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Recent years, sociolinguistic studies in China began to pay attention to language variation and change progress in the community of urban immigrants. The increasing amount of urban immigrants is, to a great extent, due to the opening-up policy of China at the end of the 1970s. Accompanied by unprecedentedly amount of people moving into metropolia such as Shanghai, Guangzhou, and Beijing, different linguistic varieties contact with each other intensively in a short period. Other than research discuss sociolinguistic changes happening in the southern part of China, this study aims at immigrants in Beijing from the northeast area of China. Through observing language attitude and phonetic and phonological choice of them when facing specific variables, this study demonstrates the relationship between linguistic practice and social variants of the immigrants. This paper demonstrates language attitude and language choice of the northeast immigrants of Beijing based on questionnaire and sociolinguistic interview.

1. Introduction

China has been carrying out the reform and opening-up policy for more than thirty years starting from the late 1970s. Accompanied by economic development, from the 1990s, China begins the process of rapid urbanization. A large amount of migrant influx into metropolis as a way to promote living standards of their own and their offspring. Consequently, different language varieties contact with each other intensively in such cities.

Beijing, which is the capital of the People’s Republic of China (PRC), as its political, economic and cultural center, attracts migrants from every corner of the country. According to official statistics\(^1\) by the end of 2009, there are 5.09 million migrants who have been living in Beijing for more than half a year, while the registered permanent population is 12.45 million.

\(^1\) Announced by Beijing Municipal Bureau of Statistics on Beijing Statistical Information Net. The Net is a classified, panoramic and professional information network system, which is created by sub-statistics departments of Beijing municipal government.
The linguistic market of Beijing presents a complex structure: the official language, Standard Mandarin Chinese (AKA Putonghua, hereafter PTH) co-exists with the local variety, Beijing Mandarin (hereafter BM) and different dialects brought by migrants from all over the country. Dialect contact in Beijing appeals my interest to explore in this paper that, what migrants’ attitude is toward BM and their dialect.

Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) classified studies of language attitude into three major categories: (i) language-oriented or language-directed attitudes; (ii) community-wide stereotyped impressions toward particular language or language varieties (in some cases, their speakers, functions, etc.); (iii) the implementation of different types of language attitudes. Although these three major categories of studies are not necessarily mutually exclusive, this paper pays attention to the second one: the social significance of language varieties. To be more specific: This paper aims at language attitude toward PTH, BM and North-eastern Mandarin (hereafter NM) of migrants in Beijing from Changchun (the provincial capital of Jilin province in the Northeast part of China).

The organization of this paper is as follows. First, I will give a brief introduction of PTH, BM, and NM, as well as the relationship of these three linguistic varieties. Then previous research regarding language attitude is provided. After that, information about participants of the study and methodology are presented. Finally, results of the study will be discussed with explanation explored on it.

2. Putonghua, Beijing Mandarin, and Northeast Mandarin

Since this study involves language attitude and language variation between PTH, BM and NM, a brief introduction of the three and the relationship between them is necessary.

The official definition of Putonghua is:

Putonghua takes northern Mandarin as its basis, the Beijing Mandarin phonological system as its norm of pronunciation, and exemplary modern baihua (vernacular) literary language (referred to as classic Chinese) as its norm of grammar. (Huang & Liao 2002)

PTH is the standard variety of spoken Mandarin in Main Land China. BM is a variety in the northern Mandarin dialect group (Zhang 2005). The standard form of BM is spoken by people who live in the downtown area of Beijing. NM subordinates to north dialect group, which is one of the seven dialect regions in China. It is also a variety of Mandarin Chinese, commonly known as ‘Dongbei Hua’. As its name reveals, NM is used by people in the Northeast part of Mainland China, in provinces like Heilongjiang, Jilin, and Liaoning.

