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Abstract

The emergence of perfective ‘already’ is attested in Cantonese-English bilingual children and a number of Southeast Asian contact languages. Analyzing the use of already in Cantonese-English bilingual children, we find that both the semantic and syntactic properties of the Cantonese [zo2 ... laa3] construction are mapped on already. While the emergence of perfective ‘already’ is usually discussed under the framework of grammaticalization (e.g., Matthews & Yip, 2009), this paper demonstrates that it should also constitute a case of relabeling. Based on our analysis, we will discuss the relationship between relabeling and grammaticalization, and argue that the two research frameworks are complementary instead of mutually exclusive.
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1. Introduction

Relabeling (aka relexification) is a semantically driven mental operation which “consists in assigning a lexical entry a new label derived from a phonetic string drawn from another language” (Lefebvre, 2015, p. 1). It plays a key role in a wide range of language contact situations, from L2 acquisition at the individual level to contact language formation (e.g. creole genesis) at the communal level (Lefebvre, 1998, 2008). The concept of relabeling is theoretically appealing as it
represents a uniformitarian approach to language contact studies which can potentially address the connection between bilingual development and contact language formation, and is consistent with Mufwene (2001)’s important notion that all kinds of linguistic innovations and changes observable at the communal level must logically stem from the idiolectal level. As Lefebvre (2008) illustrates, relabeling is (partly) synonymous with several different terms commonly used in the literature of language contact, such as calquing, transfer, and reanalysis.

Grammaticalization, on the other hand, is considered a separate process (Lefebvre, 2009), despite its relevance to semantic inference. The emergence of perfective aspect in Cantonese-English bilingual children, a phenomenon revealing the intriguing parallels between bilingual development and contact language formation, constitutes the focus of this study. The English utterances of Cantonese-English bilingual children show a number of parallels with Singapore Colloquial English (Singlish) (Yip & Matthews, 2007), one of which is the use of bare verb forms together with already when inflectional morphemes such as the -ed and -en verbal suffixes are required in Standard English (1-4).

Cantonese-English bilingual children’s English (Yip & Matthews, 2007)

(1) You wipe your mouth **already**? (Kasen 3:00)

(2) You swallow the short teeth **already**. (Timmy 3:01)

Singlish (Bao, 2005)

(3) I wash my hand **already**.
   ‘I have washed/washed my hands.’ (Bao, 2005, p. 239)

(4) I see the movie **already**.
   ‘I have seen/saw the movie.’ (Bao, 2005, p. 238)

Matthews & Yip (2009) argue that the emergence of perfective already presents a case of ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization, and make an important observation that both the [V zo2 ... laa3] and [V saai3 ... laa3] constructions may serve as the models for interlingual identification. Meanwhile, if we adopt the concept of relabeling, we don’t have to invoke the theory
of grammaticalization. Instead, “what is being transferred into the creole is a lexical item with all of its functions, thus a multifunctional lexical entry” (Lefebvre, 2004, p. 180). In this case, the emergence of perfective already can be viewed as a result of transfer of both the lexical and grammatical functions of some corresponding Cantonese (substrate) lexical entry to the English (superstrate) already. Given that Lefebvre (2009) does acknowledge that grammaticalization plays a role in creole genesis, we would like to ask what different roles do relabeling and grammaticalization play in contact situations? Is it necessary (and feasible) to draw a clear distinction between them?

To address these questions and other relevant issues, we first review and discuss issues concerning grammaticalization (especially those occurring in contact situations) (Section 2), thereby outlining a framework for analysis. We then analyze how already develops into a perfective marker in Cantonese-English bilingual children, and report findings on the bilingual children’s use of already in terms of function and placement (Section 3), which lay the foundation for the discussion of issues concerning grammaticalization and relabeling (Section 4).

2. Grammaticalization

Grammaticalization theory is concerned with the emergence and development of grammatical forms and constructions. According to Hopper & Traugott (2003, p. 18), the phenomenon of grammaticalization refers to “the change whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions”. A typical example in English is the grammaticalization of the motion verb go into an auxiliary which expresses immediate futurity, as in “He’s going to go to school soon” (Bybee et al., 1994; Hopper & Traugott, 2003). Interestingly, the grammaticalization of a motion verb meaning go into a future marker has occurred independently in a wide range of languages, such as English, French, Bari, Sotho, Zulu, Margi, Bassa, Klao, Igbo, Ecuadorian Quechua, Tamil, Basque (Heine & Kuteva, 2002), suggesting that such a phenomenon may be shaped by some universal processes of grammatical change, which may include the inherent conceptual link between go and the sense of futurity.
2.1. Contact-induced grammaticalization: an overview

Until recently, grammaticalization has typically been viewed as a “language-internal” process as there used to be a widespread assumption among linguists that grammatical structure, or syntax, cannot be “borrowed” (Heine & Kuteva, 2010). However, new findings from a number of fields, particularly areal typology (Ansaldo, 2009; Dahl, 2004; Enfield, 2013; Heine & Kuteva, 2003, 2005) and creole studies (Arends et al., 1994), have provided abundant evidence to demonstrate that grammaticalization could result from “external” factors such as geographical clustering and substrate influence. In their seminal work on grammaticalization, Hopper & Traugott (2003, p. 230) also acknowledge the important link between language contact and grammaticalization, concluding that “[c]ontact has been an important factor for most languages, and a strictly monogenetic view of grammaticalization is ultimately inappropriate”.

Analyzing data from a wide range of languages, an important observation highlighted by Heine & Kuteva (2005) is that the principles of grammaticalization are the same regardless of whether or not language contact is involved. Similarly, Matthews & Yip (2009) see contact as a catalyst driving change along pathways of grammaticalization, and suggest that “the general principles of grammaticalization are applicable, not only to the substrate language(s) in which grammaticalization originally took place, but also to the contact language affected by it” (Matthews & Yip, 2009, p. 373).

For example, while the use of equivalents of ‘already’ as a perfective aspect marker (the focus of this study) is observed in contact varieties such as the English-based Singlish (Bao, 2005), the Spanish-based Zamboanga Chabacano (realized as ya) (Steinkrüger, 2013) (5), and the Portuguese-based Papi Kristang (realized as ja) (Baxter, 2013) (6), it is noteworthy that such a grammaticalization process has also developed ‘internally’ in languages like Inuit and Buli (Bybee et al., 1994).

(5) Éle ya-matá pwérko gat Alyá gránde (Steinkrüger, 2013)

3SG PFV-kill pig really there big

‘S/he killed a really big pig there.’

The abbreviations used in this paper are as follows: 1 = 1st person; 2 = 2nd person; 3 = 3rd person; CLF = classifier; NEG = negation; PASS = passive; PERM = permissive; PFV = perfective; PL = plural; PRT = particle; SFP = sentence-final particle; SG = singular.
Such an observation is consistent with Mufwene (2001, 2008)’s argument against the distinction between “internally motivated change” and “externally motivated change”. Contact plays a crucial role in Mufwene’s approach to language evolution as he maintains that all kinds of linguistic change are made possible by the interaction between different idiolects, regardless of whether they are artificially labelled as “internally motivated” or “externally motivated”. In short, although grammaticalization may be triggered in contact situations, its underlying principles remain unaffected.

2.2. Ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization

Heine & Kuteva (2005, p. 80) distinguish “two main types of contact-induced grammaticalization depending on whether or not there exists already a model source-to-target grammaticalization process to be replicated”. If no such model exists, the process is referred to as ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization (whereas the other type is known as replica grammaticalization). The mechanisms involved in the transfer of grammatical concept or structure from the model language (M) to the replica language (R) in ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization are as follows:

(7) Ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 81)
   
a. Speakers notice that in language M there is a grammatical category Mx.

b. They develop an equivalent category Rx in language R on the basis of the use patterns available in R.

c. To this end, they draw on universal strategies of grammaticalization, using construction Ry in order to develop Rx.

d. They grammaticalize category Ry to Rx.

This process, according to Hickey (2010, p. 155), is “an unconscious one and persists even with speakers who have considerable target language proficiency”.

The use of already as a perfective aspect marker in Singlish is an example of ordinary contact-
induced grammaticalization, in which a new grammatical category was developed in the replica
language (Singlish, a contact variety of English) due to transfer from the model languages (Southern
Sinitic and Malay varieties). Compared to Standard English, Singlish seldom employs inflectional
morphology. Its aspectual system, as Bao (2005, p. 237) puts it, is “essentially the Chinese system
filtered through the morphosyntax of English”. For example, already occurs after uninflected verbs
to mark perfective aspect without involving any inflectional morpheme. This is consistent with
the use of the perfective aspect marker liau51 in Hokkien, one of the most important substrate
languages in the formation of Singlish (Ansaldo, 2009):

(8) a.  He eat already [Singlish]
    He eat PFV

    ‘He has eaten’

b.  i55>33 tsia25>32 pfi33>21 liau51 [Hokkien]

    3SG eat rice PFV

    ‘He has eaten’

In this case, the Singlish speakers grammaticalized a lexical item into an aspect marker instead of
using inflectional morphology to mark perfective aspect, following the aspect-marking strategy of
the substrate languages.

