Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection   SIT Study Abroad

Fall 2010

Mental Models of the Nature of Language in Kunming, China

Ellie Ash
SIT Study Abroad

Mental Models of the Nature of Language in Kunming, China

Ellie Ash

Independent Study Project

for SIT Study Abroad: Chinese Culture and Ethnic Minorities

December, 2010

Introduction

The focus of this study is laypeople's mental models of the varieties of Chinese language. Chinese contains many varieties, primarily dividable into Putonghua (Standard Mandarin; hereafter PTH) and Fangyan ("topolect" [1]). The Fangyan are traditionally considered "dialects of Chinese" by both Chinese and Western sources. Many Western linguists note that the dialects span a linguistic range that compares with the range of the Romance languages, but concede the label "dialects" because they share a written standard and because China is considered to be a single country, and especially because the Chinese themselves consider all the Fangyan to be varieties of a single language. [2] I began to wonder whether this claim about what "the Chinese" think about their own language is generally true, or whether it is limited to vocal elites like scholars and politicians.

This study also investigates how contemporary Chinese speakers feel about the respective legitimacy of the varieties of Fangyan and PTH.   In many ways PTH is what is often called an "H variety" ("H" for "high") while Fangyan are "L varieties" ("L" for "low"). By this I mean that PTH tends to be used in more public, formal situations and Fangyan tends to be used for more private, intimate occasions. In many countries L varieties are less respected than their H counterparts, sometimes not being considered "real languages" [3]. Yunnan is a Mandarin-speaking area, which means that the linguistic distance between the local Fangyan and PTH is similar to the distance between different dialects of English. This contrasts with the case of Cantonese speaking areas, where the most sociolinguistic research on Chinese has been done. Similarly, PTH is officially the standard variety of Chinese, and

---

1   "Topolect" translates "Fangyan" mopheme-by-morphome and thus means "place-language". It is the best translation because it is specific and lacks the connotations that "dialect" has picked up. I have chosen not to use this term not only because it is an obscure word (coined, I believe, by Victor Mair), but also because the presumed usage of "topolect(s)" doesn't parallel the usage of "Fangyan" very well.

2   See, for example, Chapter 1 in Ramsey (1987).

3   Woolard and Schieffelin (1994, 63); also Wassink (1999), which both exemplifies and questions this trend.

in the West, at least, standard dialects are often valued above nonstandard varieties [4]. So it seems possible that China, or at least Yunnan, follows this pattern. However, there is also evidence that the Fangyan are well-respected. With this study I hope to probe what kind of a thing Yunnanese think the Fangyan and PTH each are, and in particular, whether they think they are "real languages."

Originally, I was also interested in how education might affect the language beliefs of students. In the United States, classroom is an important place for teaching the standard language ideology, whether intentionally or not. Many researchers have found that teaching the awareness and legitimacy of different varieties of English improves academic performance among speakers of nonstandard vernaculars [5]. Since Chinese students seem to have little problem learning PTH in addition to their home dialect, I wondered if teachers acknowledged that their students were learning it as a second dialect. Unfortunately, I did not have time to investigate Chinese instruction very thoroughly.

Background: the language situation in China

Before the fall of the Qing dynasty in 1911, every place in China had a different spoken language, or Fangyan. There was a unified and highly stylized written language. Northern Mandarin, because it was spoken in the capital, served as an unofficial lingua franca between officials from different regions. During the Nationalist era in the first half of the 20th century there began to be a movement to designate an official standard language, which reformers believed would help unify and modernize the country.

This policy was fully realized under Mao in the 1950's, when the government

---

4 Milroy (2001). The most salient example for me as an American is the negative ideology around African American Vernacular English, which denies it legitimacy and is considered partially responsible for the racial gap in academic performance. See Wassink and Curzan (2004). The possible parallel and obvious differences from this case made me want to study the legitimacy of nonstandard varieties in Yunnan.

5 Godley, et. al. (2006)

confirmed the capital's variety as the basis for the standard and made policies to promote it.

The official definition of Putonghua is: "standard Chinese, taking Beijing dialect as the basic

pronunciation, the Northern dialects as the basis and the modern Chinese vernacular writings

as grammar standards."[6] The government's stated eventual goal was that PTH replace the

Fangyan in all situations[7], and immediate goal was that everyone in the country be able to

communicate in PTH. To this end it has passed a series of laws designating PTH as the

primary medium of instruction in schools, most recently the language law of 2001.[8] PTH

has indeed come into wider and wider use in the country over the past half century, while the

Fangyan, the local dialects, are still in common use.

The Yunnan dialects belong to the same family as PTH, called either Mandarin or

Northern Fangyan. Kunminghua (hereafter KMH) is the variety spoken in Kunming, the

capital of Yunnan, where I conducted my interviews. According to Zhang Huawen, a scholar

of Fangyan at Yunnan Normal University, KMH differs from PTH in phonology, in grammar,

and in vocabulary. There is also shared vocabulary and grammatical structures.

Communicating between KMH and PTH would have some difficulties. Within Yunnan,

speakers of some different varieties of Fangyan would also have some trouble

communicating, but others would have very little trouble.[9]

Relevant previous research on language beliefs

Beliefs about the nature of language fall under a field that is often called "language

ideology".[10] Language ideologies are cultural beliefs about the nature of language and the

values of different varieties. Though the term "ideology" often carries negative connotations

---

6 Dictionary of Contemporary Chinese, ???
7 Saillard (2004).
8 Zhou (2006). Several of my informants (who would have entered middle school around 2004) claimed that
   when they were in elementary school, teachers were allowed to use Fangyan but later it became the rule that
   teachers had to use PTH in class.
9 Zhang Huawen, personal communication (Nov. 10, 2010).
10 See Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) for a review of the field.

and can imply that the beliefs are false, in this paper I intend to use the term neutrally.   In this sense, an ideology might well have correct aspects. For example, academic linguists have their own quite clear ideology of language.[11]

Theories of language ideology are well-developed. One aspect includes studies of the associations people attach to specific dialects. In general, speakers tend to associate formal, standard ("H") varieties with social prestige and vernaculars with social solidarity.[12] Another side focuses on ideologies of standard language, especially its relation to political or social oppression.[13] This work tends to take the nature of the beliefs about language more or less for granted, and discuss their consequences. Very little work has examined what Raphael Berthele (2002) calls nonlinguists' "mental models of language". Alicia Wassink (1999) is a notable exception, investigating speaker beliefs about the nature of Jamaican Creole, including beliefs about its legitimacy as an independent language.

James Milroy's 2001 article describes a "standard language ideology" that characterizes the culture around English, French, and other languages. He defines standardization as "the imposition of uniformity upon a class of objects", whether those objects be weights and measures or varieties of language, and notes that it has the practical function of facilitating interaction within a big place. As well as designating one variety as the one to be used, the standard language ideology as Milroy describes it also holds that:

- All other varieties of the same language are wrong and illegitimate;

- It is "common sense" that there are right forms and wrong forms of speech;

- Native speakers do not determine what's right or wrong. This decision is left to "shamanistic", anonymous language authorities (like dictionaries and grammar textbooks).

- If the canonical variety is not protected, the language will degenerate.

---

11 Recently many people have questioned parts of this ideology, for example, Milroy (2001).
12 Gilliland (2006), ii.
13 Woolard and Schieffelin (1994).

The standard ideology also "reifies" the standard as an idealized, "clearly delimited, perfectly uniform and perfectly stable variety"[14], which is identified with the given language as a whole, and which all actual instances of speech or writing are aiming towards. Sometimes, however, other varieties (of the same or other languages) can also be idealized like this, which allows the defining and naming of various dialects, by both lay people and linguists.

Given that many societies seem to stigmatize nonstandard varieties, some linguists have wondered why such dialects continue to exist. A notion of "covert prestige" has been introduced to explain it.[15] Raphael Berthele (2002) suggests that the apparent inconsistency may be better resolved by considering the "granularity" of the discourse. For Berthele, "granularity" refers to the scope of the relevant audience. Thus it is not possible to talk simply about a variety's prestige or stigmatization, and one can only consider its prestige with respect to a particular speech community. A variety that is seen as improper to use in meetings of the legislature may be valued positively for use among close friends. Additionally, Berthele suggests that an interviewee may respond to a researcher's outsider status by setting the granularity they are considering to a fairly large scope, and therefore express negative opinons of "nonprestige" varieties, when in fact the same person also has positive opinions of the same variety which they notice if they think about it from a more local perspective. This has caused apparent contradictions between the negative opinions people express to researchers about certain dialects and their observed behavior of continued use.

Berthele's notion of granularity will help explain the different kinds of legitimacies enjoyed by Fangyan and by PTH. It is meaningless to say that Fangyan is or is not legitimate without specifying the domains in question. The question of whether PTH and Fangyan are the same language or different languages is probably also a question of granularity.

---

14 Milroy (2001), 14.
15 Berthele (2002), 29.

Previous research on language attitudes in China

The majority of sociolinguistic work in China has centered on Guangzhou and Hong Kong, both Cantonese-speaking regions which have a very different experience than Yunnan. Hong Kong in particular has a different administrative system from the rest of the PRC, which it only joined in 1997. Kalmar et. al. (1987), who used matched-guise tests in Guangzhou, and Bai (1994), who administered a survey to Chinese students and faculty studying abroad in the United States, both found attitudes towards PTH and local Fangyan approximating those typical of a High-Low distinction. Minglang Zhou (2001), using a questionnaire and a matched-guise test in Shanghai and Guangzhou, found this distinction much less clearly, hypothesizing that a change had occurred following the increase in use of PTH[16]

Gilliland (2006) revisited the question of attitudes in Shanghai in a study of college students involving both matched-guise tests and in-depth interviews. His results showed that PTH was moving into domains usually reserved for Low varieties in terms of both positive social-solidarity attitudes and use in informal, private contexts. However, Gilliland found fairly wide variation among attitudes towards Shanghainese and PTH, but with less value placed on SHH as a marker of Shanghai identity than he had expected. The most common reason given for valuing PTH was communication. He concludes that perceptions of the "market value" of a certain variety influence students' choice of dialect more than ideological stances do, and also that they have accepted the official ideology of "one nation, one language."

The only similar study of language attitudes in a Mandarin speaking area that I know of is Dede (2004), who surveyed 102 people in Xining, Qinghai. He also did preliminary studies of 15 people in each of Xi'an and Chengdu. His questions covered cognitive (beliefs

---

16 Unforunately I was unable to read these papers myself, but Gilliland (2006) and Dede (2004) discuss them.

about the nature of Qinghaihua), affective (value judgements about it), and behavioral

components, trying to find out whether people had "negative" or "positive" attitudes towards

the local Fangyan. The preliminary results varied between the three cities, and he found

"mixed" results within Xining. It seems likely that the people's attitudes are too complicated

to be modeled as either "positive" or "negative", but the details of Dede's results are

interesting.

Jie Dong (2009 and 2010) has done rather different work on language attitudes in

Beijing. By using ethnographic methods in Beijing classrooms and analyzing public

discourse, she concludes that "the symbolic dominance of Putonghua is accepted as natural

and normative"[17], and is used to construct identity and assign negatively valued identities to

others. Dwyer (1998) and many others similarly posit a hierarchy of languages with PTH at

the top and Fangyan somewhere below it.

