during the interviews. Several subjects did comment on this fact. In this case, the interlocutor-interviewer effect could have induced a higher percentage of retroflexes.

(Ng 1985:36)

The interviewer in the present study speaks a variety of Mandarin marked as "foreign" (so I am told by Singapore friends). The most salient non-native features seem to be certain intonation patterns, occasional mistakes in lexical tone and a tendency to have weaker aspiration in aspirated plosives than native speakers. A few of he interviewees did comment on my pronunciation. One said
that my intonation (yǐndiǎo) was "sometimes too high" and two others commented that my Mandarin was "better" or "more correct" than theirs. This latter comment seems to suggest that there could be features in my Mandarin which are "too standard" than would be appropriate for speech among Singaporeans. However, analysis of my pronunciation as used during the recorded interviews shows, for example, that initial retroflex consonants are as rare as in Singapore Huayu in general. This was not a deliberate policy but reflects years of living in Singapore (I studied Mandarin at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London, but only achieved any kind of spoken competence in the language whilst in Singapore) and perhaps unconscious accommodation to the speech of the interviewees. Erization (see 7.2.2) is similarly rare, 른 before ì tends not to be palatal (see 7.2.5), זכ rarely has audible velar friction (see 7.2.3) and there is frequently no labiovelar glide following in syllables such as tuo and duo (see 7.2.6), although I do tend to have a labiovelar glide after ï (or ɔ̌). I also use Singapore lexis such as bāshā ("basar" or "market"), bāshì ("bus") and the term Huáyú itself.

All of the above features can be considered part of a general de-facto spoken norm for Singapore Huayu (see Chapter Seven) However, in terms of the more variable features, I consistently use the standard or standard like variants of the variables (ũ), (r), (ng), rusheng and (n) (Chapters Nine to Thirteen) and do not use
nonstandard particles such as 1a (Chapter Fourteen). Thus, the variety of Mandarin used by the interviewer is much closer to an educated Singapore Huayu than to standard Putongua and as such is perhaps less likely to have elicited an "outsider's" variety of Mandarin.

Further evidence that the speech elicited in the interviews was not in any way atypical of the varieties of Huayu used when Singaporeans speak with Singaporeans comes from the evaluation tests (Chapter Eight). Of the 156 comments made on the samples, only two can perhaps be interpreted as referring to something "unnatural" or "atypical" about the samples. Both these comments were (more or less): "She speaks like a teacher". However, both comments were made of sample 3 in the test, the speaker of which is indeed a teacher and in fact was not interviewed as part of the main sample but as part of the "Huayu Specialists" group (see 6.6.1). Comments on other samples by the judges include things such as "Average - on the street Mandarin"; "An average worker type"; "A typical Singapore Chinese" and "She speaks like a normal person".
CHAPTER SIX

THE PRESCRIBED STANDARD AND ITS STATUS

This chapter is about the prescribed standard for Huayu in Singapore - how it is defined and how it relates to Putonghua in China and Guoyu in Taiwan. It is also about perceptions of and attitudes towards this standard in Singapore. It is a truism of sociolinguistics that people do not speak exactly how they think they speak and still less how they think they ought to speak. Nevertheless, some acceptance by speakers of the prescribed standard as a desirable and practical target norm would seem to be a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for greater adoption of features of this standard. Direct questioning of informants can also provide evidence of what nonstandard linguistic features are sufficiently salient to be overtly commented upon.

6.1 The Development of a Standard for Spoken Chinese

6.1.1 Guanhua and Guoyu

Whilst Guānhuá, literally "Officials' Language" more usually called "Mandarin", had for a long time been an informal lingua franca amongst imperial officials in China, the search for a national standard for the spoken language did not really begin until after the Republican
Revolution of 1911. A Conference on the Unification of Pronunciation was convened in Beijing in 1913 and after heated argument it was resolved that the national standard should be based upon Mandarin (for an entertaining summary of the arguments see Ramsay 1987). However, it was not until 1919 that a Dictionary of National Pronunciation (Guoyin Cidian) was published. This dictionary gave the pronunciation of characters (zi) using a system of phonetic notation derived from characters. This notation came to be called Zhuyin Fuhao "Phonetic Symbols" and is still in use today, particularly in Taiwan.

However, the Guoyin Cidian did not solve the problem of a national standard pronunciation. The dictionary did not set down the pronunciations of any variety of Mandarin actually spoken. It was, in fact, an artificial pronunciation which preserved features which have been lost in most Mandarin dialects, for example rusheng (see Chapter Twelve). For some time, the National Language of China had only one speaker - the linguist Y.R. Chao - who was commissioned to make a set of records illustrating this pronunciation (see Chao 1976). Finally, however, in 1932 the National Language Unification Commission published the Vocabulary of National Pronunciation for Everyday Use (Guoyin Changyong Zihui) which marked each character (zi) according to its pronunciation in Beijing dialect.
6.1.2 Putonghua

Despite the publication of the *Guoyin Changyong Zihui* arguments over the national standard continued until the "Academic Conference on the Normalization of Modern Chinese" (Xi`andai Hanyu Guifan Wenti Xueshu Huivy) convened in 1955, six years after the founding of the Peoples Republic of China. This conference resolved that the standard language or Putonghua ("Common" or "General Language", the term which from then on superceded Guoyu in China) should be based upon:

1. The pronunciation of Beijing dialect (Beijinghua).

2. The grammar and lexis of the northern Chinese dialects (Beifanghua), with exemplary works of Modern Chinese Colloquial (Baihua) Literature providing the grammatical model.

The choice of these criteria is not particularly surprising. Beijing has been the political and cultural centre of China for at least seven hundred years and Beijing pronunciation had been the basis of the old Guanhua and of the Guoyu promoted by the Republican government. The northern dialects do not differ much in grammar and lexis and are spoken by over 70% of the Chinese speaking (Han) population of China (Zhan 1981). Moreover, any literature in Baihua ("plain speech" or
"colloquial language") written over the last four or five hundred years nearly always uses a grammar and lexis based on the northern Chinese dialects (Wang 1956).

6.2 Flexibility or "Fuzziness" in the Standard for Putonghua

6.2.1 Pronunciation

By and large the criterion for the standard pronunciation is fairly well defined, although the standard is, of course, evolving in that as Beijing pronunciation changes, so will the standard pronunciation. There are, however, three areas in which there is a small amount of "fuzziness" in drawing the line between what is and what is not to be considered standard. One feature about which there has been some controversy is what is sometimes called "erization" or -r suffixation (see Chao 1968:228-236). The consensus appears to be that the very great use of erization common in colloquial Beijing speech is not appropriate to the standard language. However, erization should generally be retained where there is a meaning difference between an "erized" and a plain form (for more details see 7.2.2 and Barnes 1977).

Another small area of fuzziness in the pronunciation norm is in the extent of qǐngshēng or toneless syllables. Again the consensus appears to be that the extent of qǐngshēng characteristic of Beijing dialect need not be
insisted upon but that the feature should be retained where a meaning difference is involved. Both erization and qǐngshēng will be further discussed in Chapter Seven.

Finally, there is the question of words which are pronounced in two or more ways even within Beijing dialect. In 1957, 1959 and 1962 three tables of Words with Variant Readings Examined (Draft) were published. The work of examining such variant pronunciations was resumed in 1982 (for more details see Zhou 1986). This area of "fuzziness" in the standard pronunciation will not concern us much in this thesis, except to note a few pronunciations occasionally occurring in Singapore Huayu that seem similar to alternate Beijing pronunciations which are no longer recognized as standard (see p.339).

6.2.2 Grammar

The standard grammar is also fairly well defined, as the northern dialects do not differ a great deal in their grammar, although again there may be some fuzzy areas where the standard language is being influenced by a particular southern dialect grammatical feature (see, for example, 7.3.1.4).
6.2.3 Lexis

It is in the area of lexis that the standard allows greatest flexibility. The criterion for the standard lexicon as stated above rather begs the question. Further clarifications have made it clear that, while the lexicon of Beijing dialect as the representative dialect of Beifanghua is to be the basis of the Putonghua lexicon, certain Beijing localisms are to be rejected in favour of more widely understood terms. It has also often been stated that the standard vocabulary should be prepared to accept useful items not only from other dialects, but also from the classical language and from foreign languages. For example, Xiandai Hanyu (Modern Chinese) published in Beijing in 1963 states:

Pǔtōnghuà yìfāngmiàn dàliáng xǐshòu gèdì fāngyán zhōng fùyu bǐoxiànliè cíyǔ hé gǔdài wàilái de cíyǔ, yìfāngmiàn pāi chǐ shǎoshú běijīng fāngyán suǒ tèyóu de cíyǔ. Zěi jiù shìde pǔtōnghuà néng chāoyuè gè fāngyán zhīshàng, bǐ rènhé fāngyànde nèiróng dōu fēngfù, bǐ rènhé fāngyán dōu gèng fùyu bǐoxiànliè.

(Putonghua on the one hand absorbs a great many words rich in expressiveness from different dialects as well as ancient and foreign words and on the other hand rejects a small number of words restricted to Beijing dialect. This
makes Putonghua able to transcend the dialects, to be richer in content than any dialect and to be more expressive than any dialect.)

(Beijing Daxue 1963:4)

This clearly allows for a flexible and evolving norm in the area of lexis.

6.3 The Practical Embodiment of Standard Putonghua

The pronunciation used by announcers of Beijing radio is often cited as a practical guide to the standard pronunciation. In addition, the Pinyin system of romanisation of the standard language which has superceded the Zhuyin Fuhao in China, is widely used as a teaching aid and is used to indicate the pronunciation of characters in dictionaries published in China (and Singapore).

Dictionaries published in China such as Xiandai Hanyu Cidian (Dictionary of Modern Chinese) are taken as convenient references for the standard lexis (as well as pronunciation). This dictionary, published in 1977, organizes entries according to Pinyin romanization and, for example, marks as kǒu items considered "colloquial" and as fāng items considered to be "dialectal". However, as stated above, the norm in this area is rather
flexible and evolving. To keep up with current terminology it is necessary to refer to sources such as national newspapers and the latest works of literature being published in China, most of which ordinary Singaporeans do not have access to.

6.4 Putonghua in China Today

Considerable headway has been made in China in popularizing Putonghua throughout the non-Mandarin speaking areas of southern China. As Ramsay comments:

Throughout the South an increasing number of ordinary people, adults as well as children, are becoming familiar with Putonghua and are even able to speak it. Recent visitors to South China have noted that it is now possible in almost any Southern city to shop, buy tickets, or ask directions using only the standard language. With it, it is even possible, they say, to strike up conversations in the streets. As any old hand will attest, this is a far cry from prerevolutionary China, where any outsider who did not know the local dialect would quickly find himself hopelessly lost.

(Ramsay 1987:29)

However, in such a large and linguistically diverse country as China, there are inevitably considerable
divergences in the Putonghua spoken in many areas from the prescribed standard. Ramsay also notes that:

In North China, this policy has been of little or no consequence. Broad discrepancies from the Peking norm are tolerated as acceptable variations in the Common Language, and people who speak natively any dialect of Mandarin have simply continued to use the same speech patterns that they have always used.

(Ramsay 1987:27)

In non-native Mandarin speaking areas where Putonghua is learned as a second dialect (or language), the local dialects inevitably have an influence and local varieties of Putonghua appear to be developing. James Wrenn, a member of a delegation of American linguists who visited China in 1974 writes:

..... it would seem from our very unsystematic observations that except for some sociolinguistic groups (some university professors, some female high school teachers of Chinese trained in Peking, and female guides at museums and exhibition halls), the phonological criterion is under stress. The other two (grammar of Northern Chinese and modern colloquial vocabulary) seem to be maintaining nicely. But it would seem that the final result of the popularization process will
result in a Putonghua which will have eliminated the final nasal distinction, the retroflex initial distinctions and some unpredictable shifts in either n/l or r/l initial distinction, or perhaps both, and perhaps some equally unpredictable shifts in the tonal system, that may merely reflect some particular items. (Wrenn 1975:226).

However, not everyone agrees about the likely result of the popularization process. In a review of the published findings of the delegation (Lehmann ed. 1975), Liao comments that:

It follows naturally that many regional varieties of Putonghua have developed. Nevertheless, in contrast to the contributors predictions, my guess is that the retroflex-dental distinction will be maintained in the emerging common language, though it will take a few generations to gain a footing in the regional varieties (Liao 1977b:138)

Whatever may be the outcome of the popularization process of Putonghua in China, all of the divergences from the prescribed standard mentioned by Wrenn are also to be found in Singapore Huayu, as we shall see in the following chapters.
6.5 Guoyu in Taiwan

6.5.1 The Standard

In Taiwan, the older term *Guoyu* "National" or "State Language", continues to be used for the standard language. Like Putonghua in China, the prescribed standard for Guoyu is based upon Beijing dialect. Guoyu has been defined as "the language based on the everyday speech of an educated native speaker of the Peking dialect (one that has had at least secondary education) as the standard" (Hsu 1979:119). There has been some controversy between those who take this as implying that there is little or no difference between Guoyu and Beijing dialect and those who make a clear distinction between Guoyu and Beijing dialect. However, the received opinion appears to be that Guoyu, like Putonghua, does not include certain colloquialisms or localisms characteristic of Beijing dialect, including, as with Putonghua, the extent of erization characteristic of colloquial Beijing speech (see Barnes 1974).

The criterion for standard Guoyu pronunciation differs slightly from that of Putonghua in that it is based upon an earlier norm, that embodied in the *Guoyin Changyong Zihui* first published in 1932. Thus no official account is taken of any changes in Beijing pronunciation since this time. The standard for Guoyu also differs from Putonghua in not explicitly allowing lexical items from
other dialects, from classical literature or borrowings from other languages. Standard Guoyu also, of course, takes no account of the lexical innovations and usages which have followed from the great social and political changes which have taken place in China since 1949. Nevertheless, the differences between Putonghua and Guoyu should not be exaggerated. They are still very much the "same language".

6.5.2 Popularization of Guoyu in Taiwan

Efforts to popularize Guoyu in Taiwan since 1949 seem by and large to have been quite successful. Tse writes that "although there are no official statistics, an estimate that over 95% of the population can now communicate through the National Language, both orally and in writing, would be a conservative one" (Tse 1986:27).

Given that the popularization and development of Guoyu in Taiwan has taken place against the background of the local Taiwanese dialects as well as coming after years of Japanese occupation, it is not surprising that there are differences between the forms of Guoyu used every day in Taiwan and the prescribed standard (see Kubler 1981 and Cheng 1985). Many of these divergences will be referred to in later chapters and compared to similar features in Singapore Huayu.
6.6 The Standard for Singapore Huayu

6.6.1 The "Huayu Specialists" View

The official or prescribed standard for Huayu in Singapore is essentially the same as that for Putonghua in China. That is, it is defined by the criteria set out at 6.1.2 above. However, in order to determine how this might be interpreted in the Singapore context, a number of "Huayu specialists" in Singapore were interviewed. These include Dr. Loo Shaw Chang, Head of the Chinese Language and Research Centre of the National University of Singapore and Chairman of the Mandarin Standardization Committee; Mr. Cheah Cheak Mun, Head of the Chinese Section, Curriculum Development, Singapore Ministry of Education; Mr. Foo Hua Lim, Controller of Radio 3 (Chinese Language Programmes), Singapore Broadcasting Corporation; two teachers of Chinese (Huayu) who had been seconded to work on curriculum development and one secondary school teacher of Chinese as a second [school] language.

The interpretation of comments made by these informants and conclusions drawn from them are, of course, entirely the author's responsibility. It should be pointed out that several of these informants commented that they were giving only personal opinions and, in the area of lexis particularly, they were awaiting the publication of authoritative lists of acceptable items from the
Mandarin Standardization Committee. Nevertheless, these informants clearly represent the kinds of people likely to have great influence on the development and implementation of Standard Huayu in Singapore.

6.6.1.1 Their General View of the Standard

There was general agreement among this group of specialists that the only divergences from the Putonghua standard should be in those areas in which this Standard itself is in fact somewhat fuzzy or flexible, i.e., the extent of "erization" and qingsheng in pronunciation and the acceptance into the lexicon of items not found in Beijing dialect.

6.6.1.2 Erization

It was generally felt that speakers of Singapore Huayu need not attempt to imitate the extent of erization characteristic of Beijing dialect. All agreed that where there was no difference between an erized form and a non-erized form, erization could be dispensed with. Thus, for example, there was no need insist on chàngge r instead of chàngge to sing", or yìduóhuár instead of yì duóhuá "a flower". However, the erization of forms such as yìdiār "a little" and yìkuār "together" should be retained to distinguish them from yìdīăn "one point" or "one o'clock" and yìkùái "one piece" or "one dollar". They also all agreed that the common (at least in Putonghua)
expression *yíhùér* "a while" should retain its erization in Singapore Huayu. Two of the school teachers, however, noted that erization could be and in practice usually was almost entirely avoided by using different expressions with similar meanings, for example *yíxià* for *yíhùér*, *yìdiàn* for *yìdiá* and *yìgí* for *yìkùär*.

6.6.1.3 Lexis

All agreed that some divergences from the standard lexicon of Putonghua could be allowed or even encouraged. These could include borrowings from Southern Chinese dialects and from the other languages spoken in Singapore. However, all also expressed the need for standardizing such terminology and eliminating many of the nonstandard terms used in colloquial Singapore Huayu. Each of the informants in this group were asked which items on a list of non (Putonghua) standard terms that Singapore speakers had been recorded using they would consider suitable for inclusion as part of the local standard. All agreed that loanwords such as *lāsā* "laksa", *shādiè* "satay" and *bādí* "batik" which refer to things in the local environment for which standard equivalents do not exist could be accepted (all three are from Malay, the first two food items, the last a type of cloth). So too could loanwords which have wide currency in Singapore such as *bāshā* "market" (from Malay), *bāshì* bus", *déshì* "taxi", *lúolìcē* "lorry" and *bāxíàn*.
"percent" (all from English) despite the fact that standard Putonghua equivalents do exist.

Terms such as bi̋ la "pick up truck" (from English), a term which is used in the dialects and written (as 福 ) in contexts such as newspaper advertisements but seldom heard in Huayu speech in its fully "Huayu-ized" form (i.e., adapted to Huayu phonology, see p4oq ), were rejected by all the informants.

There was less agreement over borrowed or calque expressions from the dialects. All but one rejected dà lì rén "big shot" (from Hokkien) as "dialect" and unacceptable. Three felt that bāi wū lóng "to make a silly mistake" (from Cantonese/Hakka) was acceptable, two felt that it was rather colloquial but not completely unacceptable and one felt that it was a dialect term and therefore completely unacceptable. Similarly, chē dà pào "to boast, to talk big" (from Cantonese) was felt by three to be colloquial, but acceptable outside of formal contexts, and by three to be an unacceptable dialect expression. This will clearly continue to be the area of greatest "fuzziness" in the developing Singapore standard.

According to Dr. Loo Shaw Chang, Chairman of the Mandarin Standardization Committee, the basic principles that the Committee applies are that if there is a standard term used in China for a term used in Singapore, the committee
will seek to introduce the former term. However, certain terms widely used in Singapore have the advantage of being shorter or simpler than the standard Putonghua equivalents and might be considered for inclusion in the Singapore Huayu lexicon, for example the English loanword bāshì "bus" for Putonghua gōnggòngqìche and diànnǎo literally "electric brain" for Putonghua diànzǐ jīsuànjī "computer". Where an appropriate term did not exist in the Putonghua lexicon, a term used locally might be introduced and if it met with positive feedback included in the final recommendations of the committee.

In 1980 this Committee issued a booklet entitled Food Items Commonly Found in Hawker Centres and Food Markets including the recommended standardized terms for 415 food items in characters and Pinyin, as well as in English and the principal Chinese dialects. In October 1983, it was reported that the Committee had also compiled a list of 1000 non-food terms commonly used in Singapore and were in the process of checking dictionaries and other reference books to discover which of the terms were also in use in places such as China, Taiwan and Hong Kong. Recommendations would eventually be released, feedback gained and final recommendations made after reconsideration (Straits Times 8/10/83).
Both Beijing Radio and dictionaries from China such as the *Xiandai Hanyu Cidian* (Modern Chinese Dictionary), published in 1977, were mentioned as authoritative sources for the standard norm. However, as Singaporeans had no access to Beijing Radio, it was felt that the Huayu speaking announcers of the Singapore Broadcasting Corporation were acceptable models for Singapore speakers of Huayu.

A high standard is expected of such announcers. Candidates fail the voice test used in the recruitment of announcers if, for example, they fail to correctly distinguish retroflex from dental initials (see 7.2.1), use tones wrongly, including having lexical tone where the the standard requires *qingsheng* (see 7.2.7), or are unable to correctly read Pinyin. Although it was recognized that inevitably some traces of "dialect accent" remained, it was felt by the specialists that announcers generally achieved a standard of Huayu very close to standard Putonghua (much closer to the Beijing based standard than American and Australian English is to British English, as one informant put it). A small amount of local lexis is used in broadcasting, generally following the principles mentioned at 6.6.1.3 above. For example, very widely used and fully integrated items such as *bāshì* "bus", *dēshì* "taxi" and *gūbèn* "[parking] coupon" are used in radio broadcasts. Announcers are
also expected to follow the principles outlined above in using "erization", e.g., forms such as yíhüèr and yídiàr must be "erized", although alternatives such as yìdīǎndīǎn are acceptable.

Teaching materials are another source of standard models. Again, the principles described above apply to the development of such materials. Thus, some local lexical items such as bāshì "bus", déshì "taxi" and luólíché "lorry" are currently used in local school textbooks (although the "rulings" of the Mandarin Standardization Committee are awaited) but not dialect calques such as bāiwùlóng "to make a silly mistake". Dictionaries used by school students, although locally published, are based upon dictionaries published in China. Considerable use is also made of Pinyin romanization and recordings of the standard pronunciation. Teachers of Chinese are also sent in batches for retraining in the standard pronunciation so that they might present a more standard model of pronunciation to their students (inevitably, with rather mixed results, see comment p.165)

6.6.1.5 The Practicality of the Prescribed Standard

Each informant in the specialists group was asked how difficult he or she felt it would be for Singaporeans to master all features of the prescribed standard, whether there were any features it would be unnecessary or
impossible to master and how far the Huayu presently used
every day in Singapore differed from the standard. All
but two agreed that the standard as defined was a
feasible norm for speakers of Huayu and that it contained
no feature that Singaporeans should not or could not
eventually master.

The two differing opinions came, perhaps significantly,
from teachers (one currently teaching, one seconded to
work on Curriculum Development). Whilst recognizing
that the "real" standard was based upon Beijing
dialect, one of these two said that:

Women méiyǒu bānfā qù gēn běijīngde, nàxié
běijīnghuà lái bǐ. Nǐ nénggōu jiāngde liúlǐ,
nǐde yòngcí qiàdāng, nà wǒ juédé zhèishi
biǎozhǔn.

(There is no way we can match ourselves with
Beijing, the Beijing speech. If you can speak
fluently, with proper wording, then I think
that's standard.)

She went on to explain that, in her opinion, the most
serious fault of Singapore speakers was their tendency
to mix English and sometimes Malay into their Huayu, and
that this should be strongly discouraged among school
students. However, if, for example, a student said [tsi]
for Standard [ʈʂʰi] (i.e. dental instead of retroflex
place) or [si] for standard [ɕi] (i.e., dental instead
of palatal) this could not really be regarded as a mistake. The other teacher felt that whilst Singapore speakers might one day master the standard pronunciation, it would be very difficult to ever get general use of initial retroflexion. In having such reservations, they thus differed slightly from the other informants in this group, who all stated that there could be and need be no compromise on the criterion for the standard pronunciation.

Aside from this, there were also small differences among the informants in this group in their assessments of the difficulties to be overcome in reaching the target of a standard pronunciation. The non (school) teachers were, in general, somewhat more optimistic. They felt that outside the school system many people were making serious efforts to improve their pronunciation and that within the school system many secondary school students (and recent graduates from secondary schools) had mastered a variety of Huayu substantially more standard than that spoken by previous generations. This was even more true of the present generation of primary school students. Whilst some recognized that the Huayu pronunciation of many teachers of Chinese diverged quite considerably from the standard, the periods of retraining, the emphasis on Pinyin and the use in the classroom of recordings of standard speech was felt to be going a long way towards solving the problem.
As mentioned above, the school teachers tended to be a little less sanguine. One commented that the periods of training in Pinyin and the standard pronunciation often had little lasting effect on the pronunciation of the participating teachers. This was partly because the courses were too short and partly because many teachers were reluctant to suddenly change the way they spoke for fear of being laughed at. Another commented that with the encouragement for parents to use Huayu at home, students were being influenced by the nonstandard Huayu of their parents. All three felt that it would be a long time (if ever) before certain features of the standard such as retroflex initials were in general use.

6.6.2 Views of the Standard in the Press

Generally, the press follow the official line that the standard for Huayu must be basically exonormative and essentially the same as that for Putonghua. However, differing viewpoints occasionally surface. For example, "visiting expert" Professor Robert L. Cheng was reported as calling for Singapore to develop its own brand of Mandarin and quoted as saying that:

A society where people regard their own things as inferior and thus try to conform with the standards of others is not healthy. When you
reach a certain standard of development you
should accept your own language and set your own
standards.

(Straits Times 10/10/81)

Seven days later, five Singaporeans were reported as
rejecting this suggestion. Ho Kah Leong, Parliamentary
Secretary (Education) was quoted as saying:

Singapore cannot develop its own brand of
Mandarin that may not be understood
internationally, otherwise we could be isolated.
We must set a standard for teaching purposes so
that even if we achieve 80 per cent success, we
are not far off the standard.

(Straits Times 17/10 81).

In the same article, Dr. Loo Shaw Chang, director of the
Chinese Language and Research Centre of the National
University of Singapore and Chairman of the Mandarin
Standardization Committee, was reported as saying that
Singapore should not deliberately develop its own brand
of Mandarin but should try to minimise the local
elements, and Ban Soon Wan, President of the Singapore
Association of Teachers of Chinese as a Second Language,
was reported as saying that Singapore must conform to
the basic vocabulary of standard Huayu. "Commonly used
local terms may enrich Mandarin, but this does not mean
that Singapore should create its own brand of the language."

The difference between Professor Cheng and the official Singapore view of the standard may be more apparent than real. Whilst the Singaporeans clearly reject the view that there could be an endonormative standard, in terms of the actual linguistic features that Singapore speakers should aim at, the area of disagreement does not seem to be very great. The erization and *qìngshēng* of Beijing pronunciation are two features which Professor Cheng is reported to have said were unnecessary for Singaporeans to imitate and, as has been mentioned above, both of these are areas where it is agreed that the Singapore standard might diverge from Beijing pronunciation (though the prescribed standard would retain some erization and *qìngshēng*). The only lexical item mentioned in the article as acceptable in Professor Cheng's view is the term *bāshā* "market". Whilst it is not yet certain whether the Mandarin Standardization Committee will "allow" this term, as mentioned above, it was felt to be an acceptable item by all informants in the Specialists Group.

A view of the desirable standard differing in the other direction was expressed by Professor Robert Chang Hsiao from Taiwan's National Normal University previous to leaving Singapore after nine months as an advisor to the Ministry of Education. He called on Singapore speakers
not only to strive for standard Huayu pronunciation but also to eliminate from their speech such local terms as luódi "bread", gānbāng "kampong" or "village", bāshā "market", bāshì "bus", déshì "taxi" and so on for which there were appropriate standard terms and to use locally coined terms only when no standard term existed (Straits Times 24/3/81, Nanyang Siang Pau 25/3/81). This is clearly a more restrictive view of the standard than that espoused by the Singapore Huayu Specialists Group.

Occasionally, there has been recognition that insistence on the mastery of the standard might be counterproductive to the aim of promoting wider use of Huayu. For example, in October 1983 Ch'ng Jit Koon, the Senior Parliamentary Secretary (Prime Minister's Office), was reported as calling for the emphasis to be on "quantity before quality".

Among the Chinese in Singapore, he said, were older folk who did not have much education and those who had studied only English in colonial days. Pegging standards too high in the Mandarin drive would discourage these people and make them feel embarrassed about not being able to speak the language fluently and with the right accent, he said. The quality aspect could be promoted
only after a start has been made, said Mr. Ch'ng, so that the Chinese could speak Mandarin and speak it well.

(Straits Times 12/10/83)

In general, then, any public discussions about the appropriate prescribed standard for Huayu in Singapore have been restricted to arguments over the extent of "erization" (if any) and qingsheng that needs to be encouraged and how much local lexis should be retained. The assumption that all of the other major features of the exonormative standard (i.e., those of standard Putonghua) could and should be used by all Singapore speakers, with the possible exception of those of the older generation, is not usually publicly questioned.

6.6.3 Perceptions of Standard Huayu by "Laymen"

The responses of the 46 informants used for the main study to certain questions in the interviews will now be considered in order to gain some indication of attitudes towards and perceptions of the prescribed standard by non-specialist speakers of Singapore Huayu.

All the informants were asked what they thought was the best or most correct kind of Mandarin and whether or not Singaporeans should try to speak Huayu the way it was spoken in Beijing or Taiwan. They were also asked how they felt about the view that it did not really matter
how people spoke Huayu so long as they understood one another. Finally they were asked about what (if anything) they thought was wrong with the way they themselves spoke Huayu and with the way Singaporeans in general spoke the language. It is perhaps an indication of the great publicity and high public profile given to issues of language policy and language education in Singapore that all but two of the 46 interviewees had clear opinions on these issues.

6.6.3.1 What is the Best or most Correct Mandarin?  
The range of answers to this issue can be summarized as follows:

19% (i.e., 8 out of the 43 informants who expressed opinions on this issue): Beijing Mandarin represents the best, the most correct or most standard Mandarin and Singapore speakers ought to try to learn it. For example:

Wo xiǎng nǐ yào jiāng huá yǔ jiù jiāngde bǐjiào zhǔn a, bǐjiào háo tīng. Běijīng qiāng háo tīng.

(I think that if you want to speak Mandarin, then you should speak [Mandarin which is] comparatively correct, comparatively pleasant to listen to. The Beijing accent is pleasant to listen to.)
Of the 8 informants whose responses fell into this category, 2 said that it would be possible only for the younger generation to learn Beijing Mandarin. It was already too late for speakers of their generation (one in her 40's, one in her 50's).

7% (3 informants): Taiwan Mandarin is a more suitable model for Singapore speakers than Beijing Mandarin. For example:

Wǒ juédé wǒmen bù yīnggāi fǎng tāmen, yīnwei tāmende huàyǔ, hǎoxiǎng, tīngqǐlái hěn cìer, zhéiyàng a. Suǒyì rúguǒ xīnjīāpō rén yào xué huàyǔ wǒ kàn zuì hǎo shì xué tāiwān, yīnwei tāiwānde huàyǔ yǐjīng hé wǒmen chàbùduō hěn jiējìn a.

(I think that we ought not to imitate them [=Beijing speakers], because their Mandarin, like, when you hear it it is very harsh. So if Singaporeans want to learn Mandarin we would do best to learn Taiwan [Mandarin] because Taiwan Mandarin is already quite close to ours.)

16% (7 informants): Beijing Mandarin represents the most standard or most correct Mandarin, but for some reason it is not suitable or possible for Singaporeans to learn it or imitate it. For example:
Beijing is the most standard, but in Singapore I think that it is very hard to learn it. We are a society of southerners here, Fujian, Guangdong, Fujian province, Guangdong province and so on ... the Mandarin we have been taught and have spoken for decades...is that passed down to us by these people. Naturally we got into the habit of [using] our own Mandarin. I think that our Mandarin is very different from Beijing Mandarin.)

Beijing Mandarin of course the most correct..... we don't need to imitate their
[Mandarin]. Each place has its own language content. You can’t be one hundred percent the same as people in Beijing.)

40% (17 informants): There is no need for Singaporeans to learn or imitate someone else’s Mandarin or to take its standards from outside. This kind of answer is, in effect, not much different from those of the 16% mentioned above. For example:

Shēnwèi xīnjiāpō rén yìnggǎi shì rénwèi xīnjiāpō huáyǔ zuì hǎo la. Yīnwei tāmen shì xīqū gè fāngmiàn de zúihǎode jīnghuà... ránhòu rónghuà chéngwèi xīnjiāpō běnshèndé yǔyuán, suǒyì yìnggǎi shì, yìnggǎi shì zúihǎode.

(As Singaporeans we should recognise Singapore Mandarin as the best. Because they have...absorbed the very best essence of all aspects...and then blended it into a language of Singapore’s very own, so it should be, should be [regarded as] the best.)

(Singapore Mandarin has its own way of speaking. As for the Beijing accent, it sounds rather harsh, not very pleasant. [Interviewer: How about Taiwan's?] I think it is best if everyone has their own style. It's not necessary to learn other people's.)

However, all of the 17 informants answering in this way went on to reject the proposition that correctness is unimportant so long as one is understood. They therefore had some notion of an internal standard. When asked whose Mandarin could serve as a model of correct Mandarin within Singapore, some cited the Singapore broadcasting Corporation, a couple cited the Mandarin taught in schools and used by teachers of Chinese and some did not give clear answers.

21% (9 informants): It does not matter much about correctness so long as you are understood. For example:

Wo rènwei ruǒu jiǎngde mīngbái jiù kěyǐ la.

Bú yòng shuō yǐnggài xué tāmende.

(I think that it is alright so long as you are understood. There's no need to say that we should learn theirs.)
Thus only about 1/4 of the informants (11 out of 43) felt that Singapore speakers should and could adopt an external (Beijing or Taiwan based) variety as their standard or target norm. The remaining 3/4 felt it was either unnecessary or impractical for Singaporeans to adopt an external model for their Huayu.

6.6.3.2 Recognition of Different Norms

Some of the informants were also quite explicit about their recognition of two norms - the standard and the way they speak (and had no intention of changing, at least when speaking with other Singaporeans). For example:
Haoxiāng "[s₁]" a, "wǒ [s₁] huáren" de "[s₁]".

Xianzài wǒ shì nián "[s₁]" a, bùguǒ tāde zhèngquè de fāyīn shì "[ʃə]", "wǒ [ʃə] huáren"... .... Yǐnwei můqián a, xīnjiāpō na xīe xuéshēng xué huáyǔ a ..... wǒmen zhǐ shì,

háoxiāng wǒ zhèiyàng a, tàmen suībiàn jiāngchulai, zhǐyào tàde zìjū zhèngquè a, rènjīa tīngde qīngchu, wǒ jiù kēyi a. Bǐrú shuō nǐ xiānzài jiào tàmen liánxì nà zhòng zhèng...zhèi zhòng fāyīn a, tàmen huí juédè, háoxiāng, hén máfàn zhèiyàng, yǐnwei jiào wǒ běnshēn, wǒ yè shì zhèiyàng, wǒ, háoxiāng, hén máfàn zhèiyàng, háoxiāng shì bù shúnkòu.

(Like [s₁], the [s₂] in "Wo [s₂] huaren [=I am Chinese]." I am pronouncing it as [s₁], "wo [s₁] huaren", but its correct pronunciation is "[ʃə]", "wo [ʃə] huaren" .... Because at present, students learning Mandarin in Singapore, we just, like, they speak anyhow, as long as the wording is correct and others can understand, then it is alright as far as I am concerned. Like, if you ask them to practise the right....this sort of pronunciation, they will feel, like, it's a lot of trouble, because if you asked me to do it, I'd be the same. I, like, would find it a lot of trouble, awkward to speak.)
In addition, Several informants showed explicit recognition that norms had changed or were changing. For example:

Women zheiyidai ren jiăngde huayu gen xianzaide xiao haizi jiăng huayu jiu yidian butong, yinwei women you xie yin haiishi bugou zhun, meiyou xuédào pinyin.

(The Mandarin spoken by those of my generation [a 45 year old] is a little different from that spoken by children today, because we have some sounds which are not standard enough, we haven’t learned Pinyin.)
They [my children] always criticise me for not being able to speak the correct Mandarin of their teacher. But I reckon it's good enough, it'll do.

6.6.3.3 What is Wrong with the Mandarin Spoken in Singapore?

By far the most common comment in this area was that Singapore speakers are too fond of mixing elements from other languages or dialects into their Mandarin. For example:

Women bu xiăoxīn dehùa, tongchăng wŏmende yúyán lǐmian hùi yǒu hěn duō măláihuà a, chăngjià făngyăn....

(If we are not careful, in our language there is often a lot of Malay, mixing in of dialect ....)

Women de Huáyu shì chăngchăn dèe (Our Huayu is all mixed)

Xīnjiăpōde huáyu yè shì, jiăngqĭláí tíngqĭláí chăngdèe hěn duō zhōng yúyuăn xiăqu. Zhuyì tíng
dehua, youshi chan malaihua yi liang ju a,
guangdong hua, fujianhua ye shi you chan
yidianidian.

(Singapore Mandarin is also, when you speak it
when you hear it there is mixed in many
languages. If you listen carefully, [you can]
sometimes [hear] a couple of phrases of Malay, a
little Cantonese and Hokkien also gets mixed in.)

"Accent" was mentioned, although much less often than
"mixing". For example:

Yixie xuesheng tamen jiangde huayu hen....bu gou
shuishun a. Neing jiang dansi haoxiang you fujian
qiang a, huoshi guangdong qiang.