3. Emergence of perfective already in Cantonese-English bilingual children

The use of already as a perfective marker in Cantonese-English bilingual children was first discussed
in Kwan-Terry (1989) and further investigated in Yip & Matthews (2007). According to these
studies, the bilingual children’s development is parallel to the development of already as a perfective
aspect marker in Singlish, which is used in post-verbal or clause-final position to express perfective
notions such as completion and change of state. Such a use of already is observed in all nine children
in the Hong Kong Bilingual Child Language Corpus (Yip & Matthews, 2007), regardless of their
dominant language (Szeto et al., 2017). The question is – why is already (but not any other lexical
item) identified as a perfective marker?
3.1. *Already and the Cantonese [zo2 ... laa3] construction*

The development of *already* into a marker of perfective aspect is attested in a number of languages (see Section 2.1). The existence of such parallel developments is suggestive of some inherent conceptual links between the semantics of *already* and the sense of perfectivity.

The English adverb *already* is often associated with completed events, which makes it a natural perfective aspect marker. For example, in (9), the event of starting is completed when the event of arriving occurs.

(9) The performance had *already* started when we arrived.

However, as Traugott & Waterhouse (1969) and Soh (2009) point out, in addition to a “change of state” interpretation, an important feature associated with the use of already is that the assertion made by the sentence is contrary to what one may expect or assume (referred to as the “contrary to expectation” interpretation by Soh (2009))\(^2\). For example, the sentence in (9) implies that the performance began earlier than expected. A more noticeable example involving a “contrary to expectation” sense is given in (10), where B uses *already* to correct A’s wrong assumption B hasn’t finished his/her homework yet.

(10) A: You have to finish your homework first.
    B: I’ve finished my homework *already*!

As Soh (2009) demonstrates, the semantics of *already* is similar to the Mandarin sentence-final particle *le*, which corresponds closely to the Cantonese *laa3* (Matthews & Yip, 2013). The Cantonese *laa3* is a sentence-final particle which functions to express current relevance (Matthews & Yip, 2013) or a change of state (Cheung, 2007). It often co-occurs with the perfective aspect marker *zo2* to describe a completed event which has current relevance, thus entailing a change of state, as in (11), where there must be a prior state in which the speaker has not returned home.

(11) Ｎｇｏ５ ｆaac1-zo2 ｕk1kei2 ｌaa3
    １sg     return-PFV  home     SFP

\(^2\)As Soh (2009, p. 624) demonstrates, the “change of state” and “contrary to expectation” interpretations are independent of each other. In some contexts, already may only carry the “contrary to expectation” interpretation without any “change of state” interpretation (but not the other way around).
‘I have returned home’

Like already, the \[zo2 \ldots laa3\] construction may express senses of “change of state” and “contrary to expectation” simultaneously. For example, the utterance of B in (12) is associated with a sense of “contrary to expectation” because the fact that “B has eaten” is in contrast with A’s inviting B to join him/her for a meal. At the same time, B’s utterance also conveys the meaning that the eating event is completed and s/he has changed from a state of “not having eaten” to “having eaten”. (13) is the English equivalent of (12), in which already carries the “change of state” and “contrary to expectation” readings.

(12) a. Heoi3 m4 heoi3 sik6 faan6 aa3?
go NEG go eat rice SFP

‘Will you go and eat the meal?’

b. Ngo5 sik6-zo2 je5 laa3
1SG eat-PFV thing SFP

‘I’ve already eaten’

(13) A: Let’s go eat, shall we?
B: No, I’ve already eaten.

Although the \[zo2 \ldots laa3\] construction shares some properties with already in the above example, the differences in acceptability between (14) and (15) suggest that they differ in the obligatoriness of the “contrary to expectation” reading when responding to a neutral yes/no question, the use of \[zo2 \ldots laa3\] construction is perfectly acceptable, but the use of already in (16) sounds unnatural to native speakers. This is because the “contrary to expectation” reading inherently associated with already is incompatible with a neutral context; meanwhile, the use of \[zo2 \ldots laa3\] construction in (14) does not pose a problem because it is not obligatorily associated with a “contrary to expectation” reading. See Szeto et al. (2017) for a more detailed analysis of the congruence between already, zo2, and laa3.

(14) a. Maai5-zo2 bun2 syu1 mei6 aa3?
buy-PFV CLF book NEG SFP?

‘Have you bought the book?’
Based on the above analysis, the high degree of semantic overlap between already and [zo2 ... laa3] construction makes it likely for the bilingual children to identify the former with the latter. If this is the case, two predictions follow. First, already will undergo semantic bleaching and no longer be obligatorily associated with a ‘contrary to expectation’ interpretation. Second, given that Cantonese [zo2 ... laa3] always occurs post-verbally, we predict that already will have a strong tendency to occur post-verbally in the bilingual children’s utterances, unlike the monolingual use of already, which can also occur pre-verbally.

3.2. The use of already in bilingual children

Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.1, the high degree of semantic overlap between already and [zo2 ... laa3] construction makes it likely for the bilingual children to identify the former with the latter. If this is the case, we would expect already to undergo semantic bleaching and lose the obligatory “contrary to expectation” reading. Consistent with our prediction, there are cases in which the bilingual children’s use of already is unlikely to be associated with a “contrary to expectation” interpretation. In (15), the child appears to be replying to a neutral question by indicating that the sending action is completed. There appears to be no specific presupposition suggesting a “contrary to expectation” interpretation.

(16) Investigator: Did you send him to the hospital

Child: I send already (Timmy 3;01)

Moreover, one child is observed to use already when asking yes/no questions with no presupposition about whether the enquired actions should have been done, as illustrated in (16). The data supports our hypothesis that already is identified with the [zo2 ... laa3] construction and undergoes semantic bleaching in the bilingual children, losing its obligatory association with the “contrary to
expectation” reading.

(17) Child: You already eat?
    Investigator: Mm?
    Child: Okay, you wipe your mouth already? (Kasen 3:00)

Already is expected to have a strong tendency to occur post-verbally in the bilingual children due to influence from the Cantonese post-verbal [zo2 ... laa3] construction. The corpus data confirm this prediction. As shown in Table 1, already predominantly occurs post-verbally (90%) in the bilingual children. Five out of nine children produced already only in post-verbal position. Bilingual children’s strong tendency to place already in post-verbal position is contrasted with monolingual children’s clear preference for preverbal placement of already. As shown in Table 2, pre-verbal already is used more often than post-verbal already (69.9% vs. 30.1%) in the monolingual children. Fisher’s (1954) exact test shows that the differences between the two groups are highly significant (p < .0001). The results support our hypothesis that the bilingual children have identified already with the Cantonese [zo2 ... laa3] construction.

4. Relabeling or grammaticalization?

By now there is ample evidence suggesting that already is identified with the [zo2 ... laa3] construction by the bilingual children, as reflected by its semantic and syntactic properties. In this section, we will first discuss whether the emergence of perfective already constitutes a case of relabeling in Lefebvre’s sense. Then we will come back to the questions raised in Section 1 - what different roles do relabeling and grammaticalization play in contact situations? Is it necessary (and feasible) to draw a clear distinction between them?

3The post-verbal category can be further divided into immediately post-verbal already and sentence-final already. The strong preference for the latter reflects the syntactic properties of the Cantonese sentence-final particle laa3. Kathryn appears to be an outlier in this regard – unlike all the other bilingual children, she has slightly more preverbal use, like the monolinguals do. We suspect such a difference may be due to the fact that Kathryn’s recording started at a much later stage than the other children (see Table 2). At such an age period, the target-like tense/aspect forms may gradually emerge in the bilingual child at the expense of the non-target perfective already. See Szeto et al. (2017) for a more detailed discussion.
Table 1: The placement of *already* in the Cantonese-English bilingual children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pre-verbal already</th>
<th>Post-verbal already</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timmy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilywelyn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 (10%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>99 (90%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The placement of *already* in the English monolingual children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pre-verbal already</th>
<th>Post-verbal already</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>51 (69.9%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>22 (30.1%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1. Perfective *already* as a case of relabeling