Methodology

Respondents

I conducted 17 structured interviews with a total of 23 respondents. Interviewees

were found through friends. Of the 23 people, the first three were preliminary interviews,

after which the questions changed somewhat. All grew up in Yunnan except the first

preliminary interviewee, Amy, who is from a Mandarin-speaking area of Anhui Province, and

who will not be included in any statistics. Five participants were from Lincang and the rest

scattered around the province. Eight were male and 15 female. 16 were college

undergraduates. Of these, 12 were majoring in foreign language or philosophy, two in

National Defense Education and one in marketing at Yunnan Nationalities University, and

---

17 Dong (2010), 265

one was majoring in Preschool Education at Yunnan Normal University. Two respondents were Law graduate students, one was the student affairs coordinator for SIT's program in Kunming with a college degree, one was a beautician, and three were in the sixth grade of elementary school.

I had originally wanted to interview only people whose first language was a variety of Chinese, but for reasons of politeness I ended up interviewing two whose first languages were minority languages, and learned Fangyan and PTH as second languages (not necessarily in that order).

I had also wanted to interview more than three sixth graders, but wasn't able to arrange it in time. I did ask some of my questions informally to other sixth graders when I visited their class. (These answers are also not included in statistics.) The three sixth graders were all interviewed together. This was supposed to make them more comfortable but meant that it was hard to get them to each answer all the questions.

One other interview was done in a group of three (Graham, Riley, and Maggie), and one in a pair (Xander and Dawn). The rest were one-on-one, sometimes with other people around who occasionally helped translate or put in their two cents. The group of three (which was accidental) was disastrous, as I assume they influenced each other's answers, and also because for many questions only one person spoke. The pair worked out but only because they were old friends and were both opinionated. Interviews were conducted in Chinese with some participants occasionally shifting into English to translate a word or two. I recorded all the interviews except the first preliminary one and the interview with the sixth-graders. This helped overcome the language barrier, since it let me go back and translate things I couldn't understand on the spot.

Materials

The interview questions were based in large part on the questions used by Dede (2004) and Wassink (1999), who were both trying to investigate attitudes towards language and beliefs about the nature of different varieties. Following Wassink, I tried not to prompt my interviewees too much by introducing terms and categories, instead designing questions to be semi-vague stimuli that would elicit natural responses. [18]

The interview questions (my final version is in the Appendix) were divided into five categories. The first six were intended to get at ontological beliefs, both indirectly, by asking what languages a person spoke to see if they included Fangyan or not, and directly, by asking what Fangyan and PTH are, why they exist, what the relationship with "Chinese" is, whether they can change, and what their differences are. I also asked if there is anyone who only speaks PTH and not Fangyan.   This question was intended as a precursor to asking what such a person would have to learn if they wanted to learn a particular variety of Fangyan, but the answers ended up being extremely interesting in their own right.

The next four pertained to whether Fangyan was seen as a legitimate language in its own right: the relative expressive powers of the interviewee's native dialect and PTH; whether their dialect could be spoken with an accent, whether it could be spoken wrong, and whether it had standards.

Questions 11-14 asked for explicit attitudes towards the different varieties: what they hoped their children's competence would include, whether teachers could use Fangyan in the classroom, and what kind of person speaks what kind of language.   The next two questions had to do with the informant's personal linguistic experience in school.

The last question was a late and wise addition. I decided to simply ask what I wanted

---

18 In retrospect this may have been too fastidious, since my most useful questions turned out to be some of the most direct ones. For example, I asked "How many languages do you speak?" to try to find out if Fangyan were counted independently of PTH. This was a good question, but it would also have been useful to hear responses to "Does Fangyan count as a separate language than PTH, and why or why not?"

to know, that is, whether they think it's better to speak PTH than to speak Fangyan, and whether PTH is more "correct" than Fangyan.

Questions are quoted throughout in their final and/or most idiomatic forms. However, I did not always ask them with exactly the same wording, and some of the questions were asked with very strange grammar the first few times. (Some of the questions were unidiomatic all along, because I couldn't figure out how to ask them better.) Where the phrase "your home Fangyan" ("你那边的方言") shows up, I usually actually used the toponymic name of the variety (for example, "Kunminghua"). Names of informants have been changed to American names.

In the middle of the interviews I also administered a variety identification activity. I included PTH and KMH as controls, but the idea was to see how informants would identify varieties that mixed aspects of PTH with aspects of KMH. My host father, a Kunming native, recorded the first four varieties, and my friend Amy from Ma'anshan in Anhui recorded the last variety. The passage came from my Chinese language textbook and is in the Appendix. The varieties were as follows:

1. PTH.

2. KMH, for which my host father translated the passage into KMH and then read it aloud.

3. "Kunming Putonghua" (KMPTH), for which my host father read the passage with Kunming pronunciation of the words.

4. "MaPu", for which my host father read the KMH translation with PTH phonology.

5. "Putonghua-Kunminghua" (PTKMH), for which Amy read the KMH translation with PTH readings of the characters (读法) and PTH phonology.

I am not entirely sure what MaPu is from a linguistic perspective. I had asked my

host father to read the KMH translation with PTH pronunciation, but to my ear the result still sounded like it had a KMH accent. I could not get him to understand what I was expecting. Instead, he imitated a variety that is in use in Kunming, often called MaPu, short for "Majie Putonghua", after a part of Kunming in which it is supposedly common. MaPu was described by one of my friends, Huang Xuanxian, as having Kunminghua syntax, vocabulary, and *dufa* (读法)[19] with PTH phonology, which was verified by several informants. However, the "PTH accent" was not identical to standard PTH. For example, MaPu is "r"-less and PTH is not.

Results and Discussion

In this section I will present trends in the interviews and propose elements of a cultural ideology of language in Yunnan. I will discuss simple quantitative results and use the explanations participants provided to help me interpret them. I will also indulge in some exegesis of the meta-language people used to help illuminate aspects of mental models that can't be seen from just the gist of the answers. Direct quotations will be translated into English with the original Chinese in footnotes. In transcribing I inconsistently edited out false starts and other disfluencies without marking it, and that is how the quotations will be reported. For some interviews time did not permit transcription, and in those cases only the English will be given.

As can perhaps be expected, the responses showed a great deal of variation. There didn't seem to be correlation between answers to different questions.[20] For example, listing

---

19 Where words in two varieties of Chinese are considered cognates only because they are written with the same character, but the pronunciations do not correlate according to the systematic phonological differences between the two varieties, the words are said to have different "readings", *dufa* (读法), in the two varieties. (Li Chunmei, text message 12/10/2010)

20 This is at least in part due to the small size of the sample. My sample is also too small and the data too messy to draw any statistically significant conclusions about the greater population at all.

Fangyan in addition to PTH among languages spoken doesn't seem to predict how an informant will answer any other questions.

Models of the nature of Fangyan

People tended to use the term "Fangyan" as if it were the name of a language, rather than a label for a category of varieties the way the English term "dialect" is. It also seemed to be more common to say simply "Fangyan", with the specific dialect implicit, than to name the variety. Thus one would say, "I usually speak Fangyan with my parents", rather than "I usually speak KMH with my parents". For example, in answering the question, "what is your first language," of the eight people who specified Fangyan no one actually named the variety. Some people, who knew I wouldn't recognize the name of their region, were very reluctant to name their home Fangyan at all. The only way I could find out was by asking directly, "where are you from?" I believe this shows that they are not used to talking about their home variety by its place name, and usually just call it "Fangyan". Additonally, phrases like "a certain place's Fangyan", or "our place's Fangyan", seemed to prevail over "a certain kind of Fangyan" or "our Fangyan".[21] Though all variations certainly occurred, in this paper I try to approximate in English the Chinese usage, because I think the usage reflects the way Fangyan is conceived of.

My informants seemed to think of Fangyan as an undifferentiated entity, one continuous language that differs from place to place. Not only does the usage of the term "Fangyan" sometimes seem to refer to a single entity, the names of the local varieties of Fangyan are not fixed. Instead, they are chosen according to the granularity of the context. Interviewees mostly reported their kind of Fangyan with the name of the prefecture (e.g. "Lincang Fangyan"). However, Cordelia said "Yunnanhua" and Anya said, "My hometown's

---

21 i.e. "某个地方的方言" over "某种方言", and "我们那边的方言" over "我们的方言" or "我们的那种方言"

speech"[22]later referring to it as "Luxihua" (Luxi is a town in Honghe Prefecture). This suggests that the local varieties are not reified as distinct entities. Glory's description of PTH also seems to reflect the concept of Fangyan as a single thing that is spoken differently in different places. She says,

> "everyone can communicate [using PTH]…It's not like Fangyan. For example, sometimes Fangyan is not the same, communicating is a little difficult. But everyone speaks PTH the same." [23]

Glory puts Fangyan parallel with PTH, indicating that they're comparable kinds of languages that are spoken all over the country, but one varies and one doesn't.

The answers I got to question #7 suggested that different places' Fangyan can mix together under normal situations. There was almost a consensus on the question:

7(a) Is it possible to speak your home Fangyan with another place's accent? (可不可能说 [你那边的方言] 的时候,带有别的地方的口音？)				
Yes	No	Not usually	Not answered	Total
15	2	2	3	22

The two "no" answers were from Xander and Dawn, who I interviewed together. Dawn clarified, "Speaking Lincanghua is the Lincang accent." [24] Six of the people who said "yes" indicated that they interpreted "speaking with another place's accent" to be the same as mixing together aspects of two different places' speech, whether features of pronunciation or specific expressions. Several people gave an example of someone speaking one place's Fangyan with another place's accent. Anya's account is very clear and typical:

> Anya: My friend is from Kaiyuan, and in middle school came to Luxi. …she stayed for 7 or 8 years in Luxi. But she does speak Kaiyuanhua. But when she speaks, her *kouyin* ["accent"]-- we can tell she's speaking Kaiyuanhua, but also that it's not completely Kaiyuanhua, it carries some Luxihua. So for example, a situation like this where I'm from Luxi but I go to Kaiyuan in middle school to study. When I speak Luxihua, it'll more or less have Kaiyuanhua mixed in. ……

---

22 我的家乡话.

23 都会交流…它不像方言一样。比如说，有时候方言不一样，交流一点障碍嘛。当普通话都讲的都是一样的。

24 临沧话说就是临沧的口音

me: So what your friend speaks is Luxihua with a Kaiyuan *kouyin*?

Anya: No. What you speak is according to where you come from. So she's from Kaiyuan, came to Luxi, and her Kaiyuanhua has a Luxi sound, Luxi Fangyan. I'm a Luxi person, if I went to Kaiyuan my Luxihua would have a Kaiyuan accent.

me: Does she chose her language according to whether she's in Kaiyuan or Luxi?

Anya: No. She feels, I'm a Kaiyuan person, I will speak Kaiyuanhua all along. But the people all around me speak Luxihua, and although I want to speak Kaiyuanhua I have no choice but to be influenced by the local language situation. Her speech will change to have a little bit of Luxihua in it.

The scenario Anya presents, that of someone leaving home and acquiring the accent of another place, is very typical of the examples people gave.   That people perceive different kinds of Fangyan to be miscible may suggest that there aren't boundaries between the different varieties, or that if there are, they are particularly porous.