From the perspective of their language attitude, both Pekinese and northeast people thought they could speak PTH correctly, fluently, and some may even express the view that they are using it every day. However, either from the description of PTH or of
the dialect group of BM and NM, although PTH and BM share the same phonetic inventory, it is certainly not the case that all Pekinese use PTH in their daily life. Moreover, although NM is similar with PTH on phonology, lexicon, and syntax, it has its characters as well. In the following paragraphs, I list some of the specific examples to demonstrate the differences between the three linguistic varieties.

Discussed in the research carried out by Hu Mingyang (Hu 1987), BM and Putonghua have differences in both phonetic and lexicon.

Table 1 below shows some examples of which the same Chinese characters have only one pronunciation in BM, while two kinds of pronunciation in PTH:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Beijing Mandarin</th>
<th>Putonghua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>剥</td>
<td>bāo [bɑo55]</td>
<td>bāo [bɑo55], bō [b055]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>薄</td>
<td>báo [bɑo35]</td>
<td>báo [bɑo35], bó [b035]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>嚼</td>
<td>jiáo [tɕia35]</td>
<td>jiáo [tɕia35], jué [tɕye35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>绿</td>
<td>lǜ [ly51]</td>
<td>lǜ [ly51], lù [lu51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>色</td>
<td>shǎi [ʂ’ai214]</td>
<td>shǎi [ʂ’ai214], sè [s’y51]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another notable difference lies in Rhotacization. Rhotacization or commonly called “er-hua” in Mandarin Chinese, is a phonological process in which the sub-syllabic retroflex [-t] is added to the final, and causes the final to become rhotacized (Chao 1968). This feature is especially prominent in Beijing Mandarin (Chao 1968). Many words in BM must be rhotacized while in Putonghua they are usually not. In table 2 I list some words of this kind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Beijing Mandarin</th>
<th>Putonghua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>盆儿</td>
<td>[b’en35]</td>
<td>[b’en35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>事儿</td>
<td>[ʂ‘i35]</td>
<td>事 [ʂ‘j35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>树叶儿</td>
<td>[ʂ‘u51 jɛ41]</td>
<td>树叶 [ʂ‘u51 jɛ41]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>茶几儿</td>
<td>[ʦA35 tɕi55]</td>
<td>茶几 [ʦA35 tɕi55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>干劲儿</td>
<td>[kan51 tɕin51]</td>
<td>干劲 [kan51 tɕin51]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The neutral tone is also a phonetic difference between BM and PTH. The general picture is that there are more neutral tones in BM than in PTH. Table 3 shows some words having this kind of difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Beijing Mandarin</th>
<th>Putonghua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>明白</td>
<td>míngbai [mǐn35 bai]</td>
<td>míngbái [mǐn35 bai35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>知道</td>
<td>zhīdào [tʂǐ55 təu]</td>
<td>zhīdào [tʂǐ55 təu51]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most obvious difference between BM and PTH lies in the lexicon (Hu 1987). Although many words of BM were absorbed into PTH, still a lot more, especially some commonly used expressions, are different between the two (Hu 1987). Table 4 is examples of some expression differences between BM and PTH.

Table 4. Difference in lexicon between PTH & BM of the same meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beijing Mandarin</th>
<th>Putonghua</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>没辙</td>
<td>没办法</td>
<td>have no idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>赶明儿</td>
<td>以后</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>伍的</td>
<td>什么的</td>
<td>and so forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>头里</td>
<td>前面</td>
<td>in front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>抠</td>
<td>吝啬</td>
<td>stingy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From those examples, we can take a clear view of the difference between BM and PTH. However, none of the research has been done to discuss the relationship between PTH, BM and NM, especially to compare specific linguistic variables of the three varieties. Table 5, 6 and 7 showed the differences in phonetic and lexicon of the three linguistic varieties which are chosen by me using “Janming Dongbei Fangyan Cidian1 (Xu & Zhang 1998), “Xiandai Beijing Kouyu Cidian2” (Chen, Song & Zhang 1997) and ‘Beijing Kouyu Yuliao Chaxun Xitong3’, and with the help of two native Pekinese who have been living in Beijing since they were born as well as their parents.