In relabeling, a lexical entry from the substrate language (18a) is assigned a new label derived from a phonetic string drawn from the superstrate language (18b), and the original phonological representation is eventually removed, yielding (18c). Thus, the resultant lexical entry carries the substrate semantic and syntactic properties with a phonological representation derived from the superstrate language (Lefebvre, 2015, pp. 1-2):
As discussed in Section 3, the bilingual children’s *already* manifests both the semantic and syntactic properties of the Cantonese [zo2 ... laa3] construction. Nevertheless, there is an important difference between this case and cases of relabeling discussed in Lefebvre’s work, where the substrate lexical entry involved is typically a polysemous word with both lexical and grammatical functions, such as the Quechua *tiya-ri-* , which means ‘to sit’, ‘to live’, ‘there is’, or serves as a locative marker. By contrast, zo2 and laa3 are not independent lexical entries; instead, they must combine with content words to perform grammatical functions. Here, if we extend the applicability of relabeling to constructions, the emergence of perfective *already in* the Cantonese-English bilingual children arguably constitutes a case of relabeling, where the semantic and syntactic features of the Cantonese [zolaa3] construction are mapped onto the English *already*, as exemplified in (19):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C-E Bilingual children</th>
<th>Cantonese [zo2...laa3]</th>
<th>English <em>already</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+ completion]</td>
<td>[+ completion]</td>
<td>[+ completion]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[± change of state]</td>
<td>[+ change of state]</td>
<td>[+ change of state]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[± contra-exception]</td>
<td>[+ contra-exception]</td>
<td>[+ contra-exception]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+post-verbal]</td>
<td>[+post-verbal]</td>
<td>[+post-verbal]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-pre-verbal]</td>
<td>[-pre-verbal]</td>
<td>[+pre-verbal]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, the Cantonese [zo2 ... laa3] construction is assigned a new label derived from the phonetic representation of the English *already*. The high degree of semantic congruence between [zo2 ... laa3] and *already* has triggered the relabeling process.
As illustrated above, whether the emergence of perfective already represents a case of relabeling solely depends on whether we will extend the applicability of relabeling beyond individual lexical entries. Regardless of whether a lexical entry or construction is involved, the underlying mechanisms are arguably the same - a new label derived from a superstrate phonetic string is assigned to a substrate lexical entry or construction.

4.2. Two terms for one and the same mental process?

As discussed in Section 2, the emergence of perfective already (both in Cantonese-English bilingual children and contact languages) can be studied under the theoretical framework of (contact-induced) grammaticalization. Now that we also consider it a case of relabeling, we may seem to have created a paradox and have to seek ways to reconcile the two theoretical frameworks.

Lefebvre (2009) makes a distinction between relabeling and grammaticalization, and maintains that the former is the main process in the creation of a creole’s lexicon, which applies to both lexical and functional items. Given that relabeling is semantically driven, Lefebvre (2009, p. 297) argues that grammaticalization may come into play “when a substrate lexical entry could not have been relabelled because of its lack of semantic content, or because of the absence, in the superstrate language, of an appropriate form to relabel the substrate entry”. This statement can be understood as follows: in cases where the grammatical items co-exist with their lexical source in the substrate language, the semantic and syntactic properties of this lexical entry (including those of its derived grammatical categories), can be transferred to the emergent creole through relabeling. Meanwhile, in cases where a particular substrate grammatical category lacks a clear lexical source or an exponent which is congruent with the superstrate structure, a new lexical entry manifesting the properties of that grammatical category will be developed in the creole by means of grammaticalization. Notably, such a distinction between relabeling and grammaticalization is strongly reminiscent of that of the two main types of contact-induced grammaticalization, which depends on “whether or not there exists already a model source-to-target grammaticalization process to be replicated” (Heine & Kuteva, 2005, p. 80). The type of contact-induced grammaticalization comparable to relabeling in its narrow sense (which targets lexical entries but not constructions) is termed replica grammaticalization, in which a grammaticalization process is transferred from the model language to the replica language. For example, in Cantonese, the word for ‘give’ bei2 is believed to have undergone the grammaticalization pathway ‘lexical verb > permissive marker >
passive marker’ (Lord et al. 2002). While still retaining the lexical meaning of ‘give’, as illustrated in (20), bei2 has also developed into a grammatical marker.

(20)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Ngo5} & \text{bei2-zo2} & \text{bun2} & \text{syu1} & \text{keoi3} \\
1SG & \text{give-PFV} & \text{CLF} & \text{book} & \text{3sg}
\end{array}
\]

‘I’ve given him/her a book.’

(21)  
\[
\begin{array}{lllllll}
\text{Aa3maa1} & m4 & \text{bei2} & \text{ngo5} & \text{tai2} & \text{din6si6} \\
\text{mother} & \text{NEG} & \text{PERM} & 1SG & \text{watch} & \text{television}
\end{array}
\]

‘My mum doesn’t let me watch TV.’

(22)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{Ngo5} & \text{bei2} & \text{keoi5} & \text{daa2-zo2} & \text{jat1} & \text{haa5} \\
1SG & \text{PASS} & 3SG & \text{hit-PFV} & \text{one} & \text{PRT}
\end{array}
\]

‘I was hit by him/her once.’

In (21), bei2 functions as a permissive marker, expressing the sense that ‘my mum doesn’t give me the permission to watch TV’. In (22), bei2 functions as a passive marker, expressing the sense that the speaker is the patient of the hitting action. Interestingly, Yip & Matthews (2007, p. 243) observe that Cantonese-English bilingual children use give as a grammatical marker in English, i.e. permissive let in (23a) and passive marker in (24a), apparently recapitulating the grammatical development pathway of bei2.

(23)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{a.} & \text{appearing in swimsuit} & \text{Daddy, I} & \text{give} & \text{you see.} & \text{(Sophie 3;04)}
\end{array}
\]

b.  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Baa4baa1} & \text{ngo5} & \text{bei2} & \text{nei5} & \text{tai2} \\
\text{daddy} & 1SG & \text{PERM} & 2SG & \text{see}
\end{array}
\]

‘Daddy I let you see’

(24)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{a.} & \text{points to scratched leg} & \text{Here is} & \text{give} & \text{Timmy scratch.} & \text{(Sophie 3;06)}
\end{array}
\]

b.  
\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{Ni1dou6} & \text{hai6} & \text{bei2} & \text{Timmy} & \text{waa2-can1} & \text{ge3} \\
\text{here} & \text{be} & \text{PASS} & \text{Timmy} & \text{scratch-PRT} & \text{SFP}
\end{array}
\]

‘Here is scratched by Timmy’

From the perspective of relabeling, the Cantonese equivalents (23b-24b) of the child’s utterances illustrate that give manifests both the semantic and syntactic features of the Cantonese bei2.
Meanwhile, in many cases, it is not possible to “replicate” the grammaticalization pathway of a substrate grammatical item, either because of the absence of a clear lexical source of the grammatical item concerned or that of a corresponding superstrate structure (which often results from a lack of clean typological fit between languages in a given contact situation). Under such circumstances, ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization will be brought into play, through which the substrate grammatical categories will be developed in the superstrate language on the basis of the use patterns available in the latter (see Section 2.2). The emergence of perfective *already* in Cantonese bilingual children, as well as parallel developments in Singlish and other Southeast Asian creoles, represent cases of ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization triggered by the typological differences between the substrate and superstrate languages (Szeto et al., 2017).

The driving force and underlying mechanisms of the two types of contact-induced grammaticalization are essentially identical - speakers of the model (substrate) language would expect the same grammatical distinctions in the replica (superstrate) language when they acquire the latter as a second L1 or an L2. Consequently they would search for equivalents in the superstrate language to categories in the substrate language with which they are already familiar. In both cases, the speakers draw on universal strategies of grammaticalization to develop a new grammatical category in the contact language. The only difference lies in the availability of a salient grammaticalization pathway which can be transferred from the substrate to the superstrate. Therefore, it makes perfect sense to consider ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization and replica grammaticalization to be two subtypes of the same kind of mental operations.

However, if we maintain a rigid distinction between relabeling and grammaticalization by restricting the former to cases involving lexical entries with concrete semantic content, we may essentially be giving two names to a single type of mental process. Moreover, as relabeling in its narrow sense may still involve the emergence and development of grammatical forms from lexical items, there is no good reason to treat relabeling and grammaticalization as two distinct processes in contact scenarios. The roles of relabeling and grammaticalization are schematically illustrated in Table 3.

Contrary to Lefebvre’s (2009) position, we see a high degree of overlap between relabeling and grammaticalization. However, we share Lefebvre’s view that relabeling plays a major role in creole genesis and other types of contact-induced change. Given that the development of grammatical categories from lexical items can be driven by the conceptual links between them (see Section 2), the
transfers of lexical meaning in contact situations can potentially trigger the subsequent development of grammatical categories. Therefore, the notion of relabeling can provide a coherent framework for

| Transfer of lexical meaning, e.g. Fongbe hù ‘to murder/to mutilate’ > Haitian Creole ansasinen ‘to murder/to mutilate’ (Lefebvre, 2008, pp. 92-93) | Relabeling | Grammaticalization |
| “Replication” of grammaticalization pathway, e.g. permissive and passive give | + | + |
| Emergence of new grammatical categories based on substrate constructions, e.g. perfective already | ±⁴ | + |
| Development of grammatical categories without language contact | - | + |

Table 3: Roles of relabeling and grammaticalization

the emergence of new lexical meaning as well as new grammatical categories in contact scenarios (provided we accept that relabeling can also be applied to constructions). On the other hand, the theory of grammaticalization provides a research framework for the emergence and development of grammatical categories, regardless of whether language contact is involved.