I don't know whether other informants would agree explicitly that "what you speak is according to where you come from," but I am fairly certain that this is the default assumption. Very few people suggested that someone might go to another place, say Kunming, and try to start speaking Kunminghua. This seems to be because within Yunnan, a person can speak their home Fangyan and usually be understood by the locals. PTH provides a very convenient solution if one's Fangyan isn't understood, so there's little need to try to speak other place's dialects. [25]

I also got the feeling that the possibility that someone might be able to speak two kinds of Fangyan was not very salient for most of my informants. Anya's explanation reflects this, as she says that her friend does not choose her language according to where she is. A person speaks Fangyan and it usually has a set of features associated with the locality they grew up in, but the local varieties are not discrete. Kendra explains that the features of an

---

[25] Huang Xuanxian and Li Chunmei, students at YUN, both suggested this explanation. (Personal communication, November 2010).

individual's Fangyan could change:

> For example, a child in one place, who stays there ten or more years, and then returns to Kunming , after he gets a little older his Fangyan will change into Kunming Fangyan.[26]

For her, even if a person does start speaking another variety of Fangyan, it's a matter of the features changing, not of learning a new language.

Another percieved characteristic of Fangyan is that it is place-specific. Questions #3 and #4 asked informants to explain what Fangyan was and why it existed. In defining Fangyan, only one person failed to mention that it is local language, only spoken in a particular place.   Many also mentioned that unlike PTH, only locals can understand Fangyan. Everyone answered question 14(a), "What kind of person speaks your hometown's Fangyan?" with a variant on "natives". When I asked Glory what kind of Fangyan she spoke, she said, "I'm a Lijiang person, I know Lijiang Fangyan."[27] As the name indicates, place ("*difang*") is inseparable from Fangyan.

Thus Fangyan is both considered a unitary entity across China (or at least across Yunnan) with internal variation, and also defined as a local language that is only used in one place. This apparent contradiction can be resolved by applying the concept of granularity: from a wide viewpoint, looking at the whole of Mandarin-speaking China, Fangyan is the language that when people speak it, people from other places can't understand them, and therefore it's a local language. This interpretation seems a little abstract, but people's models of Fangyan do not usually have to explain it at the biggest granularity, because in such contexts people only speak PTH.[28]

From a narrower viewpoint, looking at, say Kunming, Fangyan is the language spoken in Kunming but not elsewhere. At this granularity it has particular features, for

---

26 比如说,一个小孩在一个地方,待了十多年, 然后回到昆明, 等他在长大一些他的方言就变成昆明的方言.

27 我是丽江人， 我懂丽江方言.

28 Given that most people consider Fangyan and PTH to be the same language in a national or international context, it could probably be argued that Fangyan doesn't exist (or isn't legitimate) at big granularities.

example, the question-forming particle "ge". From an even narrower viewpoint, say, an individual, Fangyan is the variety of Chinese that isn't PTH which they speak in informal situations. That variety usually has enough characteristics of their home district that it can be called "Kunminghua", "Lijiang Fangyan", etc. But if someone travelled a lot and many different places' characteristics got mixed into their personal Fangyan (their idiolect), it might not be categorizable as any particular town's Fangyan. But it would still be Fangyan, and, zooming out again to an appropriately large scale, it could be categorized, for example as "Yunnan Fangyan".

I have argued that my informants consider Fangyan to be singular, one entity and not many. Of course, they sometimes use the term in other ways, ways that imply that there are many different Fangyan and the word could be translated into a plural form. The conceptualization of Fangyan doubtless varies from individual to individual, and even one person's mental model is unlikely to be totally consistent, just as most words have several different usages.

Another feature of the concept of Fangyan is that it is differentiated internally primarily by phonology. In explaining what "Fangyan" means and how a type of Fangyan differs from PTH or Beijing Fangyan(questions #3 and #6(b)), characteristic tones and pronunciation were usually the first things people mentioned, with vocabulary and expressions showing up second and less frequently. The terms "Fangyan" and " *kouyin*" ("accent") in some contexts seem to be interchangeable, as in the quotation from Anya above.

The results of the speech sample identification also show that phonology distinguishes a specific variety of Fangyan, including distinguishing it from PTH. The second and third samples (KMH and KMPTH) both used KMH phonology, but only the KMH sample consistently used characteristic vocabulary and syntax. (The KMPTH sample does have a few Kunming prepositions and such.) Respondents immediately identified both samples as

KMH. However, phonology was not the only factor in variety identification. Though the MaPu sample is supposed to have PTH phonology, no one was willing to call it PTH, but only about half the people would call it Fangyan, although it has KMH structure. In part I think this is because the phonology of MaPu is not identical to PTH, having a lot of Yunnan features. Additionally, whether someone recognized the variety made a big difference in whether they considered it Fangyan or not: many of those who considered it Fangyan were puzzled by it, and most of those who did not consider it Fangyan recognized it and named it "MaPu". Similarly, no one confidently called the PTKMH sample, which did have PTH phonology, "PTH":

10. Variety identification										
response variety	PTH	KMH	KMH/Fangyan and PTH mixed together	"MaPu"	Non-standard PTH	Yunnanhua or a specific variety of Yunnanhua or "Fangyan"	Fangyan from another province	uncertain but agreed it could be considered Fangyan	None of the above	Total
PTH	17									17
KMH		16				1				17
KMPTH		13				4				17
MaPu		1	2	8		1	1	4		17
PTKMH			8	1	1				6	16

That last sample, PTKMH, is essentially very exaggerated MaPu: it had clear PTH phonology with vocabulary and grammatical constructions typical of Kunming. Unlike the other varieties, no one actually speaks PTKMH in real life, and the respondents were accordingly confused. Those willing to describe it mostly said it was PTH mixed with

Fangyan or KMH. Almost everyone agreed that it couldn't be considered either PTH or

Fangyan, showing that both phonology and other features together determine categorization

of a variety as PTH vs. Fangyan. Unfortunately this identification activity doesn't directly

bear on what factors decide how people categorize varieties as specific places' Fangyan.

Considering the salience of tones and pronunciation in describing what one would have to

learn to learn a particular place's Fangyan, it seems likely that phonology would be even more

crucial for differentiating types of Yunnanhua.

Finally, Fangyan tends to be perceived as variable not only across space but across

time. Question 5(a) asked whether it can change, and a small majority thought it could:

5(a). Can your variety of Fangyan change? ([你那边的话] 可不可能变化？)		
Yes	No	Total
15	7	22

The most common reasons given that Fangyan might change were a) people who spoke

differently influencing each other and b) the invention and borrowing of new vocabulary to

suit changing times. Thus the idea that people are influenced by each other's language,

which also shows up in explaining how Fangyan gets "mixed", seems quite powerful.

I think it is important to note that non-Mandarin Fangyan like Cantonese and

Southern Min do not seem to be included in the model of Fangyan I have just described. I do

not believe my informants consider these dialects when they think about Fangyan. A few

people mentioned non-Mandarin varieties, and a few told me that Yunnanhua belongs to the

same dialect family as PTH. But simply knowing these facts does not mean that they have to

influence your conception of Fangyan, and the vast majority of the time, a context that

includes only the Mandarin Fangyan and PTH is sufficient for Yunnanese. The default

granularity for young adults in Kunming, is, I suspect, Yunnan Province. Thus Jonathan

explains that he doesn't switch to the local dialect when away from home by saying, "If I go

to another place, if I speak Fangyan, then my interlocutor will start speaking Fangyan. But

often everyone will be able understand."[29] This shows that the context he is considering is Yunnan; the local language of Guangdong (which he cannot understand) is not relevant to the way he uses "Fangyan" here.

Models of the nature of PTH

In contrast to the similarity of all my informants' ideas of Fangyan, I see fairly wide variation in how they view PTH. I think there are several different conceptualizations of PTH, some mutually contradictory. This makes sense given that PTH was recently invented and since then its usage patterns have been constantly changing. There are, on the other hand, a few things people agree on about PTH. Almost everyone mentioned that it is standardized or that it is understood all over China in answering question 3, which asked them to say what PTH is.

The closeness between PTH and the Fangyan in the north of the country is pretty well recognized. 10 people, a little less than half the sample, mentioned Beijing or the north of China in answering question 6, whether anyone speaks only PTH and not Fangyan. Question 14 asked about who spoke the most standard PTH, and nine people (not a subset of the above 10) answered that Northerners do. (Two participants weren't asked Question 14.) Six people mentioned in defining PTH that it is based on BJH (some said northern (北方) Fangyan).

Some people, however, never mentioned place at all when talking about PTH. I believe there is a model current of PTH as intrinsically a second language, without native speakers, more or less artificial, and used primarily for communication between different places. Question #6 addressed the possibility of whether PTH could be a native language. The results tended towards thinking that it could be, as even most people who thought there were no native speakers of PTH could still imagine such a situation, but there was a minority who disagreed:

---

29 像如果我去其他地方，如果我讲的是方言，然后对方一讲的是方言。但很多时候人人可以听得懂.

6. Is there anyone who only speaks PTH and can't speak Fangyan? (有没有人知会说普通话, 不会方言？）				
Yes	No	Sort of, not really, uncertain	Not asked	Total
11	7	3	1	22

6(b) Can you imagine such a person? (你能不能想像这样的人？) [asked only to people who said "no" or hedged on question 6.				
Yes	No	Not sure/unclear	Not asked	Total
5	2	2	1	10

I suspect that answers to question 6 varied with the personal experiences of the respondent, so that people from Kunming, where there are children who learn PTH from infancy, would be more likely to think it possible, and people who grew up in environments dominated by Fangyan would be more likely to think it impossible. (Besides for the children, I only interviewed one person from urban Kunming, so I have no real evidence either way for this suspicion.)

More evidence that PTH is considered a different, less natural sort of thing came out of question 5, especially the details of people's answers to it. Question 5 asked about whether Fangyan and PTH could change. There is a slight trend towards thinking that PTH is less likely to change than a variety of Fangyan.

5(a). Can your variety of Fangyan change? ([你那边的话] 可不可能变化？)		
Yes	No	Total
15	7	22

5(b) Can PTH change? (普通话可不可能变化？)				
Yes	No	No, except for vocab	Not answered	Total
6	11	2	3	22

Most who said yes, PTH can change, qualified their answer and said that it would change less than Fangyan, or that only vocabulary would change. By itself, this shows only that PTH seems more static, and could mean anything. But a few people said that the reason it couldn't change because it is standardized, for example, Anya:

> me: Can PTH change?
> Anya: It's possible, but even less. Up to now there has been a very complete, systematized, very strong PTH. Why do foreigners take the SHK? Because it's already formed a unique——because everyone has made rules (规定了). Experts have fixed it, so everyone can follow their choices.

Anya seemed to have a more informed idea of the actual language situation than most respondents did, but the overall idea that someone has set rules for people to follow in speaking PTH, and therefore it can't change much came up several times.   This may indicate that those who mentioned this feel PTH to be somewhat artificial.