Table 5. Difference in lexicon between PTH-BM and NM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BM &amp; Putonghua</th>
<th>Northeast Mandarin</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>恶心</td>
<td>嘿 影</td>
<td>nausea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>吹 牛</td>
<td>白 话</td>
<td>brag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>不 好</td>
<td>不咋地</td>
<td>not good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>什么时候</td>
<td>嘿时候</td>
<td>when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>脏</td>
<td>埋汰</td>
<td>dirty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Tone differences between PTH-BM and NM of the same word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>BM &amp; Putonghua</th>
<th>Northeast Mandarin</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>扔</td>
<td>rēng [ʐəŋ55]</td>
<td>lēng [ləŋ55]</td>
<td>throw away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>七个</td>
<td>qīge [tɕi55 kɣ]</td>
<td>qīge [tɕi35 kɣ]</td>
<td>seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>这个</td>
<td>zhēige [tɕei51 kɣ]</td>
<td>zēige [tɕei51 kɣ]</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>破玩意</td>
<td>pòwányìr [b’o51 wan35 i51]</td>
<td>pèwán’rěng [b’ɣ51 wan35 żəŋ]</td>
<td>worn out things</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Difference in lexicon between PTH, BM and NM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Putonghua</th>
<th>Beijing Mandarin</th>
<th>Northeast Mandarin</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>白费功夫</td>
<td>瞎耽误功夫</td>
<td>白扯</td>
<td>waste of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>胡说</td>
<td>瞎掰</td>
<td>扯</td>
<td>talk nonsense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>早着呢</td>
<td>且呢</td>
<td>早和儿呢</td>
<td>too early to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>可能</td>
<td>横是</td>
<td>背不住</td>
<td>possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>嘀叨</td>
<td>嘀吧</td>
<td>墨迹</td>
<td>nagging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the discussion above, I have listed some linguistic variables to make a distinction between PTH, BM, and NM, which was commonly considered as varieties without many differences. These variables are recognized by users of each linguistic variety as speech features associated with social and personal characteristics. In the following part, I will make an introduction to the participants and methodology of this paper.

3. Previous Research

The study of language attitude emerges in the field of sociolinguistics in the 1960s, when Lambert and his colleagues developed matched guise technique (Lambert et al. 1960) to measure evaluation reactions to English and French by English Canadians (EC) and French Canadians (FC). A series of studies were made (e.g., Anisfeld et al. 1964; Lambert et al. 1965, 1966; see Ryan & Giles 1982 for an overview of such studies) applying the technique or refined version of the technique in some bilingual settings.

The following studies concentrated on language attitude of immigrants toward their native languages and language varieties of the places where they moved into: Puerto Rican immigrants in New York City (Attinasi 1983); immigrants of five nationality groups (Central Americans, Cubans, Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, and South Americans) in New York City (Garcia 1988); Italian immigrants in Sydney (Bettoni & Gibbons 1988) and Canada (Bourhis & Sachdev 1984). These studies focused on Western countries and Western languages. So what about studies concerning language attitude in China and Chinese?
From 1956, China begins its language planning policy to promote the nationwide use of Putonghua2 (SMC). Since the late 1970s, the economic development lead to dialect contact in Chinese metropolis, which gave rise to a series of language attitude studies in Guangzhou (Canton)3 and Shanghai (Kalmar, Yong & Hong 1987; Gao, Su & Zhou 2000; Zhou 2001; Wang, Ladegaard 2008; Xu 2008) where were in the leading positions of China’s economic development.

Hong Kong appeals scholar’s attention when it facing the change of sovereignty in 1997 from Britain to China. Studies were trying to track the language attitudes’ change toward Cantonese, English, and SMC in Hong Kong after it entered a new post-colonial era (Gabbert 1996; Hyland 1997; Lai 2002, 2005; 2011). Studies can also be seen to examine language attitude between ethnic minority languages and SMC (Wan & Wang 1997; Zhou 1999, 2000).