5. Conclusions

Unlike its counterpart in Standard English, the already in Cantonese-English bilingual children lacks the obligatory “contrary to expectation” reading and has a strong tendency towards post-verbal placement, manifesting both the semantic and syntactic characteristics of the Cantonese [zo2 ... laa3] construction, which arguably constitutes a case of relabeling. Although relabeling is only applicable to lexical entries with semantic content in previous studies, given the similar underlying mechanisms involved, the notion of relabeling should be extended to constructions in order to provide a coherent framework for studying grammatical change in contact scenarios. Further, instead of making a rigid distinction between relabeling and grammaticalization, we see a lot of parallels between these two notions and argue that they can serve as complementary research

In its narrow sense, relabeling only targets individual lexical entries with solid semantic content. In that case, the emergence of perfective already does not constitute a case of relabeling. However, as we argue in Section 4.1, the notion of relabeling should be extended to constructions.
paradigms for the study of language change.
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Abstract

This research presents the design and application of a prototype criterion-referenced competence test for first language(s) of linguistic minority speakers. It is designed for the linguistic purpose of language maintenance, not for educational or professional purpose. The testing content is the core or implicit knowledge of the language system per se (i.e. phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, semantics and pragmatics). The aim is to measure how competent the linguistic minorities are in their first language(s) when they are facing bi- or multi-lingualism. A major function of the prototype test is to identify the imperceptibly incremental change of language competence. This method can be applied to languages without writing systems and illiterate speakers. The testing results yielded from this methodology are presented, with application to bilingual speakers of Nuosu, a Tibeto-Burman language in Sichuan, China, and Mandarin Chinese. Accordingly, first language and bilingual competence, and language shift are also discussed.

Keywords: first language and bilingual competence, language maintenance, prototype, language assessment.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this research is to present the design and application of a prototype criterion-referenced competence test for the first language(s) (L1) of linguistic minority speakers for the
purpose of language maintenance. Many minority languages are said to be under the threat of the culturally dominant languages. It may be true given the domains of language use. However, since many speakers still learn the minority language as L1 and speak it fluently without perceptible difficulty, it is beyond the reach of direct observation to conclude whether there is actual language attrition or shift, manifested by decrease in competence, both individually and communally. Therefore, this research is targeted to answer the question of how competent the linguistic minority speakers are in their first language(s) when they are facing bi- or multilingualism.

If two tests are designed and co-normed for bilingual first language speakers, namely those who learn both the ethnic minority language and the culturally dominant language as L1s, bilingual competence and possible language shift can be identified. The application of the test will be addressed in Section 6 with bilingual speakers of Nuosu, a Tibeto-Burman language, and Mandarin Chinese, from Liangshan Yi Autonomous Prefecture (hereafter known as Liangshan, literally Cool Mountains), Sichuan, China.

The proposed testing method is a comprehensive, objective and linguistic diagnosis and measurement of the core or implicit grammatical knowledge or the language system per se of the first language(s) of normal speakers. The testing content is phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, semantics and pragmatics of the target language. Since grammatical knowledge is widely accepted as the manifestation of competence, the validity of the test is justifiable (see Section 3.4). The first language does not necessarily need a writing system; the L1 speakers can be illiterate.

As a competence test, it is different from the mainstream L2 proficiency tests (e.g. TOEFL, TOEIC) and L1 achievement tests (e.g. final exams, high-stakes entrance exams). Although “proficiency” and “competence” are used interchangeably in common sense, they differ in linguistic implications. Proficiency implies variation and is traditionally related to learning, teaching and testing in second language (e.g., Stern, 1983; Llurda, 2000); but competence implies stability (e.g., Chomsky, 1965; Taylor, 1988). Both proficiency and achievement tests are mainly for the purpose of school education. Since the tasks of these tests integrate language knowledge and skills (e.g. listening, speaking, reading and writing), it involves complex cognitive but non-linguistic abilities, such as the ability of analyzing, evaluating and synthesizing information. These cognitive abilities need explicit or formal school education, and result in large variations among performance of the examinees, whether they are native speakers or not.
Other than these, there is explicit or learned language knowledge (cf. core or implicit language knowledge in Section 3.2). For example, the content of the Chinese subject test of the University Entrance Exam in China includes comprehension of ancient Chinese texts, argumentation writing, etc. The students follow certain curriculum and textbooks, which can be reviewed before the test. Full literacy is required in order to participate. This is far beyond the core language knowledge. People who have not been formally educated are less likely to obtain the learned knowledge. However, any native speaker, without a single day of schooling, should have nearly all the core or implicit knowledge of the target language. Tests for language revitalization (e.g. Southern Min in Taiwan, Mori and Hawaiian) also follow the mainstream integrative approach as proficiency tests. In Section 2, I will compare with the proposed method another three kinds of tests of linguistic purpose: L1 vocabulary test, qualitative L1 competence test, and L1 competence test for therapeutic purpose.

Secondly, a native speaker, who speaks the language as L1 and possesses native competence, should find the test easy. Their competence should be stable (see Section 3.5 and Section 6.1). The instrument can be considered reliable if the test results are also stable under stable sociolinguistic environment. Only those L1 speakers without native competence, probably experiencing language shift, will make a significant number of mistakes. This is also the reason why such a test was not strongly needed several decades ago; by then, many first languages were still stably maintained. However, what is happening now is that an increasing number of speech communities are experiencing “unstable bilingualism or multilingualism” (see Austin & Sallabank, 2011, p. 1).

The methodology of designing the competence test will be presented in Section 3 and 4, such as the testing content and its justification, solution to dialectal difference and the literacy issue. I will illustrate the testing interface and sample questions with Nuosu, a Tibeto-Burman language in Sichuan, China, in Section 5. The application of the test is presented in Section 6, accompanied by comparative data through a vocabulary test. To conclude, I will suggest a research agenda (Section 7).

2. A brief review and comparison with the existing testing tools

Due to their educational or professional purpose, the mainstream L2 proficiency tests and L1 achievement tests are qualitatively different from the proposed method. However, there are three
kinds of tests which also focus substantially on implicit grammatical knowledge, namely L1 vocabulary test, qualitative L1 competence test and L1 competence test for therapeutic purpose. Their purpose is linguistic (e.g. language loss and impairment). But neither can they serve the same purpose of testing language competence of normal speakers.

Vocabulary test is often used for the sake of vocabulary knowledge itself (Read, 2000, see). But it is also frequently used as a quick and convenient instrument to test competence (e.g., Dai, 2011). I will prove, in Section 6.2, that vocabulary test, if used to test competence, can only make distinctions on the condition that the target language competence of the speech community is already low. It will overestimate if the L1 speakers are still fluent in the target language.

The qualitative L1 tests (e.g. grammaticality judgment, spontaneous speech elicitation) is used to understand the existing perceptible phenomena by studying one or more grammatical aspects (e.g., Altenberg, 1991; De Bot et al., 1991). They have taken certain prior value positions. The purpose is not to measure, but to confirm and deepen the understanding of some readily observable phenomena. However, there is no prior value position with the present method. It is the quantitative results from the test, which decide the situation of the target language, such as whether there is language shift and attrition.

The L1 competence tests for people with language impairment, such as Bilingual Aphasia Test (Paradis & Libben, 1987), are mainly for therapeutic purpose. Their results can only conclude whether the person has language-related pathological problems, not whether the person is a competent speaker.

To sum up, the proposed method is different from the existing tools mainly in the following seven features (also see Section 1):

1. **Comprehensive:** the content of the proposed competence test should be as adequate as possible to cover the language system;

2. **Objective:** generalizations are fair and unbiased, without subjective influence (e.g. self-assessment); the test results should not be an underestimation or overestimation;

3. **Linguistic:** the purpose of the test is not to echo pedagogical practice in language education, but for linguistic investigation, such as language maintenance;

4. **Diagnosis and measurement:** the most important functionality of the research is to diagnose
and quantify language competence; no prior value position is needed;

5. Core or implicit grammatical knowledge of the language system: the testing content is not the explicit knowledge (including literacy skills) which needs formal learning;

6. First language: the target language is not second language or foreign language;

7. Normal speakers: the target population should not have language impairment.

Table 1 summarizes the seven aspects of the reviewed tests and the present method:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Knowledge Coverage</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Test nature</th>
<th>If applied to test L1 competence</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Method</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary test</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Mostly implicit</td>
<td>Fractional</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Measurement &amp; understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative test</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Fractional</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic test</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Implicit &amp; explicit</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement test</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 test</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revitalization test</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Mostly explicit</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: A comparison between the existing testing tools and the present method

3. The testing content and its justification

For the next two sections, methodology of designing the prototype competence test will be introduced. In this section, I should answer the question: what to be tested. Following the justification for testing grammatical knowledge from Section 3.1 to 3.5. Section 3.6 will address the solution to the dialectal differences between the testing variety and the subjects’ first variety.
3.1. The testing content