On the question of whether PTH is identical to Beijinghua (hereafter BJH), there is confusion and disagreement. The issue came up with respect to the question "Is there anyone who only speaks PTH?" Of the nine answers that mentioned the Beijing area, some were sure the Fangyan there was PTH or that people there don't speak Fangyan, some were sure that there was a separate Fangyan distinct from PTH, although very close, and some were uncertain about the relationship between BJH and PTH and gave unclear answers. Anya falls in the last category:

> people who can only speak PTH are those whose fangyan is PTH.…   It [that place] has its own speech, but it's also considered to be Fangyan, and it hasn't changed into PTH. Also, for example, the people in Beijing and Tianjin, what they speak almost is PTH. Why don't I say entirely? Because their pronunciation habits are a little different from most of us who speak PTH. Their main characteristics are palatal nasals [/ng/] and *erhua* sounds [suffixing in /-r/]. …… But theirs is also PTH.

Anya notes that there are still local characteristics, (the "local" characteristics she mentions are actually codified as standard PTH, but few Yunnanese use them) and therefore it is unclear whether the speech variety could really be considered PTH.

I propose that the main characteristics of Fangyan and of PTH make the two indentites

somewhat incompatible, and the question of BJH can best be resolved by saying that BJH and PTH may have all the same features, but conceptually, they are different things. Fangyan is intrinsically local, while PTH is intrinsically not local but universal. Fangyan also tend to be described as natural languages, formed within a community of speakers and quite changeable, and PTH as a standardized language, explicitly maintained by specialists, designed to be the same everywhere. "BJH" and "PTH" refer to the same entity[30] (they have the same referent) but are used to denote different roles of that entity (they have different meanings, different "intensions"). This is currently the case, but if BJH evolved so that it was quite different from PTH, then the two terms would no longer point to the same entity. The *meaning* of each term, however, would stay the same: BJH is the language spoken natively in Beijing, and PTH is the standard language used all over China.

This is why, though many people described PTH as being "based on" BJH, only two actually identified it with BJH in answering "what is PTH?" Of these, Kendra accepted the correction of another student who was present, and Oz had originally said it was "based on BJH", but agreed when I misunderstood and asked him if PTH was BJH. The way Cordelia describes it shows that she understands the contents of BJH to be undergoing a role shift before they could be considered PTH:

> I mean, PTH was originally the Beijing area's Fangyan. Then, because Beijing is the capital, right, it spread fairly widely. [It was] standardized according to Beijing's Fangyan, and then promoted on down to other provinces. So then it had turned into PTH. [31]

For Cordelia, PTH can't be called PTH until after it has been both standardized and delocalized and brought into wide use. Faith very similarly says, "At first, PTH was the

---

30 assuming that a language can be considered "an entity"
31 就是说，普通话本来是北京那边的方言，然后，因为北京是首都嘛，然后它就被它，就是比较普及下来，根据，那个依据北京的方言为标准，然后传推广下来到其他的省份。所以就是变成了那种普通话.

northern Fangyan," but then the language was changed a little, popularized, "and then formed into PTH." [32] Being a universal language is part of being PTH, and this differentiates it from any Fangyan, no matter how identical in features.

However, as mentioned above there is not any consensus about this, or about what PTH is. Quite a few people did say that Beijing Fangyan is exactly PTH. Responses to question 5, about change, were mixed, as were ideas about whether anyone speaks PTH as a first language. Some people indicated that any variation from the absolute standard pronunciation makes a speech variety no longer PTH, [33] whereas others asserted that PTH varies from place to place, which seems to be a typical feature of natural language for at least some respondents.

Though some people see PTH as artifical and disassociated from place, others seem to percieve PTH as quite a natural language. For example, Maggie never once mentions that PTH went through a standardization process, and she believes it to be based on BJH. I have said that Fangyan variety is inherently determined by place; to some extent it seems that PTH variety, in as much as it varies, is also determined by place. The frequency of place in answers to question 14 shows this:

14. What kind of person speaks the most standard PTH? (什么样的人说的普通话最标准？)				
Northerners/Beijingers	Broadcasters/teachers	Other	Not answered	Total
9	4	5	4	22

Given how often people defined PTH as the language that everyone in China can understand, I propose that another model of PTH is "PTH is anything that can be understood by people who know PTH." Under this model, Beijing Fangyan, and indeed much northern Fangyan, is PTH. In discussing speech sample 5, Graham's comment implies that

---

32 普通话一开始它是北方的方言，是东北和北京那边儿的语言。然后因为中国定都在北京，然后就以那边儿的语言为基础，作为推广，做了一些改进。然后更适合，全部人都把这种语言习惯，然后就形成了普通话

33 Including Amy, my friend from Anhui, who was quite certain that what she speaks in daily life in Kunming, which can be understood by anyone who speaks PTH, was definitely not PTH. She had no name for it, however, not calling it Fangyan, either.

comprehensibility is part of what makes PTH:

> Me: That last one, it's not considered Fangyan; is it considered PTH?
> Riley: I think PTH is dominant.
> Maggie: That was PTH plus Fangyan, lots of Yunnanese people talk like that.
> Graham: If you used that to communicate with a northerner (北方人), they might not understand.
> Maggie: Exactly.
> This model fits with the belief that the main purpose of language, both Fangyan and

PTH, is communication. In answering questions 3(a) and 4(b) about what PTH is and why it exists, all respondents either mentioned that everyone understands PTH or were in a group interview where someone else mentioned it. Most people used the term "communication" (交流 *jiaoliu*), in all four parts of questions 3 and 4, often many times over. As Tara says,"I think language is for communication. There's no 'correct' or 'incorrect'." [34] Others expressed similar ideas. Glory said straight out, "As for 'correct', if you can understand my meaning, I think that's 'correct'." [35]

The relationship between PTH and Fangyan

      The interviews confirm that Yunnanese consider the different Fangyan and PTH to be dialects of the same language. This means both that people call them the same language, and that they are percieved to share both lexicon and grammar. However, the exact relationships between the terms "Fangyan", "PTH", and "Hanyu" ("Chinese") are somewhat unclear.

      The Fangyan and PTH are overtly considered to be the same language. For each of question 1 and 2, a slight majority listed only "中文" "*Zhongwen*" or "汉语" "*Hanyu*" (general terms for Chinese) rather than mentioning Fangyan and PTH separately:

---

34 我觉得语言，就是为了交流啊。没有什么正确不正确.
35 但是正确的,比如说，我表达的意思，你能听得懂，我觉得就应该是正确的.

1. What's your first language? (你第一次会说的语言是什么？)			
"Chinese" （"中文/汉语")	"Fangyan" ("方言") or "Fangyan and PTH" or the name of a particular variety	Other (Minority languages)	Total
12	8	2	22

2. How many languages do you know? (你会几种语言？)		
Doesn't include Fangyan separately	Includes Fangyan separately	Total
14	8	22

Many people included Fangyan separately for one question and not the other question. Jenny asserts the dependence explicity: "But we don't think that PTH and Fangyan are two languages, they're one language. Only the tones are different." [36] Others pointed out that PTH and Yunnanhua are part of the same branch of Chinese.

While most people believed that there were differences between Fangyan and PTH besides for than tones, the way people talked about the differences shows that they see the dialects as variations on a theme. When I asked question 6(b), what a PTH-speaker would have to learn to learn their Fangyan, most people responded with some of the following: tones, pronunciation, and some words and expressions. [37] The words that aren't different must therefore be considered to be the same lexical entries, to be "identical" (相同 *xiangtong*). At least two people described Fangyan in terms of "changes" from PTH. [38] This implies that the different dialects are considered to share a common core.

---

36 可是我们不觉得普通话和方言是两种语言，是一种语言。只是 tones different.

37 For an example chosen almost at random, Willow: "Differences, I guess, in tones. If you're speaking normally, tones. There are also some exclamations, for example, in English you say " *tian'a*" "My God!" Exclamations. …… Exclamations, tones, and including pronunciation, that kind of thing, there are some local ethnic language expressions, that if you were speaking PTH you wouldn't say it that way. If PTH—say, *'malinshu'*. That's how we say 'potato' (*yangyu*)." （差别可能，就是，音调上。如果普遍地讲话，音调。还有地方也有一些语气词，比如说，这个英语里边说'天啊' 'My God!' 那个语气。…… 语气词，声调，和包括发音那种会存在一些民族语言的本地的一些说法。如果叫普通话里边就不是这样说。如果普通话那个，'马蔺树'。我们那边说 洋芋.)

38 Answering question 3, Glory says, "[Fangyan is] based on PTH, but the tones will change somewhat." （"以普通话为基础，但是它那个音调那些会，像都会改变一些.")

A common interpretation of question 6.2 indicates this even more strongly. Question 6.2 asked "can Fangyan express everything that PTH can?" and vice versa. At least three people said that Fangyan could express more because it had some sentence patterns or words that were not possible in PTH, while all words and patterns in PTH can be used in Fangyan. (Many more people may have had this interpretation because it wasn't always obvious from their answers.) This shows that the default expectation for Fangyan and PTH is that the words and sentences will match up, one for one. In fact, Amy believes that they always do, and used this very phrase[39] to explain why PTH and Fangyan could express all the same things. The clincher is Anya's willingness to say a "Fangyan" sentence for me using PTH phonology so that I can understand which "words" she says. This belief that the varieties have mostly the same sentences, with some exceptions, shows clearly that they are considered to share a grammar and lexicon, and thus be versions of the same language. This model is facilitated by the fact that they use a common script.

The answers to question 3(c), "What is the relationship between Fangyan and Chinese?" show that the meaning of "*hanyu*"[40] isn't completely clear:

3(c). What is the relationship between Fangyan/your variety and Chinese? (方言和汉语有什么关系？)			
Fangyan is a kind of Chinese/ belongs to Chinese	Indicates a distinction	Not answered/unclear answer	Total
8	5	9	22

Cordelia phrases the opinion that Fangyan is a kind of "*hanyu*" most eloquently:

---

39 "一对一"

40 In Chinese language class, I learned that "*hanyu*" and "*zhongwen*" both mean "Chinese", and can be used interchangeably, but that "*hanyu*" slightly more often implies the spoken language and "*zhongwen*" the written language. Therefore I chose to ask about "*hanyu*" rather than "*zhongwen*".

Oh. Fangyan belongs to Chinese. Chinese has a very wide range. Chinese includes PTH and Fangyan. Those are the most basic ones."[41]

I think this is the usual use of "*hanyu*", and that most of the other answers can be reconciled with it. Several answers did imply that "*hanyu*" is a standardized form of Chinese and not a general category. Spike said:

I guess Fangyan is on the basis of *Hanyu*, the basis of PTH. ……Then [each Fangyan] adds some of its own——……they all add some, "*ne*", "*ge*", some of these words.[42]

Spike seems to be equating *Hanyu* and PTH, or at least the two are very similar for him.

However, Liam, who said that *Hanyu* evolved from Fangyan, also implying that *Hanyu* refers to the standard variety of Chinese, said when I asked him that it was not the same as PTH.

Jonathan expressed a very similar idea, although he doesn't equate *Hanyu* with PTH:

I think Qujinghua, it's also part of *Hanyu*. ……There's a word, "*liyu*" (俚语). …… Sometimes, it's possible that in Fangyan you can say something, but in *Hanyu* you can't find that word. [43]

Here, Jonathan both says that Fangyan is a kind of *Hanyu*, and also that some of its words don't exist in *Hanyu*, which seems to be a contradiction. It seems that for him and others, "*Hanyu*" can refer to the written language or the formal variety embodied in the written language.[44] It's therefore not necessarily the same as PTH (because literary Chinese existed before PTH) but, like PTH, is a particular formal variety common to the whole country and therefore hard to distinguish from PTH. Like many words, though, "*Hanyu*" has many uses, and can also simply mean the category "Chinese". Perhaps the meaning of *Hanyu* to refer to the written language is a metonymy of the broader meaning made possible by the prestige and universality of the written language.