(Some students they speak Mandarin very.... not
up to standard. They can speak but for example
they have a Hokkien accent or a Cantonese
accent.)

The only specific linguistic features mentioned as being
wrong in Singapore Mandarin (by just three informants)
are final particles. For example:

Woman shuode huayu bing bu shi biaozhun. Woman,
youshi xiao haizi tanhua deshihou, hen duo,
naixie bu byaode weiyan.
(The Mandarin we speak is certainly not standard. We, sometimes when children are talking [they use], many, of those unnecessary final sounds)

When we Singaporeans speak English we use "la" at the end. When we speak Mandarin we also have many such final sounds at the end)

6.7 Conclusion

Generally, the prescribed standard for Huayu in Singapore differs from the prescribed standard for Putonghua in China only in those areas in which the latter is itself flexible or evolving. Most standardization efforts in Singapore have been and continue to be directed towards lexis, the area in which the line between standard and nonstandard is at present most "fuzzy". Officially, at least, there are to be no compromises on the question of the standard pronunciation, and this is felt to be, in the long term at least, a realizable target.

Not surprisingly, "laymen" speakers of Singapore Huayu tend to be less prescriptive than the specialists who are involved in developing and implementing the standard. The majority of the "laymen" informants
rejected the necessity or feasibility of Singapore speakers taking outside models for their spoken Huayu. Thus, in the short term at least, it does not seem likely that there will be a wholesale adoption of the prescribed standard.

The hopes of the prescriptivists may be pinned on the next few generations, beginning with those now in primary school. However, it seems doubtful whether the exposure to the standard variety such students get through the mass media, recordings of standard speakers and so on will be able to fully counteract the nonstandard varieties they will continue to be exposed to both inside the classroom (few teachers are yet able to consistently present a standard model of pronunciation) and outside the classroom.
1. There was not, in fact, complete agreement on this last item. One informant felt that bāxiān should be replaced by the standard Putonghua term bāifènzhi.

2. In this section, for convenience the term Mandarin rather than Huayu, Guoyu and Putonghua will be used as a cover term for all the relevant varieties.
7.1 Introduction

This chapter will look at a number of nonstandard features which are very common in Singapore Huayu. These are features which seem to be relatively invariable (apart from, in some cases, some clearly phonologically constrained variation), both from speaker to speaker and within the speech of the same speaker. In this, they differ from the highly variable features which will be investigated in the chapters which follow.

It is suggested that these nonstandard features have not been much affected by pressure from the prescribed standard. There is little sign that they are less frequent in the speech of younger or more educated speakers or that they have become generally stigmatized. In other words, they are part of a general de-facto norm for speakers of Huayu in Singapore.

In the case of nonstandard features in phonology, the basis for the claim that they do not show significant sociolectal or diachronic variation is simply that (outside certain very restricted groups, for example, broadcasters, some language teachers and others
professionally concerned with the language) speakers of
Huayu in Singapore use them almost categorically, i.e.,
they are seldom, if ever, "replaced" by their standard
equivalents, or at least not in certain phonological
environments. One exception to this is the category of
fewer qingsheng (see 7.2.7 below).

Quite the same cannot be said of the nonstandard features
of grammar looked at in this chapter. It cannot usually
be said, for example, that their standard "equivalents"
are never used by speakers. It has to be remembered that
the concept of an "equivalent" at the level of grammar
may be something quite different from at the level of
phonology (see discussion at 7.3). However, these
nonstandard grammatical features occur in speech
samples from informants of all age groups and educational
levels and, perhaps more importantly, speakers seem
generally unaware that they are nonstandard or in any
sense "incorrect".

There are various possible reasons why the use of certain
nonstandard features might remain unaffected by the
pressure from the prescribed standard. In some cases,
speakers may be simply unaware that a particular feature
of Singapore Huayu differs from the prescribed standard.
As mentioned above, this is often the case with
nonstandard features of grammar. In other cases,
speakers may be aware of the difference but show little
inclination to generally adopt the standard variant,
although they may be able to "switch on" the standard
variant in certain very restricted contexts, such as when taking oral examinations or talking with speakers of more standard varieties from outside Singapore. Sometimes speakers can be quite explicit in their rejection of a particular standard feature as a target norm for Singapore speakers (i.e., it may have acquired a negative social evaluation).

The dividing line between these relatively invariant features and the highly variable features looked at in the following chapters is inevitably somewhat fuzzy. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to attempt a quantitative analysis of all nonstandard features in Singapore Huayu or in the recorded data and therefore allocation of some of these features to one or the other category is inevitably somewhat tentative. It is always possible that further research might discover significant patterns of variation in some of these features that this study has not revealed.

7.2 Nonstandard Phonological Features

The nonstandard phonological features examined below are very common in the speech of all informants recorded for this study regardless of age, level of education or mother tongue. Whilst the standard or near standard variants of such features may occur very sporadically in the speech of some speakers (usually at the very beginnings of interviews or in the reading sections),
such occurrences are insignificant in number compared to the number of occurrences of the nonstandard variants.

These nonstandard phonological features may be divided into those which nearly always "replace" their standard equivalents in all phonological environments (e.g. non-retroflex for standard retroflex initials and [h] for standard [x]) and those which nearly always "replace" their standard equivalents in certain phonological environments only (e.g., lack of labiovelar glide in certain syllable types). The features also differ in the effect they have on the phonological system as a whole, in particular whether they reduce options in particular systems, leading to the potential realization as homophones zi which are heterophones in the standard language, or whether they simply represent differences in the phonetic realizations of certain options. The following nonstandard features of phonology will be examined in this chapter: i) lack of initial retroflexion; ii) lack of final retroflexion; iii) [h] for [x]; iv) [ε̃] for [ε̃]; v) [s] for [ζ]; vi) lack of labiovelar glide in certain environments; vi) fewer gingsheng.

7.2.1 Lack of Initial Retroflexion

The standard pronunciation has a set of syllables beginning with the retroflex consonants [ɛ], [tɛ̃], and [ʂɛ̃] (written sh, ch and zh in Pinyin). In the
syllables shi, chi and zhi (i.e., syllables with initial retroflexion and I height) the retroflexion extends throughout the syllable and Karlgren's symbol [ɻ] is usually used to indicate the retroflex high vowel in these three syllables.

This syllable initial retroflexion is rare in the recorded data and in the speech of Singaporeans in general. 25 of the 46 informants have non-retroflexion categorically in such syllables in which initial retroflexion would be required in the standard pronunciation (the pattern of variation with the initial retroflex consonant written r in Pinyin is more complex and will be dealt with separately in Chapter Ten). The total number of instances of syllables with initial retroflexion in the speech of the other 21 informants is only 37, although the number of potential environments (i.e., zi which have initial retroflexion in the standard language) runs into many thousands. No speaker has more than 5 such occurrences (most have only one or two) and the great majority of such occurrences are near the beginnings of interviews or in the readings of word lists, i.e., in those sections of the interviews in which speakers might be assumed to be paying maximum attention to their speech.

This accords with the general observations of the author that initial retroflexion in Singapore Huayu is generally heard only in the speech of broadcasters and some
teachers of Chinese and is rare in most contexts in which Singaporeans are talking to Singaporeans.

Several of the informants who do occasionally use these consonants also showed hypercorrection, e.g., [ʂʂ] for standard [ʂʂ] in yanse "colour" (an item in the word lists) and [ʂʂ] for standard [ʂʂ] in yisi "idea" or "meaning", thus suggesting confusion over the standard distribution of the retroflexes.

Whilst the lack of retroflexion is a relatively invariant feature in the data, the precise phonetic character of the two affricates and one fricative "replacing" the retroflexes does show some variation. The place of articulation appears to vary from dental to alveolar to post-alveolar and the articulator from apical to laminal. All three show this variation. However, laminal post-alveolar realizations seem much more common with the affricates than the fricative, although the latter do occur. Such realizations might be transcribed [ʃ], [tʃ], and [ʤ] (although they are seldom as retracted as the English sounds usually so transcribed). The more front variants might be transcribed [ʃ], [tʃ] and [ʤ]. In the syllables shi, chi and zhi the lack of retroflexion applies, of course, equally to the following vowel. Thus the distinction normally recognized in phonetic transcriptions of the standard pronunciation between the retroflex high vowel [ɻ] and the non-retroflex high vowel [ɻ] is neutralized.
7.2.1.1 Phonological Implications

The lack of initial retroflexion means that most speakers do not have a regular retroflex versus dental option in the place system. Although, as stated above, speakers do not always use dental realizations where the standard would require retroflex, realizations such as [ʃ], [tʃʰ] and [dʒ] do not serve to maintain a distinction between standard retroflex and dental initials, as the same speakers often have these post-alveolar realizations also for the dental series. Thus, for example, some speakers may pronounce both chong "insect" and cong "from" as [tʃʊŋ] (or [tʃʰʊŋ]), see 11.4.2.3) whilst others may pronounce them both as [tsʰʊŋ] (or [tsʰʊŋ]). Lack of initial retroflexion thus creates many potential homophones for Singapore speakers.

7.2.1.2 Possible Reasons for the Persistence of Lack of Initial Retroflexion

The most obvious reason for the persistence of this nonstandard feature in Singapore Huayu is that retroflexion is a difficult articulatory gesture for Singapore speakers as no such feature exists in the southern dialects. However, some speakers undoubtedly are able to produce initial retroflexion and do so in some very restricted contexts (e.g., when speaking with Mandarin speakers from Northern China or when taking oral
examinations). It is likely that more is involved. Lack of retroflexion may be a general norm for speakers more than simply in the sense that it is generally absent from their speech. Retroflexion also seems to be rejected by many as part of the desirable target norm for Singapore speakers. For example (from a secondary school student):

Like "si", the "si" in "wo si huaren". I am now pronouncing it as "si", "wo si huaren", but its correct pronunciation is "shi", "wo shi huaren". Because at present, students learning Huayu in Singapore, we just, like, they speak anyhow, as long as the wording is correct and others can understand, then it is alright as far as I am concerned. Like, if you now ask them to practise the right ....this sort of pronunciation, they will feel, like, it's a lot of trouble, because if you asked me to do it, I'd be the same. I, like, would find it a lot of trouble, awkward to speak.

In this quotation, si represents the non-retroflex [sl] and shi the retroflex [ʎ]. The original Huayu version of this quotation is given in Pinyin on page 175.

Similarly, although the retroflex v. dental distinction is part of the prescribed standard within the education system, of the three teachers who were part of the "Huayu Specialists" group (see 6.6), two recognized the
difficulty of teaching the distinction and admitted that in practice one could not expect it to be generally mastered.

Such comments clearly indicate that the feature is salient to at least some Singapore speakers. That is, they may be aware of the difference between syllables with initial retroflexion and syllables without it and that the latter are nonstandard or "incorrect". However, they do not necessarily regard the standard retroflex variants as valid targets for Singapore speakers. Other comments to the author by Singapore speakers also suggest that the use of retroflex variants may be evaluated negatively as "putting it on" and regarded as a specifically Beijing pronunciation inappropriate for Singapore speakers. We may thus hypothesize that lack of retroflexion is a feature in the Huayu of most Singaporeans not simply because retroflexion is "difficult" but also because it has become a marker of "foreign-ness" or affectation.

7.2.1.3 Comparison with Other Studies

Chen Chungyu found initial retroflexion to be equally rare in her data (Chen C.Y. 1986). Only 6.3% of the potential retroflex readings examined were realized with retroflexion. However, even this percentage is almost entirely accounted for by retroflex readings from one of her ten informants. All her other informants had non-
retroflexion categorically, except for one case in which a zi was read once without retroflexion and once with it.

Ng (1985) reports findings from a study of variation in these retroflex initials in samples from a group of ten Singapore speakers aged between 20 and 25 and pursuing tertiary education in Australia. Five styles (i.e., in Labov's sense of contexts in which differing degrees of attention are likely to be paid to speech) - "free speech", a read dialogue, word lists, minimal pairs and tongue twisters were investigated. She finds that whilst the retroflex variant of sh "is not very frequent in Singapore Mandarin", it is much more likely to occur than the other two retroflex variants (i.e., [tsʰ] and [ʈʂ]). She also finds sh to be sensitive to style shift, with the lowest percentage of the retroflex variant occurring in the "free speech" style and the highest percentages occurring in minimal pairs and tongue twisters. However, she also finds "increased confusion as the contexts become more formal" (p. 34) and that percentages of hypercorrection (i.e., retroflexion with standard non-retroflex s) increase similarly.

It is interesting that Ng's study should have elicited a generally much higher rate of retroflexion with sh than in the present study or in Chen's study. It is possible that the language of the interviewer may have had something to do with this. As Ng herself states:
From the experimenter's observation, it has been noted that Singapore Mandarin speakers tend to use more retroflexes when speaking to a Peking Mandarin speaker. The subjects have also reported similar observations themselves, saying that in such a situation, they actually feel pressurized into producing retroflexes. When a Singaporean speaks to another Singaporean in a non-formal conversational situation, relatively fewer retroflexes are used. In this experiment, the Singapore Mandarin interviewer deliberately used retroflexes during the interviews. Several subjects did comment on this fact. In this case, the interlocutor - interviewer effect could have induced a higher percentage of retroflexes. (Ng 1985:36).

This, in fact, appears to confirm the hypothesis of the present study that although some speakers may be able to produce initial retroflexion, the feature has not become part of any general norm for Singapore speakers, other than perhaps in very restricted contexts.

7.2.1.4 Comparison with Other Varieties of Mandarin

The Northern (Huabei) and Northwestern Mandarin dialects mostly have initial retroflexion. However, Southwestern Mandarin dialects south of the Yangzi River and the
Jianghuai Mandarin dialects generally lack this feature (Zhan 1981).

Initial retroflexion is also frequently absent or very variable in the Putonghua spoken as a second language or second dialect in other parts of China. Lehmann, for example, comments:

In most areas we visited outside Peking we heard no distinction [between retroflex and dental initial consonants] - or great variability..... We rarely heard a speaker of Wu or Southeastern dialects who had mastered the distinction entirely.....In Canton we found the situation was informally recognized as beyond immediate solution, though some effort was made to teach the distinction, there were many more serious difficulties to overcome in teaching Putonghua.

(Lehmann ed. 1975:34)

Similarly, Ramsay comments:

In Southern dialects, and in some of the North as well, the retroflexes zh, ch and sh are not distinguished from the dental sounds z, c and s.....The problem is always discussed in Chinese schools, but in most places is regarded as insoluable. About the only people in the
provinces who approximate the pronunciation with any consistency are professional speakers, such as announcers and tour guides, and a few educators. The retroflex distinction is officially considered part of the standard language, but in practice most speakers of Putonghua get along without it.

(Ramsay 1987:42-43)

Kubler (1981) similarly notes that in Taiwan Guoyu, speakers also "tend to substitute" dentals for standard retroflex initials. He further comments that:

As a result of much time and effort, many children do learn to pronounce these sounds in slow and careful speech. However, a tendency at such times to overcompensate and retroflex all dentals [...] is evidence that the "psychological reality" of the distinction between the retroflex and non-retroflex classes no longer exists for these speakers.

(Kubler 1981:59)

Thus, whilst initial retroflexion remains part of the prescribed standard for Putonghua in China, Guoyu in Taiwan and Huayu in Singapore, there is nothing unique in
Singapore speakers honouring this more in the breach than the observance.

7.2.2 Lack of Final Retroflexion

7.2.2.1 Final Retroflexion in the Standard Pronunciation

A striking feature of Beijing dialect, particularly colloquial varieties, is the extent of syllable final retroflexion. There are two main types of such retroflexion. Firstly, there is the syllable written er in Pinyin which is in fact a retroflex central vowel, usually with some audible constriction. This may be transcribed phonetically as [ɤ] or [ɔ]. There are, in fact, only four commonly occurring zi of this type: er "child" or "son", ɔr as in ergi "moreover", er "ear" and ɔr "two".

Secondly, there are many zi which, particularly in colloquial Beijing speech, commonly have final vowel retroflex articulation which is usually considered as realizing -r suffixation or erhua "erization". According to Chao (1968), the -r suffix comes from three different etymons: i) li "in" which combines with zhe "this", nà "that" and nà "which" to form the locative deictics and locative interrogative zheli ~ zher "here", nali ~ när "there" and nali ~ när "where". ii) rî "day" used in "forming names of days with reference to the present" (Chao 1968:228-229). For example, jinri ~ jinr "today",
zuòrì ~ zuòr "yesterday" and míngrì ~ míngr "tomorrow".

iii) the so-called "diminutive suffix", originally er "child, son" which now often has no clear diminutive meaning and most frequently acts as a noun marker, with some exceptions, such as the verb wàr "to play" and the adverbs vìdiār "a little", xìkuār "together" and xìhuìr "a moment, a short time".

The extensive erization characteristic of colloquial Beijing dialect is not considered part of the standard pronunciation. However, whilst this is an area in which the criteria are somewhat fuzzy, it is clear that some erization is considered part of the prescribed standard (see 6.6.1.2 and Barnes 1977).

The forms jìnr, zuòr and míngr are not commonly used by speakers of Putonghua, Guoyu or Huayu outside Beijing and the standard equivalents formed with tǐān are perfectly acceptable and generally preferred. The erized forms are in fact marked either fāng "dialect" or kǒu "colloquial" in the Xiandai Hanyu Cidian. In other cases, where a zi has a non-erized and an erized form in Beijing dialect, the non-erized form is normally considered to be standard and is usually preferred. There are also a number of alternate forms in which either the er suffix (i.e., erization) is used or a different suffix such as the "diminutive" suffix zi (e.g., xiǎo háír ~ xiǎo hái zi "Child") or the locative suffix li (e.g., nār ~ nā li "where?"). Both forms seem to be acceptable in the
standard, although the Xiandai Hanyu Cidian marks both of the above erized forms as kòu "colloquial".

However, where there exists no such alternate form (e.g., for yíhùer "a moment") or particularly where there is a meaning difference between an erized and a non-erized form (e.g., yíkùar "together" versus yíkùai "one piece" or "one dollar") erization is required.

7.2.2.2 Final Retroflexion in the Singapore Data

In the recorded interviews, occurrences of the syllable er usually have little or no perceptible retroflexion and are realized by a plain central vowel that might be transcribed [ɔ:].

Erization is also very rare. In fact, there is only one instance of erization - of the locative interrogative när. Erized forms are usually avoided by using different suffixes, where such alternative forms are available in the standard language. The most common such suffixes are lì and biàn for the locatives, for example: nàlì instead of när "there", zhèbiàn instead of zhèr "here" and zì for nouns, for example: háizi instead of hār "child".

Another strategy for avoiding items which should be erized according to the prescribed standard is to use non-erized synonyms. For example, yìgí instead of yíkùar "together", yíxìa instead of yíhùer "a moment" and yìdǐyàndiàn instead of yìdǐar "a little". However, there
are some occurrences of *yidian* without erization, which is definitely nonstandard.

Thus, lack of erization in the speech of the informants only occasionally results in forms which are clearly nonstandard. However, it does give a very different "feel" to spoken Singapore Huayu as compared to standard Putonghua or Guoyu which have a certain amount of erization and even more so to colloquial Beijing speech, with its extensive erization.

7.2.2.3 Possible Reason for the Persistence of Lack of Final Retroflexion

Even more so than initial retroflexion, final retroflexion is generally perceived in Singapore as a stereotypical feature of Beijing speech which it is unnecessary or even an affectation for Singaporeans to imitate. For example:

Yinwei yao jiang beijing qiang yao jingguo yixie xunlian a. Haoxiang beijing qiang limian, ta you yixie "er", "sheme shir", zheyang a, haoxiang, tingde hen bu ziran.

(Because if you want to speak with the Beijing accent, you must have some training. Like in the Beijing accent, there are some "er", "sheme shir", like that, like, which sound very unnatural.)
7.2.2.5 Comparison with Other Varieties of Mandarin

Final retroflexion is not common in the Mandarin dialects. According to Barnes, "erization appears to be absent from the speech of many other Mandarin area speakers" (Barnes 1977:211). It is also very often absent from the Putonghua of many speakers in China with Southern dialect backgrounds. Barnes also notes that in Taiwan the speech of the younger generation "is in no danger of succumbing to erh-ization" and that "there is rarely sufficient time to firmly establish these features. As a result, Mandarin is acquired as a second language without erh-ization." (Barnes 1977:221).

As in Singapore, there appears to be a tendency among Taiwanese speakers to reject as a valid target feature, and even to stigmatize, retroflexion (both initially and finally). Kubler, for example, recalls:

being told by my roommates at a Taiwan university that my Chinese sounded "too feminine". When I asked for specific examples, retroflex sounds and the use of the suffix -er as well as a total lack of expletives were mentioned.

(Kubler 1981:59)
Thus, as with initial retroflexion, there is nothing unique about Singapore Huayu in its de-facto rejection of an erized norm.

7.2.3 \( h \) for Standard \( [x] \) \( (h) \)

In the data, there is rarely any audible velar friction in environments requiring the initial consonant \( h \) \( [x] \) in the standard language. Realizations seem to be fairly consistently the so-called glottal fricative \( [h] \).

7.2.3.1 Phonological Implications

The realization of the standard velar fricative as a glottal fricative in Singapore Huayu does not have any implications for the phonological system and does not lead to the production of homophones.

7.2.3.2 Possible Reasons for the Persistence of this Feature

Mandarin \( [x] \) generally corresponds to \( [h] \) in the southern dialects spoken in Singapore. As noted above, the use of \( [h] \) in Singapore Huayu does not affect the system or produce homophones. Moreover, Singapore speakers generally do not seem to be aware that it is a nonstandard feature. It is seldom commented upon or cited as a mistake that should be corrected.
7.2.3.3 Comparison with Other Varieties of Mandarin

Other Mandarin dialects spoken in China generally do have this initial consonant as a velar fricative. However, speakers of Putonghua from other dialect areas (in which Beijing [x] generally corresponds to [h] or occasionally [ŋ]) often pronounce h as [h]. Liao notes that when speakers of Southern Min in Taiwan begin to learn Guoyu, 'they always substitute native [h] for [x]' (Liao 1977a:87). The use of [h] by speakers of Singapore Huayu is therefore not particularly distinctive.

7.2.4 [ 위한] for Standard [ian] (ian)

In the Standard Pronunciation, the yunmu written as ûan in Pinyin is pronounced [ian]. In Singapore Huayu, the vowel nucleus in this yunmu is nearly always significantly higher, usually about [e]. In other words, the quality of the vowel nucleus in ûan is generally the same as in the yunmu ian.

7.2.4.1 Phonological Implications.

This realization of the vowel nucleus in ûan does not lead to the production of any homophones. However, it is a instance of the tendency in Singapore Huayu for much weaker realization of the strong y/w prosodic postures of the standard pronunciation. In Halliday's analysis (described in Chapter Four) syllables with the ûan yunmu
are analyzed as having simultaneous \( y \) and \( w \) initial posture selection, as well as final \( y \) posture and \( A \) height. In other words, they are regarded as labialized versions of the initial \( y \) posture syllables which have the \( ian \) yunmu. This explains why the vowel nucleus should be \( [ə] \) rather than \( [ɛ] \) (or \( [ɛ] \), the usual pronunciation in the standard pronunciation of the nucleus of \( ian \)), i.e., the \( w \) prosody keeps it low. In the Singapore realizations, however, the \( w \) prosody does not have this effect and thus the vowel nucleus in such syllables is usually identical to the vowel nucleus in the \( y \) posture \( ian \) syllables.

7.2.4.2 Possible Reasons for the Persistence of this Feature

This appears to be another case in which Singapore speakers are generally not aware that this pronunciation is nonstandard. As mentioned above, it has no impact on the system and does not produce homophones.

7.2.4.3 Comparison With Chen C.Y. (1986)

Chen Chungyu (1986) similarly found that the nucleus of \( ūan \) was pronounced identically to the nucleus of \( ian \) by all of her informants.
7.2.4.4 Comparison With Other Varieties of Mandarin

The vowel nucleus of "an is similarly pronounced in some Mandarin dialects, for example that of Xi'an of the Northwest group and those of Nanjing and Yangzhou of the Jianghuai group (Zhan 1981). It is also a widespread pronunciation among speakers of Putonghua and Guoyu with non Mandarin mother tongues. Chen Chungyu observes that: "This is also the pronunciation in the speech of most, if not all, speakers of a Southern dialect background outside Singapore, such as in Taiwan" (Chen C.Y. 1986:146).

7.2.5 [s] For Standard [ʂ] (x)

In Standard Mandarin, there are three palatal consonants x [ʂ], q [ʨʰ] and j [ʥ]. They are always followed by rounded or unrounded high front glides or vowels [i] and [y] (i.e., they occur only in syllables with initial " or " + w prosodic postures). In the Singapore data, the place of articulation of these initial consonants appears to vary from as palatal as in the standard language to dental, with a range of intermediate articulations. However, the fricative " in unrounded syllables comes close to being categorically non-palatal in the speech of most speakers of all education levels, ages and mother tongues. It is usually dental [s].
It is worth noting that whilst Cantonese has no such palatal consonant, Hokkien does, yet speakers with Hokkien as mother tongue also frequently realize ₓ as [s]. This is one of several nonstandard features whose origins might be ascribed to a particular dialect yet have now become part of the norm for all speakers of Singapore Huayu, irrespective of their mother tongues.

Sometimes there is no palatality at all in the initial part of the syllable, for example, xiang "like" or "similar" may be pronounced [ʂʰæŋ], making it homophonous with shang "on". However, this is much more variable and probably cannot be considered part of a general norm for Singapore Huayu.

7.2.5.1 Phonological Implications

The realization of ₓ as [s] does not produce homophones so long as palatality is still present in the following vowel or glide, as in the standard pronunciation [s] does not co-occur with initial ﺷ posture. It is, however, interesting that ₓ should be so much more likely to be realized as dental than ɡ or ɻ, as with the common Singapore Huayu realizations of the standard retroflexes and dentals, the affricates also have a tendency to be farther back than the fricatives (see p.188).
It is not clear why rounding should favour the retention of palatality in \( x \). Perhaps because this feature is itself variable in Singapore Huayu (see Chapter Nine) and combination of \( y \) and \( w \) posture seems to be a difficult articulatory gesture for many speakers, such syllables are more salient to speakers. Thus, if they succeed in getting "right" the high front rounded posture they are also likely to get "right" the other difficult feature of such syllables - palatality in the consonant.

7.2.5.2 Possible Reasons for the Persistence of this Feature

The use of [s] for \( x \) is seldom commented upon and Singapore speakers generally do not seem to be aware that it diverges from the standard pronunciation. It has no effect on the system and does not produce homophones.

7.2.5.3 Comparison With Chen C.Y. (1986)

Chen Chungyu (1986) similarly found that \( x \) is the most likely of the palatals to be realized as a dental and that palatality is much more likely to be retained in syllables that are rounded in the standard pronunciation. However, she concludes that this is a lexically specific rather than phonetic tendency, as when the tendency to realize standard [y] (i.e., syllables with initial high front rounded posture) as [i] (i.e.,
unrounded, see Chapter Nine) is taken into account, the rates for "correct" readings in rounded and unrounded syllables are almost the same. This does not seem to be the case with the present data, as speakers seem to be equally likely to use [s] in unrounded syllables whether or not they are also unrounded in the standard pronunciation. For example, one gets [sɪɛn] for xüăn "choose" as well as [sɪɛn] for xían "first". However, more quantitative study of this feature would be necessary for an absolutely firm conclusion.

7.2.5.4 Comparison With Other Varieties of Mandarin

The Mandarin dialects generally all have initial [ɻ], although in some dialects initial [ɻ] in Beijing may correspond in some zi to [x] or, in a few cases [s].

According to Chen, the use of [s] for [ɻ] "does not appear to be a common feature in the speech of southerners elsewhere, such as in Taiwan. Since it is not a feature commonly shared by southerners elsewhere (e.g., in Taiwan) it is particularly distinctive to the ear of a non Singaporean" (Chen C.Y. 1986:122).

This suggests that this nonstandard feature is more distinctive of Singapore Huayu as a unique variety than other features so far considered. However, this feature is also to be heard in Cantonese speaking learners of
Putonghua or Guoyu elsewhere (for example, in Hong Kong) and its distinctiveness should not be exaggerated.

7.2.6 [o] for Standard [uo]

In the standard pronunciation there are 14 syllables which may be transcribed C+["o] i.e., a rounded consonant, labiovelar glide and rounded half close vowel. In Pinyin they are written:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dental Place</th>
<th>Aveolar Place</th>
<th>Retroflex Place</th>
<th>Velar Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zuo</td>
<td>duo</td>
<td>zhuo</td>
<td>guo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuo</td>
<td>tuo</td>
<td>chuo</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suo</td>
<td>nuo</td>
<td>shuo</td>
<td>huo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Singapore data, syllables of this type, with the exception of those with velar initials (or velar and glottal, as in Singapore h~ is usually pronounced [h], see 7.2.3 above) are very commonly pronounced with no labiovelar glide. However, rounding is preserved throughout the syllable, although the height of the vowel is somewhat variable. Realizations range from C+[o] to C+[ɔ].

A few speakers sometimes lack the labiovelar glide also after velar initials, for example pronouncing guo as [gɔ]. However, in this environment lack of labiovelar
glide cannot be considered part of a general norm for speakers of Singapore Huayu.

This feature is only tentatively include in this chapter on relatively invariant features. The labiovelar glide does occasionally occur even after non-velar initials. However, it seems to be very sporadic in this environment and many speakers both highly educated and in the younger age groups lack the glide almost categorically in this environment. However, further quantitative investigation would be necessary to absolutely confirm the observation that this feature shows no significant tendency to be "replaced" by its standard equivalent in the speech of any group.

7.2.6.1 Phonological Implications

The lack of labiovelar glide after non-velar consonants in these syllables does not lead to the production of homophones, as the preservation of rounding in the syllables keeps them distinct from corresponding initial a posture syllables (such as go, de etc.). However, this is further evidence of the tendency for Singapore Huayu to have much weaker realization of the w/y postures prosodies of the standard pronunciation.
7.2.6.2 Possible Reasons for the Persistence of this Feature

Singapore speakers generally do not seem to be aware of the difference between the Singapore pronunciation of the relevant syllables and the standard pronunciation. As mentioned above, lack of labiovelar glide in these environments has little effect on the system and does not produce homophones.

7.2.6.3 Comparison With Chen C.Y. (1986)

Chen Chungyu (1986) similarly comments on this pronunciation. In her study, 58.2% of readings of the uo yunmu are "correct". However, as no details of initial consonants are given, this cannot be compared to the finding of the present study that this pronunciation is much rarer after the non-velar consonants.

7.2.6.4 Comparison With Other Varieties of Mandarin

[o] often corresponds to Beijing [uo] in Mandarin dialects of the Southwest and Jianghuai groups and some dialects of the Northwest (Zhan 1981). As in Singapore Huayu, the labiovelar glide is more likely to be "retained" after velar consonants than after front consonants. Kubler also notes that speakers of Guoyu in Taiwan "tend to substitute" [o] or [ɔ] for standard [uo] (Kubler 1981:64).
Once again, there is nothing particularly distinctive about the Singapore pronunciation.

7.2.7 Fewer Qingsheng

A noticeable feature of the standard pronunciation based on the speech of Beijing dialect is the extent of qingsheng ("atonic" or "neutral tone") syllables, i.e., syllables which lack lexical tone and whose pitch and shape are determined by the intonation contour of the tone group they are part of and by the lexical tone of the preceding zi.

Such atonic syllables in the standard pronunciation fall into three main categories. Firstly, there are a small number of zi which never have lexical tone—for example final particles. Secondly, there are zi which have no tone when following a toned zi in certain polysyllabic words (see Kratochvil 1968:84). Thirdly, there is the tendency in allegro speech to "drop" tone from a large number of unstressed syllable.

This is another "fuzzy" area of the standard (see 6.2.1 and Chen 1982a). However, there is no doubt that Singapore speakers regularly have far fewer qingsheng than would be considered standard. In Singapore Huayu, zi have tone in environments in which they would never have tone in the standard pronunciation. For example, yìfù for
standard *yifù* "clothes", *màituō* for standard *màitou* "wharf", *zhídào* for standard *zhídào* "know*. Moreover, in allegro speech, Singapore speakers tend to retain more toned syllables than speakers of the standard pronunciation. This is related to the tendency of Singapore Huayu to follow the southern dialects in having a more syllable timed rather than stressed timed rhythm.

Like the previous feature, this feature is included in this chapter only tentatively as no quantitative analysis has been carried out. It cannot be claimed that most speakers of Singapore Huayu never use *qíngshèng* as they never or hardly ever use final retroflexion. It is certainly variable in Singapore Huayu and all informants have some *qíngshèng*. However, there appears to be no sociolectal patterning in *qíngshèng* variation, for example, there seems to be little difference in the rate of *qíngshèng* between more educated and less educated and between younger and older informants. The tendency also persists in broadcasters of the Singapore Broadcasting Corporation, who might be regarded as speaking the most standard like variety of Huayu in Singapore. This may partly account for the comments from some informants that the occasional news items from China they see are much more difficult to understand than local items as the announcers "speak fast and indistinctly".
7.2.7.1 Phonological Implications

There are a few pairs of lexical items or expressions which are distinguished by *qingsheng* in the standard pronunciation, for example, *màitou* "wharf" and *màitóu* "horse's head". However, in context such items are unlikely to be confused in Singapore Huayu, even if both are pronounced without *qingsheng*.

7.2.7.2 Comparison With Other Varieties of Mandarin

The tendency to have much less *qingsheng* than in the standard pronunciation is quite common in the Putonghua and Guoyu spoken in areas with Southern dialect backgrounds. Kubler, for example, reports that:

> The neutral tone occurs much less frequently in Taiwan Mandarin than in Standard Mandarin....This is one reason why Northern Chinese often describe Taiwan Mandarin sounding "heavier" and having a relatively staccato rhythm"

(Kubler 1981:68)

7.3 Grammatical Features

Like all the phonological features described in this chapter, the following grammatical features are not part of the prescribed standard grammar for Putonghua, Guoyu
or Huayu (although, as will be mentioned, there are fuzzy areas) and they occur in the speech of informants of all educational levels, ages and mother tongues. Also, Singapore speakers generally do not seem to be aware that they are nonstandard features. This is not particularly surprising, as the emphasis in the teaching of Chinese in Singapore schools (as elsewhere where the Standard language is taught as a second dialect, see Ramsay 1987) has always tended to be on vocabulary development (particularly the learning of written zi) and (in recent years, especially) on pronunciation. Grammar, particularly the highlighting of differences between the standard grammar and the grammar of the Southern dialects, has tended to be less explicitly focussed upon.

However, unlike with some of the phonological features, it can rarely be claimed that a particular nonstandard grammatical feature occurs categorically or near categorically in the speech of all or most informants. Partly, this is because most such grammatical features are far less frequent than phonological features and it is therefore hard to obtain sufficient tokens to make quantitative claims. More importantly, however, a particular nonstandard grammatical feature often cannot be said to be a variant of a particular standard grammatical feature in quite the same way as, for example, the [s] in [si] (as in xī "west") can be said to be a nonstandard variant of standard [ɕ]. Whether the
zi is pronounced [si] or [ɕi] the meaning remains the same. However, where two features of grammar are involved, there is more than likely to be a meaning difference. For example, whilst in some contexts the nonstandard use of you in sentences such as tamen you lai "they came/have come", might be said to be functionally equivalent to the perfective particle le, as a speaker of the standard language might produce tamen laile in the same context, for a speaker of Singapore Huayu who has both constructions they are not necessarily equivalent. In this case, the Singapore speaker has an option for realizing temporal / aspectual meaning which the standard speaker does not have. Thus, counting the number of occurrence of the you construction versus the le construction would reflect something very different from counting the number of occurrences of [si] versus [ɕi].

Thus, the claim that a particular nonstandard grammatical feature appears not to have been affected by pressure from the prescribed standard and that it can be regarded as part of a general de-facto internal norm for Singapore Huayu will be based entirely on the criteria that it occurs widely in the speech of well educated as well as less educated, young as well as old informants and that speakers do not seem to be aware that it is nonstandard.
7.3.1 The You + VERB Construction (past time)

7.3.1.1 The Verbal Auxiliaries You and Meiyou in Standard Mandarin

In Standard Mandarin, the negative of you "have" - meiyou "not have", sometimes just mei - can precede the lexical verb in clauses with negative polarity and perfective aspect. For example:

Ta meiyou lai
He not-have come
He hasn’t come / He didn’t come

Meiyou can also be used to form choice type interrogatives with perfective aspect. For example:

Ta laile meiyou
He come-LE not-have
Has he come? / Did he come?

It can also occur alone with the lexical verb ellipsed, as in the negative answer to the above question:

Meiyou
Not-have
No (he hasn’t/ he didn’t)
However, in declarative clauses with positive polarity and perfective aspect, the positive form of meiyō - yōu "have" cannot, in the standard language, precede the lexical verb. The particles le and guo are usually used to realize perfective aspect in such clauses. For example:

Tā laíle
He come-LE
He has come / He came

Tā laiguo
He come-GUO
He has come / He [once] came

But not: *Tā yōu lai
He has come

In answers with positive polarity and perfective aspect, the verb is not ellipsed, but is repeated with the perfective particle. For example:

Laíle
Come-LE
Yes (he has come / he came)

Laiguo
Come-GUO
Yes (he has come / he [once] came)
As the translations suggest, there is some difference in function between \textit{le} and \textit{guo}. \textit{Le} simply provides an orientation to the completeness or consequence of the event whereas \textit{guo} can suggest the additional meaning that the event happened at least once at an indefinite time in the past. Hence it is sometimes referred to as the indefinite past marker (Chao 1968) or "experiential" suffix\footnote{1}.