The testing content is the core or implicit grammatical competence or knowledge. It is the language knowledge possessed by a native speaker, but perhaps without any form of schooling or explicit learning. In order to justify the use of grammatical knowledge as the testing content, there are three sub-questions: 1) what grammatical competence is, 2) why it is the testing content, and 3) whether it is testable. Grammatical competence, according to Chomsky (1965), is the entire essence of the concept of competence. It deals with the knowledge of form and meaning. The three major components are syntax, phonology, and semantics (Chomsky, 1965, p. 16). For other scholars, grammatical competence comprises different components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chomsky (1965, p.16)</td>
<td>syntax, phonology, and semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lado (1961, as cited in Purpura, 2004, p.51)</td>
<td>morphosyntactic form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canale &amp; Swain (1980, p.29)</td>
<td>lexical items, morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics and phonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachman (1990, p.87)</td>
<td>vocabulary, morphology, syntax, and phonology/graphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpura (2004, p.91)</td>
<td>form-meaning correspondence among phonology/graphology, lexicon, morphosyntax, cohesion, information management, and interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Components of grammatical competence by different scholars

As is indicated by Chelliah & Willem (2010, p. 168), a native speaker should be able to “produce syntactically well-formed utterances that are semantically meaningful, pragmatically adequate, and textually coherent”. Larsen-Freeman (1997) characterizes grammatical knowledge along three dimensions: linguistic form, semantic meaning and pragmatic use.

Therefore, the components of grammatical competence for the proposed test are 1) phonology, e.g. place of articulation, 2) morphology, e.g. derivational suffixes, 3) syntax, e.g. NP structure and causative construction, 4) lexicon, e.g. meaning, word collocation, and the syntactic behavior of adpositions and conjunctions, 5) semantics, e.g. meaning of the ideophones, and 5) pragmatics,
e.g. topic-comment construction. Some features can also be at the interface of the components (e.g. morphosyntax). Semantic competence overlaps with lexical competence in that both involve lexical semantic knowledge. If a question targets at merely lexical semantic knowledge of the words, it falls within the domain of semantic competence; if it involves more than lexical semantic knowledge, the feature falls within other domains (e.g. lexicon or pragmatics).

Each domain should have its representations in the test. But the proportion is language specific. For example, some languages are morphologically poor; the domain of morphology may have a small proportion or be absent in the test. Moreover, the features tested should be reflexive of the characteristics of the language. Each feature bears equal weight in the marking.

The next two sections will introduce two important distinctions as the criteria to select candidate testing features.

3.2. Distinction between core knowledge and learned knowledge

There are two levels of grammatical knowledge. The first level is what Lado (1961, p. 20) calls “the central core of language” or the implicit knowledge. Another level is learned or explicit. They can be distinguished by the following features:

1. **Frequency**: the core knowledge is frequently used and easily acquired, while the learned knowledge is rarely used and may not be acquired. An ideal native speaker should have all the core knowledge;

2. **Context**: the core knowledge is mostly contextually general, while the learned knowledge is contextually restricted and often literary;

3. **Variation**: there is usually only one way to express the core knowledge, such as the only form for English comparative construction (e.g. “I am taller than him”). If the core knowledge can be expressed with variations (e.g. causative verbs in Northern Chinese), their frequency is similarly high. However, the learned knowledge can often be expressed alternatively through other means with the core knowledge, such as the learned English noun “endeavour” versus the core one “try”;

4. **Inherence**: the core knowledge is inherent in the grammar, newly loaned knowledge is learned. However, if the loaning happened long ago and became an inherent part of the grammar
already, it belongs to the core knowledge, such as the numerous English words of French origin;

5. **Training**: according to Crowley & Lynch (1995, p. 10), L1 or native speakers acquire the core grammatical knowledge subconsciously and effortlessly as they grow up and follow them subconsciously and effortlessly as well. However, formal training may be necessary for the learned knowledge, which, in most cases, is obtained through formal education at school;

6. **Closeness**: the core knowledge is closed, hardly acquiring new members, while learned knowledge is open, such as the continuous borrowing of vocabulary from another language and invention of new expressions. The open lexical categories are open due to the learned knowledge.

### 3.3. Distinction between normal language change and language errors

Another distinction as the feature selection criterion is between normal language change and language errors. Though both phenomena involve the varied uses of the features, features which undergo normal language change should not be included in the test.

Normal language change is the internal development of the language; it follows universal tendencies that occur independently in unrelated languages (Bybee, 2015); however, language error is language specific. Next, normal language change is often featured with simplification with compensation while language error is reduction without compensation elsewhere (Dressler, 1991). For instance, the case systems of Latin and Old English were simplified with compensation of flourished prepositional constructions, more rigid word order and introduction of obligatory articles. Therefore, it is in no sense wrong for language change (Aitchison, 2001). However, Dressler (1991) points out that language errors, without compensation, make the language dysfunctional.

Moreover, grammatical change, including the core lexicon, is slow and steady so that it is still possible to recognize the common ancestor of some languages (McMahon, 1994). In contrast, language error can be abrupt, rapid and varied. Finally, media often reinforces the language change, such as loanwords (see Haspelmath & Tadmor, 2009). However, since language errors disrupt satisfactory communication, the changes by them are erroneous and impossible to be widely accepted by the public. Thus they are discarded by the media.
3.4. The reason of testing implicit grammatical knowledge

The reason of using grammatical knowledge as the testing content is due to its prominent and uncontroversial role in any framework of language competence ever since Lado (1961), such as in Hymes (1972), Canale & Swain (1980), and Bachman (1990). For either L1 or L2, grammatical knowledge determines the ability to communicate precisely and effectively. Practically, even for the rating of the integrative language proficiency tests (see Section 1), grammatical accuracy stands out from many considerations (e.g. comprehension and intelligibility) in marking (see McNamara, 1990).

The purpose of the present test is for language maintenance. Its target population are all normal speakers of a speech community, educated or not. The implicit grammatical knowledge is supposed to be learned by all native speakers; however, the explicit or learned grammatical knowledge is not a necessary component of native competence.

3.5. Testability of core competence

Theoretically, Taylor (1988) interprets Chomskys concept of competence as a static mental state with an absolute quality so that it cannot be compared. The interpretation is true in the sense that Chomsky (1965) proposes the concept on the basis of 1) ideal monolingual speakers, and 2) homogeneous speech community. Since the ideal speakers know the language perfectly, their core competence should be constant; no difference can be detected. Practically, to many, test of native core competence seemed unnecessary (Lado, 1961; Valdés & Figueroa, 1994).

Therefore, the core competence of L1 speakers under stable sociolinguistic environment without language loss or shift should be distributed as in Figure 1a. The box represents the core competence and the vertical line stands for the competence level. The ceiling represents the theoretically constant core competence that ideal monolingual speakers should reach. The solid dots stand for the distribution of the actual core competence of L1 speakers. Even though it is hard for them to reach the ideal level, their core competence should be close to the ideal level and similar to each other; the difference from one another should be hard to tell. This is also supported by Ellis (1994) who holds that adult native speakers competence is stable, but L2 learners are not.

Therefore, the distribution of L2 competence should be more widely scattered as is represented
in Figure 1b. It is easier to divide L2 competence into “low”, “intermediate” and “advanced” or more detailed classifications if possible. For L2 learners, all the core knowledge of the target language is explicit.

In order to reach similar distinguishability, current L1 tests aim beyond core competence and address the learned or explicit knowledge or even further. Take verbal reasoning from paper-based Graduate Record Examinations (GRE) General Test for example. It measures the ability of analyzing and evaluating written material, synthesizing information, and understanding the relationships among words and concepts. The learned competence of L1 speakers should be similarly varied like the competence distribution of L2 learners (cf. Figure 1b). However, nowadays, due

![Diagram of competence distributions](image)

**Figure 1: Comparing the distribution of competence**

to the learning of the culturally dominant language for better education and career opportunities, the stability of ethnic L1 competence is constantly challenged and even impaired by language shift and language loss. Consequently, the competence of ethnic L1 is becoming less stable and more varied than that in monolingual communities, as is represented in Figure 1c. These communities are often faced with unstable multilingualism. Though the competence variation should not be as
large as among L2 learners of the same language (cf. Figure 1b), it is larger than that of the L1 speakers under stable sociolinguistic variables (cf. Figure 1a). Due to the effect of language shift and language loss, the new state of instability and variation makes the core competence of ethnic L1 distinguishable and testable.

3.6. **Solution to the dialectal differences**

The variety tested may be identical to the one spoken by the test takers. But the two varieties may also be different, although they can be two closely related dialects of the same language. Therefore, the solution is based on the similarities of the dialects, namely only the shared features between the testing variety and the variety used by the test takers are appropriate candidate testing features; otherwise, the dialectal speakers will be placed in disadvantage due to the dialectal differences.