---

41 啊！方言的话他是属于汉语的。汉语, 它的范围很大. 它汉语包括普通话和方言。最基本的这两种。
42 应该说方言在汉语的基础，普通话的基础上。……然后加了一些自己的……都加了一些 "呢"，"ge"， 一些这些词。 *Ne* and *ge* are examples of particles that have grammatical and discourse-marking functions.
43 "我觉得曲靖话，它也属于汉语。…… 有一个词叫俚语。…… [muffled]时候，可能就是方言中，[muffled]会说一些话，但是在汉语中，找不到这个词. " When he wrote out 俚语 for me, he actually wrote it differently, but I couldn't find the character he wrote in a dictionary, so I assume he meant 俚语, although his pronunciation was more like "leiyu".
44 In answering question 18, Kendra almost definitely uses "*Hanyu*" to refer to the formal written language: "For example, when we were kids the *Hanyu* class we attended, it taught us how to read *Hanyu*. *Hanyu* is vast and rich, but even now I don't dare to say my *Hanyu* is very good, even though I'm a Chinese person. (比如说我们小时候上的语文课，它就教我们怎么认识汉语。汉语博大精深，但是我到现在都不敢说我的汉语很好，虽然我是中国人)

Legitimacies of Fangyan and PTH

        I have established that the common model holds Fangyan and PTH to be closely related to each other rather than being independent languages. The next question is whether one variety is subordinate to the other. On the one hand, nonstandard varieties are often seen as dependent upon the standard variety; on the other hand, PTH is a new and somewhat artificial language, so perhaps it is considered to be dependent on Fangyan.   In fact, interviewees hinted at both these notions, but mostly not very strongly. There were also plenty of evidence that the two varieties are equal, neither subordinate to the other, and no evidence at all that either of them is considered completely illegitimate.

        Question 6.2 was intended to discover whether Fangyan was considered lacking relative to PTH and therefore less able to express meaning. In fact, the opposite turned out to be the case:

6.2 Can PTH and your Fangyan express everything the other can?（普通话能表达的, [你那边的方言]都能表达吗？ [你那边的方言]能表达的,普通话都能表达吗？）				
Fangyan can express more	PTH can express more	Each can express everything the other can	Both have things the other can't express	Total
14	1	5	2	22

PTH is considered significantly less expressive than Fangyan. As discussed above, in some cases the interviewee meant that there are sentences and words in Fangyan that have no PTH correlate. In one of these cases, I asked whether all the meanings could be expressed, if only in different ways, and Xander said yes. Unfortunately I did not ask this systematically. For some people the lack of certain vocabulary seemed to be connected to PTH being actually less expressive. At any rate Fangyan is not defective relative to PTH, but the reverse could be the case.

Many people did find Fangyan more expressive. For example, Jenny said she "feels more" when she speaks Fangyan. Others said Fangyan is more "vivid", more "full of life", or more "precise",[45] and many gave examples of interjections and other emotional speech. I think in fact this is related less to the defectiveness of PTH and more to its formality. Most of all, I think it is because most of my informants learned PTH only when they started school. Many are still considerably more comfortable speaking Fangyan, although they are completely fluent in PTH.

There were several faint indications that Fangyan is dependent on PTH. A few people said that Fangyan is "based on PTH". Xander defined it in terms of differences from PTH, and seems unclear which came first,[46] as did Lily, one of the sixth graders, was uncertain until Sam told her PTH was first. Xander compared the "evolution" (演变 *yanbian*) of PTH to a child growing up until he comes of age, at which point PTH will not change anymore. [47] Presumably this means that the kinds of Fangyan are either still like children or else have degenerated from PTH, either of which seriously compromises their legitimacy as independent languages. This attitude, however, is far from typical of my informants. Joyce said that she only speaks one language, PTH, even though she said her first language is Fangyan. For her, Fangyan doesn't count as a language in some way. That way, however, could be because the context seemed to be international, and PTH was serving to represent all varieties of Chinese. When I asked about Fangyan, she was willing to count it. A more common indicator of PTH's dominance is the practice of calling a Fangyan "heavy" (重, *zhong*) when it is different from standard PTH, without specifying that PTH is the reference

---

45 准确 (zhunque), from Oz; Cordelia used the English phrase "full of life" and Anya used the English word "vivid".

46 ″Lincanghua is a local people's kind of pronunciation that has changes from PTH." ("临沧话就是当地的人民根据普通话有所改变的，一种发音.") It is possible that since I only study PTH, Xander defined it in these terms for my benefit. But later he implied that Fangyan evolved from PTH. Dawn corrected him, at which point he says to me, in English, "It's okay," a phrase he used later to accept a correction. Xander also considers deviations from PTH grammar in Fangyan to be errors, and in general seems to think PTH is higher quality than Fangyan.

47 什么产生？是演变过来的. 演变是发展，变化过来的。就像，小孩子长大一样。Like a kid，小孩，慢慢地长大，然后他的 zhenyu'an 发语。[muffled] 然后就变化。知道他成年。他就会有固定的声音。就是这个.

point. This implies that the default reference is PTH, even in Yunnan.[48] All these things could point towards Fangyan being subordinate to PTH or the formal written "*Hanyu*" that PTH stands for.

The most convincing evidence that Fangyan might be subordinate to PTH came from four people (Xander, Harmony, Kendra, and Sam) who said that when Fangyan deviates from PTH grammar (pronunciation in Harmony's case), that's an error. Others may hold this opinion but their examples of errors were not clearly deviations from PTH that are normal in the variety of Fangyan. The question was question 8, "Is it possible to speak the language wrong when speaking your Fangyan?" This question was particularly vexed, because I failed to find an idiomatic way to get my meaning across. The final form was "说［你那边的方言］的时候, 可不可能把语言说错?" which is awkward and confusing at best, and many informants were somewhat confused by the question. I sometimes glossed it as "把语法说错?" ("Say the grammar wrong.") I had thought that a "no" answer would indicate a belief that Fangyan has no rules and is illegitimate, but because the interviewees do not necessarily have an ideology that legitimate language has lots of difficult rules and is easy to mess up[49], I do not want to draw any conclusions from the three "no" answers.

There were even slighter hints that PTH may be subordinate to Fangyan. Kendra (who in some other respects seems to value PTH over Fangyan) said that PTH was based on Fangyan ("基于方言基础上"); Joyce claimed that it developed from Fangyan. Further, any feeling that PTH is artificial or based on BJH, as discussed above, tends toward it being dependent on Fangyan for its very existence.

Question 18 asked directly "Is speaking PTH better than speaking Fangyan?" and

---

48 For example, in Faith's response to question 14(b): "Usually it is in some places where the Fangyan is relatively heavy…." (一般就是在一些方言口音比较重的地方….) But this phenomenon can also be explained by the principle of granularity instead of by claiming that Fangyan is less legitimate: when comparing Fangyan, or comparing Fangyan to PTH, the context is the national level, and the relevant standard is PTH, which is, after all, definitionally "standard".

49 This is in fact a percieved characteristic of PTH, but only Kendra seems to think that PTH is more worthy on account of it.

whether PTH is more "correct" (正确 *zhengque*) than Fangyan, attempting to get at whether

Fangyan were considered deviations from PTH. The results were pretty clear, at least for the

first part:

18. Is it better to speak PTH than Fangyan? (说普通话比说方言好吗？)					
Yes	Yes, but it depends	No, it depends on situation	No	Not answered	Total
5	2	10	2	3	22

18(a) "PTH is more correct". Do you agree? ("普通话比较正确." 你同意不同意？)				
Agree	Sentence doesn't make sense, wrong word	Disagree	Not answered	Total
7	10	2	3	22

Most people said that which variety is better to use depends on the situation, but some

were willing to say that PTH was better, without qualifying it. Of those five, three also

agreed with 18(a). Of those three, two were sixth-graders, so that in the adult population only

one person out of the 17 agreed both that speaking PTH is "better" and that PTH is "more

correct." A little over half of those who answered felt that "correct" was a strange word to

apply to language varieties and didn't know what it would mean. Many suggested

alternatives they could agree to, mostly "formal" ("正式" *zhengshi*"). Some felt the

inappropriateness of the word choice very strongly, like Maggie, who claimed that the

sentence was ungrammatical.[50]

---

50 She explained in depth, analyzing the sentence and concluding, with reference to English grammar, that the sentence was wrong because it lacked a verb. However, when Graham suggested correcting the sentence to "比较正式" ("more formal"), she accepted the correction as sufficient. Dubious as Maggie's understanding of grammar might be, her intuitions about acceptable word choice are very clear. Her intuition that semantically peculiar sentences are just as "ungrammatical" as syntacticly peculiar sentences are is reasonable, I think. I should also point out that Chinese students don't study Chinese grammar.

Of those who agreed that PTH is more correct, three gave qualified answers. David both said speaking PTH was "better" and agreed with 18(a), but his given reason for both was that people who speak Fangyan can usually understand PTH, but not vice versa, and therefore it's better to speak PTH. Without a long train of reasoning, this does not indicate that Fangyan's features are incorrect versions of PTH, or that Fangyan is illegitimate in any other way. Cordelia said that PTH has rules and Fangyan doesn't, and that's what it means to say that PTH is more "correct". Faith seemed to feel that "correct" was a strange word to use, but agreed with the sentiment, saying, "I agree that PTH's system, and also grammar, that kind of thing, is somewhat more perfect than KMH……Also, it is an advanced language." [51] Willow gave an unqualified "yes", but immediately explained that in all but professional contexts she much prefers Fangyan. Overall, however, it seems that for most people, "correct" and "better" are not applicable concepts to absolute comparisons of Fangyan and PTH.

It seems likely that for most people PTH and Fangyan are two equal varieties of Chinese, with different uses. The main reason to think this is that the evidence just given to the contrary it is very weak, representing only a minority. It shows that it is possible for someone to believe that PTH is better or more correct, and less possible to think Fangyan is. Because the dominant view sees them as equally legitimate, some people list Fangyan as a separate language from PTH (in the appropriate granularity), and Cordelia says that Fangyan and PTH are the two main categories of Chinese, paralleling them as equals.

Idealizations of specific varieties independent of PTH

Question 9, "Does your Fangyan have norms?" ("[你那边的方言]有规范吗？") was also intended to address the legitimacy of Fangyan, because I assumed naively that a

---

51我同意普通话的体系，然后还有语法这些东西要比昆明话更完善一些…… 就是它是一个 advanced language. (From the context, it is clear that "advanced"is associated with " 发展", which refers to economic and technological development.）

language without norms would not be considered legitimate. It was a very difficult question to interpret because I wasn't entirely sure what "*guifan*" ("规范", "norms, standards") meant. Interviewees seem to have understood it in a variety of different ways, including: "rules that if broken result in ungrammatically," which is what I had intended, "common conventions of speech," and "deliberately imposed standards to create a commonly understood variety," in which last sense PTH is a *guifan* for all China. Since I didn't follow up on this question consistently, there are interviews for which I'm not sure which sense of *guifan* is in play.