7.3.1.2 \textit{You} and \textit{Meiyou} in Singapore Huayu

In the Singapore data, however, \textit{you} is commonly used before the lexical verb in declarative clauses with positive polarity (as it is in both Hokkien and Cantonese). For example:

1/Tāmen shī huì jiāng biāozhùn yīdiǎn à, yīnwei
They is can speak standard a-little A\textsuperscript{2}, because

tāmen you\underline{xúe} ma.
they have study MA

They can speak [Huayu which is] a little more standard because they have studied it.

2/ Zhùzāi Àozhōu dēshíhou, tāmen you fāng Zhōngguó
Live-in Australia when, they have show Chinese

pīan.

film.
When I lived in Australia, they showed Chinese films/a Chinese film [so I have heard the Beijing accent].

3/ Wo shàngcì you zuògōng, houlái xiǎo háizi dúshū
I last-time have work, later small children study

yīhòu jiù méiyǒu zuògōng.
after then not-have work

I used to work, but later after the children [began] school I stopped working.

4/ Wǒmen jiāng fāngyán dēshíhou, tāmen yǒu fákuǎn.
We speak dialect when they have fine

They used to fine us whenever we spoke dialect.

5/ Huí, yīnwei wǒ yǒu dúdào standard one Malay.
Can, because I have study-up-to

I can [speak Malay], because I have studied Malay up to standard one.

6/ Maláiwén wǒ yǒu xuéguó yìdiǎn.
Malay-language I have study-GUO a-little

I have studied a little Malay.
7/ Gangcai wo dagai you jiangguo.
Just-now I in-general have talk-GUO

I talked about that in general just now [so I don’t need to say any more].

8/ Nage shihou riben jun you lai.
That time Japan army have come

At that time the Japanese army came [and so I didn’t get any more schooling].

The above examples, taken from the recorded data, suggest that events realized with this construction are always placed in the past, unlike with le (or liao as the non-final perfective particle is sometimes pronounced in Singapore Huayu, see Appendix 5). There is, for example, no instance of the use of you mirroring the use of le in hypotactic constructions in which it indicates the completeness of the event in the beta clause with reference to the event in the alpha clause. Thus the data has, for example:

Youshi kanliao, yanjing juede tong.
Sometimes look-LIAO [=LE], eyes feel sore

Sometimes after having watched [tv] my eyes feel sore.

and
jígé yíhòu cái dědào láisèn.
passe after only-then get license
You only get a license after you have passed (the test).

But nothing like:

*Yóushi yóu kàn, yánjing juéde tōng
Sometimes have look, eyes feel sore

or

*Yóu jígé yíhòu cái dědào láisèn
Have pass after only-then get license

On the other hand, yóu is occasionally used where le or guó would be very unlikely in the standard language. In nos. 3 and 4 above, for example, yóu appears to have a past iterative or habitual rather than perfective function.

However, the majority of instances of this yóu construction in the data appear to have a function very similar to that of the "experiential" perfective particle guó i.e., indicating that an event has taken place at some indefinite time in the past but is still relevant to the present, e.g., nos. 1 and 5 above, although this may well be because many questions in the
interview invite the informants to talk about past educational and linguistic experiences. Interestingly, you may also co-occur with guo (e.g., nos. 6 and 7). In such sentences, it appears to simply strengthen the function of the guo.

Thus, this you + Verb construction in Singapore Huayu cannot be regarded as simply a nonstandard variant of the realizations of perfective aspect in the standard language. From the present data at least, it appears to be used only with past events and to occur in some environments in which neither le nor guo would be likely in the standard language. It thus represents an additional option for Singapore speakers in the realization of temporal / aspectual meaning.

7.3.1.3 you + VERB as Part of a General Norm for Singapore Huayu

This construction occurs widely in the speech of informants as highly educated as university lecturers and as young as secondary four students, and speakers do not generally seem to be aware that it is nonstandard.

7.3.1.4 Comparison With Other Varieties of Mandarin

This use of you in pre-lexical verb position tends to occur in the Putonghua or Guoyu of speakers whose mother tongues are southern dialects in which you is used in
this position, for example Cantonese and Hokkien. It is also an area in which the line between standard and nonstandard may be becoming somewhat fuzzy. Y.R. Chao, for example, refers to its use as "a very new borrowing from Cantonese and the Taiwanese form of southern Fukkien [i.e., Hokkien or Minnan] dialect" (Chao 1968:748). He comments that its use in sentences such as:

Ni you kanjian ta meiyou?
You have see him not-have

Have you seen him? / Did you see him?

"is getting fairly acceptable among those in contact with southerners" but that the answer:

You
Have

Yes (I have / I did)

"still grates on northern ears" (Chao 1968:748).

Similarly, Chen Jianmin comments that in recent years the question forms you meiyou VERB ? and you VERB meiyou ? have begun to be heard in Beijing speech, although rarely, but not the answer you (Chen J.M. 1982).

Robert L. Cheng describes a similar construction in Taiwanese Guoyu. As with the Singapore examples, you+VERB
in this variety of Mandarin also seems to be associated only with past reference. Cheng suggests that the you and le constructions in Taiwanese Guoyu represent a contrast similar to that in English between simple past and perfective (for details see Cheng 1985). However, this does not entirely fit the Singapore data, as the you construction appears to overlap any such constrast. Thus, whilst in all the above examples of you+VERB the time reference is past, in numbers 1, 5, 6 and 7, the orientation is clearly to the completeness or consequences of the event and its current relevance rather than to its location at a specific time in the past.

7.3.2 You + VERB (non past)

There is another very common construction in Singapore Huayu which looks the same as the construction described above. However, its functions are different. In this construction, you precedes either stative verbs or dynamic verbs where there is no possible past or perfective interpretation. For example:

1. 此-CLASS3 comparatively have standard

This (way of speaking) is more standard.
2. Ta you zai ma?

He have is-at INTERROG-PART

Is he there?

3. Interviewer: Yìngwén bào nǐ hùi kàn ma?

Can you read the English newspaper?

Interviewee: you hui.

Have can

Yes, I can.

4. Interviewer: Nǐ méitiān kàn bāozhī ma?

Do you read a paper every day?

Interviewee: You, yìngwén, húawén, wǒ liǎng zhǒng

Have, English, Chinese, I two types

don you kan.

all have read

Yes, I read both English and Chinese newspapers.

5. Youshíhou youjiāng fāngyán.

Sometimes have speak dialect

Sometimes we speak dialect.
6. Yīnwei mèitiān zài diànhí yě yǒu
   Because every-day at television also have
   bō.
   broadcast.

   Because it is broadcast on the television every
day.

7. Yǒushì tāitái yě yǒu xuǎn nǎyīge.
   Sometimes wife also have choose which-one
   Sometimes my wife also chooses which [programme
   we watch].

   The negative méi yǒu -"not have"- is similarly used. For
   example:

8. Mǎlǎiwén xiànzài zèbiān xīnjīāpō
   Malay-language now here Singapore
   génběn wànquán méi yǒu yòngdào, píngchǎng
   basically completely not-have use, ordinary
   gōngzuò shènghòu fāngmiàn dōu wànquán méi
   work life aspect all completely not-
   yǒu yòngdào.
   have use.

   In Singapore nowadays, the Malay language is not
   used at all [by the Chinese], in ordinary work
   and life it is not used at all.
9. Interviewer: Nǐ de tài tái zài wài mian zuò shì ma?
Does your wife go out to work?

Interviewee: Méi yǒu, tā méi yǒu zài wài mian
Not-have, she not-have at outside
zuò shì.
work

No, she doesn’t go out to work.

In the standard language, yǒu and méi yǒu would not be
used in any of the above examples.

The use of yǒu before stative verbs, as in nos. 1 and 2,
can perhaps be seen as an extension of the existential
function of yǒu which in the standard language occurs
only before nouns. With dynamic verbs, in almost every
occurrence in the data, there appears to be an iterative
or habitual meaning, often in contexts in which the
lexical verb alone would normally be used in the
standard language. Once again, it is clear that this
construction cannot simply be regarded as a nonstandard
variant of a standard grammatical form. With the yǒu +
VERB (non past) construction, Singapore speakers may
have an option in the realization of aspectual meanings
that does not exist for speakers of the standard variety.

7.3.2.1 Yǒu + VERB (non past) as Part of a General Norm
This construction occurs in the speech of informants of all social and educational backgrounds. Moreover, a number of informants (including one teacher and some upper secondary school students) were asked what the difference was between a sentence with \textit{you} and the same sentence without the \textit{you}. The answers were either that there was no difference or that the sentence with \textit{you} was more emphatic. They all agreed that the construction was quite correct. One in fact said that the form with \textit{you} was the correct form but that speakers often left it out for the sake of convenience.

It is also worth noting that this construction is as likely to occur in the speech of those with Cantonese as a mother tongue as of those with Hokkien as a mother tongue, despite the fact that it may well originate as a calque of a similar Hokkien construction which does not occur in Cantonese'. This is further evidence for general norms for Singapore Huayu irrespective of the mother tongue of speakers.

7.3.2.2 Comparison With Other Varieties of Mandarin

Cheng (1985) also mentions this use of \textit{you} + VERB to mark habitual events in Taiwanese Guoyu and relates it to a similar construction in Taiwanese Minnan dialect. However, it does not seem to have been noted in any other variety of Mandarin, although it seems quite possible
that it would occur in the Putonghua of other speakers of Minnan dialects.

7.3.3 Qù / Lài + PLACE

7.3.3.1 Qù and Lài in Standard Mandarin

With the verbs qù "go" and lài "come", Standard Mandarin prefers a construction in which the prepositions shàng or dào, which may both be translated as "to", followed by a place complement form a pre-posed prepositional complement. For example:

Wo yào shàng Bēijīng qù.
I want to Beijing go

I want to (or will) go to Beijing

Tāmen gānggāng dào Guǎngzhōu lái.
They just to Guangzhou come

They have just come to Guangzhou.

There are, in fact, a few common expressions in standard Putonghua in which the place complement does sometimes follow the verb. For example:

Ni qù nǎr?
You go where?
Where are you going?
Moreover, the construction seems to be creeping into Beijing speech, especially when the place complement is very short. For example:

Qu Guangzhou
go Canton
(I'm) going to Canton
(quoted in Chen J.M. 1982)

However, the prepositional construction is still generally preferred in standard Putonghua.

7.3.3.2 Qu / Lái + PLACE in Singapore Huayu

In Singapore Huayu, as in many Southern dialects including Cantonese and Hokkien, the place complement quite regularly directly follows the verbs qu and lái. For example:

Wo qu bāshā mai dōngxi.
I go market buy things
I'm going shopping in the market.

Tāmen méinían lái Nángā du
They every-year come Nanyang-University study
Huáwén.
Chinese
They come to Nanyang University every year to study Chinese
7.3.3.3 *qù* + *lái* PLACE as Part of a General Norm

This construction is also only tentatively included in this section. The construction with *dào* and (less frequently) *shàng* are also sometimes heard in Singapore Huayu, and it is not yet clear what different patterns of usage there may be between the two construction. However, the *qù* / *lái* + PLACE construction seems to be regularly used by Singapore speakers of all ages and educational levels, and there generally seems to be no feeling that it is in any way "wrong".

7.3.3.4 Comparison With Other Varieties of Mandarin

This construction is likely to be transferred into the Putonghua or Guoyu of speakers with Southern dialect mother tongues. Both Kubler (1981) and Cheng (1985) mention its use in Taiwanese Guoyu.

7.4 Conclusion

There are thus a number of nonstandard features of phonology and grammar which are widely used by Singapore speakers and may be regarded as part of a de-facto general norm for Singapore Huayu. Such features appear to be well entrenched in Singapore Huayu and do not as yet seem to be under serious threat from the prescribed standard. In some cases, this may be because speakers are
not generally aware of the difference between the local form and the standard form. In other cases, speakers may be aware that a local form is nonstandard. However, the equivalent standard form (if any) has not been "accepted" as part of a valid target norm for speakers and may even be seen as marking foreignness or affectation.

Most of the nonstandard features described in this chapter can also be found elsewhere in other varieties of Mandarin and it is not possible to unequivocally identify a single feature or "issogloss" that sets Singapore Huayu off from all other dialects of Mandarin. However, the particular combination of nonstandard may be peculiar to Singapore Huayu (for further discussion of this, see 16.12).
NOTES

1. This is inevitably somewhat simplified. For further comments on le see Chapter fourteen, and on le and guo see Wang (1975), Chao (1968) and Li and Thompson (1981).

2. Throughout this thesis, modal particles which are untranslatable or for which glosses would be unnecessary complicated for the task at hand are simply transcribed in upper case.

3. CLASS = classifier or measure, see Chao 1968:58ff.

4. Standard Cantonese does not have this construction. However, such is the mutual influence on dialects in Singapore that local Cantonese speakers do sometimes use such a construction.

5. The word class to which shang and dao belong function in ways similar to both prepositions and verbs in English. In these constructions, they are sometimes referred to as "co-verbs".
CHAPTER EIGHT

LISTENER EVALUATION OF SAMPLES AND SOCIOLECTAL VARIATION

8.1 Introduction

The previous chapter described nonstandard features of Singapore Huayu which are either near categorical in the speech of all the informants, or at least appear not to show variation relatable to the social identities of the speakers. The following chapters (Chapters Nine to Fourteen), on the other hand, will consider features which are highly variable in the data. Five phonological variables and one grammatical variable will be investigated quantitatively. This by no means exhausts the number of variable features in the data. Some other variable features which have been noted but not subjected to quantitative analysis are listed in Appendix Five.

However, before considering any quantitative evidence for relationships between the linguistic variables and various social characteristics of the speakers, it is worth considering what other evidence there might be for a dimension of sociolectal variation in Singapore Huayu.
8.2 Listener Evaluations as Evidence for Sociolectal Variation

Many studies carried out in monolingual societies have shown that members of a speech community are willing and able to make judgements about aspects of speakers' social identities (as well as other affective factors, which will not be explored here) from short samples of recorded speech (see, for example, Labov 1966 Chap.11; Labov 1972b Chap.6; Giles and Powesland 1975). It is interesting to see to what extent this might also be true where the speech community is multilingual, as in Singapore, and where the speech samples are of a language that is the mother tongue of neither the speakers nor the judges. Clearly, if informants in Singapore are prepared to make judgements only about speakers' relative proficiencies in Huayu and their probable mother tongues, then interpretations of the linguistic variation that exists might best be sought solely in terms of differences in levels of proficiency and in mother tongue transfer. However, if informants are also prepared to make judgements about likely aspects of the social identities of the speakers, then this is some evidence in support of the indigenization hypothesis that the Huayu in Singapore has developed or is developing forms of sociolectal variation.
8.3 Eliciting Listener Evaluations

In order to gather some information about the kinds of social evaluations speakers of Singapore Huayu might make of other speakers, six recorded samples of Singapore Huayu were played to 42 Huayu speaking Singaporeans. Each sample lasts about one minute and in each case the speaker is giving an opinion on the importance or usefulness of knowing Huayu. All the speakers are within the 20 to 35 age range. Three are men and three are women. Five of the samples come from the main corpus of 46 recorded interviews. The sixth is from a recorded interview with a teacher of Chinese in the "Huayu Specialists" group (see Chapter Six).

The judges are all representatives of what might be called the "educated, younger generation". Their ages range from from 14 to 30 and they are all educated up to at least secondary four level or, at the time of the experiment, were in full time education.

Each sample was played twice and the informants filled out a questionnaire (in English or Chinese) which first asks them to give their general impression of each speaker and his or her Huayu and then to evaluate each speaker's (a) likely level of education, on a scale from 1 ("uneducated") to 7 ("very well educated, e.g.: university graduate"); (b) likely occupational status, also on a scale from 1 ("in a low status job, e.g.:
hawker, unskilled labourer") to 7 (in a high status job, e.g.: doctor, lawyer"); and (c) likely mother tongue dialect.

Note that unlike Labov's *Subjective Reaction Test* (a variant of matched guise technique, see Labov 1966 and Labov 1972), the purpose of this experiment is not to test hypotheses about which linguistic features informants may be reacting to in making judgements, although some inferences can be made (see p.271 and p.370). The purpose of this experiment is simply to discover how far evaluations of spoken Singapore Huayu made by educated, younger generation speakers might resemble the kinds of social evaluations that native speakers of a language typically make of the speech of other native speakers.

8.4 The Informants' Willingness to Make Judgements

There are a total potential 238 responses to each of the three questions (a), (b) and (c). However, the informants were asked to leave blank any questions they felt they could not at least make a reasonable guess at. The number of actual responses to each question is as follows:
### Table 8.1 Numbers of Responses to Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL POTENTIAL RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Education</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Occupation</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Dialect</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, informants were prepared to make judgements about the speakers' likely levels of education and occupational statuses in over 98% of cases. However, they were substantially less prepared to make judgements about the speakers’ likely mother tongues. Two informants, in fact, wrote comments on the front of their questionnaires referring to the difficulty of guessing speakers' mother tongues. One wrote: "It is difficult to judge the speaker's mother tongue" and the other wrote: "In general, it is quite difficult to tell a person's mother tongue by listening to his/her conversation".

#### 8.5 Accuracy of Judgements

#### 8.5.1 Level of Education

In order to discover how accurate the informants' evaluations of the speakers' levels of education were, a ranking based upon the mean of the responses to question (a) for each sample was compared to the speakers' actual levels of education.
Table 8.2 Accuracy of Informants' Evaluations of Educational Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>SAMPLE NO.</th>
<th>MEAN OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>ACTUAL LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>upper sec. plus teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>upper sec. plus teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>upper secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>upper secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>lower secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is thus quite a close relationship between the evaluations of speakers' levels of education based upon short samples of spoken Huayu and the speakers' actual levels of education.

8.5.2 Occupational Status

It is interesting to note that the means of responses to the occupational status question give exactly the same ranking.
Table 8.3 The Informants' Evaluations of Occupational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>SAMPLE NO.</th>
<th>MEAN OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>ACTUAL OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Housewife (Hus. = taxidriver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Delivery man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that educational level, which has been used as a factor group in the quantitative analyses (see 5.2.2), might also correlate well with other measures of social prestige.

Note that the highest ranked sample came from one of the teachers of Huayu in the "Huayu Specialists" group who had been seconded to work on curriculum development. This may account for the fact that this sample was ranked more highly than that of the other speaker of equivalent education level, who was also a teacher but neither taught Huayu nor taught through the medium of Huayu (she worked at an English medium school).

8.5.3 Mother Tongue

The following table shows the numbers of correct guesses as to the mother tongue dialects of the speakers.
Table 8.4 Correct Guesses of Speakers' Mother Tongues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT NO.</th>
<th>MOTHER TONGUE</th>
<th>NO. CORRECT</th>
<th>% CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teochew</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentage refers to the percentage of informants who guessed correctly out of the total number of informants who attempted a guess at the mother tongue of the speaker in question.

Thus, with the exception of sample one, over 50% of the guesses at a speaker's mother tongue were incorrect. Informants, therefore, seem not only to be less willing to attempt to guess a speaker's mother tongue than to judge his or her likely educational level and occupational status, but also less able to do so accurately when they try.

Note that the speaker whose mother tongue was correctly guessed most often (no. 1) is also the speaker who was ranked lowest in terms of likely educational level and occupational status. Conversely, the two speakers whose mother tongues were correctly guessed least often (nos. 6 and 3) are the speakers who were ranked highest in terms
of likely educational level and occupational status. An obvious conclusion seems to be that, while listeners may often have difficulty in guessing speakers' mother tongues, where they can perceive mother tongue influence, they are more likely to judge the speaker to be of lower educational level and occupational status. This is perhaps exactly what one might expect in a situation in which features which may have their origin in mother tongue transfer have become or are in the process of becoming socially evaluated and involved in sociolectal variation.

8.6 Informants' Comments on the Samples

The first question on the questionnaire given to the informants read: "What is your general impression of the speaker and the way he or she talks?"

This was designed to discover something of the informants' initial reactions to the samples before being directed to comment in particular areas. Responses can be broadly divided into those which refer to the actual language used and those which refer to the speakers themselves.
8.6.1 Comments Referring to the Language

Some judges commented on specific aspects of the speaker's language. For example, the level of fluency or smoothness:

Jiānghuà bú gòu liúchàng.
(does not speak smoothly enough)

She speaks not fluently. She often uses zheige, she repeats wo, wo, wo.

Others commented on accent or pronunciation:

Keyi rang tíngzhe míngbái qí suǒ yán, dàn kǒuyín zhòng.
(The listener can understand what she says but the accent is heavy.)

Fāyín bù zhūn.
(Pronunciation not correct.)

However, none of the comments on accent or pronunciation referred to a specific dialect accent (i.e., there were no comments such as "the speaker has a strong Cantonese accent").

There were two comments on vocabulary, for example:
Xíangdǎng liúlì zhī shí yǒu xiē difāng yòngcí bù qiàdāng.
(fairly fluent but in some places the words he uses are not appropriate.)

and two comments on particles:

His Mandarin is very good but he has a lot of "ah" and "la" in his talk.

At the end of every sentence there is the sound "ah".

None of the above comments tell us much about the social evaluation of samples of Huayu. However, they are interesting in that they provide some evidence of which specific linguistic features may be salient enough to be overtly commented upon.

Most comments on the language of the samples, however, do not refer to specific features, but are of a generally evaluative nature. For example:

Wo yīwéi tāde Huáyu hái kěyì.
(I think his Huayu is okay.)

Not good Mandarin.

He generally talks quite well.
Yikou hen pioliangde Huayu.
(Beautiful Huayu.)

Again, such generally evaluative comments do not necessarily point to a social evaluation of the speech samples. They could in many cases be regarded simply as comments on the proficiency of the speakers, of the kind that might be made of learners in a foreign language situation. However, as is very well known, even in monolingual speech communities, native speakers will make similar comments about the speech of other native speakers using terms such as "good", "bad", "ugly", "beautiful" and so on, which really reflect social evaluations of the speakers.

Some of the comments classified here as general evaluations of the language do, in fact, clearly contain an implicit social evaluation, for example:

Average on the street Mandarin.

8.6.2 Socially Evaluative Comments

There were also a range of comments which referred explicitly to aspects of the social identities of the speakers. Such comments make up about 15% of the total number of comments and provide clear evidence for a social evaluation of the speech samples.
Such comments referred to:

(a) the class or likely occupation of the speaker, e.g.:

An average worker type. The way he speaks shows he is from the working class.

She speaks like a teacher.

Shūohuàzhe shì yīge jiātìng zhūfù.
(The speaker is a housewife.)

(b) the likely educational level of the speaker, e.g.:

Shūohuàzhe shòuguó gāoshēn jiàoyù, jiāngde yìkǒu liúlǐ Huáyú.
(The speaker is highly educated and speaks fluent Huayu.)

The speaker is not a well educated person and the Chinese he speaks is not good Mandarin.

(c) the "averageness" of the speaker, for example:

A typical Singapore Chinese
She speaks like a normal person

(d) the age of the speaker (only two such comments), e.g.:

Yìbān shàngniánjí rén suǒjiāngde Huáyú.
(The kind of Huayu generally spoken by the older generation.)

There was also one comment on the character of the
speaker:

He is a sort of easy going person

8.7 Conclusion

The results of this small experiment show that in evaluating samples of speech, speakers of Singapore Huayu do not restrict themselves to making judgements about the relative proficiencies of the speakers nor to making judgements about the likely mother tongues of the speakers. They are also willing and able quite accurately to make what are clearly social evaluations, in particular evaluations of the likely levels of education and occupational status of the speakers. This supports the hypothesis that Singapore Huayu is developing or has developed forms of sociolectal variation similar to those which have been observed in monolingual communities. The following chapters will consider quantitative evidence for such sociolectal variation.
NOTE

1. This excludes some questions that could not be answered due to problems of audibility of one of the samples in one session.
9.1 ŭ Syllables in the Standard Pronunciation

In the standard pronunciation, there is a set of syllables with an initial rounded consonant (always palatal except in lŭ and nŭ) followed by a rounded high front glide or vowel, which may be transcribed phonetically as [y] or [ɥ]. Such syllables thus combine features of initial ŭ and ɥ postures and are treated in Halliday (1985) as simultaneously selecting both of these initial posture prosodies (see 4.2.3). For convenience, this combined posture will here be symbolized as ŭ.

There are 24 syllables with this feature in the standard pronunciation. They are listed below in Pinyin romanization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>xu</th>
<th>qu</th>
<th>ju</th>
<th>yu</th>
<th>lŭ</th>
<th>nŭ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xue</td>
<td>que</td>
<td>jue</td>
<td>yue</td>
<td>lüe</td>
<td>nüe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xun</td>
<td>qun</td>
<td>jun</td>
<td>yun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xuan</td>
<td>quan</td>
<td>juan</td>
<td>yuan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiong</td>
<td>qiong</td>
<td>jiong</td>
<td>yong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In all of these syllables, the rounding, which is part of the realization of \( \mathcal{w} \) posture, begins with the initial consonant. In syllables along the top row (\( xu \) etc.) and syllables along the bottom row (\( xiong \) etc.) the rounding persists throughout the syllable. In syllables along lines two (\( xue \) etc.) and four (\( xuan \) etc.) the initial consonant and glide are rounded but the vowel nucleus is unrounded. In syllables along line three (\( xun \) etc.) rounding continues through the vowel nucleus but unrounding occurs before the final nasal. In such syllables, there is a perceptible change in vowel quality marking transition from rounded \( \mathcal{w} \) posture to unrounded \( \mathcal{y} \) posture. For example, \( xun \) is usually [\( \mathcal{c}\mathcal{y}\mathcal{u}n \)] in the standard pronunciation.

9.2 Syllables in Singapore Huayu

9.2.1 The \( \mathcal{w} \) and \( \mathcal{y} \) Variants

In the Singapore data, the realization of the \( \mathcal{w} \) posture in these syllables is variable. By far the most common nonstandard variant in the data is lack of rounding, or in prosodic terms, selection of \( \mathcal{y} \) rather than \( \mathcal{w} \) (or \( \mathcal{w} + \mathcal{y} \)) initial posture. This leads to a level of underdifferentiation between these syllables and a set which in the standard pronunciation are identical apart from having initial \( \mathcal{y} \) posture. This is the dimension of variation that will be investigated in this chapter, with (\( \ddot{u} \)) symbolizing the variable (i.e., all instances in
which initial \( \overline{x} \) posture would be required in the standard pronunciation), \(<w>\) symbolizing the standard rounded variant and \(<y>\) the nonstandard unrounded variant.

This, in fact, slightly simplifies the variation. Careful analysis of slow, clear pronunciations of these syllables by Singapore speakers shows that there is actually a rounding continuum, at least in the Huayu of some speakers. Two additional intermediate variants can be distinguished. One is close to the unrounded \(<y>\) variant but has some slight rounding. The other is closer to the \(<w>\) variant but has significantly less rounding than in the standard pronunciation. However, in the stream of speech, it is possible to reliably distinguish only two variants - rounded (i.e., \(<w>\) ) and unrounded (i.e., \(<y>\)). A small number (less than 5% of the total number of tokens) of intermediate variants or variants coded as "not sure" have been excluded from the analysis.

9.2.2 Other Variants

There are two other much less frequent nonstandard variants of these syllables in the data.

1. \(<w>\)

In a few occurrences of some (û) syllables in the data, there is rounding but the high frontness or palatality feature is present neither in the initial
consonant nor the following vowel or glide. In other words, the syllables can be classified as having selected initial \( w \) posture rather than \( y \) (or \( y + w \)). For example, [sun] or [sv\textsuperscript{u}n] for standard \([\varsigma\gamma\circ n]\) as in \( xun\text{\textlant{ian}} \) "to train", and [ts\textsuperscript{u}\text{l\textlant{ou}}n] for standard \([\varsigma\zeta\gamma\circ n]\) as in \( qu\text{\textlant{an}} \) "all". Having neither the \( <w> \) variant nor the \( <y> \) variant, such realizations have been excluded from the variable rule analysis.

2. \textit{iong}

Syllables along the bottom row (i.e., all those with final \( w \) posture) are almost invariable pronounced with the features of the \( w \) posture "segmentalized". That is, they begin with an unrounded consonant and glide with rounding beginning only in the vowel nucleus. For example, \([\varsigma\zeta\gamma\circ \text{j}]\) for standard \([\varsigma\zeta\gamma\circ \text{j}]\) as in \( qiong \) "poor". This is the usual pronunciation of these syllables in Singapore and they show no tendency to lose the rounding entirely, i.e., the \( w \) posture is categorical in such syllables, even though its realization may be "segmentalized". Such syllables have therefore also been omitted from the variable rule analysis. This pronunciation is, in fact, quite common in the Putonghua of speakers who are not native speakers of Beijing dialect, as well as in several dialects of Mandarin spoken natively in parts of China (Zhan 1981). Some authorities also give a similar phonetic transcription of the
standard pronunciation (e.g., Kratochvil 1968). However, in Beijing dialect, on which the standard pronunciation is based, these syllables are rounded from onset².

9.3 Variable Rule Analysis of (u)

Variation between <w> and <y> in the relevant syllables is very widespread in the data, with only two informants having the standard <w> variant categorically. This variation was analyzed quantitatively using the variable rule methodology described in Chapter Four. In all the following tables of results, a weighting of .5 indicates that the factor in question favours the nonstandard <y> variant, whilst a weighting of below .5 disfavours <y>, relative to the other factors in the same factor group.

9.4 Phonological Environment

Four factors of phonological environment grouped into two factor groups were used in the initial run of the programme with the (u) data. The two groups are Final Posture and Scope of Realization.

9.4.1 Final Posture

The factors in this group were y (i.e., all syllables ending in -n) and a (all other syllables). The hypothesis was that y final posture would favour the <y> variant,
thus maintaining the same unrounded prosodic posture throughout the syllable. However, comparison using the chi square test (see p.114) between the initial run and a subsequent run in which this factor group was omitted showed no statistically significant loss of fit to the data in the latter run. There is therefore no evidence for any effect of final posture on the (ū) variable and this factor group was omitted in the final run.

9.4.2 Scope of Realization

This group consists of the factors Glide and Nucleus, i.e., whether in the standard pronunciation the rounding associated with \( \text{ψ} \) posture extends only through the initial consonant and glide, or whether it persists through the vowel nucleus.

The results for this factor group in the final run are set out below.

Table 9.1 Variable Rule Analysis of (ü): Scope of Realization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;y&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;y&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glide</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleus</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total tokens: 2973; Total <y>: 738 (25%)
The factor Glide clearly favours the nonstandard $\langle y \rangle$ variant. A likely explanation for this is that when rounding persists through the vowel nucleus, it is more salient than when it ends earlier. This may be related to the general hypothesis that speakers of Huayu in Singapore are more likely to acquire a feature of the standard pronunciation in environments in which it is most salient (see 3.5.1.1).

9.5 Mode

As explained in Chapter five, the two factors of mode refer to the two sections of the interviews - the first section consisting mainly of the informants giving information about themselves and their language use and then expressing their opinions on a number of topics, and the second section in which informants read aloud word lists (two zi expressions) and minimal pair lists. The results for this factor group are as follows.

Table 9.2 Variable Rule Analysis of ($\ddot{u}$): The Mode Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF $\langle y \rangle$</th>
<th>% OF $\langle y \rangle$</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking</td>
<td>2537</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that speakers are likely to adjust their speech in favour of the standard $\langle y \rangle$ variant in contexts in which more attention is likely to be paid to speech.
This provides evidence for the hypothesis that the \(<w_f>\) variant may be evaluated as "correct" or more prestigious and may be associated with more formal speech.

9.5.1 Hypercorrection

There is further evidence that the \(<w_f>\) variant may be evaluated by Singapore speakers as the "correct", prestige or more formal variant. There are a number of occurrences in the data of syllables which in the standard pronunciation have unrounded \(\u0143\) initial posture but are pronounced by informants with the rounded \(<w_f>\) variant, for example, \([ly]\) for standard \([li]\) as in \(\text{li}\) "in" and \([\text{yen}]\) for standard \([\text{\textasciitilde en}]\) as in \(\text{yan}\) "speech". Most such realizations occur in the reading sections and indicate that speakers are aware that \(\u0143\) is sometimes "wrongly" used for \(w\) and in careful speech they try to correct this. However, they are uncertain about which \(z\) have which posture in the standard pronunciation, so they are sometimes led to use the \(<w_f>\) variant where it does not occur in the standard pronunciation. Such hypercorrection is often observed where speakers of one speech variety attempt to imitate a feature of another prestige variety (Knowles 1978, Trudgill 1983).

9.6 Age

The age factors used in the initial run are those listed at 5.2.1. Comparison using the chi square test between
the initial run and a subsequent run in which the factors 31-40 and 41-56 were collapsed showed no significant loss of fit to the data in the latter run. The results for this factor group in the final run are as follows.

Table 9.3 Variable Rule Analysis of (u): The Age Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;y&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;y&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-56</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that younger informants are likely to use the standard variant more frequently than older informants. Given the developments in Singapore Huayu over the last few decades, in particular the increasing concern with an exonomative standard, it seems reasonable to interpret this as diachronic change, i.e., as evidence that in the case of this variable there may be a move towards greater use of the prescribed standard variant, perhaps beginning with those speakers who finished their formal education within roughly the last two decades.

9.7 Level of Education

The level of education factors used in the initial run are those listed at 5.2.2. Comparison using the chi square test between the initial run and a subsequent run
in which the factors completed primary, completed lower secondary and completed upper secondary were collapsed showed no statistically significant loss of fit to the data in the latter run. The findings for this factor group in the final run are as follows.

Table 9.4 Variable Rule Analysis of (u): The Level of Education Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;x&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;x&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prim.</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim. to Upper Sec.</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Sec.</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings show a clear relationship between the variable and level of education, suggesting that the more highly educated the informants are the more frequently they are likely to use the standard variant.

9.7.1 A Note on the Factor <Primary>

As pointed out in Chapter Five, weightings for the factor <primary> should be treated with some caution as it identifies only three informants. The raw scores for the performance of these three informants on this variable are as follows.
Informant One: 32 tokens, 13 (41%) as <y>
Informant Two: 31 tokens, 12 (39%) as <y>
Informant Three: 64 tokens, 56 (87%) as <y>

This shows that, as expected, all three informants identified by this factor have levels of <y> occurrence substantially higher than the group percentages for the other education levels. However, it is interesting that informant three should have over twice the levels of the other two. This informant is, in fact, the most highly educated of the three, having had nearly two years of primary education. At 45, he is also slightly younger than the other two. However, he is also the only member of the <primary> group to both be male and have Hokkien as mother tongue, both favouring factors for <y> (see 9.8 and 9.9 below).

9.8 Sex

The results for this factor group are as follows.

Table 9.5 Variable Rule Analysis of (ü): The Sex Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;y&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;y&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests a relationship between this variable and the sex of the speakers. It is interesting that female
informants should use the variant hypothesized as associated with more "correct" or prestige speech more frequently than the males, as this accords with findings in culturally very different speech communities that women tend to be more sensitive to prestige variants than men (see, for example, Labov 1972:301-304).

9.9 Mother Tongue

The findings for this factor group are as follows.

Table 9.6 Variable Rule Analysis of (ü): The Mother Tongue Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF 〈y〉</th>
<th>% OF 〈y〉</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huayu</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings show that informants with Hokkien as mother tongue are likely to use the nonstandard variant more frequently than those with Cantonese as mother tongue. This is not particularly surprising, as Cantonese has a high front rounded vowel whereas Hokkien does not, and the 〈y〉 would presumably be easier for Cantonese speakers to master, although the distribution of this feature in Cantonese does not entirely correspond with Mandarin.
9.9.1 A Note on the Factor Huayu

As mentioned in Chapter Five, weightings for the factor Huayu must be treated with some caution as it identifies only three informants. The raw scores for these informants are as follows.

- **Informant One**: 55 tokens, 11 (20%) realized as $\langle y \rangle$
- **Informant Two**: 65 tokens, 3 (5%) realized as $\langle y \rangle$
- **Informant Three**: 26 tokens, 1 (4%) realized as $\langle y \rangle$

The performance of informant one on this variable differs substantially from that of the other two and has clearly skewed the weighting for this factor. There is no obvious reason why informant one should be an exception. He is a 16 year old secondary student and informant three is his sister. Like the other two informants in this group, he has been educated primarily through Huayu as first school language and claims to know little or nothing of his ancestral dialect (Hakka).

Thus, we can only note that two out of the three informants whose speech might be taken as representing a truly "indigenized" variety of Huayu have very low levels of the nonstandard variant of this variable, and that the weighting of .56 for this factor is skewed by the performance of one informant.
9.10 Comparison with Chen C.Y. (1986)

Although Chen Chungyu's data base is very different from that used in the present study (see p.27), her results show some similarity. She too found that a high front vowel (i.e., the <w> variant, transcribed by Chen as 'u) was more likely to be "correctly" pronounced "where 'u functioned as the main vowel (as in 'un and 'u) than when it functioned as a medial (as in 'ue and 'uan)" (Chen C.Y. 1986:138). She also found that her Cantonese informants had a much higher level of correct readings (81.5%) than her informants from the other dialect groups (the Hokkien group scored 57.9% correct).