Previous language attitude studies inside China mainly focused on the relationship between local dialect and SMC. From the 1980s, industrialization, commercialization and greater demographic mobility have changed what used to be homogenous speech communities (Zhou 2001). Large cities attracted domestic migrants seeking a better education and employment. However, none of the previous studies discussed language attitude toward migrants’ native dialect and the local dialect in a metropolis where they move into. Furthermore, all the previous studies concentrated on the geographic area of the Southern part of China, for instance, Shanghai, Guangzhou and Hong Kong.

In this paper, I will focus on migrants’ attitude (migrant from Changchun in Beijing) toward their local dialect (NM) and dialect of the place they move into (BM) and trying to find answers to these questions:

1. What is the language attitude of northeastern migrants toward PTH, Beijing Mandarin (BM), and Northeastern dialect (ND)?
2. How are gender and age influencing northeastern migrants’ language attitude and language practice?

4. Methodology

In what follows, I will first introduce the 20 participants, mainly on how I recruited them and their social backgrounds. Second, I will introduce how the questionnaire and interview were designed, and what I am looking for from them.

4.1 Participants

Considering the aim and dimension of this investigation, random sampling is not employed, because this study aims at northeast immigrants who are living in Beijing. Those NIBs share residential area with native Pekinese, not having stand-alone living area. The mixed living status decides that random sampling is not appropriate for this
study. Specifically speaking, subjects were selected by two methods. In places like school libraries, for example, I take chance sampling which categorized to non-random sampling method by Chen (Chen 1999); and the other subjects were chosen through the method of ‘a friend of a friend’, by which the subjects will not be concentrated in schools confined by my personal contact ranges, so as to ensure the subjects’ quantity and most importantly, diversify the social stratum of the investigation. In all the 20 participants, female and male subjects each have an equal number of 10. They are all northeast immigrants either work or study in Beijing for more than one year. Their age is between 12 and 40.

4.2 Questionnaire

The structure of the questionnaire takes Lei’s investigation of immigrants in Shanghai (Lei 2008) as a reference.

*Personal background information.* The first part is to ask about subjects’ personal background information, including date of birth, gender, educational background, and occupation. Sociolinguistics research found that language variation is not only influenced by inner factors of language system itself but also affected by many social variables such as age, gender, and social status. If we just study language from its inner structure, not consider outside social factors, then we cannot reveal language’s psychological characters and its’ social structure (Schilling-Estes 2002).

*Language use.* This part is about NIB’s language use by asking directly what kind of language variety they may choose. Phonetic and phonological variables were selected from PTH, BM and NM:

I select eight phonetic and phonological variables which are different between PTH, BM and NM, including: three items of (o) variation; one items of (ʐ) variation; one item of (tʂ) variation; three items of tone variation: from first tone in PTH and BM, change into third tone in NM. In the list below, the first variant is the standard form of PTH and BM, and the latter is of NM:

1. variable (o): [o] and [ɣ]
   - ‘neck’ bózi [bo35 tsɿ], bězi [bɣ35 tsɿ]
   - ‘spinach’ bōcài [bo55 tsʻai51], bēcài [bɣ55 tsʻai41]

2. variable (ʐ): [ʐ] and [l]
   - ‘throwaway’ rēng [ʐəŋ55], lēng [ləŋ55]

3. variable (tʂ): [ʦ] and [ts]
   - ‘this one’ zhèige [ʦei41 kɿ], zèige [tsei41 kɿ]

I also select a tone variable which is considered as a remarkable symbol to distinguish NM from PTH and BM:
By this investigation, I want to observe NIB’s language choice when facing specific phonetic and phonological variables of each language varieties. Through quantitative analysis of their language choice and the association with their social background, I made discussions upon social variables’ influence on language variation and choice.

Social contact. The last part of the questionnaire asks about subjects’ social contact, such as, people from what area do subjects like to associate with, and how much time each day do subjects get in touch with the mass media. Since communicating with different linguistic variety users would exert influence on people’s linguistic practice and choice, it is necessary to make an investigation of subjects’ social contact.