However, by considering question 9 and question 8 (which asked about the possibility of errors) together, along with answers to other questions, I was able to draw conclusions about the opinions of most informants as to whether Fangyan have internal systems of what forms are used and what aren't (whether they have what I would call "rules of grammar") that are not simply identical to PTH's system. Five answers were completely inconclusive. Quite a few people (7) made it fairly clear that they consider a given variety of Fangyan to have its own standards, independent of PTH's standards.   Of the four people who found Fangyan's deviations from PTH to be errors, two also acknowledged that Fangyan have their own special features. Four people said that one can't make language mistakes in speaking Fangyan, but I'm not sure how to interpret that, because it could mean that native speakers are unlikely to make mistakes, or it could mean that "anything goes" in Fangyan.

Because one of the features of Western standard ideology is that the standard language (and possibly some nonstandard varieties, as well) is a clearly delimited, stable ideal, I am interested in whether, in the Chinese context, there are similar kinds of platonic ideals ascribed to varieties, that is, whether the different kinds of Fangyan are reified. Overall, I rather think that such reification is not the norm for Fangyan. The tendency to believe that Fangyan can change, that they vary geographically in a continuous rather than discrete manner, and that different varieties normally mix together in an individual's speech indicates

against positing a platonic form of, for example, KMH. So does the tendency to refer to a variety of Fangyan as "Fangyan" rather than by its place name.   However, there is room in any human belief system for contradictions, and there are probably elements of such an ideology current in the Yunnan thought system. For example, Glory proposed that recent loans into Dali Fangyan from PTH, like "*qiaokeli*" (巧克力), "chocolate", aren't fully Dalihua, because they weren't "originally" ("原来 *"yuanlai"*) part of the dialect.   Question 5, about whether Fangyan or PTH can change, also speaks to the question of whether anyone believes in a stable ideal of some specific variety of Fangyan. The results (given above) show that a minority of interviewees thought Fangyan couldn't change.

Conversely, many more people thought PTH would not change, and most agreed that PTH has norms (*guifan)*. Many pointed out that having standards was a defining characteristic of PTH, in contrast to the Fangyan. However, the norms and the invariability seem to be recognized as artificial, not divine like those of a platonic ideal, given that so many people believe the origin of PTH to be deliberately decided as a standard. PTH has been reified but for most people, not idealized.

The complementary distribution of PTH and Fangyan

My informants had a very conscious notion of what linguists call the distinction between an H-variety and an L-variety. They explained easily and often that PTH is used in formal and business situations and carries overtones of formality and distance, while Fangyan is used in the home and in other private spheres and conveys intimacy. For many people this use distribution was part of defining what PTH and Fangyan are.

PTH's function as a koine makes the use pattern a little different from the classic H-L type situation, because PTH is also used for L functions (informal, private spheres) when the participants can't understand each other's Fangyan. My informants were also aware of this,

and many said that what language you speak depends on who you are talking to, and not only on whether they understand your Fangyan, but also on whether they began by speaking Fangyan or PTH to you.[52]

Everyone recognizes that Fangyan is more informal and PTH is more formal, but are these characteristics accidental or instrinsic? This study did not delve deeply into this question, but there are some indications that each varieties is considered intrinsically only suitable for some registers. Question 13 asked whether it might be acceptable to use Fangyan in the classroom, a canonically H-domain place. (It must be noted that in many of my informants' experience, Fangyan was in fact used in their classrooms in younger grades.) All but three people agreed that it would be a bad idea to teach in Fangyan, but most explained in terms of practicality: some students might be from elsewhere and not understand, and it would make it harder to learn PTH well, and PTH has obvious market value. Only a few clearly thought that Fangyan is intrinsically unsuited to formal functions like teaching school. Cordelia said that Fangyan should not be used because the classroom is a formal place. Liam expressed a slightly less obvious opinion:

> Liam: Because, to be a teacher, speaking PTH is a must, I feel.
> Me: Why?
> [muffled conversation between Liam and Amy, then a long pause.]
> Liam: Because PTH is also——our mother tongue should be considered PTH, so [the teacher] really ought to know it.[53]

"Mother tongue" seems to have some normative meaning that I don't understand, but Liam's difficulty articulating why a teacher should speak PTH shows that for him it's not a matter of practicality but of what ought to be, "just because". For him, PTH is inherently the language that should be spoken in classrooms in China.[54] On the other hand, the three who thought it was okay to use Fangyan in schools presumably believe that Fangyan's tendency towards an

---

52 Anya said that it is disrespectful to answer in Fangyan to someone who spoke PTH to you, or to speak PTH in a group where you usually speak Fangyan.

53 Liam: 因为，做一个老师，这个普通话应该是必须要说，我觉得。
me: 为什么？
[muffled conversation. long pause]
Liam: 因为普通话也是；应该我们的母语应该算普通话，所以他应该必须，必须会。

54 There may well also be an element of nationalism in this sentiment of Liam's.

informal register is not intrinsic.

Several people also indicated that PTH, conversely, is illegitimate for L functions.

They said if one spoke PTH with friends from home, or with parents, those friends or parents

would feel strange or uncomfortable, or that it would be rude. Willow says:

> "PTH is more correct" is not wrong. But in PTH……if you usually use it during
> work, okay. If you use it speaking casually with other people, it's just……like, me
> and Xander: generally, if we were together and he spoke PTH to me, it would feel
> very annoying. Because we're both Lincang, right, I feel that if we speak Lincanghua
> together, that's very good. But if some time we were together and he spoke PTH to
> us: "Oh, stop speaking PTH, speak Fangyan." Sometimes, although PTH is correct
> Fangyan is still very intimate. [55]

Willow may only be expressing personal preference. However, her preference is strong

enough to have normative force. If Xander were to persist in speaking PTH to her, it sounds

like he would run the risk of losing her friendship, or at least creating some distance between

them. Graham, who speaks an Yi minority language at home, showed the inappropriateness

of PTH for certain functions when he said that his children should speak the local Fangyan in

addition to PTH and Yi language, because where he is from it would be strange to use PTH to

communicate in daily life. The inappropriateness of using PTH in most emotional situations

may well account for part of its being perceived as less expressive than Fangyan. In other

words, it feels as if one can't express strong feelings or dirty words in PTH because it is so

formal that one never would.

However, in answering question 11 (results below), many people said they would

mostly speak PTH with their child, which implies that PTH is in fact suitable for intimate

situations:

11. What language do you plan to speak with your child? (如果你将来有孩子, 你打算跟孩子说什么话？)					
mostly PTH	mostly Fangyan	both	depends	other	total

---

[55] 普通话这个比较正确是不错。但是，普通话里面……如果用于平时工作上可以。如果用于口语跟其他的人讲话，就会……如果……我和那个，Xander: 如果平时，我们在一起他和我讲普通话我会感觉很烦。……因为我们都是临沧嘛，感觉我们在一起如果讲临沧话的话，会很好。但是如果有时候在一起的话，他和我们讲普通话，‘［sigh]别讲普通话了，讲方言吧’这样很，很……。有的时候虽然普通话正确但是方言会很亲切。

8	7	3	2	2	22

The necessity of speaking PTH in situations where there are people from many different places also means that PTH can't be completely barred from L functions.   It seems that PTH in registers usually reserved for Fangyan is a bit more acceptable than vice-versa, and that it is not generally considered to be intrinsically limited to H-domains.

The difference in what uses PTH and Fangyan are effective for was far more salient for my informants than any difference in absolute legitimacy or "correctness" and "incorrectness". I believe this is related to the attitude that language is a tool for communication, and concepts like "legitimate" don't apply to it. By and large, function seems to be more important than existential status.

Differences between the attitudes of younger and older people

So far, my analysis has been based primarily on the responses of my young adult respondents, although statistics have included the three sixth-grade interviewees, Sam, Lily, and Mary. My hypotheses about how children think must be even more tentative, because I only formally interviewed three of them, and that was under less than ideal circumstances. I also asked some of my questions informally of other students when I visited their class.

 On another occasion I had a conversation with a sixth grader from a different school that went more or less like this:

> Her: You speak PTH very standardly.
> Me: No I don't. You speak PTH very standardly.
> Her: Well, of course! We're natives (本地人)!

I can't really imagine any of my young-adult interviewees saying something like that, since they tend not to think of "natives" as speaking PTH. On the contrary, a few of them mentioned that their own PTH was not very standard.

Lily said several times that PTH is easier to understand, and she and Mary told me that they're more comfortable speaking it than Fangyan. Mary described PTH as "not weird

(怪 *guai*) like Fangyan", but Lily and Sam questioned the implication that Fangyan was

"weird". The girls, accordingly, planned to speak PTH with their children, but Sam preferred

Fangyan. Lily and Sam agreed that PTH was "better" and more "correct", but some of the

sixth-graders that I asked informally said that you couldn't compare them, and it depended on

the situation. The class monitor told me that she uses both PTH and Fangyan when talking

to her friends, and everyone I asked (besides Mary) said they knew Fangyan.

Overall, the children seem slightly more normative towards PTH and prefer it in more

places than the adults, but they show great variation in experience and attitudes, perhaps more

than the adults do. However, this apparent trend, if it even exists, could almost entirely be

explained by the big city/small town distinction, as the adult interviewees came from all over

the province, only one from Kunming city proper, and all the children were living in

Kunming.

Conclusion

With respect to many things there is no dominant ideology determining how people in

Kunming model language psychologically. However, with respect to some there does seem

to be a prevailing ideology. In summary, that ideology is as follows:

The normal first variety for a child is Fangyan, which has a different form in every

place and is limited in usefulness to the local area. If someone leaves their home locale, the

Fangyan they speak is likely to experience some changes, because they will automatically be

influenced by the Fangyan spoken around them. This phenomenon can also cause diachronic

changes in a local variety. A person should also learn PTH, which has a different function

from Fangyan, since it is necessary for formal situations, while Fangyan is best for informal

ones. The main purpose of both PTH and Fangyan, like that of all languages, is communication. Fangyan is good for communication on a local level and PTH is good for communication on an inter-provincial level, another reason to learn both.   PTH and Fangyan are the main forms of Chinese, and they share a common structure and lexicon, although there are some places where there are differences between different varieties.   PTH is standard, but this probably does not mean it is better.

Comparison with Milroy's "standard language ideology"

PTH is certainly a standard language, and like Milroy's standard languages, seems to mostly be viewed as a "clearly delimited, perfectly uniform and perfectly stable variety". However, it seems to be a standard only in the non-valued sense. Fangyan is considered another variety of the same language, but is not seen as wrong or illegitimate. There may be right forms and wrong forms of speech, but given the difficulty I had explaining my question addressing this point, I have to conclude that they are not "common sense", another component of the standard language ideology.   Finally, I would guess that if PTH's standards were not maintained, people would expect inter-provincial communication to degenerate but would not worry about the quality of the Chinese language. This last, however, is uncertain, since PTH is closely associated with the written language, which in turn carries enormous prestige.

With regard to PTH itself, however, everyone did know that there are right and wrong forms, and that it takes a certain amount of training to speak it correctly.   Similarly, PTH's standards are not determined by native speakers, but by language authorities. These authorities are a little less than "shamanistic", however, because they are often identified with the government. The native speakers of the Fangyan, on the other hand, are considered to control the form of the language.