The dialectal differences can be phonological, lexical and structural. If the mutual intelligibility of the two varieties is low, a separate test should be used for the competence of the target language with the variety of the test takers. For example, in the indigenous language tests in Taiwan for the purpose of revitalization, the test takers can choose which dialect, namely Truku, Toda or Tgdaya (Tsukida, 2005), they prefer to be tested with as a speaker of Seediq, an Austronesian language.

4. **The question types and the testing format**

So far, I have answered the what-question and provided the justification. In this part, I will continue to answer the question of “how to test the grammatical competence”.

4.1. **Question types**

Discrete-point approach is used in the test. This approach measures one point of the grammar at a time and makes each item independent of the other. It will also make the marking of the test results clearer than integrative approach.

Since the answers need to be controlled, selected-response and limited-production tasks are used in the test. According to Purpura (2004), selected-response tasks measure the recognition of grammatical form and/or meaning, such as multiple-choice question. Limited-production tasks
differ in that the expected answer involves a limited amount of language production, such as gap-filling question. A crucial advantage of the two kinds of task is that they are objective; they, according to Purpura (2004), do not require expert judgment in terms of the marking criteria. Evaluation of extended production tasks requires expert judgment which are often subjective and hard to be controlled. Possible question formats can be: multiple-choice question as selected-response task, and true/false question with correction and sentence-making question as limited-production tasks (see Section 5 for illustration).

4.2. Literacy issue and change of the testing format

About half of the worlds living languages do not have its writing system Lewis et al. (2015). The writing systems of some languages have only historically limited usage, such as the use of the Nuosu writing system mainly for religious purpose. Ordinary speakers are almost illiterate in their ethnic first language. They cannot be tested in the written format.

Literacy ability is independent of ones grammatical competence. It is impossible to refer to ones illiterate monolingual grandparents as non-native speakers of their first language. In order to accommodate languages without writing systems and illiterate speakers, the test should be undertaken in an audible-and-spoken format. It can be realized through a computerized testing interface built with HTML and embedded with a recording module (e.g. Nanogong 5.0) for answering questions (e.g. corrections in the T/F questions).

4.3. Sustainability

Each test can only cover part of the grammatical knowledge. Exhaustive testing is not feasible to both test developers and test takers. What is more important than being exhaustive is the sustainability of the test. There are two ways to achieve sustainability. Firstly, since one test covers a non-exhaustive selection of features, other features can be selected in another test. Secondly, if the same feature is tested again, variation of the input can be realized to test the used features.
5. Testing interface and sample questions

I will illustrate the sample questions with features from Nuosu, a Tibeto-Burman language spoken by over 2 million Nuosu people in Liangshan, Southwest China, which is under the threat of Southwest Mandarin and Standard Chinese as the culturally dominant varieties. I will also integrate the questions into the testing interface. Linguistic description of Nuosu can be found in Ding (2016) and Gerner (2013).

Nuosu has a syllabary writing system. Besides the characters, there is another Romanized phonetic form, called Nuosu pinyin. They are used in the Nuosu-Chinese bilingual education and on the internet. Although the Nuosu writing system reputedly dates back to the 7th century (Wu, 1991), it was historically limited to be used for religious purpose. Ordinary Nuosu speakers, including most Nuosu students in the Nuosu-Chinese bilingual education program, have not mastered it (Ding, 2016). On the testing interface, Nuosu Romanization and Nuosu characters are placed along the questions as visual aids.

5.1. Attitudinal clitics with multiple choice question

Attitudinal clitics of Nuosu occur at the end of the sentence. It belongs to the domain of pragmatics. They do not change the meaning of the utterance, but denote attitudinal information of the speaker, such as the requestive [ha\textsuperscript{33}] to make a polite request or order, the suggestive clitic [ma\textsuperscript{21}] to soften the abruptness of the utterance, the stimulative clitic [lo\textsuperscript{21}] for encouragement or stimulation, and the admonitive clitic [ma\textsuperscript{55}] to signal the warning. The attitudinal clitics attach to the clause, not the verb.

(1) a. \[rv\textsuperscript{55}ga\textsuperscript{33} ga\textsuperscript{55}=ta\textsuperscript{33} ts\#mr\textsuperscript{21}z\textsuperscript{33} yr\textsuperscript{21} la\textsuperscript{33} |______|

   clothes wear=DUR flu get come [______]

   ‘Put the clothes on. Don’t catch cold!’

b. ha\textsuperscript{33} lo\textsuperscript{21} ma\textsuperscript{21} ma\textsuperscript{55} (answer)
5.2. Simplex-causative verb with T/F question

Nuosu, represented by the Shynra dialect, has a few simplex-causative verb pairs which differ in the voicing of the onset. They are (near) minimal pairs. The simplex variants of such pairs use voiced initial while the causative variants use voiceless onset, such as [gW33] listen and [kW33] cause to listen, and [dW33] eat and [tùa33] feed. It belongs to the morphological domain. Simplex-causative verb is tested with T/F question which requires grammaticality judgment and correction. The mistake is underlined.

\[
(2) \quad \text{ma}^{33} \text{ ka}^{33} \text{nur}^{34} \text{ dzuW}^{33} \text{ mo}^{33} \text{ d}^{34} \\
\text{grandpa} \text{ Latsse} \text{ to say COMP Latsse} \text{ here} \text{ come} \text{ 2SG} \\
\text{a}^{21} \text{ d}^{21} \text{ hi}^{21} \text{ ti}^{30} \text{ si}^{21} \text{ tc}^{55} \text{ su}^{33} \text{ yi}^{34} \text{ a}^{21} \text{ yi}^{21} = \text{nur}^{33} \text{ a}^{34} \text{ p}^{6} \text{ w}^{33} \text{ s}^{21} \text{ nda}^{55} \\
\text{yesterday} \text{ 1SG} \text{ take} \text{ slap} \text{ since} \text{ today} = \text{FRM} \text{ grandpa} \text{ pear} \\
\text{ma}^{33} \text{ ka}^{33} \text{nur}^{34} \text{ dzuW}^{33} \text{ mo}^{33} \text{ d}^{34} \\
\text{CLF ResV 2SG eat ATT QUOT} \\
\text{Intended meaning: “the grandfather said to Latsse: “Latsse, come here. Since I slapped you yesterday, (as an apology), today (let) grandpa take a pear and feed you.”} \\
\text{[dzuW33] eat should be changed to [tùa33] feed or make eat. The test takers can record their}
answer. They can listen to their response; if they do not feel satisfied, they can rewrite it by recording it again.

Figure 3: The testing interface of T/F question

5.3. Focus-presupposition construction with sentence-making question

Nuosu uses a periphrastic construction, which is a topic-comment articulation, to introduce some constituents as the focus of a sentence. It belongs to the syntactic domain. The construction involves the copula and a nominalized complement: (NP) + (topic clitic) + Focus + [-[su33] + [yu33]].

The copula is [yu33] and the nominalizer is [su33]. Though the construction is similar to the English cleft sentences or Mandarin Chinese pseudo-cleft sentences in terms of discourse function, the single clause is not divided into two parts. Thus the term “cleft” is not adopted. The constituents of the sentence are shuffled and re-arranged in alphabetic order. The test takers are required to assemble them in correct Nuosu sentence.

(3) tçu33šçu33 a34yu3333 = mu33 tshçu33 zu33 = sr34 p33 v34ko33 la34 silver.gold many=ADVL 3SG grab=Res return home come
t33hu33 = ko33 = nuu33 v55vu33 ko33 tco34 na33 la34 = o34 ts33 21 tco34 time=C.TOP=FRM elder.brother him to ask come=PFV 3SG to
tçu33šçu33 ______ di34 silver.gold ______ QUOT

“When he took the silver and gold and returned home, the elder brother came to ask him, (he said) to him: ______ the silver and gold?”
The shuffled constituents are given as:

(4)  \( ta^{33} \) from \( kha^{55} \) where \( la^{33} \) come COP \( su^{33} \) take NMLZ

The answer is:

(5)  \( ka^{55} ta^{33} si^{21} la^{33} su^{33} yur^{33} \) where from take come NMLZ COP

‘Where do (you) take the (silver and gold) from?’

The topic or the presupposed information, namely [tchu\(^{33}\)zi\(^{33}\)] silver and gold, is already given for the sentence. The test takers should finish assembling the predicate containing the focus domain. Since they may not know how to type the Nuosu characters or the Romanized scripts, they only need to fill in the number to indicate the order.