4.3 Sociolinguistic interview

In the interview, I want to observe participants’ language attitude by asking them questions directly. Language attitude is people’s attitude toward different languages, dialects, accents and its users. It can be revealed from evaluations of users’ personal character, and can also be demonstrated by subjects’ evaluation of varieties’ characters, exactness, function (Trudgill 2003).

The interviews were conducted after participants finished their questionnaires, and for each participant, the interview was conducted in his/her workplace or school environment where they used to work or study in. The reason I did not take the interview in a place which might be quieter and has fewer people around is that, to put participants into an unfamiliar environment may affect their language use into an unnatural status. There is two general topics in the interview: (1) Attitude toward PTH, BM, NM, and the usage of these three varieties. (2) The reason they choose to use one kind of variant, such as the reason of using [ʐ] between [ʐ] and [l] in which the latter is the phonetic form of NM. Each interview lasted for 20 to 30 minutes.

5. Results

Limited by the length of this paper, I choose one part of the investigation in the questionnaire to make a discussion: NIB’s language choice of specific phonetic and phonological variables. Based on participants’ gender, age and motivation move to Beijing, I analyze the different language choices between them.

5.1 Gender

Gender disparity is one of the most active social variables in today’s sociolinguistic research. Studies have shown that females use more prestigious standard variant than male language users do (Trdugill 1972).
As shown in Figure 1 in percentage, for variable (o) and (ʐ), all the female subjects choose to use the standard variant of PTH and BM, instead of [ɣ] and [l], both of which are the typical phonetics of NM; for variable (tʂ) and (55), 90% of female choose the standard form.

![Figure 1. Comparison of use of the four variables by female and male NIB](image)

Analyzing the social-economic and cultural status of Beijing and northeast area of China, I try to make an explanation of female participants’ language choice. Compared to Beijing, it is the fact that northeast area of China is less developed, and consequently, was considered less cultivated. The bias was emphasized by recent years’ mass media, in video programs such as television series and movies. The effect is more prominent in TV short sketches which are acted by performers using laughable NM as a way to please the audience; especially those live telecasted in each year’s evening party on the Spring Festival, the audience of which may cover 80% of the population of China. It is indispensable to watch the party on television with all the family members to spend that festival for most Chinese people. The imitations of dialects in the Spring Festival party, on the one hand, help to spread NM in China, but on the other hand, it also negatively deepens the funny, vulgar impression of NM in Chinese people. It is a plausible explanation for female participants’ comparatively identical linguistic choice to use a standard variant, rather than NM variant: because the association with northeast native when using NM may damage a woman’s character to the extent of rustic and uncultivated.

This type of disparity corresponds with the research on social status and power of female language users that, compared with men, women are mostly endowed with lower social status and power in the society. The outcome is that women have to use a more prestigious linguistic variant to emphasize their social status and power, to be respected (Labov 2001: 275~279). It is confirmed by women participants in the sociolinguistic interview on the attitude they have toward these variables. NM variants were commented to be:
‘tài tǔqi le, méirén yòng’ (It is too rustic, no one will use it), or
‘shuo zhe ge yin hui beiren xiaohua’ (I would be laughed at if use that kind of pronunciation)

We could summarize from these attitudes that, NM variants have a stigmatized local character type in NIB’s language ideology.

In the study of American English, researchers (e.g., Shuy, Wolfram & Riley 1967, Wolfram 1969, Fasold 1968) also found that males used a higher percentage of non-standard forms than females did. Figure 2 shows that the pattern in the studies of English is also the case for this study. For six male participants out of 10 take the standard variant, and the rest 4 of them still choose to use a variant of NM. Male Participants in this study who choose NM variant are those who evaluate NM as having higher prestige compared to PTH and BM. As discussed above, NM was considered rustic and uncultivated by women participates. Contrarily, during the interview, some men convey that NM is a kind of dialect which can reveal one’s masculinity.