If the ideology around PTH were to fit into Milroy's model of standard ideology, the Fangyan would have to be outside the scope of its influence, at least in most people's belief systems. However, nonstandard realizations of PTH, like the so-called MaPu, might fill the role of the stigmatized substandard varieties.   It seems simpler, however, to say that Chinese has a koine but does not have a standard language ideology of the kind Milroy describes.

Comparisons with previous research on Chinese language attitudes

My findings contrast with those of Dong (2009 and 2010), who concludes that standard PTH has more prestige than other varieties. This may be because Dong was mostly looking at Beijing, while I have talked to people from Yunnan. Another factor in the different conclusions could be that Dong also considers official discourse, which admittedly wants to promote PTH as much as possible, whereas I have focused on ordinary people. This probably also explains the difference in my conclusions from Dwyer (1998)'s claim that Fanyan are below PTH in a language hierarchy. Dwyer considers mostly official ideology, while I have considered personal, subconscious ideology. I would argue that Dwyer's absolute claims about languages and power should be reconsidered in light of the notion of granularity.

This study is much more comparable in form to those of Dede (2004) and Gilliland (2006), done in Qinghai's Xining and Shanghai, respectively. Where the questions were similar, many of the findings are also. Like Dede, I found that people consider Fangyan somewhat more expressive than PTH.

Gilliland concluded that PTH is making inroads into L-domain informal contexts, and that Shanghai students accordingly feel that PTH is as intimate as Fangyan. While my adult respondents do not seem to feel that way, the children do, and I have found that PTH is used for practical reasons in informal contexts, and therefore even the adults do not entirely limit

the use of PTH to H domains.   Since Shanghai is a bigger city and a more cosmopolitan place than Kunming (and therefore with more outsiders around), it makes sense that PTH would come into informal use sooner there than in Yunnan. Gilliland was also interviewing only Shanghainese, whereas my interviewees were mostly not from Kunming, so this probably also reflects a big city-small town difference.

My findings that usefulness and convenience are a major factor in people's consideration of the value of a variety is very similar to Gilliland's claim that Shanghainese students use a model of linguistic capital. Like his, this study also found a nice mix of opinions as to what students plan to speak with their children, including PTH and Fangyan and also English, and that the most common reason given for the existence or value of PTH is its necessity for communication.

Limitations of the study

This study is severely limited. First of all, my study was too small for results to be statistically significant, which means all my conclusions are only preliminary. The sample was also rather noisy, mostly students at Yunnan Minzu Daxue whose first language was Chinese, but with nearly half being exceptions from at least one of those qualities. Time limits meant I wasn't able to do follow-up interviews, which would have been very useful for clarification and systematically pursuing interesting topics that came up in the first round of interviews.

Secondly, my lack of solid Chinese language skills hampered the interviews in many ways. Several of my interview questions are unidiomatic and confusing, and several more were only fixed after the first few interviews.   I wasn't fully able to understand on the spot what my interviewees were saying, so the conversation was highly unnatural and I didn't always clarify things that needed clarifying or follow up on unusual points. Many of my

interviewees tailored their Chinese to make it easier for me to understand, which was a good thing, because it meant I could understand. But it also made their answers less spontaneous and probably less precise or with even slightly different meanings than they would have liked to express. Finally, the language barrier makes me even less certain how to interpret ambiguous statements, and I miss most of the overtones and connotations of words.

Thirdly, I limited my study to Yunnan natives, but in retrospect I think it would have been more useful to limit my study either to people from cities or to people from smaller towns and rural areas. It seems that experiences of language are closely correlated with size of hometown, and experiences probably influence beliefs.

Finally, my picture of the dominant language ideology in Yunnan is suspiciously close to academic linguists' ideology, especially the emphasis that "correct" and "legitimate" don't apply to languages. It is entirely possible that I have projected my biases onto a complicated set of data.   To somewhat help the suspicious reader, I have included in the Appendix the spreadsheet I made to organize and summarize the raw data.

Further research

The sociolinguistic situation in China is fascinating, complex, and entirely understudied, so almost everything needs to be studied. This study in particular could be clarified by similar but better qualitative studies focusing on specific aspects raised in these interviews. A study that looked at the perceptions of boundaries (or lack thereof) between different varieties of Fangyan, using interviews and a more developed variety-identification activity, would be fascinating.   Similarly, someone should look at the boundaries of PTH, and how people categorize nonstandard approximations of it.

Work on whether Fangyan is believed to be systematic and rule-based is certainly indicated. This study has revealed that words like "standard" ("标准", "规范") and "rules"

("规律", "规则" may not have the normative connotations they often have in English, and this should be considered in any research on the topic.

A classic study of language-attitudes that looked at positive-negative attitudes (what Dede calls the "affective component") would be useful, as would matched-guise testing to see if associations with Fangyan and PTH follow the typical H-L breakdown or not. Other investigations into how much the language situation approximates the classic H-L situation would also be wonderful, for example, looking into gender differences in usage or attitudes. One of my informants mentioned a "middle" variety he uses, that is neither PTH nor a completely local kind of Fangyan, suggesting the existence of mesolectal varieties. A study investigating whether the situation could be described as a acrolect-mesolect-basilect continuum might be revealing.

Someone with fluent Chinese and at least a little bit of Yunnan Fangyan should do a linguistic ethnography focusing on language ideology, and another ethnography on code-choice among people who use both PTH and Fangyan frequently. Since code-switching is an extremely normal phenomenon in Kunming, the city provides a wonderful ground for studying aspects of code-choice. For one, different varieties of Chinese certainly have indexical properties that should studied further.

Since China these days is characterized most by rapid changes, diachronic studies would doubtless be fascinating. Systematic comparisons of attitudes and usage patterns of people of different generations should also be done.

I originally also wanted to look into Chinese language education. A comparison between urban and rural or small-town schools would be productive, although possibly awkward for the rural schools who may or may not be in compliance with official policy about the use of PTH. Someone interested in how urban children who primarily speak Fangyan at home acquire PTH would want to observe kindergartens. Many people told me

that schoolchildren have no trouble suddenly attending class in PTH because they've already been exposed to it in kindergarten and from television. This claim should be investigated.

Conclusion

This paper looked at the beliefs young adults in Kunming hold about Fangyan and PTH. Due to the smallness of the sample and other limitations, it is a very preliminary investigation which could potentially be helpful in guiding the preparation of materials for more systematic studies.

Appendix

Participants

(YUN indicates current undergraduate at Yunnan University of Nationalities (Yunnan Minzu Daxue);

	gender	age	education; major/occupation	home (place of growing up)	nationality
Oz	M	20	YUN; National Defense	Kunming Xundian county	Han
Jenny	F	25	BA; English/program assistant	Lincang Yun county	Yi (L1 Fangyan)
Willow	F	19	YUN; Japanese	Lincang Gengma prefecture	Han
Tara	F	20	YUN; Malaysian	Lincang Yun county	Han
Kendra	F	? 20 or 21	YUN; English	Chuxiong	Han
Anya	F	21	YUN; English and Education	Honghe Luxi	Han
Glory	F	20	YUN; English	Dali Jianchuan	Bai (L1 Bai)
Harmony	F	23	Law graduate student at YUN	Lijiang	Han
Cordelia	F	20	YUN; English	Zhaotong	Han
Zander	M	19	YUN; National Defense	Lincang Changyuan	Han
Dawn	F	19	Yunnan Normal University, preschool education	Yichang in Hebei and Lincang	Han
Liam	M	19	YUN; Marketing	Lincang Yun county	Yi (L1 Fangyan)
Jonathan	M	21	YUN; English	A county in Qujing	Han
Joyce	F	23	High school; beautician	Dali	Han
Faith	F	24	Yunnan University; Law	Kunming city proper	Han
Graham	M	21	YUN; philosophy	Lijiang	Yi (L1 Yi)
Riley	M	19	YUN; philosophy	Qujing	Han
Maggie	F	21	YUN; philosophy	Dali	Bai (L1 Fangyan)
Spike	M	20	YUN; philosophy	Yuxi	Han
Sam	M	11 or 12	Shaoshan Elementary School	Kunming	Han
Lily	F	11 or 12	Shaoshan Elementary School	Kunming	Han
Mary	F	11 or 12	Shaoshan Elementary School	Kunming, born Hunan	Han

Interview questions

These represent my best version and were not asked completely consistently. Additional questions were also asked of many people as they came up. The numbering system is more or less random and the peculiarities reflects the revising process, not anything meaningful. In administering the interviews I usually replaced "KMH" with the name of the interviewee's home dialect, depending on circumstances.

语言背景
1. 你第一会说的语言是什么？
2. 你会几种语言？有哪些？
   a. 你会方言吗？哪些方言？

语言概念
Ontological questions
3. 什么是普通话？什么是昆明话？方言是什么？
   a) 昆明话／方言 和汉语有什么关系？

4. a) 为什么有方言？
   b) 为什么有普通话？ 普通话是怎么产生的？

5. 昆明话可不可能变化？普通话呢？怎么变化？
6。 有没有人只会说普通话，不会方言？你能不能想像这样的人？
   a) 这样的人，或者北京人，想要学习昆明话的话，应该怎么学习？

Legitimacy of KMH
6.2. 普通话能表达的昆明话都能表达吗？ 昆明话能表达的普通话都能表达吗？
7. "口音" 有什么意思？
   a) 可不可能有一个人说昆明话的时候带有别地方的口音？为什么？
8. 说昆明话的时候, 可不可能语言说错？
   a) 比如说什么？
9. 昆明话有规范吗？
   a)有什么规范？ 昆明话的规范和普通话的一样吗？

10. activity: variety identification

语言态度

11.如果你将来有孩子, 你打算跟他说哪种话？为什么？

12. 你希望孩子听得懂昆明话吗？

   a) 会说昆明话？ b) 普通话呢？

13. 如果老师们在课堂上讲方言, 你觉得怎么样？

14. 一个人平常说什么中国话的决定因素是什么？

   a) 什么样的人说昆明话？

   b)什么样的人的普通话最标准？什么样的人说不标准的普通话？

学校环境

15. 你上小学，中学的时候，老师说什么话？

   a) 要求学生说普通话吗？

   b) 如果你说方言, 老师怎么办？

16. 上学的时候你有没有谈论过昆明话和普通话的不同？

   a) 和朋友们谈论过吗？

17。说普通话比说方言好吗？为什么？

   a)有一个人对我说，"普通话比较正确." 你同意不同意？

你有没有问题要问我？

个人背景
   年龄, 性别，再哪里长大？老家在哪里？，民族，职务/学校
   有没有上过语言学课：

English translation

Linguistic Background

1. What's your first language?

2. How many languages do you speak, and what are they?

   a) Do you speak any topolects? What kinds?

Concepts of language

3. What is *Putonghua* (PTH)? What is *Kunminghua* (KMH)? What are Fangyan?

4.   a) Why are there *fangyan*?

        b) Why is there PTH? How did PTH originate?

5. Could KMH change? Could PTH? How?

6. Is there anyone who only speaks PTH (and not any other variety)? Can you imagine such a person?

        a) If such a person wanted to learn KMH, what would they have to learn?

6.2. Can KMH express anything that PTH can express? Vice versa?

7. What does *"kouyin"* [accent] mean?

        a) Is it possible to speak KMH with another place's accent? If not, why not?