9.11 Comparison with Other varieties of Mandarin

This syllable initial high front rounded feature of the standard pronunciation is also variable or absent in a number of the Mandarin dialects spoken in China. The Mandarin dialects of Yunnan and Guizhou generally have no high front rounded glide or vowel at all. Other dialects do have such a feature, but it does not always correspond to [y] in the standard pronunciation. For example, in Nanjing dialect the yunmu of 比 que "but" is [io?] and of 你的 "fish" is [u], and in Hankou dialect the yunmu of 诺 que is [io] (Zhan 1981).

Speakers of Putonghua as a second dialect in China are also sometimes heard to use <y> for standard <w> and
Kubler mentions the merger of the two in the Guoyu of "many Taiwanese" (Kubler 1981:65). Similarly, Liao (1977), in a study of the Mandarin reading pronunciations of five informants from Taiwan, found the same phenomenon, with üé being the most favouring environment for the <x> variant, ū and üan less favouring and ün the least favouring. This differs slightly from the findings of the present study which would predict that ū would be no more favouring than ün.

It is clear, then, that the use of an unrounded front initial posture where the standard pronunciation would require rounding is not a unique feature of Singapore Huayu.

9.12 Conclusion

The evidence suggests that the variation investigated in this chapter represents change in progress towards the standard rounded <w> variant of (ü), and that this change may be motivated by a social evaluation which associates the standard variant with more educated, formal or "correct" speech. In this, the (û) variable looks very similar to the kinds of sociolinguistic variables that have been investigated in many other, mainly monolingual, communities.

However, the variable may also be affected by the speakers' mother tongues, with speakers whose mother
tongue lacks a high front rounded posture being likely to use such a feature less frequently in their Huayu. The nonstandard \( \langle y \rangle \) can therefore be said to bear some of the hallmark of an interference feature. Such a crossover from interference feature to social marker is what we might expect in a context in which Singapore Huayu has developed against the background of southern Chinese dialects, is learned as a second language (i.e., not mother tongue) by most of its speakers, yet is also a language of everyday use and the dominant language of a substantial number of its speakers.

The evidence also suggests that the standard \( \langle w \rangle \) variant is more likely to occur in environments in which its phonetic realization persists longest in the syllable. This relates to the general hypothesis that a standard feature is more likely to be acquired in environments in which it is more salient.
1. The prosodic postures $\uparrow$, $\downarrow$, $\omega$ and $\alpha$ will be always underlined. When they represent variants of a variable, $\uparrow$ and $\omega$ will also be enclosed within angled brackets (i.e., $<\uparrow>$ and $<\omega>$). This is to clearly distinguish them from phonetic representations such as [y], [w] and [a].

2. Chao also transcribes the yunmu of such syllables as [iŋ]. However, he adds a note that "the medial in iong is slightly rounded" (Chao 1968:23).
10.1 \textit{r}- in Standard Huayu

The syllable initial consonant written as \textit{r}- in Pinyin is, in the standard pronunciation, a voiced retroflex alveolo-palatal fricative and is usually transcribed phonetically as [\textit{\textit{z}}]. However, the extent of friction is somewhat variable and it is sometimes characterized as a retroflex continuant (e.g., Chao 1968) which may be transcribed as [\textit{\textit{\textae}}]. Table 10.1 lists all the \textit{r}- initial syllables in Pinyin, arranged according to initial and final prosodic postures. Note that the \textit{r}- initial never occurs with initial \textit{y} posture.

\textbf{Table 10.1 \textit{r} Initial Syllables in Standard Huayu}

\textbf{POSTURES}

\begin{tabular}{ccccccc}
\hline
Initial/Final & a & a & ri & re & a & w \\
\hline
a & w & rou & reng & rao & rang & a & y \\
\hline
a & y & ren & ran & w & a & ru \\
\hline
w & a & ru & ruo & ru & rui & run & ruan
\end{tabular}
10.2 $r-$ in Singapore Huayu

In the Singapore data, there is a great deal of variation in the initial consonants of syllables having $r-$ in the standard pronunciation. The variation involves place of articulation, extent of retroflexion and extent of friction. The variants identified are as follows:

1. $\chi$ and $\gamma$ - the standard variants, very rare in the data, at least with the extent of retroflexion usual in the standard pronunciation (but see variant 4 below).

2. [l] - an alveolar lateral, sometimes pronounced with some audible friction.


4. [ɭ] - a post-alveolar continuant. In careful speech some speakers have slight retroflexion bringing it closer to the standard variant $\chi$.

5. [r] - an apical flap.

6. [dz] - an alveolar or dental affricate. In careful speech, a few speakers have slight retroflexion, producing a variant between [dz] and $\ell$. 
7. [z] - similar to [dz] but without the initial closure. Sometime, however, it appears to be between [z] and [j].

8. [j] - a palatal glide

There are no occurrences in the data of the syllables rúa, rui, run and rao.

10.2.1 Complementary Distribution among the (r) Variants

There is a strong tendency towards complementary distribution among the above variants. [j] is almost entirely restricted to the syllable rong (the exception is an isolated occurrence in rj). [dz] occurs very commonly in ri syllables. Such syllables are often pronounced with friction throughout, i.e., the minimal lowering of the tongue which in the standard pronunciation produces the high vowel (usually transcribed as [l], or [l] when retroflex) does not take place. [dz] also occurs in the syllables ren, re, and reng but very rarely in other syllables. [z] (or [j]) seems to have the same distribution but is much less frequent. [l] occurs in all syllables except rong (the [l] variant will be examined in greater detail below). This also seems to be the case with [n], although this variant is much less frequent. [l] and [r] occur in all syllables.
10.2.2 Underdifferentiation of Standard Oppositions

Note that three of these nonstandard variants, [l], [n], [dz] and [j], may lead to underdifferentiation of oppositions in the standard pronunciation between the initial consonant r and the initial consonants 1-, n-, z-, and y- (in certain environments only, of course).

10.2.3 Sociolinguistic Status of the (r) Variants

In the following analysis, the variants [r], [q], [u], [r], [dz] and [z] have been classed together as potentially "standard-like", non-stigmatized variants as opposed to [l], which seems the most likely candidate for being recognized by Singapore speakers as "incorrect" or "uneducated" (i.e., a stigmatized variant). There are a number of reasons for this.

Firstly, [l] seems to be the most salient of the nonstandard variants to Singapore speakers. It is the variant most likely to be commented upon and labelled "incorrect" or "nonstandard", for example in the "Speak Better Mandarin" genre of lessons broadcast or published in the mass media.

In order to get some confirmation of this, a small experiment was carried out in which two Singapore informants, both under 25, university graduates and Chinese medium educated up to pre-university level, were
asked to mark as correct or incorrect a selection of
pronunciations of \( r \)-syllables from the reading aloud
sections of the recorded data. One of these informants
marked as definitely incorrect only one reading - that of
\( [ł] \) \( rąng \) "yield" with initial \([l]\), but hesitated over a
reading of \( \lambda \) \( rù \) with \([l]\) as he was not sure whether
"should be \( rù \) or \( lù \) in Pinyin." The other informant
marked as incorrect readings of \( [ł] \) \( rąng \), \( \lambda \) \( rù \) and \( \ddot{v} \)
\( ròo \) with initial \([l]\). It is significant that neither of
them showed any hesitation in marking as correct readings
of \( \lambda \) \( rù \), \( rè \), \( ròu \) and \( \lambda \) \( rên \) with initial \([z]\),
readings of \( \ddot{v} \) \( ròo \) and \( [ł] \) \( rąng \) with initial \([r]\) and
readings of \( \ddot{o} \) \( rì \) with both initial \([dz]\) and initial \([z]\).

Secondly, in the sections of the interviews with teachers
of Huayu (see 6.6.1) in which they were asked how
important they thought it was to correct certain errors,
all agreed without hesitation that the \([l]\) variant ( in \( \lambda \)
\( rên \) ) was wrong and should be corrected, whereas there
was less certainty about the variants \([ł]\) ( in \( rên \) ) and
\([dz]\) ( in \( rì \) ). One said they were both incorrect "as
there should be no compromise with the Beijing
pronunciation". However, the other two said that it was
probably not worth trying to correct such
pronunciations, one commenting that "retroflexion is very
hard for Singapore speakers".
Thirdly, during the reading aloud section of the interview, one informant made the following comment on the pronunciation of *rou* "meat".

Rúgūo nǐ dú, hàoxiàng zheige yè yǒu liǎng zhǒng niànfǎ la, lòulei, yǒu xīe rén dú, yǒu xīe rén shí dú lòulei, yǒu xīe rén shí dú ròu, bǔguò ròulei shì zhèngquède la.

(If you read it, for example this one also has two readings, lòulei, some people read, some people read it as lòulei, some people read it as ròu, however ròulei is correct.)

(Note: In the underlined syllables ₁ = [l] and r = [ɭ], perhaps with some slight retroflexion.)

This clearly indicates recognition of just two variants, ɭ ("correct") and l ("incorrect").

Finally, in the evaluation tests the two samples rated highest by the judges in terms of the speakers' likely level of education and status of occupation (see 8.5.1) contained 5 and 4 occurrences of the [ɭ] variant and no occurrences of the [l] variant, while the two samples rated lowest each had two occurrences of the [l] variant and none of the other variants. The former two samples attracted such comments as fāyín hěn zhùnquè "correct pronunciation", pìsōliàngde Huáyǔ "beautiful Huayu", shòuguò gāodù jiàoyù "highly educated", whereas the latter two attracted such comments as fāyín bù zhùn
"incorrect pronunciation", bu biāozhǔn "nonstandard" and "not well educated." This does not, of course, prove that it was this variable that the judges were responding to in making their judgements. However, it does at least indicate that the presence of non-retroflex variants such as [ŋ] does not prevent a favourable evaluation of a speech sample.

The hypothesis is, then, that the nonstandard variants [ŋ], [r], [dz] and the less frequent [z] are, with some complementary distribution, "permissible" variants of r- in any emerging educated norm for Singapore Huayu, whereas the [l] variant may be a stigmatized variant, perceived as incorrect, nonstandard and (possibly) uneducated.

10.3 Variable Rule Analysis of (r)

10.3.1 The Variable and the Variants

In the following analysis, (r) symbolizes the variable (i.e., all occurrences of what would be the initial consonant r- in the standard pronunciation ), <l> the nonstandard or potentially stigmatized variant and <r> the other "standard-like" variants. In all the tables of results, a weighting of above .5 indicates that the factor in question favours the <l> variant and a weighting of below .5 indicates that the factor
disfavours it, relative to other factors in the same group.

10.3.2 The Syllable rong

Occurrences of the syllable rong are excluded from the analysis as the 1 variant never (or very rarely) occurs in this environment. The initial segment of rong in the data is commonly [j] and this syllable seems to be something of a special case. [j] does not occur (apart from very rare exceptions) as a variant of (r) with any other yunmu. It is quite possible that this pronunciation of rong is due to the influence of southern dialects spoken in Singapore. Nearly all the occurrences of this syllable in the data are in the 'simple', which in Cantonese is pronounced with initial [j] and in Hokkien with initial [i] (Beijing Daxue 1964).

However, it is also worth noting that in Beijing dialect, on which the standard pronunciation is based, there is also a variant pronunciation of this zi with initial [j]. Modern dictionaries of the standard language (for example the Hanyu Cidian) give only rong as the pronunciation of this zi, but older dictionaries (e.g., Mathews' Chinese English Dictionary) also give the alternative pronunciation. In many other dialects of Mandarin spoken in China (for example those of Shenyang, Xi'an, Chengdu, Kunming and Yangzhou) this zi is also pronounced as [γŋ] or ['oŋ] (Beijing Daxue 1964). As with several of the
features of Singapore Huayu, it is not always possible to determine a single origin.

10.3.3 The [n] variant

Occurrences of the variant [n] were also excluded. The number of occurrences of [n] is very small and its status is unclear, although it can probably be regarded as a nonstandard, stigmatized variant similar to <l> (note that in Singapore Huayu, there is also variation between [n] and [l], see Chapter Thirteen).

10.4 Phonological Environment

As (r) occurs with a fairly small number of yunmu, it was possible to include them all as factors in the variable rule analysis. The factor group coding phonological environment therefore consists of the following factors.

1. \(\hat{i}\) initial a posture, final a posture
2. \(\hat{e}\)
3. \(\hat{ou}\)
4. \(\hat{eng}\) initial a posture, final w posture
5. \(\hat{ang}\)
6. \(\hat{en}\) initial a posture, final y posture
7. \(\hat{an}\)
The results for this factor group are as follows.

Table 10.2 Variable Rule Analysis of (r): The Yunmu Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;1&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;1&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ang</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uo</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ou</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total tokens of (r): 1510. Total no. of <1>: 325 (21%).

The relatively high weightings for uan, u and uo suggest that initial w posture favours the <1> variant more strongly than initial a posture, although ang seems to be an exception, see 10.4.1 below). The higher weightings for ang, ou and eng than for an and en similarly suggest
that final w posture might favour \( <l> \), although less strongly than initial w posture. Yunmu with a postures both initially and finally seem to be the least favouring environments for \( <l> \).

10.4.1 The Syllable r\(\text{ng} \)

The yunmu \( \text{ang} \) seems to be an exception to the general pattern, as it has a initial posture yet is the second most favouring environment for \( <l> \). However, of the relatively few tokens (39) of the \( \text{ang} \) yunmu in the data, 35 (including all 13 of the \( <l> \) variant) are pronunciations of the zi \( \text{j} \) in \( \text{rangbu} \) "to give way". The higher than predicted weighting for \( \text{ang} \) is therefore somewhat unreliable and may reflect a lexically specific tendency.

10.4.2 Recoding of Phonological Environment

The results of a second run in which the phonological environment factors were recoded into two factor groups, initial posture and final posture, are set out below.
Table 10.3 Variable Rule Analysis of (r): Initial and Final Posture Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIAL POSTURE</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;1&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;1&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL POSTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison between the two runs using the chi square test shows a statistically significant, though small, loss of fit to the data at the .05 level of significance used in this study (p. in fact = just slightly below .05, i.e., there is slightly less than a 1 in 20 probability that the difference between the runs is due to chance).

However, the advantages of this latter run are that it brings out the patterns in the data more clearly and reduces the danger of having unreliably small numbers of tokens for some factors.

10.4.3 Labiovelar Posture and the (r) Variants

The findings of the variable rule analysis clearly indicate, then, that initial labiovelar posture strongly favours the <1> variant. This accords with another
phenomenon in the data. Some occurrences of \( r \)-syllables which have initial \( w \) posture in the standard pronunciation are de-labialized (i.e., become homophonous with \( a \) posture syllables) when pronounced with the \([\sim\]) or \([r]\) variants, for example \([\sim\text{ an}]\) for \(\text{ruan} \) (standard \([\sim\text{ an}]\)). Thus, \(<1>\) appears to have a general tendency to attract or be attracted to labialization, whilst \([\sim\]), \([r]\) and the other variants tend to repel it.

10.4.5 Final Posture

The evidence for the effects of final posture on the \( (r) \) variation needs to be treated with some caution. It is tempting to regard the higher weighting for \( w \) final posture as consistent with a general hypothesis that labiovelar posture anywhere in the syllable favours \(<1>\). However, this must be a somewhat tentative conclusion. It is unfortunate that the one syllable which has \( w \) posture both initially and finally - \(\text{rong} \) - should prove to be a special case and have to be omitted from the analysis, as we therefore have evidence for the effects of final \( w \) posture as against \( y \) and \( a \) postures only in initial \( a \) posture syllables.

It is also not entirely clear why final \( y \) posture should favour the \(<1>\) variant so much more strongly than \( a \) posture. However, the low weighting for \( a \) is partly due to the very low likelihood of the syllables \(\text{re} \) and \(\text{ri} \) being realized with \(<1>\) (5% and 3% respectively). This
may be due more to the fact that the vowels in these two syllables strongly attract the [dz] and [z] variants, which have been counted as "standard-like", than to the disfavouring of <l> by a posture. This may be particularly the case with ri in which the "vowel" is often realized simply by the continuation of the friction in [dz] or [z] (see 10.2.1).

10.5 Mode

Comparison using the chi square test between the initial run including all factors and a later run in which the mode factor group was omitted showed no statistically significant loss of fit to the data in the latter run. There is therefore no evidence of a shift away from <l> where the informants may be paying greater attention to their pronunciation.

10.6 Age

Comparison using the chi square test between the initial run with all the age factors and a run in which the factors 21-30, 31-40, and 41-56 were collapsed showed no statistically significant loss of fit to the data in the latter run. The results for this factor group in the final run are set out below.
Table 10.4 Variable Rule Analysis of (r): The Age Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;1&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;1&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-56</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that there may be a move towards the standard-like variants, but that move may have begun fairly recently with those still in formal education or those who have completed their education within the last decade.

10.7 Level of Education

Comparison using the chi square test between the initial run with all factors and a run in which all the factors above <primary were collapsed into a single factor showed no statistically significant loss of fit to the data in the latter run. The results for this factor in the final run are set out below.

Table 10.5 Variable Rule Analysis of (r): The Education Level Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;1&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;1&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Prim.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Prim.</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This suggests that there could be an association between higher frequencies of the \textit{l} variant and less educated speech. However, the only significant difference is between below primary level of education on the one hand and primary education and above on the other.

10.7.1 A Note on the Factor \textit{primary}

All three informants identified by the factor \textit{primary} have relatively high levels of the \textit{l} variant, confirming the relationship between a less than primary level of education and higher frequencies of the nonstandard variant. However, one of the three has a much lower level than the other three. The raw scores are as follows:

- \textit{Informant 1}: 20 tokens, 6 (30\%) realized as \textit{l}
- \textit{Informant 2}: 9 tokens, 8 (89\%) realized as \textit{l}
- \textit{Informant 3}: 11 tokens, 9 (82\%) realized as \textit{l}

It is interesting that informant one should again be the odd one out (see 9.7.1). However, unlike with the (\textit{\textmu}) variable, with (r) he has lower levels of the nonstandard variant than the other two informants. This might be explained by the fact, already noted in Chapter Nine, that he is slightly more educated and younger than the other two and that male and Hokkien do not favour the nonstandard variant of (r) as they do the nonstandard variant of (\textit{\textmu}).
10.8 Sex

Table 10.6 Variable Rule Analysis of (r): The Sex Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;l&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;l&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that the factor female slightly favours the <l> variant whilst the factor male slightly disfavours it. If a similar trend were to show up in several of the variables, we might look for a social explanation - for example that in Singapore males may be more likely than females to participate in certain public domains in which more formal Huayu might be used. However, the only other variable to show a similar pattern is the la particle (Chapter Fourteen) and it will be suggested that in this case it may be related to the modal function of the particle. None of the other phonological variable show this pattern. The (û) variable, in fact, shows the opposite pattern (see Table 9.5). It would, therefore, be unwise to draw any firm conclusions from the fact that the factor female slightly favours the nonstandard variant in a single phonological variable.
10.9 Mother Tongue

Table 10.7 Variable Rule Analysis of (r): The Mother Tongue Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;l&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;l&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huayu</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The factor Cantonese favours the <l> variant only marginally more than the factor Hokkien and this cannot be taken as a clear evidence for mother tongue interference.

Neither Hokkien nor Cantonese have an initial consonant phonetically close to the r in standard Huayu. The Mandarin initial r generally corresponds with Hokkien [dz] (or [dz] before [i]), for example in the Hokkien pronunciations of 焦 ran, 彰 ren, 热 re and 素 ri, and [l] varying with [n], for example in the Hokkien pronunciations of 軟 ruan and 人 ren (Yuan et al 1968)^2.

Mandarin r generally corresponds to Cantonese [j], as in all the above zi. Thus, if anything, one might expect speakers with Hokkien as a mother tongue to use the <l> variant more frequently than speakers with Cantonese as a mother tongue. It seems reasonable to conclude that
mother tongue interference does not have a great effect on the patterning of this variable.

10.9.1 A Note on the Huayu Factor

It is interesting that the factor Huayu so strongly disfavours <l>, suggesting that any "indigenized" variety of Singapore Huayu that the speech of these informants might be thought to represent is likely to retain only very low levels of the <l> variant. However, as previously pointed out, the results for this factor must be treated with some caution and need to be looked at in greater detail. The raw figures for these informants are as follows:

Informant 1: 29 tokens, 1 (3%) realized as <l>
Informant 2: 23 tokens, 5 (22%) realized as <l>
Informant 3: 42 tokens, 0 realized as <l>

Looking at only informants one and three, we might conclude that the nonstandard variant of (r) is almost entirely absent in this mother tongue variety of Huayu. However, as with (u) (see 9.9), informant two (the 16 year old schoolboy) is the odd one out, with a substantially higher level of the nonstandard variant than his sister or the other informant with Singapore Huayu as mother tongue. Again, there seems no obvious reason why this should be so.
10.10 Comparison with Chen C.Y. (1986)

Chen Chungyu identifies the nonstandard variants as [l], [n], [j] and [dz] and in her study, 25% of readings of standard r- zi are realized with initial [l] and 1.4% with initial [n]. Her findings for the phonological environments favouring [l] are substantially the same as in the present study. She finds that initial w prosodic syllables are the most favouring environment, r- being "replaced by /l/ or /n/" in 40% of such syllables (p.127). She differs slightly from the present study in that ri and re were found to have no tendency at all to be realized with [l] (there are just 2 and 4 such realizations respectively in the present study), and although she notes that 72.5% of the readings of the syllable rong had initial [j], she also observes 1 case of the r- in rong being "replaced by /l/ or /n/" and 1 case of it "varying with /l/ or /n/" (p.127).

10.11 Comparison With Other Varieties of Mandarin

Among dialects of Mandarin spoken in China, there is a great deal of variation in this initial consonant. Of the ten dialect points listed in Zhan (1981:99) representing the Mandarin dialects, one (Yangzhou) has initial [l] in r\_ ren, 3 ri, x\~\varepsilon ru and n\~\varepsilon rui, one (Shenyang) has [l] in rui but zero in r\_ ren, 3 ri and x\~\varepsilon ru, one (Jinan) has [\varepsilon] in r\_ ren and 3 ri but [l] in x\~\varepsilon ru and n\~\varepsilon rui, one (Hankou) has [n] and [l] in r\_ ren, [l] in n\~\varepsilon rui
and zero in \( \ddot{\text{i}} \) and \( \dddot{\text{u}} \) and one (Chengdu) has [z] for all four zi.

Initial [l] in standard \( \text{r}^- \) syllables is also quite often heard in the Putonghua spoken as a second dialect in China. However, Kubler (1981) mentions only [dz] as a nonstandard variant of \( \text{r}^- \) in Taiwanese Mandarin.

Thus, the nonstandard variants of \( \text{r}^- \) in Singapore Huayu are not unique to this variety of Mandarin, although it is possible that the use of the <l> variant may serve to distinguish a Singapore "accent" from a Taiwanese "accent".

10.12 Conclusion

Pressure from the prescribed standard does not seem to be resulting in a significant movement towards use of the standard retroflex realizations of \( \text{r}^- \) and there is some evidence of a range of acceptable nonstandard variants with a strong tendency to complementary distribution. However, there does seem to be a move away from what appears to be the most salient nonstandard variant - <l> - led by speakers below about twenty. There also seems to be an association between a high frequency of the <l> variant and the lowest level of education (not completed primary). However, despite the fact that the difference between the <l> and <r> variants is salient to at least some speakers (see 10.2.3) and that the <l> variant is
sometimes explicity referred to as incorrect, the present
data does not show a significant shift away from <l> in
the reading sections.
1. The status of *rua* in Standard Huayu is somewhat doubtful. There is, in fact, only one *zi* in colloquial Beijing dialect with this form.

2. This is based upon the pronunciation of Xiamen (Amoy) city. In other varieties of Hokkien Mandarin *r-* may correspond with [dz] and [j], see, for example, Tay (1968)'s description of Eng Chun Hokkien. However, I have checked with a number of Hokkien speaking Singaporeans who assure me that the usual pronunciation of these latter *zi* in Singapore is with initial [l].
11.1 Nasal Yunmu in Standard Huayu

The standard pronunciation has a set of nasal yunmu or "rhymes" which normally end in a velar stop [ŋ] (although actual closure may be variable, see 11.1.2 below) and are written with final ng in Pinyin. In terms of Halliday's 1985 analysis, these are analyzed as syllables selecting nasal resonance and final w posture, which is realized by backing and rounding. The standard pronunciation also has a corresponding set of nasal yunmu which normally end in [n], are written with final n in Pinyin and are analyzed as selecting y final posture, which is realized by fronting and raising. These two sets of nasal yunmu are set out in Table 11.1 in Pinyin together with their major phonetic realizations in Beijing Mandarin.
Table 11.1 Nasal Yunmu in Beijing Mandarin
(Based on Halliday 1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-ng (w posture)</th>
<th>-n (y posture)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eng ɔŋ</td>
<td>en ɔn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing ɛŋ</td>
<td>in ɛn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ong ɔŋ</td>
<td>un ɔŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ang ɔŋ</td>
<td>an ɔŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uang ʊŋ</td>
<td>uan ʊŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iang ɪŋ</td>
<td>ian ɪŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iong ɥŋ</td>
<td>ün ɥŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>üan ɥŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = fronted relative to the cardinal value of the symbol
− = backed relative to the cardinal value
ₗ = lowered relative to the cardinal value

11.2 Variation in Nasal Yunmu in Beijing Mandarin

In Beijing Mandarin, the major dimensions of variation in these yunmu are absence or presence of the final nasal stop ([n] or [ŋ]) and the extent to which the realization of the nasal prosody extends back from the syllable margin (Barale 1982, see also Appendix Two). Thus, for example, phonetic realizations of eng may be [ɔŋ], [ɔŋ] or [ɔŋ].

Note that even when there is no final nasal stop, nasal syllables differing only in final posture (i.e., w or y) do not become homophonous, as final posture choice
affects vowel quality as well as place of articulation of the final nasal stop.

11.3 The (ng) Variable in Singapore Huayu

In Singapore Huayu, standard n versus ng yunmu (i.e., nasal yunmu with final y versus w postures) are sometimes not differentiated. For example, zi such as 铭记 "dust" and 重 "city", or 装 "ship" and 张 "bed" may be homophonous. The commonest form this underdifferentiation (from the viewpoint of the standard pronunciation) takes is for yunmu belonging to the ng class in the standard to be variably realized with final [n] rather than [ŋ] by Singapore speakers. However, as we shall see, this cannot always be regarded simply as selection of y posture instead of w posture, as in some cases the phonetic quality of the vowel nucleus may suggest one posture whilst the place of articulation of the final nasal stop suggests another. In analyzing the variation, we will need to take into account not only variable underdifferentiation or neutralization of w v. y final posture options in nasal yunmu but also the extent to which the Singapore pronunciation approaches that of the standard pronunciation in its phonetic realization of the posture prosodies.

In the following variable rule analysis of this variation, (ng) symbolizes the variable, i.e., all yunmu in the data which belong to the ng class ( or in more
conventional variable rule terminology, all potential environments for the application of the rule ng→n). [ŋ] is used to symbolize the standard variant and [n] the nonstandard variant.

There are some cases in the data of nasal yunmu ending with a final bilabial closure [m]. These can almost always be explained as assimilations from a following labial consonant, the most common of these is [fʊmʔtʰoː] for fangmian. These are excluded from the analysis.

There are also occurrences in the data of underdifferentiation in the opposite direction - that is, syllables having η, (i.e., Y posture) yunmu in the standard pronunciation being realized with final [ŋ]. However, these are far fewer and will not be included in the variable rule analysis (but see Table 11.4 p.306).

The yunmu ιong and ong were found to have no tendency to be realized with [n]. They have, therefore, also been omitted from the variable rule analysis.

11.4 Phonological Environment: the Whole Yunmu

11.4.1 Results for the Factor Group Yunmu

For the purpose of the variable rule analysis, the ng yunmu listed in Table 11.1 form the factors of one factor group. The advantage of coding for the whole yunmu rather than just the preceding phonological segment, as is
usually done in such analyses, is that it allows for a possible non-segmental interpretation of the results, avoiding an a priori assumption that the variable is placed in one segment and is conditioned only by immediately adjacent segments. The results for this factor group are given in Table 11.2. As in all the following tables, a weighting of above .5 indicates that the factor in question favours the nonstandard variant ([n]) and a weighting of below .5 indicates that the factor disfavours it, relative to other factors in the same group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS OF (ng)</th>
<th>TOTAL [n]</th>
<th>% [n]</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uang</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ang</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iang</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS: 5569 tokens of (ng); 666 (12%) realizations as [n].

11.4.2 Discussion of Results

Table 11.2 shows that this variable is strongly phonologically constrained. In the data analysed, the standard yunmu eng is by far the most favouring environment for [n], iang is the least favouring (apart
from iong and ong for which [ŋ] is categorical, see p.392) and uang, ang and ing are intermediate.

11.4.2.1 A Segmental View

Before considering these results from the non-segmental or prosodic phonological perspective, it is worth briefly illustrating some difficulties that arise in attempting to incorporate these findings within the formalism of segmental phonology, such is usual in variable rule studies (see 4.3).

In segmental analyses (both structural and generative) the difference between a syllable with an ng yunmu and a corresponding syllable with an n yunmu is regarded phonologically as a contrast between two places of articulation in the final nasal stop segment, with other phonetic differences resulting from regressive assimilation. Thus, for example, Cheng (1973a) in a generative treatment of Mandarin phonology gives the underlying forms of an, ang, ian, iang, uan, uang and üan as ʌn/, ʌŋ/, ʌiʌn/, ʌiʌŋ/, ʌuʌn/, ʌuʌŋ/ and üuʌn/, i.e., they all have the same underlying low vowel in the nucleus. The phonetic forms are derived by the following Backness Rule:
A further rule applies to the output of this rule to yield the form \([i n] \) from underlying \(/i n/:\)

\[
\text{a} \rightarrow [i n]
\]

(Cheng 1973a:19)

Thus, regressive assimilation accounts for the phonetic form of the underlying low vowel in all of these yunmu, with the exception of \(ian\), for which both progressive and regressive assimilation must be posited.

This is essentially the same as a "classical" phonemic analysis of these finals in which the allophones of a phoneme /a/ would be \( [\text{\textbullet}] \) after /i/ and before /n/, \( [\text{a}] \) before other occurrences of [n] and \( [\text{\textbullet}] \) before [ŋ] (e.g., Hartman 1944).

Note that the phonetic output of these rules is not quite so narrow as that of the transcriptions given in Table 11.1. One major difference is lack of recognition that in \(u\)ang rounding usually persists throughout the syllable,
in Beijing Mandarin at least. An additional rule would be necessary to take account of this.

Similarly, Cheng does not recognize any phonetic differences between the vowels of en and eng (both given as [ə]) and between the vowels of in and ing (both given as [i]), although, of course, if he had recognised such differences, he could equally have accounted for them in terms of regressive assimilation.

The usual formulation of variable rules (as a refinement of the optional rule of generative phonology, see 4.3) incorporates the segmental bias of these kinds of analyses in that it implies that variation takes place in one segment and may be constrained by preceding and following segments. At first glance this should present no problem for representing the Singapore Huayu nasal yunmu variable. A basic variable rule for the (ng) variable might be formulated thus:

\[ [+\text{NAS}] \rightarrow \text{<-BACK>} / <V> \underline{---} \# <F> \]

V would be the possible preceding vowel features ordered according to the findings of the statistical analysis and F would be any feature of the initial segment of the following syllable found to constrain the application of the rule, similarly ordered.

\# indicates syllable or zi boundary.
However, if we attempt to interpret the results of the variable rule analysis given in table two in terms of a hierarchy of constraints in the immediately preceding segment, we run into some difficulties. If we follow Cheng (1973a) in regarding the vowel nucleus of \textit{uang} as unrounded (as it very often is in Singapore Huayu, see p.304), the following hierarchy seems to suggest itself:

\[
V \\
[+\text{NAS}] \rightarrow \langle-\text{BACK}\rangle / [-\text{ROUND}] \\
+\text{MID} \\
+\text{LOW} \\
+\text{HIGH}
\]

This would show that nasal fronting is ruled out by rounded vowels in the preceding segment (accounting for \textit{ong} and \textit{iang}), is high for mid vowels (accounting for \textit{eng}), intermediate for low vowels (\textit{ang}, \textit{uang} and \textit{iang}) and low for high vowels (\textit{ing}).

However, this would predict that the weightings for \textit{ang}, \textit{uang}, and \textit{iang} would all be identical, since in all these yunmu the variable segment is preceded by a low vowel, but as Table 11.2 shows, they are not the same. Neither does the rule suggest any phonological motivation for the hierarchy of constraints on nasal fronting.

The greatest difference in weighting is between \textit{iang} and the other two. To account for the low weighting for \textit{iang} compared to \textit{ang} and \textit{uang}, the rule could be rewritten:
This would block application of the rule when there is a front glide preceding the vowel nucleus (there is in fact some probability of application in this environment but it is very slight. However, this is a very unsatisfactory solution as there is no phonological motivation for a feature [+back] appearing two segments before the variable segment favouring the [-back] variant. As will be argued later, the differences in weightings among \textit{uang}, \textit{ang} and \textit{iang} as well as among the other nasal finals are related to the degree of phonetic difference between the -n variant and the -ng variant of each pair. In other words, it is related the extent of differences in vowel qualities which in the segmental analyses are conditioned by the place of articulation of the following nasal stop. However, one cannot write into a variable rule a constraint on the application of the rule which surfaces only after the rule has been applied.

11.4.2.2 A Non-Segmental View

A non-segmental approach allows us to take into account the prosodic configuration of the whole syllable in trying to explain the results from the variable rule analysis. The variable is no longer seen as placed in the final segment and constrained by adjacent segments
but as variation between syllables with \( \mathbf{v} \) final prosodic posture (the \( -n \) set) and syllables with \( \mathbf{w} \) final prosodic posture (the \( -ng \) set). Vowel qualities in the syllables are seen as determined by options in the three prosodic systems of initial posture, final posture and height. Thus the prosodic configurations for syllables having the nasal yunmu under discussion in this section are as follows (following Halliday 1985):

Table 11.3 Nasal Yunmu According to Syllable Prosodies of Initial Posture, Final Posture and Height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINAL POSTURE</th>
<th>INITIAL POSTURE</th>
<th>( \mathbf{w} )</th>
<th>( \mathbf{v} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>eng ( \mathbf{v}g )</td>
<td>en ( \mathbf{v}n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>uang ( \mathbf{w}ng )</td>
<td>uan ( \mathbf{w}n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>iang ( \mathbf{y}ng )</td>
<td>ian ( \mathbf{y}n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>iong ( \mathbf{y}ng )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{uan} \mathbf{y}n )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that while the yunmu \( \mathbf{an} \), \( \mathbf{ang} \), \( \mathbf{uan} \), \( \mathbf{uang} \), \( \mathbf{ian} \), \( \mathbf{iang} \) and \( \mathbf{uan} \) are all analysed as having selected the same option in the height system (A or low), the phonetic qualities of the vowel nuclei are not regarded as the
result of assimilation or of derivation from a single underlying vowel. Rather they are part of the realization of the simultaneous selection of options from the three sets of syllable prosodies. Viewed in this way, it is no longer surprising that yunmμ such as eng, ang, uang and iang should be shown to have different effects on the variation, i.e., different likelihoods of being realized with final [n], as they all have different configurations of syllable prosodies.

Avoiding the usual variable rule formalism in dealing with the present data has another advantage. As mentioned in Chapter Four (4.3), the GP formula of \(A \rightarrow B/ X \ldots Y\) used to write a variable rule assumes that the element to the left of the arrow is in some sense "underlying" (taking a synchronic perspective) or (taking a diachronic perspective) an earlier or "original" form. In the variable rule for the Singapore Huayu variable (ng) given above, the implication is that a back nasal variably "becomes" front in certain environments.

However, there is no reason to assume that speakers of Singapore Huayu "have" underlying final /ŋ/ in any yunmμ which they pronounce with final [n], nor is there any reason for believing that the [ŋ] variant in these yunmμ represents an earlier variety of Singapore Huayu.

Avoiding such a formalism, gives us the freedom to view the variation from different perspectives. We may be interested in how the standard language "changes" as it
is learned and used by those for whom it is not a mother tongue. In which case, we can think of the variation in terms of a \( ng \) to \( n \) directionality. However, we may instead be interested in how Singapore speakers may be moving closer to the standard language. In which case, we are thinking of a \( n \) to \( ng \) directionality, with speakers having to learn which zi have \( ng \) yunmu and which have \( n \) yunmu. Finally, we may view the variation as relatively stable (as seems to be the case with (ng), see 11.6), with neither of the variants being necessarily prior.

There are, therefore, some advantages in avoiding the segmental and dynamic biases of the usual variable rule formalism. However, the ranking shown in Table 11.2 has still not been fully explained. To begin to do this, we need to look more closely at the realizations of the relevant prosodies in the standard pronunciation and explore the extent to which speakers of Singapore Huayu approximate this strong prosodic system.