As one of the male participants said:

‘…Shuo dòngběihuà xiànde rén hěn zhíshuài, bùxiàng běijínghuà nàme tuōla ’
(It appears direct to speak NM, not like someone speaks BM who seems sluggish)

Compared to those who choose to use [ʐ] variant, those who use [l] variant expressed their attitude that using NM can promote their impression left on others because the northeast man represents the character of courageous, straightforward and trustworthy. At this point, we have therefore been able to argue that NM has prestige in
some NIBs because using NM reveals one’s masculinity. This explains the different language choice between female and male participants.

Figure 3. Comparison of use of four linguistic variables by female NIB

By Figure 3, we also noticed that among the four variables chosen by female participants, two subjects have different language choice compared to others: one of them chooses to use the NM variant of [ts] and the other choose [35]. Search for their personal information, I find out that the woman who uses [ts] variant has been living in Beijing for 20 years. The only possible reason she has not changed her language choice is that, she was from Heilongjiang Province, since all the other male participants from the same place has the same choice of [ts], we infer that variant [ts] of Heilongjiang Province dialect is an obstinate dialect attribute which may stick in one’s language use for even 20 years when the use of other variables have changed to standard form. The similar phenomenon lies in (55) variable: all the male participants from Liaoning Province choose the [35] variant, which explains the only woman participants who are also from Liaoning Province has the same choice. We can conclude based on this point that, although variant [ts] and [35] both belong to NM, however, each has its’ own regional character compared to other variants. More research are needed to focus on language choices of NIB from different areas to see whether there is any disparity of language variation and choice between immigrants from different regions of the northeast area. In the following section, I will discuss NIB’s language choice by their age and motivation to immigrate.

5.2 Age

The standard model of linguistic change related to age is that, in the oldest generation, a small number of one kind of variant emerges; of the middle age, the appearing frequency of this variant increases; in the youngest generation, this variant are used most frequently (Chambers et al. 2002:355). This is the model of a newly emerging variant contacting with a stable linguistic variety. However, this study emphasizes urban
immigrants move into a city where two kinds of varieties are stably used, PTH and BM. My assumption of NIB’s language variation and change is that the change will be more evident with the longer time span living in Beijing of each age group. The initial consideration to design this part of the investigation is aimed at depicting NIB’s language changing in progress by their differential language choice distributed among each age group. However, limited by the number of participants of the investigation, not enough and a proportional number of subjects is taken for each age group: four participants of 10 to 20 years old; eleven of 20 to 30 years old; and five of 30 to 40 years old.

Figure 3. Comparison of use of four linguistic variables by age variation of NIB

As we can see in Figure 3, in group I, all of the four participants choose to use the standard form, while they are in the group with shortest time span living in Beijing, all of them have lived in Beijing for less than two years. Group III shows almost the same language choice with group I, except for the choice of (ts) variable, one of them choose variant [ʐ]. For group II, for the variable (o), (ʐ) and (tʂ), seven compared to 4 of them use NM variant [ɣ], [l] and [ts]. While for the variable (55), six compared to 5 of them use standard variant [55]. (Despite) As the aim to observe NIB’s language choice on the view of age variation cannot be achieved, I try to explain it by coalition with their motivation to move to Beijing.

All of the four participants in Group I are elementary school students who move to Beijing with their parents for the education of higher quality than that of their hometown. Moreover, particularly, by studying in Beijing as a registered permanent residence, they can attend university more easily by taking University Entrance Examination of Beijing district where the attendance rate is much higher; instead of competing with students all over the country. Because of this benefit, as well as Beijing’s various cultural and recreational activities, one participant said that:
‘wǒxīhuān Běijīng, zài zhèr bǐzài lǎojiāyōuyìsì duōlè’
(I like Beijing, it is more enjoyable to live here than my hometown.)