Figure 4: The testing interface of sentence-making question

6. Application of the method: Results and discussion

I have applied a Nuosu test and a Chinese test with similar design on the basis of the proposed method to three generations of Nuosu speakers during a fieldwork in Liangshan. The average age, dialectal background and the number of the participants for each generation are summarized in Table 3. The total number of male participants was 22 and of female participants was 12. The gender imbalance is actually a reflection of the patriarchal society of ethnic Nuosu. In the field,
the females thought that the males should do talking to the strangers. Therefore, they felt rather reluctant to participate. Since the participants were taken care of one after another in the tests, my sample size was not large.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age label</th>
<th>Avg. age</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Nuosu dialect</th>
<th>L2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young group</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nuosu and SWM &amp; SC</td>
<td>Shynra 7</td>
<td>English Yynuo 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-aged group</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>mostly Nuosu only</td>
<td>Shynra 10</td>
<td>mostly SWM &amp; SC Yynuo 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder group</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nuosu</td>
<td>Shynra 9</td>
<td>SWM &amp; SC Yynuo 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Shynra 26</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yynuo 8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The Nuosu participants (SWM: Southwest Mandarin; SC: Standard Chinese)

There are five dialects of Nuosu: Shynra, Suondi, Adur, Yynuo and Lindimu (or Tianba) (Bradley, 1997; Gerner, 2013). The participants were speakers of Shynra and Yynuo. These two dialects are highly mutually intelligible (Bradley, 2001) and their speakers account for over 70% of the whole population of ethnic Nuosu (Gerner, 2013). The young generation still actively learned Nuosu as their ethnic L1. Except those who have completed shifted to Chinese, such as urban residents in the families of Nuosu cadres, most of the Nuosu young generation, who learned Nuosu as L1, can speak the language, by observation, as fluently as the elder and middle-aged generations without perceptible difficulty. Meanwhile, most of them learned the culturally dominant language, Mandarin Chinese, specifically Southwest Mandarin and Standard Chinese as two dialects, as another L1. However, nearly all of the elder generation and most of the middle-aged generation learned Mandarin Chinese as L2.

The variety used for the Nuosu test was Shynra Nuosu, and the one for the Chinese test was Standard Chinese, which were the varieties the participants were most familiar with under testing scenario. All the subjects participated in the Nuosu test and the young generation took the Chinese test as well. Eight out of the eleven middle-aged Nuosu speakers also took the Chinese test. Only one elder speaker had the confidence to take the Chinese test; the others gave up due to their lack of confidence in their Chinese competence. Additionally, I have invited a control group of 10 young Han Chinese speakers, whose average age was 20.3, to take the Chinese test; they spoke, as well,
Southwest Mandarin and Standard Chinese as L1, with knowledge in English as a foreign language. Han Chinese is the only majority ethnic group in China. The other 55 ethnic groups in China are all officially recognized as minority groups, such as Tibetans, Uyghurs and Mongolians.

Meanwhile, I have also conducted a 40-word Nuosu vocabulary test to the Nuosu participants in order to make a methodological comparison. The 40 words were selected from the 100-word Swadesh list (Swadesh, 1952). They covered words of number, color, body parts, objects, animal, and basic verbs. All are basic so as to measure the core knowledge of the speakers. The subjects were shown the pictures of the words and asked to identify them in the target language.

By the time of the fieldwork, I have not figured out how to treat phonological competence due to the dialectal differences between Shynra and Yynuo. Therefore, the productive competence in both Nuosu and Chinese phonology was not tested. It is admitted that it should be included in future research. But the following results can already prove the feasibility of the proposed prototype competence test. Moreover, since Standard Chinese lacks inflectional morphology, there was no question about Chinese morphology. The content of the Nuosu test and Chinese test are summarized in Appendix I and Appendix II.

I also want to mention that Question C8 and C14 (see Appendix II) in the Chinese test were intentionally designed to detect dialectal influence from Southwest Mandarin upon Standard Chinese in the bigger project. But the results were re-calculated in the present research. Even though some subjects responded to the two questions with their dialectal knowledge, the answers were accepted as long as they are correct in either Southwest Mandarin or Standard Chinese.

The two tests have different testing content and the internal ratios among the linguistic domains are also different. Since they are different languages with its unique features, it is not necessary to strike an identical internal ratio. The two tests will be independently scored; the absolute scores will be converted to comparable relative percentage, namely correctness rate. The rule to score is to assign each feature with the same weight. The marking scheme is binary: one point as the full mark for a discrete item and zero as non-mastery of a certain feature.
6.1. Instability as the evidence of the gradual decline of Nuosu competence

According to the competence distribution in Figure 5, all the elder and middle-aged Nuosu speakers have reached the correctness rate of 80%. The elder group have stably maintained their performance as high as above or close to 90%. Meanwhile, the Chinese competence of the Chinese control group was also stale, i.e. at or above 85% (see Figure 6).

Regarding the Nuosu competence, the average performance was 93.73% for the elder group, 92.16% for the middle-aged group and 78.74% for the young group. According to the independent samples t-test in SPSS, there was no significant difference ($p = .408 > .05$) between the performance of the middle-aged group and of the elder group. However, only half of the young speakers reached over 80%. The performance of the young group was significantly lower than that of the middle-aged group ($p = .005 < .05$) and the elder group ($p = .002 < .05$). This is also the evidence that the stability of Nuosu competence decreases gradually throughout the three generations. The highest and the lowest correctness rates have been marked in Figure 5 and 6.

![Figure 5: Competence in Nuosu across the three generations](image)

Take the range of difference as the reference, namely highest performance minus lowest performance within a group. The range of difference was 10.34% (i.e. subtracting 100% from 89.66%) for the elder group, 17.24% (i.e. subtracting 100% from 82.76%) for the middle-aged group and 44.83% (i.e. subtracting 100% from 55.17%) for the young group. The larger the range of difference is, the less stable the core competence is.
Secondly, the speed of language loss accelerates more rapidly in the young generation. The reminder from subtracting the range difference was used to indicate the rate of increasing instability. It was found that stability decreased slightly from the elder group to the middle-aged group, namely less than 7% (i.e. subtracting 17.24% from 10.34%), but drastically to the young group, namely 34.49% (i.e. subtracting 44.83% from 10.34%).

Thirdly, some Nuosu young speakers were able to keep similarly high competence like the elder generations while the others were not. This suggests that there is individual variation regarding the paces of adaptation to the changing sociolinguistic environment. Regarding the Chinese competence, although it was more varied among the Nuosu young group, independent samples t-test, namely \( p = .365 > .05 \), found no significant difference between their Chinese competence and that of the Chinese control group. The average performance was 91.5% for the Chinese control group, 88.75% for the Nuosu young group and 82.5% for the Nuosu middle-aged group. Eight subjects from both the Chinese control group and the Nuosu young group (see Figure 6) reached the correctness rate of 90% in the Chinese test. The Chinese competence of the middle-aged group was more varied than that of the Nuosu young group. The only elder Nuosu speaker who took the Chinese test scored 60%, while his Nuosu competence was 96.55%. His performance confirmed that the elder Nuosu speakers were Nuosu-dominant.

Figure 6: Competence in Chinese across the three groups
6.2. Vocabulary test

However, according to the results of the vocabulary test, all the three Nuosu groups had near-ideal performance, namely over 99% (see Figure 7).

![Figure 7: The average competence by Nuosu vocabulary test](image)

This confirms the limited distinguishing ability of vocabulary test. Firstly, those with lower competence by grammatical test also achieved perfect competence by vocabulary test. For example, Subject M10, Y2 and Y10 (see Figure 8 and 9), who had relatively lower Nuosu competence through the grammatical test, also reached 100% through Nuosu vocabulary test. The results by the vocabulary test hide the lack of competence.

However, it is unfair to abandon the use of vocabulary test. Vocabulary test is useful to make distinctions when language shift is almost completed and the competence of the target language is already low. The lowest performance by Subject Y1 (see Figure 9) in Nuosu grammatical test (i.e. 55.17%) and vocabulary test (i.e. 92.5%) was not a coincidence.

This is also the reason why Dai et al. (2011) were able to use vocabulary test to make a 4-level distinction among the Jingpho people whose ethnic L1 is either Jingpho proper or Zaiwa, two Tibeto-Burman languages. Their subjects were urban residents of ethnic Jingpho. Their language shift from the minority language to Chinese was much more substantial and widespread than among the Nuosu people.
6.3. Bilingual competence: Language shift among the Nuosu young generation

The two tests have been co-normed to make further comparison. Since the correctness rates are relative percentages instead of absolute scores, they are comparable between different languages. The column “Chinese better” in Table 4 and 5 indicates the results by subtracting the Nuosu competence from the Chinese competence. The symbol “+” means that the Chinese competence is better than the Nuosu competence and the symbol “−” means vice versa. The last column “difference value” is the subtracted results of the competence of the two languages. Three middle-aged subjects did not participate in the Chinese test, due to their lack of confidence in their Chinese competence.