The \( w \) final posture in the \( w \) syllables backs and rounds while the \( y \) posture in the \( n \) syllables fronts and raises. However, the precise phonetic effects of final posture selection in any particular syllable depends upon its interaction with the other syllable prosodies. Looking back at Table 11.3, it is possible to make some generalizations. Firstly, where initial posture is neutral (\( a \)), the phonetic difference between \( y \) final
posture and \( w \) final posture is smaller than where the initial posture is \( y \) or \( w \). This is not surprising, since when the two postures (initial and final) are the same, the forces exerted from the syllable peripheries are both pulling the same way and the effect on the vowel qualities is much greater than if the \( y \) or \( w \) posture is only final. Moreover, if the initial posture is \( y \) and the final posture is \( w \) or vice versa, there are very often audible phonetic phenomena associated with the transition from one posture to the other. Thus, of the syllables with \( \mathbb{H} \) height, the difference between \( \text{en} \ [\mathbb{H}n] \) and \( \text{eng} \ [\mathbb{H}\eta] \) (excluding the place of articulation of the final nasal segment) is quite small - the vowel in \( \text{en} \) is slightly fronter than the vowel in \( \text{eng} \). With \( \text{in} \ [\mathbb{H}n] \) v. \( \text{ing} \ [\mathbb{H}\eta] \), \( \text{un} \ [\mathbb{V}^2n] \) v. \( \text{ong} \ [\mathbb{V}\eta] \) and \( \text{un} \ [\mathbb{V}^2n] \) v. \( \text{iong} \ [\mathbb{V}^2\eta] \), however, the differences are a little greater - involving small differences in both height and fronting as well as a change in vowel quality where there is a transition from one posture to a different posture.

Similarly, of the syllables with \( A \) height, the difference between \( \text{an} \ [\mathbb{H}n] \) and \( \text{ang} \ [\mathbb{H}\eta] \) is smaller than the differences between \( \text{uan} \ [\mathbb{U}^2n] \) and \( \text{uang} \ [\mathbb{U}\eta] \) and between \( \text{ian} \ [\mathbb{I}^2n] \) and \( \text{iang} \ [\mathbb{I}\eta] \).

Secondly, the effects of final posture choice are generally somewhat smaller with \( \mathbb{H} \) height syllables than with \( A \) height syllables. This is again not surprising, since where posture is partly realized by raising, the effect is likely to be greater with low height. Thus, the
difference between en [\textipa{ɛn}] and eng [\textipa{ɛŋ}] is smaller than between an [\textipa{æn}] and ang [\textipa{æŋ}], the difference between un [\textipa{ʌn}] and ong [\textipa{ʌŋ}] is smaller than between uan [\textipa{uæn}] and uang [\textipa{uæŋ}] and the difference between in [\textipa{ɪn}] and ing [\textipa{ɪŋ}] is smaller than between ian [\textipa{iap}] and iang [\textipa{iap}].

It seems reasonable to suppose that the greater the phonetic effect of final posture choice, the more prominent or salient may be the difference between the ng member and the n member of each pair, and that Singapore speakers may be least likely to acquire or maintain ng v. n oppositions in environments in which the differences are most salient. In other words, standard ng yunmu may be more likely to be realized as n yunmu where the two are least differentiated phonetically. We might therefore expect them to be: (i) less likely to acquire the eng v. en opposition, where there is only a very small extra "clue" in the vowel quality as to which final posture is involved; (ii) somewhat more likely to acquire in v. ing, un v. ong, an v. ang and un v. iong; and (iii) most likely to acquire ian v. iang and uan v. uang in which the two prosodies are most clearly differentiated.

This can go someway to explaining the results of the variable rule analysis shown in Table 11.2. It might explain why the weighting for eng is by far the highest, why the figure for iang is very low and why those for ang and ing are intermediate. However, it does not
explain why the figure for *uang* should be so high and those for *iong* and *ong* so low.

11.4.2.3 Phonetic Realizations of Nasal Yunmu in Singapore Huayu

In order to explore this further, it is necessary to look in more detail at the realizations of these yunmu by a Singapore speaker. Given below is a phonetic transcription of the pronunciation of these yunmu by a Chinese educated, fairly well educated (upper secondary level) speaker in his 20's, who might be considered a "typical" younger generation, educated speaker of Singapore Huayu.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{eng} & \sim & \text{en} & \sim \\
\text{ing} & \sim & \text{in} & \sim \\
\text{ong} & \sim & \text{un} & \sim \\
\text{uang} & \sim & \text{uan} & \sim \\
\text{ang} & \sim & \text{an} & \sim \\
\text{iang} & \sim & \text{ian} & \sim \\
\text{iong} & \sim & \text{un} & \sim 
\end{align*}
\]

It is clear from the above that in Singapore Huayu - at least as far as represented by this speaker - the effect of posture selection tends not to have such a strong and consistent phonetic effect as in the standard pronunciation. If we pursue the hypothesis that where selection of final posture has least prosodic effect, the
ng and \( n \) pairs are most likely to be underdifferentiated (i.e., the \([n]\) variant will be favoured), the patterns in the above transcriptions seem to fit the findings of the variable rule analysis fairly well. With \( en \) and \( eng \) there is consistently no perceptible difference at all in vowel quality. The phonetic difference between \( uang \) and \( uan \) is smaller than in the standard pronunciation, as the vowel nucleus tends to be less fronted in \( uan \) and less backed in \( uang \), and rounding in \( uang \) tends not to persist beyond the glide. This may help to explain the higher weighting for this yunmu in the variable rule analysis than might otherwise have been expected. On the other hand, the differences between \( ong \) and \( un \) and between \( un \) and \( iong \) are greater than in the standard pronunciation, as the vowel of \( ong \) tends to be more open than in the standard, and the separating out or segmentation of the features of the \( y \) (or \( w \) plus \( y \)) posture prosody into an unrounded consonant and front glide followed by a rounded back vowel keep it quite distinct from \( un \). \( Ong \) and \( iong \) are the two \( ng \) yunmu that show no tendency to "become" \( n \) yunmu in the data.

11.4.2.4 \( in \) and \( ing \)

However, the above transcription would suggest that the weighting for \( ing \) should be much greater than Table 11.2 shows, as the prosodic effects of final posture selection in \( ing \) and \( in \) are very inconsistent, with the vowel quality sometimes suggesting one posture while the place of articulation of the stop suggests the other.
On closer examination, the in v. ing pair turns out to be somewhat unusual. So far only realization of standard ng yunmu as n yunmu has been considered. This is by far the most common type of nonstandard realization of nasal yunmu in the data. However, there are also some occurrences in the opposite "direction", i.e., standard n yunmu realized with final [ŋ]. As the majority of such realizations occur in the reading sections, the temptation is to regard them all as hypercorrections. However, as the following table shows, the in v. ing pair is an exception to the general pattern, as there are more occurrences of standard in yunmu realized with [ŋ] than vice versa.

Table 11.4 Percentages of [n] and [ŋ] Realizations Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD (ng) YUNMU</th>
<th>% REALIZED AS [n]</th>
<th>STANDARD (n) YUNMU</th>
<th>%REALIZED AS [ŋ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eng</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uang</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>uan</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ang</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iang</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>ian</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that if we look at this variable in terms of underdifferentiation between pairs of standard ng v. n yunmu, rather than simply "replacement" of standard [ŋ] by [n], the level of underdifferentiation between ing and
in is much closer to what we might predict from observations of the strength of the prosodic effect of the final posture. We thus have a a rough hierarchy based on likelihood of underdifferentiation which corresponds with a hierarchy based on extent of phonetic difference between the members of each pair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Phonetic Difference</th>
<th>Likelihood of Underdifferentiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eng v. en</td>
<td>no phonetic difference (apart from place of articulation of the final nasal segment) / high rate of underdifferentiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in v. ing</td>
<td>inconsistent phonetic difference / fairly high rate of underdifferentiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uang v. uan</td>
<td>intermediate degree of phonetic difference / intermediate rate of underdifferentiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ang v. an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ian v. iang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un v. ong</td>
<td>large phonetic difference / nil or very low rates of underdifferentiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un v. iong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, at least one aspect of the pattern of variation in nasal yunmu in the Singapore data can best be understood in terms of the speakers' acquisition of the relevant prosodic system of the standard pronunciation as a whole, rather than as variation in a final nasal stop.
segment constrained by adjacent phonological segments. There is a clear relationship between the strength of the prosodic effect of final posture selection and the likelihood that a particular pair will be kept distinct. Another way of expressing this would be that the more the functional load of the opposition is spread through the syllable, the more likely it is to be maintained or acquired.

11.5 Phonological Environment: the Following Segment

11.5.1 Results for the Factor Group "Following Segment"

Each occurrence of (ng) was coded according to the immediately following segment, i.e., the initial segment of the following syllable. The segments were classed into the following factors:

**Velar Consonants (VC):** This includes g [g] and k [kʰ] but not h [x] and w [w]. Although in the standard pronunciation the consonant written h in pinyin is a velar fricative, in Singapore Huayu there is rarely any audible velar friction and it has therefore been coded separately (see below). The labio-velar semi-vowel [w-] is also seldom pronounced with audible friction in Singapore Huayu and it was felt more reasonable to class it with the back vowels. The hypothesis was that velar consonants would favour the standard [ŋ] variant.
Labial Consonants (LC): This includes the consonants b [b], p [p], m [m] and f [f]. The hypothesis was that these consonants would not favour either variant.

Front Consonants (FC): This includes all lingual consonants whose point of articulation is palatal or further forward (note that this includes consonants which would be retroflex in the standard pronunciation but which are normally dental, alveolar or palato-alveolar in Singapore Huayu). The hypothesis was that such consonants would favour the nonstandard [n] variant.

High Front Semi-Vowels or Vowels (HF): This includes y- ([j] and [ɻ]) as well as the vowels i ([i] or [ɪ]) and u [y] which, unlike in the standard pronunciation, sometimes occur in syllable initial position with no preceding semi-vowel or glide (see Appendix Five). The hypothesis was that these would favour the non-standard [n] variant.

High Back Semi-Vowels or Vowels (HB): This includes the labio-velar semi-vowel w [w] as well as the vowel u [u] which, unlike in the standard pronunciation, sometimes occurs in syllable initial position with no preceding semi-vowel or
The hypothesis was that this factor would favour the standard [ŋ] variant.

Non-High Vowels: These include the following vowels which can occur in syllable initial position: ø ([ɤ] or [ɔ]), ø ([ɔ]) and a ([ɔ] and [x]). It was hypothesised that they would favour neither variant.

h (H): In Singapore Huayu h is usually [h] rather than [x]. It was hypothesised that this would not favour either variant.

Pause (P): The hypothesis was that a following pause would not favour either variant.

Comparison using the chi square test between an initial run with all the factors and a run in which the factors P and L were collapsed showed no statistically significant loss of fit to the data in the latter run. This makes phonetic sense as both leave the tongue free to take up any position. The factor HF could also no doubt be combined with P and L with no significant loss of fit, as could the factor HR with H. However, there appears to be no phonological motivation for doing this.

The results for this factor group in the final run are set out below.
Table 11.5 Variable Rule Analysis of (ng): The Following Environment Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF [n]</th>
<th>% OF [n]</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.5.2 Discussion of Results

This confirms some of the hypotheses. A following front consonant strongly favours the [n] variant, whilst a following velar consonant strongly disfavours it. Similarly, a high front semi-vowel or vowel favours the front nasal more than a following high back semi-vowel or vowel.

However, the weighting for NH is very surprising. One would not expect these vowels to so strongly favour the [n] variant, as they are all generally much further back than vowels under HF. On closer examination, it turns out that a very large number of the tokens represented by this factor are of nasal yunmu preceding the common particle çµâ. This particle is generally pronounced [v]
or [ɔ]. It is possible, therefore, that the relatively front vowel of the particle favours the [n] variant, and has skewed the weighting accordingly. However, this does not fully explain why this factor should favour [n] so much more strongly than, for example, the factor High Front Semi-Vowel or Vowel.

Similarly, it is not clear why a following pause or labial consonant should favour the [n] variant as strongly as a following high front semi-vowel or vowel.

There seems to be no obvious reason to fully explain the results for this factor group. In order to investigate this further, it would be necessary to have a data base with many more tokens of the variable than in the present study, to allow for a much finer coding so that the effects of each relevant initial could be investigated separately. Any further study might also take into account the initial prosodic posture of the following syllable.

11.6 Age

Comparison using the chi square test between the initial run with all the factors and a run in which the factors 31-40 and 41-56 were collapsed showed no statistically significant loss of fit to the data in the latter. The
results for this factor group in the final run are set out below.

Table 11.6 Variable Rule Analysis of (ng): The Age Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF [n]</th>
<th>% OF [n]</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-56</td>
<td>2901</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results present a different picture from those of the same factor group for the (ū) and (r) variables. There is no evidence of a change in progress towards the standard [ŋ] variant. If anything, the results suggest that the older age groups are likely to use slightly more of the standard variant than the younger groups. However, all the weightings cluster close to .5 and the very small differences among them suggest that (ng) may be a comparatively stable variable.

11.7 Level of Education

Comparison using the chi square test between the initial run and a run in which the factors <Primary and Primary were collapsed into one factor and a run in which the factors Secondary, Upper Secondary, Post Secondary and University were collapsed into one factor showed that these factors could all be combined in this way with no statistically significant loss of fit to the data. The
results for this factor group in the final run are set out below.

Table 11.7 Variable Rule Analysis of (ng): The Education Level Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF [n]</th>
<th>% OF [n]</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and below</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and above</td>
<td>4717</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There seems to be some relationship between level of education and this variable. However, the only statistically significant difference is between above and below secondary level.

11.8 The Other Factor Groups

Comparisons using the chi square test between the initial run and runs in which the factor groups Mode, Sex and Mother_Tongue were each omitted showed that all of these factor groups could be omitted with no statistically significant loss of fit to the data.

It is interesting that the mother tongue factors - particularly Hokkien and Cantonese - should have no significant effect on the variation. Both Cantonese and
Hokkien preserve the Middle Chinese three way opposition of nasal yunmu ending in m, n and ng. As the m set have generally merged with the n set in modern Mandarin, it should not be too difficult for speakers of Hokkien and Cantonese to develop a transfer strategy for assigning to the appropriate standard Huayu n or ng class zi ending in m, n or ng in their home dialect (although they would not necessarily know which n or ng yunmu to use, as correspondances can be quite complex). However, in Hokkien, unlike in Cantonese or Mandarin, many of the nasal yunmu are preserved only as nasalized vowels with no final closure and in some cases the nasality has disappeared entirely leaving only oral vowels. Thus, if mother tongue interference were a major factor in this variation, one might expect those with Hokkien as mother tongue to have much greater trouble acquiring the standard distribution of n and ng yunmu.

11.9 Comparison with Chen C. Y. (1986)

Chen Chungyu similarly found a tendency for the yunmu ang, eng, ing and uang to be read with final n, with, as in the present study, eng being most susceptible to this (only 40% "correct" readings as opposed to 79.2% for uang, 81.9% for ang and 79% for ing).

However, her findings differ in that they do indicate that mother tongue can have an effect, in that her two Teochew (Chaozhou) informants scored only 52.5% "correct"
readings compared to 91.0%-86.9% by the other groups, and Teochew is the only one of the five relevant dialects to have no opposition of $n$ and $ng$ yunmu. Also unlike the present study, she found the tendency for standard $n$ yunmu to be realized with final $[ŋ]$ to be marginally greater than the opposite tendency, although she similarly found that the yunmu in was most susceptible to this (53.3% "correct" as opposed to 92.2%-86.7% for the other finals). However, once again, it should borne in mind that her data base is much smaller than in the present study and represents only "reading aloud" mode.

11.10 Comparison with Other Varieties of Mandarin

There is considerable variation in these nasal yunmu among the other dialects of Mandarin spoken in China. There is a clear $n$ v. $ng$ opposition in all seven pairs only in most of the Northern Mandarin (Huabei) group and some dialects of the Northwestern (Xibei) group. In general, $eng$ v. $en$ and $ing$ v. $in$ are the pairs most often merged in the other dialects, most commonly both forms becoming $-n$ as in the Singapore data (Zhan 1981).

Underdifferention of these nasal yunmu can also be heard in the Putonghua of speakers in China who are not native speakers of dialects in which all the pairs are differentiated (see, for example, Lehmann ed. 1975:32-33). Kubler also notes that:
-ing and -eng are often replaced in Taiwan Mandarin by -in and -en, the distinction between the finals -in and -ing and between finals -en and -eng thus not being maintained.

(Kubler 1981:58)

Thus, as with (u) and (r), the use of the nonstandard [n] variant is not unique to Singapore Huayu.

11.11 Conclusion

The pattern of variation for (ng) is different from that for both (u) and (r). (ng) does not appear to represent change in progress. That is, there is no evidence that pressure from the prescribed standard is leading to a more standard distribution of ng yunmu. Neither does the variation seem relatable to mother tongue interference (at least, not in the case of Cantonese versus Hokkien). There does seem to be a relationship with level of education, although the (ng) variable seems less sensitive to level of education than the (u) variable and there is no evidence of style shift that would provide evidence that the ng variant is evaluated as more correct, educated or prestigious. However, there are clear phonological constraints on the variation, in particular a relationship to the strength of the phonetic effects of final posture choice in the syllable. As with other features, the (ng) variable also illustrates the tendency of Singapore speakers to "segmentalize" and
realize more weakly the strong prosodies of Beijing Mandarin.
NOTE

1. Note that these vowel qualities vary somewhat in the data and these symbols approximate the major realizations. [Y] is generally more central than in the standard pronunciation.
12.1 Tones in Standard Huayu

The Standard Huayu pronunciation has four basic (lexical) tones. Using Y. R. Chao's system of representation (see Chao 1968:25-26) these are:

- Tone 1 High level (Yinpíng) ˥
- Tone 2 High rising (Yangpíng) ˦
- Tone 3 Low dipping (Shāngshēng) ˧
- Tone 4 High falling (Gushēng) ʔ

In Pinyin romanization, the four tones are symbolized —, ′, ‾, and ‘.

The two major tone sandhi affecting these tones in both careful and fast speech are that a tone 3 immediately preceding another tone 3 becomes a high rising tone, i.e., phonetically identical to tone 2, and a tone 3 followed by any other tone tends to lose its final rise.

Other phenomena affecting these tones in fast speech (apart from becoming atonic or qingsheng, see 7.1.7) include the change of a tone 2 to a high level tone
(phonetically identical to tone 1) when it is in the second syllable of a three syllable group of which the first syllable has tone 1 or 2 and the third syllable any tone except neutral (Chao 1968:27-28) and the tendency for a tone 4 immediately followed by another tone 4 to start slightly lower and fall only about to the middle of the pitch range (Chao 1968:28-29, Kratochvil 1968:39).

12.2 Tone in Singapore Huayu

There are a number of fairly minor differences in the realizations of these tones in Singapore Huayu. Tone 1 tends to be below the top of the pitch range, and may often be represented as \( \ddagger \). There is also sometimes a slight fall at the end of a tone 1. (generally only perceptible in careful speech). Tone 4 tends to be shorter than in the standard pronunciation, sometimes seeming to start slightly lower and often not falling as far. These might be represented as \( \ddagger \) and \( \ddagger \).

However, there is also a separate phenomenon which results in a difference in the tone system of Singapore Huayu from Standard Huayu. This involves the existence of a "Rusheng" or "entering tone" category, which has also been called the Singapore Huayu "fifth tone" (Chen C.Y. 1982b). The realization of this tone category is very variable in the data and is the variable feature to be focussed on in this chapter.
12.3 Rusheng in Singapore Huayu

With a very few exceptions, rusheng tone occurs in the data only in zi which belonged to the rusheng tone category in Middle Chinese. In modern standard Huayu, the historical rusheng set have been redistributed among the modern four tones. All zi occurring with rusheng tone in the data are listed in tables 12.6, 12.7 and 12.8 at the end of this chapter.

Variation in realization of rusheng in the data involves tone contour, tone (and therefore syllable) length and the presence or absence of an audible final glottal stop. The major variants identified are as follows:

1. A falling tone more or less indistinguishable from standard pronunciation tone 4 (in zi having tones 1, 2 or 3 in the standard pronunciation).

2. A falling tone slightly shorter than tone 4 in the standard pronunciation, although no shorter than a common realization of tone 4 in Singapore Huayu (see 12.2 above).

3. A falling tone slightly shorter than common realizations of tone 4 in Singapore Huayu.

5. A short level tone ending in an audible glottal stop (less common than the other variants).

It is clear from the above that the variant realizations of *rusheng* represent a continuum of shortness in falling contour (apart from the less frequent variant 5) with an abrupt ending of the fall by glottal closure at one end of the continuum and a length of fall indistinguishable from the standard tone 4 at the other. We can thus agree with Chen Chungyu that there is an "obscure and flickering borderline between the 4th tone and the 5th tone" (Chen C.Y. 1982b:4).

12.3.1 The Possible Sociolinguistic Status of *Rusheng*

The above realizations of *rusheng* can lead to underdifferentiation between *rusheng* zi which have tone 1, 2 or 3 in the standard pronunciation and tone 4 zi. This has been observed to sometimes cause confusion, for example, between *shí sì kuài* "fourteen dollars" and *sì shí kuài* "forty dollars" where a *rusheng* falling tone on *shí* as well as lack of initial retroflexion make the two numbers homophonous, i.e., both as [sǐ nǐ].

The potential for such confusion is often pointed out in the various television and radio programmes as well as published courses seeking to promote the standard pronunciation of Mandarin. Realizations of *rusheng* were
also designated as "should be corrected" by every informant in the "Huayu Specialists" group. Rusheng therefore seems a possible candidate for becoming generally stigmatized as "incorrect" or possibly "uneducated" and for being eliminated in any new internal educated or prestige norm that may be developing.

12.4 Variable Rule Analysis of Rusheng

The use of rusheng in the relevant zi is highly variable in the data, both among informants and within samples from individual informants. In the following analyses, two variants are recognized: 1. the standard variant, i.e., the tone category in the standard pronunciation of the zi concerned; 2. the nonstandard variant, i.e., a falling contour (where other than tone 4 would be required) with or without a glottal stop. This is symbolized as <\>.

It was decided not to distinguish rusheng with glottal stop as a separate variant from rusheng with no audible glottal stop. This is because in practice it proved difficult and unreliable to code for the presence of the glottal stop in the flow of speech. One reason for this seems to be that, as Chen Chungyu (1982b) also observes, the glottal stop varies in prominence, and a certain tenseness of articulation sometimes diffuses through the whole syllable in
anticipation of the glottal closure (although a distinct glottal stop may or may not be present). A further complicating factor is the tendency of some speakers of Singapore Huayu to have a glottal stop initially in syllables which in the standard pronunciation have an initial [y-] or [w-] semi-vowel (see Appendix Five). Where such a syllable is immediately preceded by a r̃̃sheng zi, it is sometimes impossible to say whether the glottal stop is part of the realization of r̃̃sheng in the first zi or is an initial feature of the second zi. For example, this was sometimes the case with the pronunciation of fæ̞lın "pronunciation" as [fə́ ỹ̃lin].

Every occurrence in the data of a zi which belongs to the r̃̃sheng category in Middle Chinese but to tone 1, 2 or 3 in the standard pronunciation is regarded as a token of the variable which will be symbolized as (ru). Standard tone 4 zi are therefore excluded from the analysis as tone 4, being a falling contour, cannot be consistently or reliably distinguished from r̃̃sheng. However, tone 4 zi which do occur with a clear glottal stop ending in the data are listed in table 12.7 at the end of this chapter.

Also excluded from analysis are zi of the historical r̃̃sheng class but which have final closing glides in modern Mandarin, i.e., oral syllables which shift to final y or w posture (e.g., lai and liu). Such syllables show no tendency to have r̃̃sheng tone (see Table 12.8). There are in fact two exceptions to this in the data -
the zi ㄌ "six" and the zi ㄖ "meat", the former occurring once with the rusheng glottal stop and the latter twice. However, the pronunciations in these occurrences are ㄍ and ㄐ respectively, i.e., there is no posture shift as in the standard pronunciation. Nevertheless, these three occurrences are still excluded from the analysis as they both have tone 4 in the standard pronunciation.

In all the following tables, a weighting of above .5 indicates that the factor in question favours the nonstandard <\> (falling) variant, whilst a weighting of below .5 indicates that the factor disfavours it.

12.5 The Historical Rusheng Categories

Middle Chinese rusheng zi all had final ʰp, ʰt or ʰk (Hashimoto 1969 and Chen M.Y. 1976 also posit a palatal ʰc ending). In Beijing dialect and therefore modern standard Huayu these endings have been completely lost and rusheng zi distributed among the modern four tones. Matthew Y. Chen summarizes the loss of the final stops in the development from Middle Chinese to Beijing dialect as follows:
(Chen M.Y. 1976:211)

i.e., fusion of $p$ with $t$ and of $g$ with $k$ and final loss of the stops "in all likelihood" through the intermediate step of reduction to glottal stop.

The situation with rusheng in the other modern dialects is rather complicated. Some dialects (e.g., Cantonese) have complete preservation of the $p$, $t$, $k$ endings, some dialects only partially preserve the endings (generally following the pattern diagrammed above, with the $p$ endings merging with the $t$ endings), some dialects have only glottal stop endings (e.g., Nanjing dialect and many of the Mandarin dialects which preserve a rusheng category), some dialects have $p$, $t$, $k$ and glottal stop endings, i.e., the glottal stop has not replaced $p$, $t$, $k$ in all rusheng zi, just in a portion of them (e.g., Hokkien) and in yet other dialects the stop endings have completely disappeared but rusheng zi are preserved as a category by a separate tone shape (Bi 1982).
The first factor group in the variable rule analysis is designed to investigate whether there is any relationship between the patterns of occurrence of rusheng zi in the Singapore data and these historical categories of rusheng, which are preserved to varying degrees in the modern dialects. The zi which occur in the data with rusheng tone are listed in table 12.6 at the end of this chapter according to their historical endings. This suggests a greater tendency for the k class to be realized with rusheng, followed by the t class, with the p class showing the least tendency. However, this does not take into account the frequency of occurrence of potentially rusheng zi in the data.

For the variable rule analysis, every occurrence of (ru) in the data was coded according to whether the zi belongs historically to the p, t or k class. The results for this factor group are set out in table 12.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt; &gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt; &gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total tokens of (ru): 2751 Total < >: 396 (14%)
This suggests that rusheng is favoured by zi belonging to the historical k category. It is interesting that this should be so. According to Matthew Y. Chen (1976:213), if only one of the three rusheng stop endings exists in a particular modern dialect, it is typically k. There may thus be a general tendency in Chinese dialects for rusheng of the k class to be preserved longest.

12.6 The Standard Tone Categories

Zi realized with rusheng tone in the data are listed in Table 12.7 at the end of this chapter according to their tone category in the standard pronunciation. This suggests that tone 2 zi are the most likely to be realized with rusheng tone, followed by tone 1, with tone 3 zi the least.

However, in order to take into account the frequency of occurrence of potential rusheng zi belonging to the three standard tone categories, all occurrences of (ru) in the data were coded according to which standard tone category they belong to. The results for this factor group are given in Table 12.2 below.
This indicates that standard tone 1 favours rusheng tone slightly more than tone 2, whilst tone 3 disfavours it.

Chen Chungyu (1982b) finds a similar pattern in her data and suggests that it might be due to the fact that the fall rise contour of tone 3 makes it more distinct, as only Teochew (Chaozhou) of the five major dialects spoken in Singapore has a tone with a similar contour. This seems a reasonable suggestion and accords with the finding for several of variable features in Singapore Huayu that a features of the standard pronunciation is most likely to be acquired where it is most salient. In fact, according to Cheng, "bidirectional" tonal contours (i.e., fall rise or rise fall) are overall much less frequent in Chinese dialects than falling, level or rising tones (Cheng C.C. 1973b:103).

It is also worth noting that acoustic studies of Standard Huayu tones have shown that, in citation form at least, tone 3 is the longest in duration (Howie 1976, Massaro, Cohen and Tseng 1985). As shortness is one of the
characteristics of the Singapore Huayu rusheng tone, it seems reasonable to suppose the relative length of the standard tone 3 may also serve to keep it distinct from the rusheng tone.

12.7 Mode

The results for the style factor group are set out in Table 12.3 below.

Table 12.3 Variable Rule Analysis of (ru): The Mode Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking</td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that, all else being equal, informants are likely to use rusheng more frequently in the reading sections of the interviews, i.e., when slower, more careful (and therefore more "correct") speech might be expected.

It is possible that the weightings are somewhat skewed by the fact that reading sections happen to include some zi which have a much greater probability of being pronounced with rusheng tone than would be predicted from the weightings for their historical categories and standard tones alone. The zi 升 ge, 福 fú and 发 fā
have a much higher rate of rusheng (56%, 70% and 49% respectively) than other zi in the reading sections. Fú and fā also occur in the "talking" sections. However, the three zi between them make up about one fifth of the tokens of (ru) in the reading sections and so would have had a significant effect on the weighting for the "reading" factor. Thus it seems possible that there are lexical constraints on (ru) which are not taken into account in the factor groups used in the analysis (also see 12.13 below).

Nevertheless, the results for this factor group provide clear evidence against the hypothesis that the Singapore Huayu rusheng tone may have become a generally stigmatized feature likely to be avoided in careful speech.

12.8 Age

The findings for this factor group are set out on Table 12.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;'&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;'&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-56</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These results suggest that there is a relationship between (ru) and age. Apart from a small "bump" in the 21-30 age group, for which there is no obvious explanation, there is a clear tendency for higher age groups to favour the nonstandard \textless{}\textgreater{} variant. As with the other variables, it seems reasonable to interpret this as diachronic change, i.e., as a move over time away from the use of the nonstandard \textit{rusheng} tone.

12.9 Mother Tongue

The findings for this factor group are set out in Table 12.5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF \textless{}\textgreater{}</th>
<th>% OF \textless{}\textgreater{}</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huayu</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results suggest that informants with Hokkien as mother tongue are likely to use \textit{rusheng} tone slightly more frequently than informants with Cantonese as mother tongue.

It is interesting that this should be so. Cantonese in fact preserves the historical \textit{rusheng} zi with the three
stop endings much more completely than Hokkien. In Hokkien, the loss of the stop endings is quite well advanced, in some cases having been reduced to a glottal stop in others to zero. In Cantonese, there are three rusheng tone contours, i) shàngyín rù \( \uparrow \), ii) xiàyín rù \( \uparrow \) and iii) yàng rù \( \downarrow \). Each of these tone contours are also contours of non-rusheng tones in Cantonese. In Hokkien there are two rusheng tone contours, i) yín rù \( \uparrow \) or \( \downarrow \) in syllables ending in a glottal stop (Zhu 1975) and ii) yángrù \( \downarrow \). One of these contours, the yín rù, is unique in that it does not also occur as a non-rusheng tone contour (Bi 1982). Note that the Hokkien yín rù tone, like the Singapore Huayu rusheng tone, is a short falling tone. It thus seems not improbable that the existence of rusheng in Hokkien with glottal stop endings and short falling tone contours might account for the likelihood of Hokkien speakers using the phonetically similar Singapore Huayu rusheng tone slightly more frequently than Cantonese speakers.

12.9.1 The factor Huayu

The raw scores for this variable of the three informants identified by the factor Huayu are as follows.

**Informant 1:** 57 tokens of (ru), 2 (3%) realized as \( \uparrow \)
**Informant 2:** 54 tokens of (ru), 1 (2%) realized as \( \downarrow \)
**Informant 3:** 50 tokens of (ru), 2 (4%) realized as \( \uparrow \)
Thus, the nonstandard rusheng variant is rare in the speech of all three informants with Huayu as mother tongue.

It is also worth noting that of the five occurrences of nonstandard rusheng in the speech of these informants, 3 (one by each informant) are of the zi \( fù \) (twice in the word 福建 fujian "Hokkien" and once in the minimal pair 福 fù v. 興 fù) and the other 2 are of the zi 匯 fā (in fāyīn "pronunciation") and the zi 美 gē (in the minimal pairs section). In other words, every occurrence of rusheng in the samples from these informants are of the three zi tentatively identified above (12.7) as having a lexically specific strong tendency to be realized with rusheng tone.

This suggests that in so far as the speech of these informants might be thought to represent a fully "indigenized" variety of educated Singapore Huayu such a variety is likely to preserve very low levels of rusheng tone, possibly only with a small subset of the potential rusheng zi. However, no firm conclusions can be drawn from the speech of just three informants.

12.10 The Other Factor Groups

Comparisons using the chi square test between initial runs and subsequent runs in which the factor groups Level of Education and Sex were each omitted showed no
statistically significant loss of fit to the data in the latter runs. These factor groups were therefore not included in the final run.

12.11 Comparison with Chen C.Y. (1982b)

Chen Chungyu concludes that there is no significant correlation between the historical stop endings and the frequency of the Singapore Huayu rusheng, although in her data zi belonging to the k and p class have higher percentages of rusheng (74.2% and 77.8% respectively) than zi belonging to the t class (64.1%).

However, as in the present study, Chen similarly finds that tone 1 zi are most likely to have rusheng tone (84.1%), followed by tone 2 (68.9%) with tone 3 least likely (22.8%).

Also as in the present study, she finds that her two Hokkien informants have a slightly higher average percentage of rusheng tone (89.4%) than her two Cantonese informants (82.2%). However, both the Cantonese group and the Hokkien group have significantly higher rates of rusheng than the other three dialect groups (Hakka 77.2%, Hainanese 62.8% and Teochew 61.3%).

It is interesting that the overall percentage of rusheng tone in Chen's data (70.9%) is much higher than in the present study (14%). All Chen's tokens are from readings
of isolated zi in a context in which the informants' most careful pronunciation might be expected. This provides further evidence that the Singapore Huayu rusheng tone is not a feature generally stigmatized and therefore likely to be "corrected" by speakers in careful speech.

12.12 Comparison with Other Varieties of Mandarin

A number of the Mandarin dialects spoken in China preserve the rusheng tone in various forms. In the majority of cases rusheng is a short tone with a final glottal stop. In some cases the glottal stop may be somewhat indistinct, sometimes audible sometimes not, as with the Singapore Huayu rusheng, but the tone is clearly short. In other cases, rusheng tone is neither short nor has a final glottal stop but is distinguished from other tones by a separate contour (Yang 1981).

Rusheng tone has not been noted as a feature of the Mandarin spoken in Taiwan where Minnan dialects related to the Hokkien spoken in Singapore are spoken.

The existence in Singapore Huayu of a rusheng tone with a variable glottal stop and shortness of duration is not, therefore, unique for a variety of Mandarin. However, for some listeners, it may distinguish a Singapore speaker from an Taiwanese speaker.
12.13 A Note on the Possible Source of the Singapore Huayu Rusheng Tone

Chen argues that influence from the southern dialects spoken in Singapore is the source of the Singapore Huayu rusheng tone (Chen C.Y. 1982b:21-22). As has been noted above (p.334), Hokkien has a rusheng tone which is similar to the Singapore Huayu rusheng in being a short falling tone with variable glottal stop. This seems a possible origin for the Singapore Huayu rusheng, as Hokkien is the most widely spoken dialect in Singapore.

However, this is by no means certain. It is interesting that in the data zi which shift to final y or w posture show no tendency to have rusheng tone. It is common in Chinese dialect for there to be pattern congruity between rusheng and final y/w (nasal and oral) yunmu. For example, Cantonese has rusheng [w p'], [w k'] and [w t'], nasal [m], [ŋ] and [n] and oral [i] and [u], but not *[t i'], *[w k] etc. Similarly, in the Jianghuai Mandarin dialect of Nanjing (which has only the glottal stop ending for p, t, k) there is, for example, [ai], [au] and [aŋ] but not *[au'] or *[ai']

Hokkien, however, has the rusheng yunmu [ai'], [au'], [iau'], [iu'] and [ui'] (Zhu 1975 and Xiamen Daxue 1982). This appears to present an argument against the Hokkien rusheng being the origin of the Singapore Huayu rusheng. It is also interesting that the two instances in the data
of rusheng with zi which do shift to final y or w posture in the standard pronunciation (六 liu and ne rou) were both pronounced without this shift (see p.326). Chen argues that such pronunciations have their origin in borrowings from the southern dialects spoken in Singapore (Chen C.Y. 1982b:18-19). However, [lu] and [zu] are also older or alternate pronunciations of these zi in Beijing dialect as well as in the 1919 Official Pronunciation of the Guoyin Zidian (see p.145) which artificially preserves the rusheng tone. There are similar older or alternate pronunciations (without final y or w posture) of the zi \[\text{\textbf{shuo}}\] zhao (～ bo), \[\text{\textbf{shou}}\] zhu (～ zhu), \[\text{\textbf{chui}}\] chao (～ ca) and \[\text{\textbf{zai}}\] zhe (～ zhe) which occur in Chen's data with rusheng tone and without final y or w posture. Such evidence seems to point to the possibility of influence from other Mandarin dialects (via the early teachers of Mandarin in Singapore) on the development of the Singapore Huayu rusheng tone. As mentioned previously, shortness and a glottal stop varying in degree of prominence are features found in the various rusheng tones in the Mandarin dialects.