The sub-consciously but actively participates in the life of Beijing explains why all of the four subjects aged 10 to 20 choose to use a standard variant. They want to be part of their classmates and appear to be a real Pekinese who can speak PTH and BM without NM accent.

Group II consists of college students and young graduates who work in Beijing. The two kinds of participants’ present different language choices: college students are more inclined to use NM variants than those who work in Beijing. The following discussion is largely speculative because of the lack of concrete evidence.

Firstly, students spend their time mainly in the school environment, to use NM variant will not have much influence on their study, because the grade of each course largely relies on written work. Secondly, those students have just been away from their parents for less than three years; compared to NIB students in elementary school; college students can find friends and fellow-villagers more easily, the homesick make them spend more time with them. It also leads to the slow change of their language choice. As for students of Group I, their motivation to use a standard form of the variant is much more intensive than the college students do.

As for those who work in Beijing, to get a job related to their value, except for their professional skills and diploma, their language attribute is also combined as part of their capacity for a job. Job applicants are competitors and commodities in the market, and they have to sell themselves (Zhang 2005). It urges these NIBs to use the standard form variant of PTH, or the variant of local characters, BM, to be accepted by the local market. In conclusion, the powerful position of PTH and BM in Beijing’s linguistic market determines NIB working people’s language choice. However, more investigations of language attitude need to be done to confirm it.

Participants in group III all work in Beijing, but the time span they move in varies from just one year to almost 20 years. The lack of participants varied in their background (more participants who have lived in Beijing for reasons other than study or work are needed) cause this part of investigation cannot be analyzed as my initial objective to design this part of the question. However, language choice of group III of all the four variables shows similar though less dramatic pattern. Just on a variable (tʂ), one of the five participants choose to use NM variant; the reason was discussed in the above, as a firm regional phonetic character of Heilongjiang Province. The comparatively unanimous language choice of group III demonstrates again that in the linguistic market of Beijing, PTH and BM has the most powerful position. Anyone who wants to find a position in this linguistic market has to accommodate with language use of the market, which is to adopt the use of PTH and BM.
6. Conclusion

The investigation of the language variation and choice of the Northeast Immigrants in Beijing indicates that in the linguistic market of Beijing, PTH and BM as either Standard Mainland Mandarin or highly prestigious local dialect enjoy the most valuable linguistic capital. Possession of these two kinds of linguistic capital helps NIB to become competitively participant in Beijing. The relatively consistent language changing tendency is a lively illustration: 90% of female participants choose to use the standard form variants; as for male, there are also 60% of them choose the standard form. I explain the disparity of female and male participants’ language choice as socio-culture factors underlying the linguistic variety. NM has the prominent masculine character of straightforward and outright, such features would be admired by men participants and on the other hand, avoided intentionally by women. Since in the society, women are more status-conscious than men (Martin 1954) and are therefore more inclined to get their social status and power using a variety of high prestige than men did. By observing NIB’s language choice by their motivation to move to Beijing, this study finds that for immigrants who are seeking better education in Beijing, younger elementary students are more likely to change their using of NM into PTH and BM. For college students, the less intensive aspiration for involving into Beijing linguistic market causes different language choice compared with younger NIB students’. However, working NIB has the most frequent social contact with Pekinese and people from all over the country, their language choice is at one hand unconsciously influenced by their colleges, and on the other hand, the convenient and benefit it has to use PTH and BM is the main reason of their choice to use the standard form variants.

Through the investigation of immigrants’ varied participation in the linguistic market, this study explore explanations for the immigrants’ distinct linguistic practices. The findings reveal the sociocultural implications of immigrants’ language attitude and linguistic practices and could serve as valuable references for language policies. As I have discussed at the beginning, studies upon the immigrants in the southern part of China focus solely on language attitude, this study takes language attitude as a basis to the analysis of the Northeast immigrants’ language choice of phonological variants, and it attempts to shed light on the socio-culture implication beneath the surface of language attitude. At the same time, for practical nature, my study may help with language planning in the standardization of speech.
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