8. When speaking KMH, is it possible to say the language wrong? Can you give an example?

9. Does Kunminghua have standards? What are they?

    10. Variety identification activity.

Language attitudes

11. If you have a child in the future, what language will you speak with them? Why?

12. Do you hope your child will be able to understand KMH? Why?

        a) Do you hope they'll be able to speak KMH? Why?

        b) What about PTH? Why?

13. What would you think if teachers taught class in *fangyan*?

14. What decides what variety a Chinese person uses?

        a) What kind of person speaks *fangyan*?

        b) What kind of person speaks the most standard PTH? What kind of person speaks nonstandard PTH?

Educational environment

15. When you were in grades 1-12, what did your teachers speak in class?

16. did your teachers require you to speak PTH?

        a) What would they do if you didn't speak PTH?

17. Did you ever talk in class about the differences between *fangyan* and PTH?

        a) What about with your friends?

18. Is speaking PTH better than speaking Fangyan?

        a) Someone said to me, "PTH is more correct". Do you agree?

Personal Information

age

sex

Where did you grow up? What's your hometown?

Ethnicity

Work/major

Educational background/school

Have you ever taken a linguistics class?

PTH version of text used for variety identification activity

你听我说，我工作以后，有了稳定的收入，这就开始有了信用。我先付车款的十分之一或者五分之一，其余的向银行贷款汽车我先开着，贷款我慢慢地还着。每年还百分之十或二是，几年以后，我把钱还完了，车就是我的了。 我先借了钱，又按时还了钱，我的信用也就越来越高了，对不对？ 你向银行借过钱了没有？

From my Chinese textbook, the <u>New Practical Chinese Reader Textbook</u>, book 3.

Spreadsheet of summarized responses begins on next page.

Subjective account and itinerary

I stayed in Kunming at the dorms at Yunnan Minzu Daxue for the whole thirty days. I spent 750 RMB on housing, about 500 RMB on gifts and treating people to food, and about 800 RMB on living expenses.

The ISP was a wonderful experience for me, if a little stressful. It confirmed my desire to go to graduate school for linguistics. Being alone in Kunming and doing interviews of Minzu Daxue students, my peers, helped me integrate just a little into the regular life of the campus. By that I mean I made friends on campus who I sometimes ate meals with and could say hello to when I ran into them around campus. That's not to say that I didn't get lonely without American peers.

The ISP was also very good for my listening and speaking abilities, because there was no one around to speak English with, so I was really living in Chinese. Also, my main activities were conducting interviews in Chinese, which meant conversing in Chinese often with speakers of accented PTH, and transcribing interviews, which meant listening and making sure I understood everything, looking up unknown words or asking for help. My vocabulary improved in areas related to the interviews, mostly because I made a point of writing down new important words in my notebook and occasionally reviewing them. If I don't write it down, I usually forget a new word instantly. My biggest advances were in the area of pragmatics, as I learned how to ask "what's up?" (I'll give you a hint: it's not "*nihao ma?*") and what the usages of certain phrases are. (For example, when saying good night to someone, you can wish them to fall asleep quickly.)

My biggest regret is not going over the interview questions with someone with a good command of English and Chinese before starting. I was going to have my advisor help me out, but the whole advisor thing didn't really work out. (It didn't help that I was confused about what the advisor's role was supposed to be.) But it would have been so easy just to check with Xiao Zhou or Wang Laoshi that the questions meant what I wanted them to mean before interviewing 22 people and discovering that they didn't mean what I thought they did.

I set my goals a little too high and too broad for the project, which resulted in a certain amount of stress. I was constantly slightly worried, rightly, that I wouldn't finish on time. I should have planned from the outset to focus only on the interviews and not try to learn anything about the educational system. Also, I should have focussed only on the young adult population and not tried to talk to children as well. Visiting the school was fun and good for my personal education, but did not end up fitting into the paper. I'm glad I went there,

because staying in my room doing interviews and transcribing them was driving me stir-crazy. However, I didn't need to interview the sixth graders, which took up time without adding to my paper, since I wasn't able to do more than three interviews.

My original plan had been to do 10 interviews of young adults and 10 of children. I'm glad I didn't end up doing that, because then the sample size of each population would have been even smaller.

I also didn't leave myself enough time to write the paper, which ended up being much longer than I expected. I couldn't resist trying to transcribe all the interviews, even though I knew I didn't really have time. If I had consistently spent all my spare time transcribing in the earlier weeks, I would have had time, but I would also have gone insane. For this reason, I only started writing three days before the end of the ISP period, which was a bad idea. I turned the paper in on time, but was unable to socialize or sleep in the few days after everyone came back but before the paper was due. Also, my paper probably would have been better if I'd had a few days to revise in, rather than one day.

Regrets aside, I think I've learned and grown more in this month than in any other month of my life (not including when I was a toddler and learning a gazillion new words of English a day). I gave myself a crash course on sociolinguistics and field methods, did some original (if paltry) research, and started recognizing and imitating places where the details of Chinese social behavior are not the same as American social behavior. I got used to eating rice for every meal and going to bed when the electricity cut out.

Possible future ISPs

- Qualitative study of how people model the different varieties of Fangyan and the boundaries between them.
- Qualitative study of whether people think of Fangyan or language in general as rule-governed, and how they talk about it. The goals of such a study might be to figure out how to ask about this matter, a step in developing materials that could be used to do a more quantitative study.
- For someone with fluent Chinese, an ethnographic look at code-choice.
- Find out why one of my respondents said that PTH and not Fangyan was their "mother tongue" (母语）.
- Investigate code-choice in media for indexical and register effects. Huang Xuanxian

recommended the movie 十余九美 as a comedy that plays with using different Fangyan, and she told me about a TV program that dubs cartoons into nonstandard Chinese, using different accents and MaPu.

- Compare attitudes and usage patterns between children and adults.

- Investigate how children acquire PTH as a second language, since they seem to do so without explicit instruction. Someone interested in how urban children who primarily speak Fangyan at home acquire PTH would want to observe kindergartens. Many people told me that schoolchildren have no trouble suddenly attending class in PTH because they've already been exposed to it in kindergarten and from television.

- Compare PTH education in rural/county and urban schools.

- If you does any of these, or anything linguistics related, please let me know so I can read your paper! This is a fascinating place linguistically and not nearly enough is known about it. (I'd also be happy to give advice about finding resources in Kunming.) My email address is elishevabina@gmail.com, and should be pretty stable as long as Google is.

Bibliography

Agheyisi, R and J Fishman. 1970. Language attitude studies: a brief survey of methodological approaches. *Anthropological Linguistics* , 12:5, 137-157.

Bai, Jianhua. 1994. Language attitudes and the spread of standard Chinese in China. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 18:2, 128-138.

Berthele, R. 2002. Attitudes and Mental Models of Language: On the Cognitive Foundation of Sociolinguistic Practice. *Målbryting* 6, 25-66.

Bolton, K and A S L Lam. 2006. Applied Linguistics in China.   In Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics, v. 1, Elseviers Ltd., Oxford, 350-356.

Bradley, D. 2006. China: Language Situation. In Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics, v. 1, Elseviers Ltd., Oxford, 319-323.

Chen, P. 1999. Modern Chinese: history and sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Contemporary Chinese Dictionary, Chinese-English Edition (现代汉语词典) . 2002. Beijing, China: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Dede, K. 2004. "Language Attitudes in Xining, Qinghai." *Language and Linguistics* 5:3, 543-557.

Dong, J., 2009. 'Isn't it enough to be a Chinese speaker': language ideology and migrant identity construction in a public primary school in Beijing. *Language & Communication* 29:2, 115–126.

——. 2010. The enregisterment of Putonghua in practice. *Language & Communication* 30, 265-275.

Frekko, S. 2009. "Normal" in Catalonia: Standard language, enregisterment, and the imagination of a national public. *Language in Society* 38, 71-93.

Gilliland, J. 2006. Language Attitudes and Ideologies in Shanghai, China. (Master's thesis.) The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Godley, A et. al. 2006. Preparing Teachers for Dialectically Diverse Classrooms. *Educational Researcher* 35, 30-37.

Kalmar, I et al. 1987. Language attitudes in Guangzhou, China. *Language in Society* 16, 499-508.

LaPolla, R. 2010. Language Contact and Language Change in the History of the Sinitic Languages. Selected Papers of Beijing Forum 2007. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2, 6858-6868.

Lum, J. 1976. Bilingual Policies in the People's Republic of China. *Studies in Comparative International Development* 11:1, 88-98.

Milroy, J. 2001. Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5:4, 530-555.

Ramsey, R. 1987. The Languages of China. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Saillard, C. 2004. 'On the promotion of Putonghua in China: how a standard language becomes a vernacular.' In Zhou M (ed.). Language policy in the People's Republic of China: theory and practice since 1949. Kluwer, Norwell, MA, 163–176.

Sun, C-F. 2006. Chinese: A Linguistic Introduction. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Tang, C. 2008. Mutual Intelligibility of Chinese Dialects: An Experimental Approach. (Dissertation.) The University of Leiden, Utrecht.

Wassink, A. 1999. Historic low prestige and seeds of change: attitudes toward Jamaican Creole. *Language in Society*, 28:1, 57-92.

Wassink A, and A Curzan. 2004. Addressing Ideologies around African American English. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 32:3, 171-185.

Wen-Chao Li, C. "Conflicting Notions of Language Purity: the Interplay of Archaising, Ethnographic, Reformist, Elitist and Xenophobic Purism in the Perception of Standard Chinese." *Language & Communication* 24:2 (2004): 97-133.

Woolard, K, and B Schieffelin. 1994. Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23, 55-82.

Yang, J. 2006. Language choice and industrialization: A case study of language use in Luoyang, China. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 16:2, 259-277

Zhou, M. 2001. The spread of Putonghua and language attitude changes in Shang hai and Guangzhou, China. *Multilingual Matters* 11, no. 2: 231-253.

Zhou, M. 2006. Language Education Policy in China.   In Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics, v. 1. Elseviers Ltd., Oxford, 442-446.

Human resources

I met with Professor Shi Qizeng, retired professor of English at Yunnan Normal University. He told me about his Chinese-English translation dictionary.

I also met with Professor Zheng Huawen, professor of Fangyan studies at Yunnan Normal University, who taught me about the differences between KMH and PTH.   He has contributed to a dictionary of KMH and done research on KMH grammar. However, he speaks little English.

A huge thanks to Yang Bicong for recording most of the speech samples. Thanks to Luo Meng for recording the PTKMH sample.

Luo Meng (Jenny), currently a second-year English major at Yunnan Minzu Daxue gave me invaluable assistance transcribing and understanding interviews, as did Zhou Yan and Huang Bi. Huang Bi is currently the proprietor of the Lotus Pool internet cafe in the basement of the student apartments at Minzu Daxue.   She is also a graduate student at Yunnan University, studying the evolution of the Chinese characters, and could potentially be a resource for other SIT students interested in linguistics. Her English is good but not fluent.

Huang Xuanxian (Winddy), Li Chunmei, and Luo Meng all helped me interpret the language situation and the interviews. They are all currently second-year students at Minzu Daxue.

I visited a sixth grade class at Shao Shan Elementary School (韶山小学）on Bei Men Jie. My contact there was their Chinese teacher, Zhao Laoshi, who Luo Laoshi put me in touch with.