As with several such features in Singapore Huayu, it is probably not possible to point with confidence to a single source for the Singapore Huayu rusheng.
12.14 Conclusion

As with (u) and (r), there is some evidence with the
rusheng of a move away from the nonstandard variant over
time. However, unlike the other variables, (ru) shows no
evidence of greater use of the standard variant
associated with higher levels of education or with more
careful speech. This suggests that the nonstandard
variants of rusheng may not carry a negative social
evaluation.

It is possible, nevertheless, that there are patterns of
rusheng variation that have not been captured by this
analysis. As mentioned earlier (12.3), there is a
continuum in realizations of Singapore Huayu rusheng from
variants indistinguishable from tone four to variants
ending in a clear glottal stop and considerably shorter
in duration than the usual tone 4. For the reasons stated
(p.324-325), no distinction was made in the coding
between rusheng realizations with glottal stop and
without glottal stop. However, it is likely that variants
with a glottal stop are more salient to Singapore
speakers than variants phonetically closer or identical
to tone 4, and it is possible that these former variants
are stigmatized whilst the latter variants are not. What
may be happening is that some rusheng zi (perhaps, for
example, zi such as  telefono,  telefono and  telefono, see p.331-
332) are being reallocated to tone 4 whilst rusheng as a
distinct tone category may be disappearing. Further
research, using a more detailed phonetic coding of the variation and looking at the effects of different zi, would be necessary to confirm this.
NOTE

1. Samples from an original three variant coding of *rusheng* were re-checked by myself and by Professor M.A.K. Halliday and whilst there was a high level of agreement on tone contour there was much less on presence of glottal stop.
**Table 12.6 Zi Occurring as Rusheng in the Data by Middle Chinese Endings**

(Zi in parentheses occur only once in the data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-P</th>
<th>-T</th>
<th>-H</th>
<th>NON RUSHENG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ 合 入</td>
<td>大</td>
<td>接</td>
<td>择</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>立 法 答</td>
<td>罚</td>
<td>八</td>
<td>职</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>发</td>
<td>出</td>
<td>古</td>
<td>福</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>说</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>素</td>
<td>隐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>雪</td>
<td>(越)</td>
<td>定</td>
<td>福</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日</td>
<td>(越)</td>
<td>乐</td>
<td>目</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>热</td>
<td>貴</td>
<td>乐</td>
<td>福</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(缺) 达</td>
<td>力</td>
<td>分</td>
<td>力</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>刑</td>
<td>各</td>
<td>視</td>
<td>服</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table lists examples of Zi occurring as Rusheng in the data by Middle Chinese Endings. Zi in parentheses occur only once in the data.*
Table 12.7 Zi Occurring as Rusheng in the Data by Standard Huayu Tone Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TONE 1</th>
<th>TONE 2</th>
<th>TONE 3</th>
<th>TONE 4 (glottal stop variant only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>八发唱</td>
<td>贺答读</td>
<td>法零使</td>
<td>客热月内日</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>七削说</td>
<td>达福国</td>
<td>午择职服</td>
<td>饭月内日</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>屋出接(复)</td>
<td>觉学别(复)</td>
<td>奏月内日</td>
<td>月内日</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(复)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(月)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 12.8 Zi Occurring in the Data by Standard Huayu Yunmu (in Pinyin)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSTURE:</th>
<th>aa</th>
<th>ay</th>
<th>aw</th>
<th>wa</th>
<th>ya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ei:0</td>
<td>ou:1</td>
<td>ü:1</td>
<td>i:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ai:0</td>
<td>ao:0</td>
<td>òe:7</td>
<td>ie:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yw</th>
<th>wa</th>
<th>wy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iu:1</td>
<td>u:8</td>
<td>ui:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iao:0</td>
<td>uo:3</td>
<td>uai:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ua:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE (n) VARIABLE

13.1 Initial n- in the Standard Pronunciation

The initial consonant written as n in Pinyin is an alveolar nasal. Table 13.1 lists the syllables in which this initial occurs.

Table 13.1: n Initial Syllables in Standard Huayu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIAL POST.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>na ne</td>
<td>nou</td>
<td>neng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>nu nuo</td>
<td></td>
<td>nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>ni nie</td>
<td>niu</td>
<td>niao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ǒ/</td>
<td>nu nue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.2 (n) in Singapore Huayu

In the Singapore data at least four variant initial consonants occur in the above syllables. These are [n] - the standard variant; [l] - an alveolar lateral; [l̃] - a nasalized alveolar lateral; and [r] - an apical tap or flap. [r] is the least frequent of these variants. It occurs a number of times in the reading sections as a
realization of the initial consonant of the zi nong.

In the Hokkien (or Minnan) dialects, the initial consonant usually transcribed as ɿ is in fact very variable and is often a rapid apical flap (Kubler 1981, Tay 1968, Yuan et al 1968, see also Note 1 at the end of this chapter). It is possible, therefore, that this variant represents a transfer from Hokkien.

In rapid speech, the [l] and [ɿ] variants are often hard to distinguish, particular in syllables with nasal yunmu in which the nasality may be diffused throughout the syllable.

In the following analyses, (n) represents the variable, i.e., all initial consonants in the data which would be n in the standard pronunciation, and <ɿ> represents the nonstandard variants [l] and [ɿ] and <n> represents the standard variant [n]. The few instances of [r] have been omitted from the analysis.

13.2.1 Underdifferentiation Between n- and ɿ- Zi

In the standard pronunciation, all of the yunmu occurring with initial n in table 13.1 also occur with initial ɿ, with the exception of the yunmu en. The use of the nonstandard <ɿ> variant can therefore lead to underdifferentiation between pairs such as nào "angry" v. lào "old" and nán "difficult" v. lán "blue".
13.3 Quantitative Analysis of the (n) Variable

Unlike (ū), (r), (ng) and (ru) which are variable in the speech of nearly all the informants, (n) is variable in the speech of only 26 of the 46 informants. In other words, 20 informants have <n> categorically where it would be required in the standard pronunciation, while 26 informants vary between <n> and <l> in these environments (no informants have <l> categorically). Variable rule analysis will not, therefore, be used to investigate any relationship between this variable and various non-linguistic factors. Instead, the characteristics of the two groups - those having <n> categorically and those varying between <n> and <l> - will be compared. However, variable rule analysis will be used to investigate phonological constraints on the variation in the speech of those for whom it is variable. In the following tables of results from this analysis, a weighting of above .5 indicates that the factor in question favours the nonstandard <l> variant and a weighting of below .5 indicates that the factor disfavours it.

13.4 Phonological Environment

In initial runs, three factor groups of phonological environment were coded for. These are final posture, initial posture, and resonance.
13.4.1 Final Posture

There are three possible final posture prosodies in \( n \) syllables (see Table 13.1). These are \( a, w, \) and \( y \). However, comparison using the chi square test between the initial run and a subsequent run in which this factor group was omitted showed no statistically significant loss of fit to the data in the latter run. This factor group was therefore omitted in the final run.

13.4.2 Initial Posture

There are four possible initial posture prosodies in \( n \)-syllables (see Table 13.1). These are \( a, w, y \) and \( y' \) (or \( w + y \)). However, as all \( y' \) initial posture syllables also select oral resonance and as all tokens of such syllables in the data are of the \( zi \) \( nu \) "female", these syllables have been omitted from the analysis. There are therefore only three factors in this group. The results for this factor group in the final run are set out in table two below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
<th>No. of (&lt;1&gt;)</th>
<th>% of (&lt;1&gt;)</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(w)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(y)</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total tokens: 1208  Total no. of \(<1>\): 132 (11%)
This indicates that the labiovelar posture strongly favours <l> while the palatal posture disfavours it. It is interesting that this should be so, as with the variable (r) it was also found that an <l> variant was favoured by this posture (10.4.2). There thus seems to be a general tendency for <l> variants to be favoured by labiovelar posture.

However, it is necessary to treat these results with some caution due to the relatively small number of tokens of w. This is because there are no occurrences in the data of the w posture syllables nuo or nuan and only three occurrences of nu. Thus the weighting for w is based only on 17 tokens of nong (11 of which have <l>) and three tokens of nu (2 of which have <l>).

The figures for nu (not included in the above analysis) are as follows: No. of Tokens: 47, No. of <l> 8 (17%). Although, as mentioned above, all tokens of nu are pronunciations of the zi nü "female", this does suggest that, as might be expected, combination of initial w plus y postures results in a percentage of <l> higher than that of initial y posture alone but lower than that of initial w posture alone.
13.4.3 Resonance

The factors in this group are nasal (i.e., all syllables ending in n or ng in Pinyin) and oral (all other syllables). The findings for this factor group are set out in table 13.3 below.

Table 13.3 Variable Rule Analysis of (n): The Resonance Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>TOKENS</th>
<th>NO. OF &lt;1&gt;</th>
<th>% OF &lt;1&gt;</th>
<th>WEIGHTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates that nasal resonance favours the <1> variant and oral resonance disfavours it. It is possible that lack of nasality in the yunmu makes a non-nasal lateral initial more salient, i.e., nasality is then not present anywhere in the syllable, whereas when nasality is present in the yunmu, its lack in the initial is less salient. However, this can be no more than a tentative explanation, particularly as one of the nonstandard variants, [1], does have nasality. It is worth noting, nevertheless, that Chen Chungyu (1986) found that in her data [l] and [n] are confused only in syllables with nasal yunmu (see 13.9 below).
13.5 Age

In this and the following sections, the two groups of informants, those with <n> categorically and those with variation between <n> and <1>, will be compared with reference to the non-linguistic factors used elsewhere in the variable rule analyses. The breakdown of the two groups according to the age factors is given in table 13.4 below.

Table 13.4  Percentages and Numbers of Informants with Categorical and Variable (n) by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>CATEGORICAL</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>64%*(7)</td>
<td>36% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>55% (6)</td>
<td>45% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>44% (4)</td>
<td>56% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-56</td>
<td>20% (3)</td>
<td>80% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages are of the total of informants in each age bracket.

This suggests that the younger the age of a speaker, the more likely he or she is to use the standard <n> variant categorically. It seems reasonable to interpret this diachronically as evidence that the nonstandard <1> may be becoming much less frequent in Singapore Huayu. However, some caution is necessary in interpreting this and the following tables, as unlike the variable rule
analysis, this kind of analysis does not control for the effects of other factors (for example, that the younger age groups are also likely to be the more highly educated groups).

13.6 Level of Education

Table 13.5 Percentages and Numbers of Informants with Categorical and Variable (n) by Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>CATEGORICAL</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower sec.</td>
<td>38% (6)</td>
<td>62% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper sec.</td>
<td>57% (4)</td>
<td>43% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post sec.</td>
<td>83% (5)</td>
<td>17% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>56% (5)</td>
<td>44% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This clearly suggests a relationship with level of education, in particular with speakers with a level of education below lower secondary being more likely to use nonstandard <l>. However, again these results do not control for age differences. For example, age differences may partly account for the higher number of informants in the variable group with university education than with (non-university) post secondary education. The one informant with variable (n) in the post sec. group is in fact the only informant in that
group to be over 40. However, in the university group, there are six informants over 40, three of whom have variable (n).

13.7 Mother Tongue

Table 13.6 Percentages and Numbers of Informants with Categorical and Variable (n) by Mother Tongue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTHER TONGUE</th>
<th>CATEGORICAL</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hokkien</td>
<td>43% (10)</td>
<td>57% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>45% (9)</td>
<td>55% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huayu</td>
<td>33% (1)</td>
<td>66% (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that speakers of the two dialect mother tongues are equally likely to have variable (n). It is not surprising that both Hokkien speakers and Cantonese speakers should have some trouble in acquiring the standard distribution of [n] and [l] initials. In Hokkien [n] and [l] are in complementary distribution, with [n] occurring before nasalized vowels (i.e., nasal yunmu with no final closure) and [l]\textsuperscript{1} before all other yunmu (including nasal yunmu with final closure) (Yuan et al 1960). Descriptions of standard Cantonese (that of Guangzhou) usually include an initial [n] v. [l] opposition. However, this is variable even in Guangzhou. Chao (1947) states, for example, that "about one out of four persons in Canton city has no initial [n] and pronounces an [l] in words beginning with [n] for other
speakers". Similar variation has been noted in Hong Kong Cantonese (Bauer 1982). No systematic study of the Cantonese spoken in Singapore is available. However, personal observation confirms the existence of such variation in Singapore Cantonese.

The occurrence of the nonstandard variant in the speech of two informants with Singapore Huayu as mother tongue seems a little surprising. However, each has only one occurrence of the nonstandard <1> variant (as it happens, both out of a total of 33 tokens). It would therefore be rash to conclude from this anything about the likely persistence of (n) variation in any "indigenized" variety of Huayu in Singapore.

13.8 Sex

Table 13.7 Percentages and Numbers of Informants with Categorical and Variable (n) by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>CATEGORICAL</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46% (12)</td>
<td>54% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40% (8)</td>
<td>60% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This seems to indicate a slight tendency for males to be more likely to have variable (n) than females. This is despite the fact that more males than females have upper secondary or above levels of education (16 to 6) and more females than males have below lower secondary levels of
education (6 to 2). The suggests the possibility that, as with the variable (i) (Chapter Nine), females may be more sensitive to the prestige or standard variant than males.

13.9 Comparison with Chen C.Y (1986)

Chen Chungyu also found that in her data "the lateral 1 and the nasal n were found to replace each other occasionally". However, as noted earlier, she found that only items with nasal resonance were susceptible to this confusion. This may be due to her much smaller number of tokens.

13.10 Comparison with other Varieties of Mandarin

Initial [n] has merged with [l] or is variable in most of the Southwestern dialects and some of the Jianghuai and Northwestern dialects of Mandarin (Zhan 1981). Lehmann ed. (1975) also mentions [n] / [l] confusion in speakers of Putonghua in China.

Variation between [l] and [n] has also been noted in the Mandarin of Cantonese speaking learners in Hong Kong. However, Kubler (1981) mentions only the use of [r] for 1 in Taiwanese Guoyu, but not [r] or [l] for [n].

The variable use of [l] for the standard n initial is not, therefore, a unique feature of Singapore Huayu.
However, it may serve to distinguish a speaker of Singapore Huayu from a speaker of Taiwanese Guoyu.

13.11 Conclusion

Variation between <n> and <l> is clearly not so widespread as the other phonological variables investigated in previous chapters and nearly half of the informants have the standard <n> variant categorically. The nonstandard <l> variant is more likely to occur in the Huayu of less educated and older speakers than in the speech of highly educated and younger speakers. It is therefore possible that this nonstandard variant may eventually disappear or become very infrequent in Singapore Huayu.
1. The Hokkien initial transcribed above as [l] is very variable in varieties of Hokkien or Minnanhua. It is generally described as a an apical flap, however perceptually it may sometimes seem more [l] like and sometimes more [d] like (see Tay 1968 and Bodman 1955). This may well be the source of the variant transcribed as [r] above (13.2). However, variants which are clearly [r] or [d] like are quite infrequent in the Singapore data.
CHAPTER FOURTEEN

THE LA PARTICLE

14.1 Nonstandard Particles in Singapore Huayu

All Chinese dialects have a word class usually called "particles" which realize a range of aspectual and modal meanings. However, the southern dialects are generally much richer in such particles, particularly modal particles, than the northern dialects.

Similarly, a much wider range of modal particles occurs in Singapore Huayu than in Standard Huayu. Some such particles are:

la (usually toneless, sometimes with other tones)
me [mi]
lai de
ho [hɔ] (pre-pause, clause complex non final)
há (pre-pause, clause complex final)
ho [hɔ] (post pause, clause complex final)
lo [lɔ] (sometimes mid level, sometimes toneless)
lē [lē]
wo (low falling tone)
meiyou
Some of these particles seem to be very close to particles in one or other of the southern dialects spoken in Singapore and may be direct transfers (for example ml, lo and wo from Cantonese, and clause complex final hó from Hokkien), others appear to be calques of particles in the dialects (e.g., laide from Cantonese [lɛi ɡɛ]). It is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss the possible functions of all of these particles. Inevitably, with data drawn from a context such as the sociolinguistic interview, the range and frequency of such modal particles is rather small. In order to obtain sufficient numbers of such particles for any kind of quantitative analysis, it would be necessary to draw data from a many more registers including many more speech functions.

However, there is one particle in the data which is sufficiently frequent to allow at least an exploratory investigation. This is the particle la (also see Appendix Five for brief notes on some of the other common particles).

La is interesting for a number of reasons. Firstly, a similar la particle exists in the standard language. However, whereas the standard la particle is essentially aspectual, the Singapore Huayu particle is essentially modal. Secondly, the Singapore Huayu modal particle appears to be involved in sociolectal and registerial variation (as far as the latter can be investigated in
the present study). Finally, a similar particle, possibly with similar functions, has been identified in Singapore English.

14.2 La in Standard Huayu

It is first necessary to distinguish nonstandard Singapore Huayu la from Standard Huayu la (which may also occur in Singapore Huayu).

La in Standard Huayu can almost always be analyzed as a fusion of the perfective particle le with the clause complex final modal particle a (Wang 1975). With la in the standard language, the perfective function of le is thus still present, although with some very common expressions, such as dui la! ("right", "correct") the perfectivity has become somewhat fossilized².

However, there is one other function of le (or la) in the standard language which should be mentioned. This is as the particle of what Chao Yuen Ren calls "lively enumeration" which is used for listing. Thus in the Singapore data, there are uses of la such as:

Guangdong la, fujian la, kehua la, wosan zhong
Cantonese LA, Hokkien LA, Hakka LA, I three types
dōu hùi jiāng.
all can speak
Cantonese, Hokkien and Hakka, I can speak all three.

Such a use of la is regarded as standard and, like instances in which the la has a perfective function, will not be counted as occurrences of the nonstandard Singapore Huayu la.

There are also some instances of la in the data in which the distinction between the nonstandard Singapore Huayu la and the standard la is somewhat fuzzy. For example:

Interviewer: Ni nǎzhòng fāngyǎn jiāngde zǔi liúliúne? Which dialect do you speak most fluently?

Interviewee: Dángrán shì guǎngdōng la Dialect? Of-course is Cantonese LA

Dialect? Cantonese of course! (the informant has already said that his mother tongue is Cantonese)

Wǒde zhíyè? Ni yīnggāi zhīdào la My occupation? You should know LA

My occupation? You should know! (from a colleague interviewed for the pilot study)

There are a number of such occurrences of la in the data which appear to indicate that the speaker considers that
the question is something the interviewer should have known. This appears close to what Chao calls the "obviousness" function of le (Chao 1968:800). However, other sources do not mention such a function of le or la and it is possible that this usage represents southern influence that may be creeping into the standard language. I have presented a number of utterances such as the above to speakers of Putonghua from China. It is interesting that two speakers from southern areas (Shanghai and Guangzhou) were prepared to accept them, while two speakers from northern China (Beijing and Tianjin) were divided over whether or not such uses of la were acceptable in Standard Putonghua.

Instances of la in the Singapore data which can be interpreted as having this "obviousness" function have, therefore, not been counted as nonstandard for the purposes of the present study.

14.3 Nonstandard la in Singapore Huayu

Singapore Huayu la may usually be transcribed as [læ]. Sometimes the vowel seems a little farther back and might be transcribed as [lɤ]. Four main tonal variants of la occur in the data. These are low fall, high level, mid level and toneless. However, the great majority of la's in the data are of the toneless variant. This variant occurs in the speech of all informants except two, whereas the other tonal variants are very sporadic in
occurrence and, with a few exceptions, appear to be used only by informants who have Cantonese as their mother tongue. As similar particles occur in Cantonese, these might tentatively be identified as mother tongue transfer features. This chapter will consider only the toneless la variety.

With very few exceptions, la (toneless) occurs only clause complex finally, as does the la of standard Huayu. However, in the Singapore data, la occurs in contexts in which it would be highly unlikely in standard Huayu. For example:

1. Chi wūfān shì, duōshū shì jiāng fǔjiānhuà la.
   Eat lunch when, majority is speak Hokkien LA
   We usually speak Hokkien over lunch.

2. Zhiyè? Wǒ shì bāng rénjiā xǐ yǐ de la
   Occupation? I am help others wash clothes DE LA
   My occupation? I wash clothes for others

3. Tāmende huáyǔ, juéde gūai gūai3 la.
   Their huayu, feel strange-strange LA
   I feel that their Huayu is ...rather odd.

4. Xīnjiāpō huáyǔ bù dà...náge tún ā, náge
   Singapore huayu not very...that tune A. that
tone a, bijiao bu hao la.
tone A, comparatively not good LA
Singapore Huayu is not very ...the tune, the
tone is not very good.

5. Yao xue duo yizhong yuyan dangran shi hao
Want study more one-type language of-course is good

la. Buguo ha, bu keyi mianqiang renjia de la
LA. However HA, not can force others DE LA

Of course it is good to want to learn another
language. However, you can't force people.

The use of la in these contexts would at the very least
be rather odd in the standard language. Very often, it
would imply some kind of change from a past situation to
the present situation, i.e., perfective aspect. For
example: "This is now my child (but she did not use to
be)"; "We now speak Hokkien over lunch (but we used to
speak Cantonese)"; "Singapore Huayu is no longer very
good (but it used to be)" and so on. None of these
interpretations is possible in context.

14.3.1 Possible Functions of Singapore Huayu la

Any discussion here of the functions of la in Singapore
Huayu is necessarily limited by the fact that the context
of the interview encourages certain speech functions and
discourages others. Part one of the interview generally requires the informant to give information about his or her background and linguistic repertoire. Part two generally requires the informant to express opinions. Rarely does an informant question the interviewer, give instructions to the interviewer and so on. However, even within these limits, there do seem to be some trends.

In the first part of the interview, la is used with statements of fact in which there is little doubt. It often seems to convey a meaning something like: "That's the answer to your question. There is no doubt about it and nothing more to add." In this, it perhaps retains a slight favour of the perfective function of standard la. In addition to nos. 1 and 2 above further examples are:

6. **Interviewer:** Ni měitiān kàn bāozhī ma?
   Do you read a newspaper every day?

   **Interviewee:** Ō, huáwénde, yīngwénde, dōu yǒu have, Chinese-one, English-one all have kàn la
   read LA
   Yes, I read both an English one and a Chinese one

7. **Interviewer:** Nǐde zhíyè shì shéme?
   What is your occupation?
Interviewee: Zài yìgè xuéxiào dāng shūjí lā
In one school act-as clerk LĀ
A clerk (or secretary) in a school

In the second part of the interview, lā frequently occurs with what seem to be fairly certain or unequivocal opinions. In addition to nos. 4 and 5 above, other examples are:

8. ...mófang bèijīng huáyǔ, zhèiyàng, wǒ kàn bú
imitate Beijing huayu, this-type, I see not

bì, wǒmen yǒu wǒmènde huáyǔ lā.
necessary, we have our Huayu LĀ

As for imitating Beijing Huayu, I think it is unnecessary. We have our own Huayu.

9. Yīnweì fǔjiānhuà tōngcháng shì huárén suǒ....
Because Hokkien usually is Chinese that-which...

zài Xīnjìapō shì fǔjiānrén zúi duō lā. Búguó
in Singapore is Hokkiens most many LA, however

yīnggāi hǎ, mànmàn yīnggāi yǔyán tōngyí lā
should HA, slowly should language unify LA

Because Hokkien is what the Chinese....in Singapore
Hokkiens are the majority. However, we should slowly unify our language.

From all the above examples, it would seem that la is associated with the certain and unequivocal statement of facts and opinions about which there may be little more to say.

However, there appears to be more to it. Conversations with Singapore informants suggest that utterances with la also have the feeling of being "toned down" and less dogmatic or that the proposition is just an "off the cuff" remark that the speaker is not necessarily strongly committed to. For example, one informant explained that the utterance:

\[ \text{Wo yi\=ngg\=ai d\=uo jiang Hu\=yu}. \]
I should more speak Huayu
I should speak more Huayu.

could suggest that the speaker will make a serious effort to use Huayu more often. However, the same clause with la:

\[ \text{Wo yi\=ngg\=ai du\=o jiang hu\=yu la} \]

might mean something like: "I suppose I really should try to speak more Mandarin."
Similarly, an utterance such as:

zheīge hěn yōuqù la
this-one very interesting LA

That's interesting

might be a casual comment made whilst, for example, watching television and the speaker would not expect the proposition to be disputed. However, the same utterance without the la could be part of a more serious conversation.

It seems that the particle la can be used to make the stating of information or expression of opinion seem less dogmatic or argumentative, whilst at the same time indicating that the speaker considers that there is nothing more to be said on the subject.

14.4 La as a Stigmatized Feature

Modal particles, and particularly la, are among the few linguistic features explicitly mentioned by informants as "what is wrong with the way Huayu is spoken in Singapore" (see p.179-180). The use of La and similar modal particles seems to have risen "to overt social consciousness" to become what Labov calls a "stereotype" (Labov 1972:248). For example:
Bírú shuō, wǒmen Xīnjiāpō rén jiāng yīngyǔ yòngdào hòumiànde "la". Wǒmen jiāng huáyǔ yě shì yǒu hěn duō hòumìan zhèixié weiyīn.

(For example, when we Singaporeans speak English we use "la" at the end. When we speak Huayu, we also have many of these final sounds at the end.)

Wǒmen shūōde huáyǔ bīng bù shì biáozhùn. Wǒmen, yòushí xiǎo háizǐ tánhuá deshíhou, hěn duō, nà xiē bù bìyàode weiyīn

(The Huayu we speak is not at all standard. We, sometimes the children when they are talking have lots of those unnecessary final sounds)

Final particles were also mentioned in the "General Comment" sections of the Listener Evaluation Tests (Chapter Eight). For example:

His Mandarin isn’t very good as he has a lot of "lah" in his talk.

(Comment written in English)

It is also worth noting that the two samples in the evaluation tests which were rated highest have no occurrences of nonstandard la, whilst all the other samples have at least two occurrences each.
14.5 La and Sociolectal Variation

All but 2 of the 46 informants use nonstandard \textit{la} at least once in the course of their interviews. However, there is very great variation among speakers in the frequency of \textit{la} usage. Given the rather small number of total occurrences of \textit{la} (554), particularly compared to the variable phonological features, and the fact the \textit{la} cannot be clearly identified as a variant of a standard feature (see discussion p.214-215), this variation will not be investigated using variable rule analysis. Nevertheless, even a rather crude statistical analysis does reveal some interesting patterns.

14.5.1 La usage and Level of Education

The number of occurrences of \textit{la} in 15 minutes of each interview (5 from the "giving facts" section and 10 from the "giving opinions" section) were counted. Table 14.1 compares the mean number of occurrences per person for informants grouped according to three levels of education - completion of primary education or less, completion of secondary education (lower or upper) and completion of post secondary training (university or non-university).
Table 14.1 Mean Individual Frequency of La Occurrence by Level of Education

Primary and Below 21.9
Secondary 11.3
Post Secondary 8.3

Comparison between the primary and below group and the secondary group using a difference of the means test yields a z-score of 2.33. This enables us to reject at the 0.05 level of significance the null hypothesis that the two groups belong to the same population.

However, comparison between the secondary and post secondary groups yields a z-score of only 1.06, which is considerably smaller than the 1.96 required for rejection of the null hypothesis at the 0.05 level of significance. We therefore can have confidence that the data indicates a significant difference in frequency of la usage only between informants who have completed secondary education and above and informants who have completed primary education or below. The means for these two groups are as follows:

Primary and Below 21.9
Secondary and Above 10.1
Thus, not only is la an overtly stigmatized feature but also greater frequency of la usage seems to be associated with a lower level of education.

14.5.2 La and Sex

The frequency of occurrence of la also seems to vary with sex. Table 14.2 gives the mean number of occurrences for the two sexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Mean Number of Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inevitably this is partly distorted by the fact that there are more females in the lower educational group than in the higher group. However, if education level and sex are looked at together, it is clear that this is a consistent pattern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary and below</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and Above</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is possible that this pattern represents a greater tendency for women to select a modal closure which allows them to avoid a dogmatic or overly assertive tone.

14.6 La and Registerial Variation

General observation of La usage in Singapore Huayu suggest that La is unlikely to occur in public contexts (speeches, formal meetings and so on) and far more likely to occur in private, informal contexts (casual conversation among friends and so on). The nature of the data collected does not allow any in depth analysis of this. However, it does provide occasional evidence for the relationship between frequency of La usage and registerial variation, for example, where the tape recorder was left running during interruptions such as telephone calls. In one case, an interview was interrupted by the informant receiving a phone call from a friend and colleague. The main topic of the telephone conversation is the arranging of a meeting. There is thus a shift from a context in which the two interlocutors are relative strangers and have on the whole quite distinct speech roles within the interview situation to a context in which the participants are friends and are engaged in a shared search for a time and place convenient to both. In other words, there is a change in the tenor of the discourse (Halliday 1978). In the course of the telephone conversation, the informant has an average of 1 La for every 4.5 clauses. However, in the interview, the
informant has an average of only 1 la per 14 clauses. Increased La thus appears to be related to a change in register, particularly in the dimension of tenor.

14.7 Comparison With La in Singapore English

According to Richards and Tay, the la particle in Singapore English "serves to mark that the speech act is one involving dimensions of informality, familiarity, solidarity and rapport between the participants" (Richards and Tay 1977:155). In other words, it appears to be related to register variation – particularly tenor – in similar ways to la in Singapore Huayu. They also suggest that the source of the Singapore English la may be a similar particle in Hokkien.

Kwan-Terry (1978) identifies two la particles in Singapore English, one stressed and protracted and the other unstressed and contracted. She goes a little further than Richards and Tay in attempting to explore the meanings of the two particles. She suggests that the stressed la basically expresses "emphasis", although this meaning is "modified by context" and the unstressed la indicates authority or a hint of impatience or annoyance.

Low (1985) looked at la particles in the English of preschool bilingual children in Singapore. She identifies three basic tonal variants of la – high, mid and low – each of which may be further modified by a rise or fall
which carries "additional emotive meaning" (p.9). A rise generally indicates irritation, annoyance or impatience, while a fall indicates an authoritative attitude.

It is difficult to unequivocally equate the toneless, unstressed $\lambda_a$, which is by far the most common form of $\lambda_a$ in the Singapore Huayu data, with any of the forms and functions of Singapore English $\lambda_a$ as reported in the above studies. Partly, of course, this is likely to be because the speech functions commonest in the present data, giving information and expressing opinions, are not those which have received much attention in the above studies. However, there is similarity between some of the functions of $\lambda_a$ mentioned by these authors those of $\lambda_a$ in the present data. Kwan-Terry (1978) includes "obviousness", "softening of tone and attitude" and "a certain explanatory attitude" as being some of the different possible meanings of the "stressed and protracted $\lambda_a$" and both Low (1985) and Kwan-Terry identify a $\lambda_a$ whose basic function is to indicate authority (the "unstressed contracted" $\lambda_a$ for Kwan-Terry and the low level $\lambda_a$ for Low).

14.8 Conclusion

$\lambda_a$, toneless and unstressed, is by far the most common nonstandard particle in the data. In contrast to $\lambda_a$ in standard Huayu, its function is primarily modal rather than aspectual. It appears to be a stigmatized feature
and is associated more with registers in which the tenor of discourse is characterized by solidarity or closeness of social distance. In the data, it used more frequently by those with lower levels of education than those with higher levels of education. It is also used more frequently by women than men.

In the expression of facts and opinions, la appears to be associated with a degree of certainty and finality, whilst at the same time enabling the speaker to avoid a dogmatic tone. It is likely that further research will reveal additional functions of la combined with different speech functions.

It is likely that La in Singapore Huayu is related to the la in Singapore English. It may thus be a Singapore areal feature.
NOTES

1. Following Halliday 1985 "sentence" is taken to describe a unit of written language and clause complex the similar (but not identical) unit of spoken language.

2. However, even this can be interpreted as perfective - "now you are right", "now you've got it".

3. For comments on such nonstandard reduplication, see Appendix Five.

4. For comments on the nonstandard word order here, see Appendix Five.
CHAPTER FIFTEEN

"ROJAK" HUAYU

15.1 Language Mixing

The "mixing" into Huayu of elements from other languages or dialects is the area of nonstandardness which is most salient to Singapore speakers. It is sometimes referred to as rojak (a Malay word for a local kind of salad) or as chān chān (de) "mix mix" or "mixed". It was such mixing that was most often cited by informants when asked what they thought was wrong with the way Singaporeans spoke Huayu and it is to the elimination of much of the "borrowed" lexis in Singapore Huayu that most of the efforts of standardization have been directed.

It is also the aspect of Singapore Huayu which is most salient to speakers of other varieties of Mandarin and, indeed, can sometimes render Singapore speakers unintelligible to outsiders.

Language contact phenomena in Singapore Huayu may be related to different dimensions of variation. Some speakers may "switch to" or "import" elements from other languages or dialects in order to supplement deficiencies in their own Huayu or because they believe it may make them better understood by an interlocutor they believe to
be less proficient in Huayu. In other words, language contact phenomena may be related to variations in speakers' proficiencies. However, very proficient speakers of Huayu may also exhibit similar forms of linguistic behaviour. In such cases, it may be related to variation in aspects of register such as field or tenor. For example, certain more scientific fields may be associated with a greater use of "borrowed" English lexis, and tenors characterized by a high degree of solidarity may be associated with greater use of certain kinds of colloquial borrowings and dialect calque.

*Mixing* may refer to a very wide range of language contact phenomena and it is beyond the scope of this thesis to provide an exhaustive account of this area. However, this chapter will make a preliminary investigation into a range of interlingual phenomena involving Huayu by analysing transcriptions of four samples of speech recorded in Singapore, and will consider how far they can be described with the kinds of labels used elsewhere in descriptions of language contact phenomena, such as code-switching, borrowing and creolization.

15.2 The Samples

Samples 1, 2 and 3 are taken from interviews which were rejected from the main study on the grounds that they were too mixed or contained too much obvious language transfer or interference (see 5.1.6). The fourth sample
is from a conversation between two Singaporean informants who do not share a common dialect mother tongue.

Transcriptions of the samples are given in Pinyin or the conventional orthographies of English and Malay where relevant. Significant deviations from standard pronunciations are given below the line in IPA and a word for word translation (apart from the English elements) is given below this. In these transcriptions, ˘ below a vowel indicates raised relative to cardinal value, ˌ indicates lowered, + fronted and - backed. Lexical tone (where it differs from in the standard language) follow Y.R. Chao's notation (Chao 1930 and Chao 1968). Nonstandard variants which are dealt with elsewhere in this thesis are noted in the transcriptions but will not be commented upon in the analyses which follow. Note that versions of the samples in written zi are given in Appendix Seven.

The four samples are ordered according to the extent of their divergence from the norms of Standard Huayu (and of the other input languages) and to the degree of "separateness" of the Huayu and non-Huayu elements.
15.3 Sample One

15.3.1 Transcription of Sample One

1 Yuwyn shi .... zhèngrú, er, for example, you dza
Language is .... just like

2 ask me to read, you know, Tángshī Sānbái Shǒu
Tang poems 300 CLASS

3 weishéme, it’s very interesting to note one thing why,

4 and that is, and that is, how come some of

5 my science trained, ehm, colleagues, and Chinese

6 educated, shǒu zhōngwén jiàoyùde, tā
receive Chinese educationDE they

7 fānér hǎoxiāng méiyíhǎo
on-the-contrary for-example everyCLASS

8 juejù, this one, er, er, ta shì Tángshì Sānbái
juejù, it is Tang Poems 300
9 Shou, weisheme, tamen buhui liaojie tade, 
CLASS, why, they cannot understand it.

10 zheige zhuti ne, zhei shi, yinwei ha, I, I
dian thisCLASS theme NE, this is, because HA,

11 learn English literature also, and certain

12 concepts are also found in English literature.

13 Therefore it is just a language barrier. I mean,

14 I can guess, suiran haoxiang you yiban a, 
although for-example have one-half A,

15 jin zi, nage zi la, wo dou bu renshi, bu
"jin" zi, thatCLASS zi LA, I all not know, not

16 zhidao ta shi xiang shi sheme dongxi, bu shi, 
know it is like is what thing, not is,

17 bu zhidao fanyi, because I was trained in the
not know translate,

18 zhengti a, not the simplified Mandarin.
standard-form A,
Translation

Language is... Just like, er, for example, you ask me to read, you know, Three Hundred Tang Poems, why ... It’s very interesting to note one thing and that is, and that is, how come some of my science trained, science trained, ehm, colleagues, and Chinese educated, Chinese educated [colleagues], they, in fact, for example, every jueju (= a verse form) this one, er, er, it is Three Hundred Tang Poems, why, they in fact cannot understand its, er, theme. That is because I, I learn English literature also, and certain concepts are also found in English literature. Therefore, it is just a language barrier. I mean, I can guess... Although, for example, half of it, the character "jin" I don’t know. I don’t know what kind of thing it refers to. It isn’t... I don’t know how to translate it, because I was trained in the old style characters, not the simplified Mandarin.

15.3.2 The Informant

The speaker in sample one is a 28 year old woman and a teacher by occupation. Her mother tongue is Cantonese and she has had twelve years of primary and secondary education plus one year teacher training, all through the medium of English as first school language. However, she
claims to be equally fluent in Huayu, her second school
language. She also claims to be more fluent in both
English and Huayu than in her mother tongue, Cantonese.

15.3.3 The Mix and its Intelligibility to Outsiders

There are clearly two distinct languages in this sample,
one quite close to standard Huayu and the other quite
close to standard British English. It proved to be fully
intelligible to Mandarin / English bilinguals from
outside Singapore. Three speakers of Putonghua from the
Peoples Republic of China currently studying at the
University of Sydney all claimed one hundred percent
comprehension of this recorded sample.

15.3.4 Code-Switching

This sample presents the least difficulty for
description. The language behaviour can be labelled code-
switching, i.e., the use of two or more languages within
the same speech situation, such has been observed and
described in the language of bilinguals in many parts of
the world. In this sample, the English and Huayu elements
are clearly distinct and most switches involve
constituents of at least clause length. This sample is at
one end of a scale of separateness / integration of Huayu
and non-Huayu elements.
In terms of Blom and Gumperz distinctions (Blom and Gumperz 1972), the switching in this sample is clearly not situational, as there is no change or redefinition of relationships among the participants (i.e., the tenor remains constant). Neither can it be called metaphorical code-switching, as there is no obvious exploitation of the possible social meanings implicit in the use of the two languages. However, the switching can to some extent be related to *triggering* or *switch words* (Clyne 1967). Thus, for example, in lines 5/6 "Chinese educated" seems to trigger a following switch into Huayu ("consequential switching"), in line 11 "English literature" seems to trigger an earlier switch into English ("anticipatory switching") and in line 14 *yǒu yībān* ("half of it") — a reference to a volume of Chinese poetry, a copy of which was on a side table — seems to trigger a switch back into Huayu. In other words, the switching may be related to small fluctuations in field.

15.3.5 Nonstandard Features

Nearly all the nonstandard features of the Huayu in this sample have already been noted as widespread in Singapore Huayu and are not specifically characteristic of mixed or interference varieties.
15.4 Sample Two

15.4.1 Transcription of Sample Two

1 Wo shuo yuyan a, ziran yao la, yao xue
I say language A, naturally want LA, want study

2 duo bijiao hao, shi women zijdde
more comparatively good, cause we selvesDE

3 knowledge a, widen our nage knowledge la.
A, that-CLASS LA.

4 Danshi bu shi, bu keyi yao yidingde, yao
But not is, not can want certainDE, want

5 mianqiang renjia de la, haoxiang, laorenjia
force others DE LA, for-example, old-people

6 yiding ye yao xue sheme, bu da hao
certain also want study something, not very good

7 la. Jiaru renjia bu xihuan, nali gei yige
LA. If others not like, how give a-CLASS,

8 yidingde force a, gei ren yige nage
A, give people one-CLASS that-CLASS
9 atmosphere bu haode. Suoyi shuo jinli not goodDE. Therefore, say do-one’s-best

10 yao xue, zheiyang bijiao hao la, want study, that-way comparatively good LA,

11 gulì encourage a, bu shi yiding shemede encourage A, not is certain somethingDE

12 jiemu yao cancel a, sheme, suoyi bu programme want A, something, therefore not

13 yao force nage language la.

want that-CLASS LA.

Translation

I would say that language, of course it’s better to want, to want to learn more, to make our knowledge, to widen our knowledge. But it isn’t, you can’t demand, force others. For example, it’s not very good to demand that old people learn something. If people don’t like [to do it], how can you force them? It gives people a, a bad atmosphere. So it’s best to say "do your best to learn". Encourage [them], you don’t have to do things like cancel [TV] programmes. So don’t force the language.
15.4.2 The informant

The informant in sample two is a woman in her forties and the wife of a taxi driver. Her mother tongue is Cantonese. She has been educated up to secondary three level mainly through English as first school language and Huayu as second school language. She claims to use Cantonese and Huayu with her husband, and Cantonese, Huayu and English with her children. She says that her English is a little better than her Huayu.

15.4.3 Intelligibility of the Sample

Of the group of three bilinguals from the PRC, two estimated that they could understand about 60% of the sample and one estimated that she could understand about 90%. They all recognised it as "accented" Mandarin mixed with some English and some elements they were not sure about.

15.4.4 Borrowing or Code-Mixing

This sample also consists of Huayu and English elements. However, the English elements are much shorter than in Sample 1, generally consisting of one or two consecutive words only. These elements could be regarded as exemplifying either borrowing from English into Huayu or code-mixing of English and Huayu - using the term code-
mixing rather than code-switching for switches of less than clause length (Thelander 1976).

15.4.5 A Continuum of Integration

A possible criterion for distinguishing between code-mixing at the level of single lexical items - or "skipants" (Chao 1976) - and "true" loanwords is the extent of assimilation of the item to the phonology of the recipient language. However, a striking feature of "Rojak Huayu" is that there is a continuum of assimilation of foreign elements to the phonology of Singapore Huayu and great instability, with the same items occurring in different forms even within the speech of the same speaker.

Thus, for example, in this sample the words "atmosphere" (line 9), "cancel" (line 12), "language" (line 13) are all quite close to standard British English pronunciations. However, [ɛŋkəli] (line 11) seems largely assimilated. Syllable final consonants have been dropped and the English sequence [LLJ] replaced by the Huayu sequence [li]. However, [en] is not a possible Huayu sequence. The nearest would be [ən] or [ən]. The word "knowledge" occurs in two forms, both in line 3. The first occurrence [nət li'v] appears to be fully assimilated. There is no final consonant apart from a glottal stop, which is possible in Singapore Huayu (see Chapter Eleven). It also appears to have lexical tone
rather than English word accent. However, the second occurrence of the word is in a form very close to standard English pronunciation.

A further problem is that to refer to items as assimilated or not assimilated to some extent depends on what is assumed to be the source variety of the items in question. If one assumes that a variety close to standard English is the source, then it makes sense to describe forms like \([n\text{̄} l\text{̄}\text{̄}]\) as being assimilated to Singapore Huayu phonology. However, such forms may well be quite acceptable in some varieties of Singapore English (see Platt and Weber 1980) and it is not necessary to assume assimilation to Singapore Huayu phonology.

15.4.6 Nonstandard Phonological Features

Most of the nonstandard phonological features in this sample have been already noted as part of a general norm for Singapore Huayu or as variants of features variable in the speech of most speakers. There is, however, at least one realization which does not fall into the above categories. This is the pronunciation of the two zi (bisyllabic or bimorphemic) word mianqiang (line 5) as \([m\text{̄} n\text{̄} j\text{̄} q\text{̄} ]\). In this sample, the first zi is pronounced almost exactly according to the Cantonese pronunciation whilst the second zi is according to the Mandarin pronunciation with the fairly common Singapore Huayu nonpalatal initial (see 7.2.5). It would clearly be odd
to label this "code-mixing at the syllable level". One might want to regard it as an instance of "interlingual identification" (Weinreich 1953) in which elements of one language are identified with similar elements in another. However, in other places, the speaker does use the Mandarin pronunciation of this yunmu ([ɨn]) where Cantonese would again have [in] (e.g. in Fujianhua "Hokkien"). This may seem a very minor point. However, such problems are multiplied in the next two samples.

15.4.7 Nonstandard Grammar

The construction xue duō "learn more" (lines 1/2) is nonstandard. In the standard language duo "more" and shao "less" precede the verb in such expressions. In southern dialects, such as Cantonese and Hokkien, they follow the verb and this construction can probably be regarded as a dialect calque, although the influence of English cannot be ruled out. This structure occurs quite commonly in Singapore Huayu and is not specifically characteristic of a "Rojak" variety (see Appendix Five).

15.5 Sample Three

15.5.1 Transcription of Sample Three

1 Ta liangge ren tong nage
    They two-CLASS people share that-CLASS
2 záhuòdiàn  ne, mái mǐ a, mái shéme,
   general-store NE, sell rice A, sell something,

3 záhuòdiàn ne. Liángge rén qù zuògōng a,
   general-store. Two-CLASS people go work A,

4 yìge dùshū dú  shì shàngwǔ la, yìge
   one-CLASS study study is morning LA, one-CLASS

5 dú  xiàwǔ la. Yìge zuògōng zuò shàngwǔ la,
   study afternoon LA. One-CLASS work do morning LA,

6 yìge zuògōng zuò xiàwǔ la. Zheiyàng
   one-CLASS work do afternoon LO. This-way

7. liǎngge la, liǎngge shuāngbāoyī
two-CLASS LA, two -CLASS twins

8. yìge qǐlái qù dùshū a, yìge qǐlái
   one-CLASS get-up go study A, one-CLASS get-up

9 qù zuògōng a. Nàgè fāngxué huílái
   go work A. That-CLASS finish-school come-back

10 qù zuògōng a, nàgè fānggōng huílái
    go work A, that-CLASS finish-work come-back

11 qù dùshū a.
   go study A.
The two of them shared a general store, selling rice and things, a general store. The two of them went to work. One went to school in the morning and the other went in the afternoon. One of them worked in the morning and the other worked in the afternoon. In this way, the two of them, the two twins, one got up and went to school and the other got up and went to work. When one got home from school, he went to work. When the other got home from work, he went to school.

15.5.2 The Informant

Sample three comes from a 57 year old woman. Her mother tongue is Cantonese, which is her strongest language, and she has had only a few months primary education through Cantonese and Huayu.

15.5.3 Intelligibility

Of the group of three bilinguals from the PRC, one claimed to understand about 50% of the sample and characterized it as "Mandarin with a strong accent mixed with southern dialect." The other two claimed to understand 80% to 90% and characterized it as "Mandarin with a very strong Cantonese accent". However, of these
last two judges, one was from Guangzhou and spoke Cantonese and the other, though a northerner, had had experience teaching Mandarin to Overseas Chinese, including many Cantonese speakers.

15.5.4 "Sliding" Between Phonologies

This sample seems to exhibit marked instability. It is difficult to draw a clear boundary between the Cantonese and Huayu elements and the pronunciations seem to slide back and forth between forms close or identical to Cantonese to forms very close to Huayu. For example:

In the noun group [lɔŋ ɡəŋ 1ən ɡ] "two people" (line 1) the numerative and the classifier [lɔŋ ɡəŋ] are very close to standard Cantonese (Huayu would be [lɪŋ ɡ]) whilst the head noun [lən ɡ] "people" is given a common Singapore Huayu pronunciation, with [l] for the standard Huayu initial [z] or [ŋ] (see Chapter Ten).

The noun group [dʒə fə ɗen] "general store" (line 2) is similarly mixed. The pronunciation of the first zi is close to Huayu [dʒə], although the initial [dʒ] is more like the initial in the Cantonese pronunciation [dʒəp]. [fə] is very close to the Cantonese pronunciation. Standard Huayu would be [xʊəʊ], although [hʊəʊ] is usual in Singapore Huayu. The final morpheme [ɗen] appears to be neither Cantonese nor Huayu, although it is closest to
the Mandarin [d`u n] but without the glide and with level tone instead of the standard falling tone.

The classifier ge occurs as [gə ] in lines 4 and 8 which is somewhere between Cantonese and Huayu. It has the approximate central position and tonelessness (qingsheng) of the standard Huayu pronunciation [gy ] with the rounding of the Cantonese pronunciation [gə ]. However, in lines 1, 3 and 7 the same zi is pronounced more less according to Cantonese, whilst all other occurrences of the zi are pronounced more or less according to Huayu.

The noun group [su ʑ bau tʰjı ] "twins" (line 7) is also a mixture of the two phonologies. [su ʑ ] might be regarded as midway between Cantonese [sɔ ʑ ] and the common Singapore Huayu pronunciation [s`ʊ ʑ ] (identical to standard Huayu apart from the non-retroflex initial, a slightly more forward vowel quality and often a slightly lower level tone). The vowel nucleus is closest to Huayu but the lack of a labiovelar glide is a feature of the Cantonese pronunciation. The second zi is pronounced [bɔ ʑ ] in Standard Huayu and [bau ] in Cantonese. The pronunciation of the zi in this sample could therefore be said to be quite close to both. The pronunciation of the third zi [tʰjı ] is almost identical to the Cantonese pronunciation. The standard Huayu pronunciation would be [tʰjı ]. The lexical item as a whole is Mandarin. The equivalent Cantonese word meaning "twins" is [ma l dʒ ɔ i ].

It is worth noting that in another part of the interview
from which this sample is taken, the speaker does in fact use the Cantonese word.

15.5.5 Dialect Calque

There is also some of what might be called dialect calquing in this sample. The two expressions \textit{fânxue} "to finish school" and \textit{fahggong} "to finish work" (lines 9 and 10) are Cantonese expressions, although the pronunciations are closest to Huayu.

15.5.6 English Lexis

In other parts of this interview not included in this sample, the speaker also uses some English derived lexis. For example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{[3d fθj]} - "office"
  \item \textit{[liθj]} - "lift"
  \item \textit{[hθbι bθj bθj]} - "Harbour Board"
\end{itemize}

These items do seem to be considerably modified away from standard English pronunciation, although it is not clear whether they should best be regarded as assimilated to Singapore Huayu phonology, Cantonese phonology or, indeed, to colloquial Singapore English phonology. For example, the lack of all final consonants except glottal stop suggests Singapore Huayu phonology. However, the low falling tone on the first syllable of \textit{[hθbι bθj bθj]}
suggests Cantonese. The sequence $[\text{r} \text{i} \text{l}]$ in $[\text{j} \text{r} \text{i} \text{l}]$ is, in fact, not permissible in either Huayu or Cantonese.

15.5.6 Interference or Code-Mixing

It would be possible to regard this sample simply as Singapore Huayu with strong mother tongue (Cantonese) interference. It might also be possible to talk of code-mixing, as some forms are more or less identical to Cantonese whilst others are more or less identical to (Singapore) Huayu. However, neither term seems adequate to describe this "sliding" between phonologies, even within single lexical items.

15.5.7 Creolization?

Can this sample be regarded as exemplifying some kind of creolized Huayu? The term creolization is here used not in the strict sense of processes of functional expansion in a pidgin as it becomes a native language, but in the wider sense such as used by Gumperz and Wilson (1971) in showing how processes of reduction and convergence characteristic of pidginization and creolization occur in a language contact situation on the Indo-Aryan / Dravidian border in India, or by Bailey and Maroldt when they use the term to mean "a gradient mixture of two or more languages" and define "creole" as "the result of mixing which is substantial enough to result in a new
system, a system that is separate from its antecedent parent systems" (Bailey and Maroldt 1977).

Whilst there may not always be complete agreement on what would constitute a "new system", it is clear that in order to regard certain processes as amounting to creolization, we would need some evidence of the emergence and institutionalization of new norms that might eventually lead to a relatively stable variety distinct enough from its source languages to be mutually unintelligible with them (Sankoff 1980).

Whilst convergence might be regarded as a feature of this sample, there is little evidence of substantial restructuring that could lead to the emergence of an autonomous element with its own norms. Most of the sample is grammatically and lexically Huayu (at least at those points in which the two varieties of Chinese differ on these levels), apart from a very small amount of calque. The phonology is similarly either more or less (Singapore) Huayu or more or less Cantonese, apart from the single item [den], which does seem distinct from both but which is hardly sufficient evidence for substantial restructuring. It is also worth noting that the sample was quite well understood by the two Putonghua speakers who also knew Cantonese or had contact with Cantonese speakers.
15.6 Sample Four

15.6.1 Transcription of Sample Four

1 Wo chi kopi la, chi mianbao la, tiantian
    Wo eat coffee LA, eat bread LA, every-day

2 gengjia(?) chi. Wo you chi fan e. Hen fei wo,
    more (?) eat. I have eat rice E. Very fat WO,

3 fei hen duo, wo zhidao. Wo kande yisheng o, kande
    fat very much, I know. I seeDE doctor O, seeDE

4 yisheng jiang, buyao chi duo duo, chi xie sheng
    doctor say, don't eat much much, eat some fresh

5 guo la. Wo bu yao chi sheng guo la, oranges a,
    fruit LA. I not want eat fresh fruit LA, A,

6 apples a, wo maken e, meiyou, wo jiali la,
    A, I eat E, not-have, I home-in LA,

7 meiyou chi.
    not-have eat.

Translation

I drink coffee, I eat bread. Every day I eat more. I
eat rice. I'm indeed very fat, I've become very fat,
I know. The doctor I saw, the doctor I saw said (or I saw a doctor, I saw a doctor and be said) "Don't eat so much. Eat some fresh fruit". I don't want to eat fresh fruit. Oranges and apples, I eat, [we] don't, at home [we] don't eat them (or there aren't, at home there aren't any to eat).

15.6.2 The Informant

This informant is a woman in her late forties and an unskilled worker. Her mother tongue is Hokkien. She has had primary education only, through both Hokkien and Huayu. She claims to also know some Malay, a little Cantonese and Teochew and a very little English. The interlocutor in this case is a young, well educated Chinese Singaporean whose mother tongue is Cantonese and who was educated through English as first school language and Huayu as second school language.

15.6.3 Intelligibility

All three speakers of Putonghua from the PRC understood very little ("20% or less") of this sample, although they recognized that it contained "a few words of Mandarin".

15.6.4 Ingredients of the Mix

Elements in this sample seem to be derived from Huayu (the greatest percentage), Cantonese, Hokkien, Malay and
English. There are many interlingual phenomena in this sample. Examples of the main categories will be given below.

15.6.5 English Elements

The English derived lexical items [ɔ lən] "oranges" (line 5) and [ə əp] "apples" (line 6) appear to be more or less assimilated to Huayu phonology, although again they could also be pronunciations in a variety of Singapore English.

15.6.6 Malay Elements

There are two Malay words in this sample, kopi "coffee" (line 1) and makan "eat" (line 6). Both of these words are widely used in colloquial varieties of many of the languages/dialects spoken in Singapore.

15.6.8 Dialect Lexis

The pronunciations of the lexical item [fa] "fat" (line 2) is closest to Huayu. Cantonese would be [feŋ] and Hokkien would be [buə]. However, the usage is Hokkien or Cantonese. In Huayu this lexical item is not used to refer to humans.
15.6.9 Nonstandard Grammar

[tsɿ̊ ɗɿ̊ ɗɿ̊] (line 4), literally "eat much much" is not standard Huayu, which would be ɕí̯de ɾai doʊo - "eat too much" - or ɕí̯de hěn doʊo - "eat a lot". Neither is the construction very common in Singapore Huayu.

In addition to the common Singapore Huayu la (Chapter Fourteen), other modal particles appear in this sample. As previously mentioned (p.360), such particles often occur in Singapore Huayu and many seem to be transfers from the southern dialects. For example, the particle [ʊɔ̝] (line 2) appears to be related to the Cantonese particle similarly pronounced (see Gibbons 1980). Its use here might be glossed roughly as: "people say I'm...."

15.6.10 Nonstandard Phonology

Most forms seem closest to Huayu. However, there are also forms very close to or which seem to be strongly influenced by Cantonese and Hokkien. Some forms seem distinct from the phonologies of any of these three varieties. For example:

[minɿ bəɿ̊ɿ] "bread" (line 1) is very close to the Cantonese pronunciation.

[fon ɿ] "rice" (line 2) seems to have the initial consonant, front nasal final and tone shape of the
Mandarin pronunciation \([\text{f}n\text{n}]\) but the reduced schwa like quality of the vocalic nucleus of the Hokkien pronunciation \([\text{b}\text{ŋ}^\text{−}]\).

\([\text{g}\text{ŋ}^\text{−}]\) "say" (line 4) is close to both Cantonese \([\text{g}\text{ŋ}^\text{−}]\) and Hokkien \([\text{g}\text{ŋ}^\text{−}]\), although its tone is closest to Hokkien. Standard Huayu would be \([\text{d}\text{ŋ}^\text{−}]\).

The rounding in \([\text{s}\text{ŋ}^\text{−}]\) "raw, fresh" is not a feature of the Mandarin, Hokkien or Cantonese pronunciation of this zi. However, the same zi is pronounced \([\text{s}\text{zn}]\) in line 5, which seems closest to the Cantonese pronunciation \([\text{s}\text{zŋ}]\).

15.6.11 Creolization?

This sample does look a little more like a creolized variety. It is mainly unintelligible to outsiders, it seems very mixed, there is a degree of convergence in the phonology and there are some forms distinct enough from the input varieties to suggest a certain amount of restructuring. However, most of the elements in the sample could be explained in terms of interference from the dialects on Huayu phonology, plus a small amount of dialect calquing, plus a few words from English and Malay which are in common usage in Singapore, whatever the language being spoken. More importantly, however, many of the forms in this sample appear to be idiosyncratic, that
is there is little evidence that they represent any kind of stable or shared norms.

15.7 Proficiency and "Instant Pidgin"

Some of the interlingual phenomena in the four samples examined above can be related to the speakers' proficiency levels in Huayu. Thus, the mainly English educated speaker of sample 2 may be more familiar with the English words "atmosphere" and "knowledge" than with their Huayu equivalents. Similarly, the speakers of samples 3 and 4 are clearly likely to be more proficient in their home dialects than in Huayu.

This can be related to a more general sociolinguistic phenomenon in Singapore. Due to the variation in the language repertoires and relative proficiencies among Singaporeans, interlocutors sometimes do not share a dominant or primary language (i.e., a language in which the speaker knows best and is most fluent in). The first motivation in such situations is obviously to achieve intelligible communication. Speakers may thus shift their own speech forms in the direction of a variety they feel the other speaker may know, and at the same time draw on elements from other languages to supplement their own limited proficiency in the variety, or because they feel such elements will be better understood by the interlocutor. In other words, a kind of "instant pidgin" (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985) is created. Thus, the
speaker of sample four, speaking a different home dialect from the interlocutor and knowing very little English, shifts in the direction of a target lingua franca, Huayu, and draws on elements from Malay, Cantonese and English that she knows the interlocutor will understand. The determinants of the nature of such "instant pidgins" in any one interaction will be the repertoire and proficiency of the speaker and his or her judgement of the likely repertoire of the interlocutor. Singaporeans are, in fact, very good at making such judgements.

15.8 Rojak and Registerial variation

However, such interlingual phenomena are by no means always a question of limited proficiencies. In sample 1, the code-switching appears to be related more to other features of the context of situation than to any limitation in the speaker's proficiency in Huayu or English. As has been suggested, there is tension between the role relationship of the participants (local talking to "Caucasian" foreigner) and the interviewer's choice of Huayu. Moreover, small shifts in the field of discourse seem to trigger switches in language.

There may also be a relationship between tenor and certain other kinds of interlingual phenomena. Whilst some borrowed lexical items may now be considered appropriate even for the most public and formal registers (e.g., bāshì "bus", déshì "taxi" and bāxīān
"per cent", see 6.6.1.3), many other borrowed items, particularly those from dialects or Malay, are generally restricted to use among friends, fellow students and so on, i.e., where the tenor is characterized by solidarity rather than distance. The following are examples of the latter type of lexical item which have been noted in the informal Huayu of Singaporean friends and colleagues.

a) from Chinese dialects

bǎiwùlóng "to make a silly or big mistake" eg:
Wǒ bǎiwùlóngle, wǒ yǐwéi shì jīntiān kāi hùi.
I've made a mistake. I thought the meeting was today.

chédàpào "to talk big" eg:
Tā láoshi chédàpào.
He's always talking big.

dàlìrén "an important person" eg:
Tā hǎoxiàng shì ge dàlìrén.
He seems to be a big shot.

gōngsī "jointly" eg:
Zheìběn shū shì wǒmen gōngsī mǎide.
We bought this book between us.
b) from Malay

lǒngbàng "give a lift to" or "to hitch a lift" e.g.:
Jīntiān xìayǔ, suǒyī tā lǒngbàng wǒ shàngbān.
As it was raining today, he gave me a lift to work.

duōlóng "to help, to ask for help" e.g.:
Tā duōlóng wǒ bāng tā xiūlì qìché.
He asked me to help him repair his car.

[For more examples of borrowed lexis in Singapore Huayu see Appendix Six]

A clear example of the use of dialect calque in the context of solidarity among the participants was noted by the author on a camping trip with university students who were all very proficient speakers of Singapore Huayu (all educated in Huayu as first school language until entering university). The following exchange was noted:

A: Chúān, nǐ kān'ouméiyōu?
   Boat, you look-have-not-have
   Can you see the boat?

B: Kānmeiyōu
   look-not-have
   No, I can't.

This use of yǒu and méiyōu as resultative complements is a nonstandard calque of a Hokkien construction. The
Standard Huayu forms which would be used in this context are:

A: Chuan, ni kandedào ma?
Can you see the boat?

B: Kanbudào
No, I can't

The use of this calque is not common in educated Singapore Huayu, nor had it been noted previously in the speech of these students. When asked about it, one of the students explained that it was "Hokkien Huayu". They knew it was "wrong" but it was okay to use it among themselves.

15.9 Instability of Forms

As has already been noted, there appears to be a continuum between "skipants", whose pronunciation is close to the donor language, and borrowings which are fully assimilated to Singapore Huayu phonology. Moreover, the same item may appear in the speech of the same speaker at different times. Many such items in Singapore Huayu appear to be similar to what Gibbons, in a study of the mixed language of students at the University of Hong Kong, calls "conscious ad hoc borrowings", whose phonology ranges from near RP to forms considerably modified in the direction of Cantonese phonology (Gibbons
The forms of such borrowings are not predictable and they appear in different forms on different occasions. Gibbons distinguishes such elements from what he calls "integrated borrowings" whose forms are assimilated closely (but not entirely) to Cantonese phonology, and are predictable and rule governed.

In Rojak Huayu, the instability of forms extends even to borrowings which have been, or seem likely to be (see 6.6.1.3), accepted into the prescribed standard. For example, the English loanword 仗 "taxi" may be heard in news broadcasts according to its standard pronunciation [d5±]. However, the following forms have also been noted as used by persons speaking Huayu:

- [thɔksi] - similar to the standard English pronunciation

- [dɔk' siŋ] - similar to the Cantonese and Hokkien pronunciations (note that the loanword is written 大 in Singapore, not 大 as in Hong Kong)

- [dɔ'y siz] - a Singapore Huayu pronunciation with rusheng in the first zi and non-retroflex initial in the second.
15.10 Conclusion

Whilst the samples in this chapter represent only a tiny proportion of the various possible mixes involving Huayu that can occur, they do illustrate the continuum (or continua) that exists in terms of the extent of divergence from the standard varieties of the languages and in terms of the extent to which the "ingredients" from different languages are kept distinct or separate. Mixed varieties appear to be rather unstable, with somewhat unfocussed norms (Le Page 1978). The characteristics of a particular instance of Rojak Huayu may often be related to the shared repertoires and degrees of proficiency of the speakers. However, the various kinds of interlingual phenomena may also be exploited by proficient speakers for registerial variation.
CHAPTER SIXTEEN

CONCLUSION

16.1 Categorical and Variable Features

This thesis has identified and described a number of linguistic features in the Mandarin Chinese spoken in Singapore (Singapore Huayu) which are different from those of the standard variety. Such features have been broadly classified into categorical nonstandard features and variable nonstandard features. The former category were found to be relatively invariant in the speech of most or all of the informants. The latter were found to be variable both among different speakers and (in most cases) within the speech of single speakers.

The categorical or near categorical features can be seen as part of a general norm for speakers of Singapore Huayu. In other words, they are part of a variety learners of Huayu in Singapore learn from other Singapore speakers of the language rather than errors due to mother tongue interference or other interlanguage phenomena. Similarly, investigation of certain of the variable features has suggested that they might best be regarded as sociolectal rather than interference variables.
16.2 Change in Progress

Quantitative analysis of the variable features has provided evidence that Singapore Huayu is undergoing linguistic change, in particular a change in the direction of the prescribed standard variety. Thus the findings for the phonological variables (ü), (ru) and (n) all show a tendency for younger informants to use the standard variants more frequently than older informants. Similarly, findings for the (r) variable show a move away from the nonstandard [l] variant. However, in this case the move is not necessarily simply towards the standard variant but rather towards a range of "acceptable" variants with a strong tendency to complementary distribution.

16.3 Salience

The notion of salience has been found useful in addressing the question of why some features should be affected by pressure from the prescribed standard whilst others are not thus affected.

In some cases, it may simply be that where the difference between a nonstandard feature and its standard equivalent does not involve a phonological contrast, the difference is less likely to be salient to speakers. This appears to be the case with b (7.2.3), üan (7.2.4), x (7.2.5) and uo
The use of nonstandard variants of these sounds does not affect the phonological system, speakers generally do not seem to be aware that they are nonstandard and there is no evidence that they are in the process of being replaced by their standard equivalents. On the other hand, differences between the nonstandard and standard variants of (ũ), (ru), (n) and (l) - the variables which do seem to represent change in progress - all involve phonological contrast.

In the case of the variables (ũ) and (ng) the notion of salience has been extended to the interpretation of the linguistic constraints on the variation. In both cases, it has been suggested that the favouring environments for the standard variants are those in which the feature in question has the greatest phonetic effect. Thus, the standard variant of (ũ) is favoured where the roundness of the w posture prosody is greatest in extent and the standard variant of (ng) is favoured where the final posture prosody has the greatest effect on the vocalic nucleus of the syllable, i.e., where there is the greatest phonetic distance between realizations of the two variants of the variable.

It is interesting that Singapore speakers do not seem to be generally aware that the grammatical features described in Chapter Seven are nonstandard. It would seem that for speakers of Singapore Huayu, phonological
differences from the standard variety tend to be more salient than grammatical differences.

16.4 Social Evaluation of Linguistic Features

The fact that certain nonstandard features are prominent enough for speakers to be aware that they diverge from the prescribed standard does not guarantee that they will come to be replaced by their standard equivalents or be adopted as target features by learners of Singapore Huayu. Explanations for change (and lack of change) have also been sought in the social evaluation of the linguistic features, for example, the extent to which a particular feature may be evaluated as "good" or "correct" Huayu or may be associated with prestige groups in society, such as the more highly educated. This brings us to the question of sociolectal and registerial variation in Singapore Huayu.

16.5 Sociolectal Variation

Chapter Eight provides evidence that Singapore Huayu speakers are prepared and able to make the same kinds of judgements that speakers in monolingual speech communities make about aspects of the the social identities of speakers from short samples of their speech. In other words, it is likely that Singapore Huayu has developed forms of sociolectal variation similar to those observed in various monolingual speech communities.
The quantitative analyses of the variable phonological features also provide evidence for sociolectal variation. The standard or standard-like variants of three of the variables which seem to represent changes in progress - (u), (l) and (r) - were found to be favoured by higher levels of education. The variable (ng) also showed some evidence of a similar relationship with level of education. However, in this case, there is no evidence for change in progress. (ng) thus seems to be a relatively stable sociolectal variable.

The la particle (Chapter Fourteen) shows clear sociolectal variation, being used more frequently by women and by informants with less than secondary education. Such nonstandard particles, in fact, seem to be exceptions to the general finding that grammatical features are likely to be less salient than phonological features. La, in particular, may be overtly stigmatized (14.4), despite the fact that a similar particle does exist in the standard language, although with different functions. La is by no means the only nonstandard particle in Singapore Huayu. Such particles would undoubtedly be worth further research, not least because several of them seem to be areal features, i.e., used in the local varieties of several of the languages and dialects spoken in Singapore.
16.6 Registerial Variation

Of the phonological variables, only (û) showed evidence of a shift towards the standard variant in the "reading aloud" sections. It thus shows evidence of variation associated with the registerial dimension of mode.

There is also evidence that the la particle is involved in variation associated with the registerial dimension of tenor (14.6). However, further research using data from a wider range of contexts of situation is needed to investigate this more thoroughly. Clearly, language contact phenomena such as dialect calquing (15.8) may also be exploited for registerial variation, but again this is an area which needs further research.

16.7 The (ru) Variable

(ru) is the one variable which, from the findings of the age factor group, seems to represent change in progress yet shows no significant relationship with level of education nor a tendency to favour the standard variant in the "reading aloud" mode. Indeed, there appears to be a significant shift away from the standard variant in this mode. As is suggested at 12.14, further research using a more detailed phonetic analysis of the nonstandard variant might reveal patterns of variation missed in the present study.
16.8 Stereotypes

Some features of the prescribed standard seem to be salient to the point of becoming stereotypes and this may explain their general absence from the Huayu of most Singapore speakers of all ages and educational levels. Thus, syllable initial retroflexion appears to be perceived as a stereotypical feature of Beijing Mandarin and inappropriate for use in interactions among Singaporeans. This also appears to be the case with syllable final retroflexion or erization, although the precise extent of erization "required" by the prescribed standard is somewhat vague (7.1.2.1).

16.9 Mother Tongue Interference and Sociolectal Variation

The results of the analyses of most of the variables suggest that speakers' mother tongues (at least Cantonese and Hokkien, the two mother tongues of the informants in this study) do not significantly affect the variation. This confirms the hypothesis that as a language indigenizes, patterns of linguistic variation may sometimes be better explained as sociolectal and registerial than as related to mother tongue interference. Interestingly, one exception is (ǔ), which in other ways is the variable which patterns most like the "classic" sociolinguistic markers studied in monolingual speech communities. However, as is suggested in Chapter Nine, this is exactly the pattern one might
expect with a feature which may have originated in mother tongue transfer but has become or is in the process of becoming a sociolectal and registerial variable.

16.10 Language Contact Phenomena

This thesis has also looked at aspects of language contact phenomena in relation to Singapore Huayu. Even a fairly limited investigation of this area as represented in Chapter Fifteen reveals a great deal of variation in the source languages and dialects of elements in "mixes" with Huayu and in the degree of integration of the various elements. It is clear that it is not always easy to say where the language we are calling Huayu "ends" and another language or language variety "begins". The various linguistic behaviours covered by the term Rojak seems to be an area in which norms are at present somewhat unfocussed.

It is worth considering what might be the result of this kind of language "mixing". Is it likely that there will eventually emerge some kind of relatively stable, norm governed variety quite distinct from any of the input languages or dialects and that one might want to call a Huayu-based creole?

As Mühlhäusler (1979) points out, in such cases much depends on the continued presence of the standard language and its prestige and accessibility. In
Singapore, the prestige of Huayu is not in doubt, at least in relation to the Chinese dialects and, as we have seen, the campaign to promote the use of Huayu among Chinese Singaporeans and to promote the prescribed standard has been vigorous and looks set to continue for many more years. Singaporeans have access to more or less standard varieties of Huayu through the mass media and the education system, in which the great majority of ethnic Chinese students study the language as at least a second school language.

For as long as the repertoires of Chinese Singaporeans remain multilingual, code-switching between distinct languages and dialects will undoubtedly continue. It is also probable that speakers will continue to use, particularly in informal contexts, a certain amount of borrowed lexis beyond that officially admitted into the prescribed standard and that dialect calquing may sometimes be exploited for registerial variation. However, the conditions do not seem to be present for the development of a distinct, stable Huayu-based creole in Singapore.

16.11 Treatment of Prosodies

One interesting theme that has emerged is the general tendency for Singapore Huayu to weaken and segmentalize the strong syllable prosodies of the standard Beijing based pronunciation. This is seen, for example, in the
Singapore pronunciations of üan (7.2.4), iong (p.252) and the generally weaker effects of the final posture prosodies (p.304). This may well be a feature of the southern dialect substratum which will have a lasting effect on Singapore Huayu. It is worth noting that the adoption in parts of this thesis of a nonsegmental phonological perspective, such as provided by Halliday 1985, has enabled this phenomenon to be observed more clearly.

16.12 The Uniqueness of Singapore Huayu

Another question which has been addressed is the extent to which the nonstandard features in Singapore Huayu may serve to mark Singapore Huayu as an identifiable, new variety of Mandarin different from other varieties of the language.

As we have seen, most of the categorical nonstandard features described in Chapter Seven are also found in other varieties of Mandarin, including certain Mandarin dialects spoken natively in China, varieties of Putonghua spoken as a second dialect in parts of China and the Guoyu spoken in Taiwan. However, this does not mean that Singapore Huayu can necessarily be identified with any one other variety. In many aspects, Singapore Huayu seems closest to Taiwanese Guoyu. For example, it appears that the you+VERB (non-past) construction is a feature which Singapore Huayu shares only with Taiwanese Guoyu.
However, features such as initial [s] for \( x \), whilst they do occur in other varieties of Mandarin, may serve to distinguish a Singaporean "accent" from a "Taiwanese" accent (7.1.5.4).

Similarly, most of the variable nonstandard phonological features examined in Chapters Nine to Thirteen also occur quite widely in other varieties of Mandarin, including Taiwanese Guoyu. However, a partial exception may be rusheng. A rusheng tone category does occur in some Mandarin dialects. However, the particular form rusheng takes in Singapore Huayu may mark a Singapore "accent" and, in particular, serve to distinguish it from Taiwanese Guoyu, in which such a rusheng category has not been noted. The Singapore Huayu <l> variants of (r) and of (n) have also not been noted in Taiwanese Guoyu.

The modal particle la (Chapter Fourteen) seems to be used in ways which have not been noted in other varieties of Mandarin and it seems likely to continue to be a distinctive marker of at least informal Singapore Huayu.

The use of certain borrowed lexical items will no doubt also continue to give Singapore Huayu a unique "flavour". As noted in Chapter Six, a small number of such items are in the process of being accepted even into the prescribed standard. Where the source language is Malay, in particular, such borrowed items are distinctive of
Singapore Huayu and may not be understood by Mandarin speakers from outside the area.

Thus, whilst many of the nonstandard features described in this thesis can also be found in other varieties of Mandarin, the particular combination of such features may serve to identify Singapore Huayu. In addition, certain borrowed lexical items and the use of certain modal particles may be unique to Singapore Huayu.

16.13 An Overview of the Linguistic Variation

To sum up, in Singapore, a prescribed standard variety of Huayu is being vigorously promoted through the education system and mass media and there is evidence of a movement towards greater use of certain features of this standard. However, some standard features appear to be being resisted. There also remains a tremendous amount of linguistic variation. Some of this variation is between nonstandard features and their standard or near standard equivalents. There is also variation involving various kinds of interlingual phenomena. Both these kinds of variation may sometimes be relatable to aspects of the social identities of the speakers, the context of situation and/or the proficiencies of the speakers. The result is a continuum between, at one end, varieties of Huayu which are in general perfectly intelligible to Mandarin speakers from outside Singapore and contain a relatively small number of nonstandard features, many of
which may be also heard in other varieties of Mandarin, and, at the other end, varieties which are unintelligible to outsiders and may not even be recognized by them as Mandarin.

16.13.1 Singapore Huayu and the Creole Continuum

The situation described above bears some resemblance to the post-creole continuum model such as has been used by Bickerton to describe the linguistic situation in Guyana (Bickerton 1973, 1975). This model describes a situation in which a creole co-exists with the standard language from which it originally developed, and pressure from the more prestigious standard language leads to a degree of de-creolization and a continuum of varieties from close to standard ("acrolect") to farthest from standard ("basilect") via intermediate varieties ("mesolect"). Platt (1975) makes use of this model to describe varieties of Singapore English, although he uses the term "creoloid" to indicate that there is no evidence for a previous English based creole or pidgin.

This model can to some extent fit variation in Singapore Huayu provided that the continuum can be visualized as pyramidal, as there are many dimensions of variation and no single farthest from standard basilect can be identified. It is not possible, at least from evidence at present available, to range varieties of Singapore Huayu
along a single continuum according to some kind of implicational hierarchy².

16.14 Future Developments

It is perhaps somewhat rash to try to predict future developments in Singapore Huayu within such a complex and fast changing sociolinguistic environment. Nevertheless, there do seem to be a number of possibilities.

It seems likely that the Huayu spoken daily in Singapore will in general continue to move closer to the prescribed standard, and certain nonstandard features, for example [l] for n- (Chapter Thirteen), may disappear entirely or become very infrequent. However, some nonstandard features of phonology, grammar and lexis are likely to persist for at least the foreseeable future. In other words, a relatively stable de-facto endonormative standard may be emerging which will be a compromise between the older "Chinese educated" norm (3.4.1) and the prescribed standard.

Undoubtedly, considerable linguistic variation will also continue to exist in Singapore Huayu, both among speakers and within the speech of single speakers. As suggested above, some currently variable phonological features may move towards categorical or near categorical use of standard variants. However, others may become relatively stable variables, as already appears to be the case with
(ng), and some will no doubt continue to be involved in forms of sociolectal and registerial variation different from those in the standard language.

Thus, much of the Huayu in everyday use in Singapore will, for the foreseeable future, continue to diverge in certain respects from the prescribed standard variety. However, this is unlikely to lead to the development of a Singapore Huayu different enough from other varieties of Mandarin to prove a barrier to communication with the Mandarin speaking world beyond Singapore.
NOTES

1. No attempt has been made in this thesis to distinguish Singapore Huayu from Malaysian Huayu. See Chapter One, Note One.

APPENDIX ONE

PHONETIC REALIZATIONS OF SYLLABLES IN BEIJING MANDARIN

(From Halliday 1985, reproduced with the kind
permission of the author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) &quot;unspirited&quot; (voiced pronunciation of release)</th>
<th>(b) &quot;spirited&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pinyin</td>
<td>IPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jian</td>
<td>dʑiɛn - dʑiɛn - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jia</td>
<td>dʑiɛ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jiang</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jiao</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jin</td>
<td>dʑiɛn - dʑiɛn - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jie</td>
<td>dʑiɛ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jing</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jiu</td>
<td>dʑiɛʊ - dʑiɛʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ji</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhan</td>
<td>dʑiɛn - dʑiɛn - dʑiɛ - qɨɨ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhai</td>
<td>dʑiɛ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zha</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhang</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - qɨɨ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhaa</td>
<td>dʑiɛo - dʑiɛo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhao</td>
<td>dʑiɛn - dʑiɛn - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhe</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhe</td>
<td>qɨɨ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhang</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhou</td>
<td>dʑiɛʊ - dʑiɛʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhi</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ - qɨɨ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛŋ - dʑiɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhuai</td>
<td>dʑi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TWO

PART OF A SYSTEM NETWORK FOR THE BEIJING
MANDARIN SYLLABLE

(Reproduced with the kind permission of Professor M.A.K. Halliday)

Notes

1. In order to conform to the terminology used in this thesis, the terms retroflex, height, high and low are used here to replace the terms cerebral, closure, close and open used in the original network.

2. The symbol $a$ in the POSTURE (IIii) system indicates "either $y$ or a posture but not $w$". The use of this symbol
allows simultaneous selection of both initial $y$ and
initial $w$ postures (see 4.2.3). Thus, $a = a$, $ay = y$, $w = w$
and $wy = w$.

3. $\uparrow$, $\dagger$ and $\circledast$ followed by arrows indicate that if the term
they are adjacent to is selected, then a term in a later
system bearing the same notation must be selected. Thus,
for example, if labial is selected in the PLACE (i)
system, a must be selected in the POSTURE (IIii) system,
thereby eliminating syllables such as *puo and *fuo.
Similarly, if oral is selected in the RESONANCE system,
shifting must be selected in the W/Y SHIFT system,
thereby eliminating syllables such as *jiai and *guau.

1These explanatory notes are the responsibility of the
present author.
APPENDIX THREE

SOME SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE OF INFORMANTS

1. Numbers of Informants in Each Housing Type

1, 2 and 3 room public flats: 22

5 room flats, semi-detached houses and bungalows: 24

2. Numbers of Informants by Highest Level of Education

Not completed primary: 3
Completed primary: 5
Completed lower secondary: 16
Completed upper secondary: 7
Completed post secondary training: 6
Completed a university degree: 9

3. Numbers of Informants by Sex

Male: 26
Female: 20
4. Numbers of Informants by Age Group

15-20: 11
21-30: 11
31-40: 9
41-56: 15
APPENDIX FOUR

THE QUESTION SCHEDULE FOR THE INTERVIEWS

This is a guide to the questions used in the sociolinguistic interviews of the 46 informants used in the main study. The exact wording and order of the questions inevitably varied from interview to interview. In many cases, follow up questions were also asked and questions irrelevant to particular informants omitted (see 5.3). The question schedule is given in Pinyin transcription followed by an English translation.

Part One

1. Ni neng gaosu wo ni jinnian jisui ma?
2. Ni shi zai nali chushengde?
3. Ni zai xinjiapo zhule duo jiu le ne?
4. Nide fuqin shi zai nali chushengde?
5. Nide muqin ne?
6. Nide fumu gen nimen yiqi zhu ma?
7. Zufu zumu ne?
8. Nide zhiye shi sheme?
9. Ni neng gaosu wo nide xinshui dagai you duoshao ma?
10. Ni jiehunle meiyou?
11. Qingwen, nide taitai / zhangfu / fuqin / muqinde zhiye shi sheme?
12. Nimen you haizi ma? (you jige haizi?)
13. Qingwen, nimen yijiade shouru dagai shi sheme?
14. Ni neng gaosu wo ni shoule duoshao jiaoyu ma?
15. Ni dude shi yingwen xiaoxue haishi huawen xiaoxue?
16. Zhongxue ne?
17. Ni meitian kan baozhi ma? Kan yingwende haishi huawende?
18. Yiban laishuo, ni kan dianshi deshihou shi kan yingyu jiemu duo haishi huayu jiemu duo?
19. Nimen zai jiali jiang nayizhong fangyan? / Ni benshende fangyan shi sheme?
20. Ni xiao deshihou, xian xue nayizhong yuyan huo fangyan?
21. Chule..., zhiwai, ni hui shuo qitade fangyan ma? (Yidiandian? Xiangdang liuli?)
22. Chule zheixie fangyan zhiwai, ni hai tingdedong qitade fangyan ma?
23. Chule huayu zhiwai, ni hui shuo qitade yuyan ma? (Yidiandian? Xiangdang liuli?)
24. Ni nazhong yuyan huo fangyan jiange zui liuli, zui ziran ne?
25. Ni jiange yingyu gen huayu, nayizhong bijiao liuli ne?
26. Ni zai jiali gen taitai / zhangfu tanhua deshihou, changyongde shi nazong yuyan huo fangyan?
27. Nimen wanquan buyong huayu / yingyu / fangyan ma?
28. Nimen yijia chi wanfan deshihou, changyongde shi nazong yuyan huo fangyan?
29. Ye yong huayu / yingyu / fangyan ma?
30. Ni gen haizimen tan tamende gongke huo qita xuexiao 
    wenti deshihou, ni changyong nazhong yuyan huo 
    fangyan?
31. Haizi huida ni deshihou, ye yong...ma?
32. Huayu / yingyu / fangyan wanquan bu yong ba?
33. Ni ruguo yao ma tamen ne?
34. Ni gen nide fumuqin tanhuade shihou, changyongde shi 
    nazong yuyan huo fangyan?
35. Gen zufu zumu ne?
36. Ni shangbande shihou gen tongshi tan gongzuo wenti, 
    changyongde shi nazhong yuyan huo fangyan?
37. Ni gen tongshi chi wufan deshihou, yong sheme yuyan 
    huo fangyan jiaotan?
38. Ni gen tamen wanquan bu yong huayu / yingyu / fangyan 
    ma?
39. Ni gen guke zuichang yongde yuyan huo fangyan shi 
    nazhong?
40. Ni xiabanshi, gen pengyou xianliao (kanxi, qu he cha) 
    changyongde shi nazong yuyan huo fangyan?
41. Ni dao baihuogongsi qu mai dongxi shi, changyong 
    nazhong yuyan huo fangyan gen tuihuoyuan jiaotan?
42. Dao xiaofan zhongxin gen basha qu deshihou ne?
43. Ni dao zhengfu bumen (youzhengju dengdeng) changyong 
    nazhong yuyan huo fangyan?

Part Two
1. Ni renwei zui haode , zui zhengquede huayu shi nazhong 
   huayu? (shi shei shuo de huayu?)
2. You ren shuo, xinjiapo huaren jiang huayu deshihou yinggai mofang Beijing qiang (Beijing rende kouyin). Ni tongyi zheizhong kanfa ma? (Weisheme ne?)

3. Taiwan qiang ne?

4. Zai xinjiapo shei shuo zheizhong zhengquede huayu? Shei keyi dang mofan?

5. You ren shuo, zai xinjiapo, shuo huayu deshihou, zhi yao nide yisi qingchu, zhengquede yufa he fayin shi bu zhongyao. Ni tongyi ma?

6. Zai xinjiapo shuo huayu you sheme haochu?

7. You ren shuo, zai xiandaide xinjiapo xue huayu buguo shi langfei shijian eryi. Ni tongyi ma? (Weisheme?)

8. Ruguo ni pengjian yige bu hui jiang huayude huaren, ni dui ta hui you sheme ganxiang?

9. You ren shuo ruguo yige huaren bu hui jiang huayu, ta bijiao rongyi jieshou xifang wenhualide yixie bu haode dongxi. Zhei shi zhende ma? (Weisheme?)

10. Yingyu zai xinjiapo jianghui yue lai yue zhongyao er huayu jianghui manmande xiaoshi. You zheige keneng ma? (Wei sheme?)

11. Muqian xinjiapo zhengfu suo tuidongde huayu yundong, dui ni you sheme yingxiang ma? (Biru: you sheme changhe ni yiqian jiang fangyan, xianzai jiang huayu ma?)

12. Zheige yundong hui chenggong ma? (Weisheme?)

13. Xinjiapo dianshi guangbotai yinggai jixu guangbo fangyan jiemu ma? (Weisheme?)

14. Ni juede yibande xinjiapo ren suo shuode huayu zemeyang? (Yinggai gaijin ma? Qedian zai nar?)
15. Ni dui nide huayu hai manyi ma? (Nayi fangmian yinggai gaijin?)

TRANSLATION

1. Can you tell me how old you are?
2. Where were you born?
3. How long have you lived in Singapore?
4. Where was your father born?
5. And your mother?
6. Do your parents live with you?
7. And your grandparents?
8. What is your occupation?
9. Could you tell me roughly how much you earn?
10. Are you married?
11. May I ask what your wife's / husband's / father / mother's occupation is?
12. Do you have any children? (How many?)
13. May I ask roughly what your family income is?
14. Can you tell me how much education you have received?
15. Did you study in an English medium or a Chinese medium primary school?
16. And your secondary school?
17. Do you read a paper every day? An English one or a Chinese one?
18. Generally speaking, when you watch television do you watch English programmes more or Chinese programmes more?
19. What dialect do you speak at home? (What is your own dialect?)

20. When you were young, what was the first language or dialect you learnt?

21. Apart from...can you speak any other dialect? (A little? Quite fluently?)

22. Apart from these dialects, can you understand any other dialect?

23. Apart from Huayu, can you speak any other language? (A little? Quite fluently?)

24. Which language or dialect do you speak most fluently and most naturally?

25. Which language do you speak more fluently, English or Huayu?

26. Which language or dialect do you usually speak when at home talking with your wife / husband?

27. Don’t you use Huayu / English / a dialect at all?

28. When you are all having dinner, which language or dialect do you usually use?

29. Do you also use Huayu / English / a dialect?

30. When you are talking with your children about their homework or other school matters, which language or dialect do you usually use?

31. When your children reply, do they also use ...?

32. Don’t you use Huayu / English / a dialect at all?

33. How about if you want to tell them off?

34. When you talk with your parents, which language or dialect do you usually use?

35. And with your grandparents?
36. When you are at work, what language or dialect do you usually use to discuss work matters with your colleagues?

37. When you are having lunch with your colleagues, which language or dialect do you usually talk?

38. Don't you use Huayu / English / a dialect at all?

39. Which language or dialect do you use most often with customers?

40. After work, chatting with friends (going to see a film, going to drink tea) which language or dialect do you usually use?

41. When you go to a store to buy things, which language or dialect do you usually use with the shop assistants?

42. How about when you go to hawker centres and markets?

43. When you go to government agencies (post offices and so on), which language or dialect do you usually use?

**Part Two**

1. Which type of Huayu do you consider the best, most correct Huayu? (Who speaks that kind of Huayu?)

2. Some people say that when Singaporeans speak Huayu, they ought to imitate the Beijing accent. Do you agree with this view? (Why?)

3. How about the Taiwan accent?

4. In Singapore who speaks this correct Huayu? Who can serve as a model?
5. Some people say that in Singapore when you speak Huayu provided your meaning is clear, correct grammar and pronunciation are unimportant. Do you agree?

6. What are the advantages of speaking Huayu in Singapore?

7. Some people say that in Singapore learning Huayu is just a waste of time. Do you agree? (Why?)

8. If you were to come across a Chinese who could not speak Huayu what would you feel about him / her?

9. Some people say that if a Chinese cannot speak Huayu, he/she is more likely to be receptive to bad things in Western culture. Is that true? (Why?)

10. English in Singapore will in future become more and more important and Huayu will slowly disappear. Do you think that is a possibility? (Why?)

11. Has the current Huayu campaign promoted by the government had any effect on you? (For example: are there any situations in which you previously spoke dialect but now speak Huayu?)

12. Will the campaign succeed? (Why?)

13. Should the Singapore TV continue to broadcast programmes in the dialects? (Why?)

14. What do you think of the way Singaporeans in general speak Huayu? (Is improvement needed? What are the shortcomings?)

15. Are you satisfied with your own Huayu? (Which aspects need improvement?)
READING ALOUD

发音 日头 喝水 屋子
应当 觉得 运动 训练
入口 力量 扔求 英国
石头 雪糕 肮脏 年龄
难看 因为 客人 法子
平安 肉排 能力 黄色
两百 人们 女人 选择
软弱 让步 旅行 读书
原来 浓茶 你们 热水
拿起 邻国 容易
APPENDIX FIVE

VARIABLE NONSTANDARD FEATURES NOT CHOSEN FOR
QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

These are nonstandard features which either occur in the speech of at least two (usually many more) of the informants used in the present study or have been noted by the author as being fairly widespread in Singapore Huayu. However, many of these features may not be as widespread as those described in Chapter Seven or in Chapters Nine to Fourteen. Future research might reveal some of these features to be involved in sociolectal or registerial variation. The short discussions following each feature are not intended to be exhaustive but to serve as guides to further research.

1. PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES

[f] for huo: This seems to be most common before -o, e.g., huo "fire" as [fo] or [fɔ]. However, it also occurs occasionally in huan and hua, e.g., xihuan "to like" as [ɕi fən]; huayu "Huayu" as [fəˈjʊ].
iu: This yunmu in the standard language is usually transcribed as a triphthong, although representations of the intermediate vowel quality may differ, e.g., /iou/ (Chao 1968) and /iɔu/ (Hockett 1947), [iɔu] (Halliday 1985). Such transcriptions represent the "dipping" of the tongue in the transition from y posture to w posture. This "dipping" is variable even in the standard language. With syllables of longer duration (e.g., tone 3 zi) the "dipping" tends to be greater. However, as Kratochvil (1968) points out, the care and speed of the speech will also affect this, with realizations ranging from [iʊu] and [iɔʊu] to [iu] or even [iɔ].

In Singapore Huayu, there is often no audible "dipping" in this yunmu. Even in careful speech, some speakers produce [i] or [i] with all four tones.

ui: Like iu, this yunmu also sometimes lacks the "dipping" of the standard pronunciation ([uə]) in the transition from initial y posture to final w posture. Realizations may be [u] or [ui].

? or [?] for y-: Syllables beginning with a palatal semi-vowel or glide (both rounded and unrounded) in the standard language sometimes lack this feature in Singapore Huayu. Sometimes the syllable may begin with an audible glottal stop.
2. GRAMMATICAL FEATURES

Liǎole: The sentence (or clause complex) non-final perfective particle (or verb suffix) \( \text{J} \) and the final perfective particle (also written \( \text{J} \)) are both pronounced \( \text{le} \) in standard Huayu. Even when a sentence ends in a verb, they may not be used together. In Singapore Huayu the non-final \( \text{J} \) is sometimes pronounced \( \text{lia} \) (only a reading pronunciation in the standard language) and both perfective particles may sometimes be used together after a verb at the end of a sentence, e.g.:

Tā lái liǎole

He has come.

Modal Particles: Some nonstandard modal particles in Singapore Huayu are listed at the beginning of Chapter Fourteen. Of these, the most commonly occurring in the data (apart from \( \text{la} \)) are non-final \( \text{hó} \) and \( \text{há} \) (both with variable nasality), \( \text{laide} \) and \( \text{méiyou} \). \( \text{hó} \) and \( \text{há} \) appear to function to draw attention to elements which are thematic in the clause or clause complex, e.g.:

Xianzàide rén hó, shì bǐjiāo zhùzòng jǐnqián, zheǐ xiē qiántú la. Suǒyì há, tāmen dui huáwén, kànfǎ bú zhòngyào a. Dáshí hó, yīnwēi zài
tuidong dehua, tamen zhi neeng yidiandian xue jiang yiliang ju la.

(People today place rather a lot of importance on money and future. Therefore they don’t consider Huayu to be very important. But because it is being promoted, they at least have to learn to speak a few phrases of it.)

méiyóu appears to be mildly interrogative, functioning perhaps to check that the listener is following or agrees with the speaker. It also sometimes seems to have an "explanatory" feeling. It can often be translated into English as "you see" or "you know", e.g.:

Tāmen dà duō shì chàozhōurén, bǐjiào xǐhuan jiāng chàozhōu huà méiyóu.
Most of them are Teochew and [so] they prefer to speak Teochew, you see.

lái de is a particle of identification, e.g.,:

Zhei shì wǒde mǔqīn láide.
This is my mother.

VERB + xiān / duō / shǎo : In the standard language, these zi (meaning "first", "more" and "less") precede the verb. In Singapore Huayu, they sometimes follow the verb, e.g.:
Wo zou xian.
(I'll be off now. Literally: I'll go first)

(for an example of the use of VERB + duo see p.386)

ADJ + guo: In the standard language the comparative construction with adjectives (or stative verbs as they are sometimes called) is NOUN A bi NOUN B ADJ. "NOUN A is more ADJ. than NOUN B". In Singapore Huayu, the construction NOUN A ADJ+guo NOUN B is sometimes used, e.g.:

Yinwei huaren duoguo maalaien.
(Because there are more Chinese than Malays.)

ADJ + guo tou: Guo tou means "extremely" or "excessively" and is occasionally used where standard Huayu would use jile, e.g.:

Ni congming guotou.
(You are extremely intelligent.)

Reduplication: Adjectives (stative verbs) are sometimes reduplicated. In most cases the function appears to be intensification, as in some southern dialects such as Hokkien, e.g.:

guaiguai (de) - "very strange" (see p.363)
chanchan (de) - "all mixed" (often used to describe "Rojak Huayu")
APPENDIX SIX

LEXICAL BORROWINGS INTO SINGAPORE HUAYU

The following is a list of borrowed lexical items which are sometimes used in Singapore Huayu with at least some degree of accommodation to Huayu phonology. It thus excludes a large number of items which Singapore speakers may use when speaking Huayu and which may also occur in local written Chinese, but have not been noted as occurring with such accommodation, i.e., they may retain a pronunciation close to the donor language or close to the form a particular loanword may have in one of the southern Chinese dialects (see Tay 1968 for the treatment of loanwords in Hokkien). However, as noted in Chapter Fifteen, this is an area in which there is marked instability at present. Even such borrowings as do sometimes occur with significant accommodation to Huayu phonology may also occur in quite different forms on other occasions. Also note that the inclusion of an item here does not necessarily imply that it is regarded as nonstandard Singapore Huayu (see p. 158). However, all these items are not (as far as I have been able to ascertain) to be found in standard Putonghua.

The pronunciations of all the following items are transcribed according to Pinyin romanization and also given in written zi. However, the zi given here may not be the only ones used to write these borrowings in
Singapore. A few of the following items were taken originally from written sources. However, in such cases, a number of informants (some staff and students at the former Nanyang University) were consulted in order to exclude items not likely to be used in spoken Huayu in (more or less) "Huayu-ized" forms.

Borrowings from English and Malay\(^1\) may take the form of phonetic adaptations (or phonic transfer), calques or blends (i.e., where there is an element of both phonetic adaptation and meaning transfer). In the case of phonetic adaptations, initial adaptation is normally to the phonology of one or other of the local Chinese dialects, into which most loanwords are first borrowed. When a loanword subsequently enters Huayu, the zi of the dialect form are simply given their corresponding Huayu pronunciations, which will often result in a form quite distant from the original form of the item in the donor language. Borrowings from the Chinese dialects spoken in Singapore are almost always calques, i.e., the Huayu pronunciations of the zi used in the dialect expressions. Such borrowings will be listed below simply as "borrowings from the dialects". Owing to the considerable mutual influences that the Chinese dialects spoken in Singapore have on one another, it is often not possible to identify with certainty the source of a particular item.
1. BORROWINGS FROM ENGLISH

Bāshì(chē) "bus" (phonetic adaptation) 巴士 (车)
Bāxiān "percent" (phonetic adaptation) 巴仙
Déshì "Taxi" (phonetic adaptation) 德士
Fēilín "film" (phonetic adaptation) 菲林
Gùběn "coupon", especially "parking coupon" (phonetic adaptation).

Huángyè "yellow pages (in telephone book)" (calque) 黄页
Kǎshì Lùyīn "cassette recorder" (blend) 卡式录音机
Lǐshèn or Lāishèn (the latter is more usual) "licence" (phonetic adaptation) 理申
Lúnli (chē) "lorry" (phonetic adaptation) 罗里 (车)
Móduōxīkǎ "motor-cycle" (phonetic adaptation) 摩多西卡
Rèjiǔ "hot dog" (calque) 热狗
Shíqiān "ten thousand" (calque) 十千
Zhēnbǎojī "jumbo jet" (blend) 珍宝机

2. BORROWINGS FROM MALAY

Bāshā "market, bazaar". From Malay: "pasar" (phonetic adaptation) 巴刹
Bǎdī "batik (cloth)". From Malay: "batik" (phonetic adaptation) 巴迪
Dūolóng "to help". From Malay: "tolong" (phonetic adaptation) 多龙
Lúnghāng "to hitch a lift" (sometimes also "to give a lift"). From Malay: "tumpang" (phonetic adaptation) 帐房
Mādā "police". From Malay: "mata" (="eyes") (phonetic adaptation)
Shālong "sarong (item of clothing)". From Malay:
"sarong" (phonetic adaptation).

3. BORROWINGS FROM DIALECTS

Bǎiyī, bāier, bǎisān etc. "Monday", "Tuesday", "Wednesday" etc. 看一, 看二, 看三
Bǎiwùlóng "to make a silly or big mistake".
Chēdāpào "to talk big".
Chīqián "to be corrupt" 吃钱
Chīshé "to be lazy, to be idle when one should be working" 吃蛇
Dàlìrén "a big shot, an important person". 大名人
Dārizī "a festival or public holiday". 大日子
Fāhúo "to get angry, to lose one's temper". 发火
Gōngsì "together, jointly". 公司
Hongmóorén "Westerner, European". 红毛人
Huánghlí "pineapple". 黄梨

Mìtáng "honey". 蜜糖
Qǐjià "to go up in price". 起价
Wèishuǐ "proud, cocky". 醇水
Xuēgǎo "ice-cream". 雪糕
Xuēguì "refrigerator". 雪柜
Zì "five minutes". 字
4. EXTENSIONS OF STANDARD MEANINGS

The following items can be regarded as extensions in the meanings of standard Putonghua lexis rather than borrowings in the strict sense. However, in many cases they may be influenced by usages in one or other of the dialects.

**Dong:** this means "understand" in standard Putonghua, but in Singapore Huayu it is sometimes used to mean "know a fact" as in:

```
Wo bu dong tade dizhi
```

(I don't know his / her address)

**Fei:** this means "fat" and in standard Putonghua is used only of animals and meat. In Singapore Huayu it is sometimes also used of people (as in Cantonese).

**Haoxiang:** In standard Putonghua, **haoxiang** means "like, or similar to". It is also used in the expression **haoxiangshuo** "for example". In Singapore Huayu, **haoxiang** (without **shuo**) is also commonly used in the meaning of "for example". Sometimes it also seems to be used simply as a filler, to give the speaker time to think, e.g.:

```
Women shi yong huayu duo, chule naxie, haoxiang, naxie shi, haoxiang, you yixie shi tamen bu hui jiang huayu de la.
```

(We mostly use Huayu, except those, like, those [who], like, there are some who cannot speak Huayu.)
*Huáyǔ* and *huárén*: as has been pointed out many times in this thesis, the usual term in Singapore for "Chinese Language" or more specifically "Mandarin" is *Huáyǔ* or sometimes *Huáwén*. Similarly, *Huárén* is the usual term for a person of Chinese ethnicity. These terms are seldom if ever used in Putonghua, although the term *huáqiáo* "overseas Chinese" is commonly used.

Jāng is the usual word for "to speak / talk" in Singapore Huayu. As in many southern dialects (including Hokkien, Cantonese and southern Mandarin), it is used much more widely than in standard Putonghua, including contexts in which the standard language would prefer to use *shuò*, e.g.:

\[ Tā hùi jiāng yīngyǔ \]

*(He / she can speak English)*

Kànxi: In Singapore Huayu, this is the usual term for going to see a film. The standard Putonghua term for "film" is *diànyǐng*, although *kànxi* is now occasionally heard in Putonghua spoken in China.

Pào: this means "run" in standard Putonghua. In Singapore Huayu it is sometimes used to mean "go" or "leave" (similarly to standard *zǒu*).

Yǔ, *hùa* and wén: Standard Putonghua uses *hùa* to form the names of spoken languages and dialects, e.g.:

\[ Tā hùi shuò zhōngguóhùa/guāngdōnghùa \]

*(He / she can speak Chinese / Cantonese)*
Weăn is also used to name both spoken and written languages, e.g.:

Tā āi shuo / kàn zhōngwen
(He / she can speak / read Chinese)

Yŭ tends to be reserved for more formal or literary expressions such as Hányu "the Han Language" (i.e. Chinese) and Yüeyu "the Yue Language" (i.e. Cantonese).

In Singapore Huayu, yŭ is regularly used to form the names of languages, e.g.: Huáyú (Chinese / Mandarin), Yìngyú (English), Rìyú (Japanese). Some speakers seem to use yŭ and wén interchangeably to refer to both written and spoken forms of languages. However, others insist on using yŭ for spoken forms only and wén for written forms only. Names of dialects, however, are nearly always formed with hua, e.g., Fújiānhua (Hokkien).
NOTE

1. Words from Tamil or other Indian languages have been borrowed into the dialects, for example Hokkien loti "bread". However, the author has not noted any such word in a form accommodated to Huayu phonology. The "huayu-ized" form of loti would be lúodi.
个人都会讲嘛，不会写，最主要是写，假使你不会写的话，你会讲都没有用，对吗？你看街上，一个例子来讲，街上的招牌，那些街名ha，跟....或者去一个部门，或是去airport那边，还不是用英文多吗？

Interviewer：飞机场不是用华文吗？没有，没有。现在在Changi Airport没有了，都是用英语多。华语还是，将来会被淘汰，所以是这样讲啊，华语你会讲不会写也是没有用，是吗？这个是很重要的一个问题。

不同语言的互相影响是正常的情形，语言与语言的接触是社会发展历史的必然结果，这种接触也必然引起语言的融合，从语言的融合可以看出文化的交流。希特勒曾经企图复版出现在德国语中的外来词，以“纯日耳曼语”作为德国的语言，但是他的这种想法跟他妄图征服世界的野心同归于尽。

CHAPTER FIVE

P. 138

华语ha，到现在啊，就是说，还有前途啦。不过ho，将来，我看还是会淘汰，虽然你会讲华语....只是你会讲嘛，根本你都没有写，ho？你会讲，你会不会写，每
我们没有办法去跟北京的，那些北京话来比，你能够讲的流利，你的用词恰当，那我觉得这是标准。

我想你讲华语要讲比较准啊，比较好听，北京腔好听。

我觉得我们不应该模仿他们，因为他们华语，好像，听起来很刺耳这样啊，所以，如果新加坡人要学华语我看最好是学台湾，因为台湾的华语已经和我们差不多很接近啊

北京是最标准的，不过在新加坡我觉得那个是很难去学的。我们这边是南方人的一个社会，福建，广东，福建省，广东省，等……那个几十年我们所接受的训练，讲的华语……是这批人传过来给我们的。当然我们习惯了我们这一套的华语。我觉得我们的华语跟北京的华语差很远。

北京华语当然最准的啦……我们不必模仿他们的，各地方有他们自己语言的内容。你不可能一百巴仙跟北京人一样。

身为新加坡人应该是认为新加坡华语最好啦。因为他们是……吸取各方面的最好的精华，然后融化成为新加坡本身的语
言，所以应该是，应该是最好的。

P. 174

新加坡华语有新加坡华语讲法，北京腔的话 hó，你听起来比较刺耳，不大好听。
[台湾的呢？] 我认为每个人有每个人的风格比较好啦，不要学人家啊。

我认为如果讲得明白就可以啦，不用说应该学他们的。

P. 175

只要大家能够听得懂的华语，不会太过。方言腔太重，我想都能够接受啦。

P. 176

好像“是”啊，“我是华人”的“是”。现在我是念“是”啊，不过他的正确的发音是“是”，“我是华人”... 因为目前啊，新加坡那些学生学华语啊，我们只是，好像我这样啊，他们随便讲出来，只要他的字句正确啊，人家听得清楚，我就可以啊。比如说你现在叫他们练习那种正... 这种发音啊，他们会觉得很麻烦这样，因为叫我本身，我也是这样，我，好像，很麻烦这样，好是不顺口。

P. 177

这个看法 hó，如果是本地人啊，新加坡人对新加坡人的话，自己话可以成立啦。
如果 hó，我们跟外国人的时候，跟好像那些中国台北的话，最好我们比较注重正确啦。
我们这一代人讲的华语跟现在的小孩
讲华语就有一点不同，因为我们有些音
是不够准，没有学到拼音。

P. 178

他们每次批评我不会讲他们老师的正
确的华语，但是我看差不多啦，过得去。

我们不小心的话，通常我们的语言里面
有很多马来话啊，掺加方言。

P. 179

我们的华语是掺掺的。

新加坡华语也是，讲起来听起来掺的很
多种语言下去，注意听的话，有时掺马
来话一两句啊，广东话，福建话也有掺一

点点。

一些学生他们讲的华语很...不够水准啊，能讲但是好像有福建腔啊，或是广东腔。

P. 180

我们说的华语并不是标准，我们，有时
小孩子谈话的时候，很多，那些不必要的
尾音。

我们新加坡人将英语用到后面的“啦”。
我们讲华语也是有很多后面这些尾音。

CHAPTER SEVEN

P. 199

因为要讲北京腔要经过一些训练啊，好
像北京腔里面他有一些“儿”，“什么事儿”，这样啊，好像，听得很不自然。

P. 218

1. 他们是会讲标准一点啊，因为他们有学嘛。

2. 住在澳洲的时候，他们有放中国片。

P. 219

3. 我上次有作工，后来小孩子读书以后就没有作工。

4. 我们讲方言的时候，他们有罚款。

5. 会，因为我有读到 standard one Malay。

6. 马来文我有学过一点点。

7. 刚才我大概有讲过。

P. 220

8. 那个时候日本军有来。

P. 224

1. 这个比较有标准。

2. 他在在吗？

P. 225

3. 英文报你会看吗？有会。
4. 你每天看报纸吗？
有，英文，华文，我两种都有看。

5. 有时候有讲方言。

6. 因为每天在电视也有播。

P. 226

7. 有时太太也有选哪一个。

8. 马来文现在这边新加坡根本完全没有用到，平常工作生活方面都完全没有用到。

P. 230

9. 你的太太在外面作工吗？
没有，他没有在外面作工。

P. 243

P. 244

讲话不够流畅。

可以让听者明白其所言，但是口音重。

发音不准。

相当流利只是有些地方用次不恰当。
我以为他的华语还可以。

P. 245

一口很漂亮的华语。

P. 246

说话者受过高深教育，讲得一口流利华语。

一般上年纪人所讲的华语。

CHAPTER TEN

P. 271

如果你懂，好像，这个有两种念法啦，肉

类，有些人读，有些人是读肉类，有些人是读肉，不过肉类是正确的啦。

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

P. 361

广东啦，福建啦，客话啦，我三种都会讲。

P. 362

你哪种方言讲得最流利呢？方言？当然是广东啦。
1. 吃午饭时, 多数是讲福建啦。

2. 职业? 我是帮人家洗衣的啦。

3. 他们的华语, 觉得怪怪啦。

4. 新加坡华语不大... 那个tune 啊, 那个tone 啊, 比较不好啦

5. 要学多一种语言当然是好啦, 不过há, 不可以勉强人家的啦。

6. 你每天看报纸吗? 有, 华文的, 英文的, 都有看啦。

7. 你的职业是什么?
在一个学校当书记啦。

8. 模仿北京华语, 这样, 我看不必. 我们有我们的华语啦。

9. 因为福建话通常是华人所... 在新加坡是福建人最多啦. 不过应该há, 慢慢应该语言统一啦。

10. 我应该多讲华语。

11. 我应该多讲华语啦。
P. 369
这个很有趣啊。

P. 370
比如说，我们新加坡人讲英语用到后面的“啦”。我们讲华语也是有很多后面的这些尾音。

我们说的华语并不是标准。我们，有时小孩子说话的时候，很多，那些不必要的尾音。

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

P. 382-383
Sample One
语文是...正如[...] 唐诗三百首，为什么

[...] 受中文教育的，他反而，好像每一句绝句[...] 他是唐诗三百首，为什么他们不会了解他的，这个主题呢，这是，因为 há[...] 虽然好像有一半啊，（错？）字，那个字啦，我都不认识，不知道他是象什么东西，不是，不知道翻译[...] 正体啊[...].

P. 387-398
Sample Two
我说语言啊，自然要啦。要学多比较好，使我们自己的 knowledge 啊，widen our 那个knowledge 啦。但是不是，不可以要一定的要勉强人家的啦。好像，老人家一定也要学什么，不太好啦。假如人家不喜欢，哪里给一个一定的force 啊，给人一个atmosphere 不好的。所以要尽力要学，这样比较好啦。鼓励
encourage 啊，不是一定什么的节目
cancel 啊，什么。所以不要 force 那个
language 啦。

P. 392-395

Sample Three

他两个人同那个杂货点呢，买米啊，卖什么的，杂货点呢，两个人做工啊，一个
读书读书是上午啦，一个读下午啦，一个
作工作上午啦，一个作工作下午。这样
这样两个啦，两个双胞胎，一个起来去读书
啊，一个起来去做工啊。那个放学回来
去做工啊，那个放工回来去读书啊。

P. 400

Sample Four

我吃 kopi 啦，吃面包啦。天天更加吃。
我有吃饭 e. 很肥 wo, 肥很多, 我知道。
我看的医生噢，看的医生讲，不要吃多多，
吃些生果啦。我不要吃生果啦。oranges 啊，apples 啊，我 makan e，没有，我家里
啦，没有吃。
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