To determine whether the participants are balanced bilingual speakers or not, confidence interval or CI is calculated to estimate the measurement errors of the criterion-referenced test (Brown, 1996):

\[
CI = \sqrt{\frac{M_p(1-M_p)-S_p^2}{k-1}}
\]

\(M_p = \text{mean of the proportion scores}\)

\(S_p = \text{standard deviation of the proportion scores}\)

\(k = \text{number of test items}\)
Figure 9: Results through the two methods in the Nuosu young group (Y: young speaker)

Taking the confidence level 68%, the estimated measurement error in the Nuosu test is 5.82%\(^1\). The figure represents a confidence interval, namely plus or minus 5.82%, around the examinees score within which the test users feel confident that the examinees score will fall 68% of the time if the test is administered to this person many times. For instance, if the correctness rate of the Nuosu test by a test taker is 82.76%, he or she will score as low as 76.94% (i.e. 82.76% - 5.82%) or as high as 88.58% (i.e. 82.76% + 5.82%) if the test is administered to him or her again. The score will fall within this band, namely between 76.94% and 88.58%, 68% of the time if the test is taken repeatedly. Applying the similar calculation to the Chinese test, the estimated measurement error is 7.17%\(^2\).

It was found that most of the Nuosu middle-aged speakers were still more competent in Nuosu than Chinese while most of the Nuosu young speakers were more competent in Chinese than Nuosu (cf. Table 4 and 5).

\(^1\)For the Nuosu test, \(M_p\) is 87.93% from all the 34 subjects in the three generational groups. \(S_p\) is 10.59%; Brown (1996) specifies that standard deviation of proportion scores should use the \(N\) formula, rather than \(N - 1\). \(K\) is 29; though there are 23 test questions of core knowledge, they involve 29 test items; each score is counted as one test item.

\(^2\)For the Chinese test, \(M_p\) is 87.10% from all the 31 subjects in the three generational groups of ethnic Nuosu and the Chinese control group. \(S_p\) is 12.10% (using the \(N\) formula). And \(k\) is 20; though there are 18 test questions of core knowledge, they involve 20 test items.
Without the measurement errors, the competence gap between the two languages of the test takers may be narrowed. Therefore, with the results of the confidence intervals, the subjects whose difference value is 12.99% (i.e. 5.82% + 7.17%) are considered as balanced bilinguals. The current use of the term “balanced bilingual” is within the literal interpretation since it is possible that the balance exists at a low level of competence (Müller & Pillunat, 2008). Whether it fits the
implicit idea of balanced bilingual who is supposed to possess native level of competence in the two languages (e.g., Bloomfield, 1933) have been investigated in another study of Ding (2016).

Moreover, people whose difference value is $>12.99\%$ are categorized into two types. The first type is those who still use Nuosu as the dominant language; their difference value is negative. The second type is those who are experiencing language shift; their difference value is positive and Chinese is their dominant language. All those who gave up the Chinese test were considered as Nuosu-dominant speakers. See Table 6 for a summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology of bilingualism</th>
<th>Young group</th>
<th>Middle-aged group</th>
<th>Elder group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuosu-dominant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese-dominant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Summary of the subjects with different bilingual status

Most of the middle-aged speakers were still Nuosu-dominant. But balanced Nuosu-Chinese middle-aged bilinguals already existed. They served as a transitional generation of language shift from Nuosu to Chinese among the three generations. Only one Nuosu young subjects were Nuosu-dominant. Half of the young subjects became balanced Nuosu-Chinese bilinguals. There were five young subjects experiencing language shift and became Chinese-dominant. The language shift of some was more drastic than the others (cf. the column of “difference value” in Table 4).

In sum, despite the fact that the change of competence in Nuosu is still imperceptible and can hardly be detected by observation among the young active L1 speakers of Nuosu, the prototype test has successfully identified the competence decline among the Nuosu young generation. Although most of the young Nuosu speakers are still fluent in the minority language, as is indicated by Baker & Jones (1998), simple communication skills may hide someones lack of competence or inexperience in a language. What should be highlighted is that Subject Y1 (see Table 4) with the lowest Nuosu competence (i.e. 55.17\%) still learned Nuosu as L1 and spoke it fluently. Simply by observation, I could not tell any difficulty of his use of the language.

It is admitted that competence decline among the young generation of some minority languages may not be new to many field linguists. However, what matters is how the phenomenon is found, namely through measurement with full neutrality, not delayed perception by observation. Even for observable competence decline, this methodology can serve as an objective instrument, unlike
subjective report or qualitative observation, to provide a quantitative linguistic confirmation.

Finally, what is mentionable is that the eight Yynuo speakers were not placed in disadvantage even though the testing variety was Shynra Nuosu. Their average performance (i.e. 88.36%) in Nuosu was slightly higher than that of the Shynra speakers (i.e. 87.8%). More comparison based on dialectal differences were conducted in another study (see Ding, 2016).

7. A general research agenda

The first step for such a research is to describe and understand the target testing varieties and the related dialects. After the shared candidate features are selected, the investigator should conduct a few trial tests to establish validity and reliability.

If necessary, a short background questionnaire can be integrated on the computerized interface to obtain personal and language information. Then a training session should be conducted before the formal test to familiarize the test takers with the characteristics of the test tasks, probably with sample questions. In order that the examinees can perform at their best, there should be no time limit for them to finish the test. The ideal testing time for one language is 20 to 30 minutes.
# Appendix I: The content of the Nuosu test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Features tested</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Domain tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>verbs of animal call</td>
<td>with strict collocation</td>
<td>semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>sibling terms</td>
<td>distinguished by the relative age, the addresses gender, and the speakers gender</td>
<td>semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>logophor</td>
<td>as source-tracing pronoun in reported speech</td>
<td>morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>NP structure</td>
<td>head noun + Adj. + DEM + NUM + CLF</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5</td>
<td>derivational suffixes</td>
<td>to derive nouns or nominals from verbs</td>
<td>morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6</td>
<td>attitudinal clitics</td>
<td>to denote attitudinal information, such as the requestive, the assentive and the expectative</td>
<td>pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7</td>
<td>ideophones</td>
<td>the same monosyllabic root can be compounded with different reduplicated syllables to express different vivid impressions</td>
<td>semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N8</td>
<td>number-sensitive classifier</td>
<td>form of the general classifier changes if the number is three or more</td>
<td>morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N9</td>
<td>simplex-causative verbs</td>
<td>voiced initial for simplex variant and voiceless onset for causative variant</td>
<td>morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N10</td>
<td>double object construction</td>
<td>agent + theme + (V1) + recipient + V2</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N11</td>
<td>oblique complement with deictic adverbs of space</td>
<td>with obligatory deictic adverb</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N12</td>
<td>structure with resultative clitic</td>
<td>V + resultative clitic + resultative complement</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N13</td>
<td>resultative construction</td>
<td>V + resultative clitic + resultative complement or V V + comitative + resultative complement</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N14</td>
<td>position of negative clitic</td>
<td>negative clitics occupy the penultimate position in the clitic group</td>
<td>morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N15</td>
<td>comparative construction</td>
<td>morphology of the adjectives/descriptive verbs determines the structures for comparison</td>
<td>morphosyntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N16</td>
<td>grammatical tone</td>
<td>tones of the verbs determine the thematic roles of the preceding argument</td>
<td>morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N17</td>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>some of the temporal references are encoded through aspectual enclitics</td>
<td>lexicon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N18</td>
<td>alternative question</td>
<td>realized through the copying of the final syllable of the predicate</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N19</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>conjunctions in Nuosu is mainly clause-final</td>
<td>lexicon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N20</td>
<td>focus-presupposition construction</td>
<td>(NP) + (topic clitic) + focus + -NMLZ + copula</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N21</td>
<td>verb of borrowing</td>
<td>distinguished by whether the object returned is the original one or not</td>
<td>semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N22</td>
<td>Epistemic and deontic modals</td>
<td>distinguished as the abilitive, the skillitive and the permissive</td>
<td>semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N23</td>
<td>Causative construction</td>
<td>The structures are determined by the controllability of the causer over the causee, namely make versus let</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The content of the Nuosu test
## Appendix II: The content of the Chinese test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Features tested</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Domain tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC questions with one best answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>distinguished by goal and source</td>
<td>semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>verb-copying</td>
<td>$V_i + \text{object} + V_i + \text{resultative clitic} + \text{resultative clause}$</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>ideophones</td>
<td>the same monosyllabic root can be compounded with different reduplicated syllables to express different vivid impressions</td>
<td>semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>sentence-final clitics</td>
<td>to express the pragmatic functions of interrogation and attitude</td>
<td>pragmatics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True or false questions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>verb ‘eat’ and ‘drink’</td>
<td>with strict collocation according to the solidness and fluidness of the food</td>
<td>semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>idiomatic expression</td>
<td>with strict collocation</td>
<td>semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>structure of delimitative aspect</td>
<td>patterns determined by the number of the syllables of the predicate</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>double object construction negation</td>
<td>agent + $V + \text{recipient} + \text{theme}$</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>epistemic and deontic modals</td>
<td>distinguished as the general negator, the perfective negator and the deontic negator</td>
<td>semantics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gap-filling questions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>durative aspect</td>
<td>to mark ongoing situation as an enclitic</td>
<td>lexicon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>$V$-$de$ construction</td>
<td>$d\acute{e}$ appears after the main verb as the modal auxiliary</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>pseudo-cleft sentence</td>
<td>copula + focus + -NMLZ</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sentence-making question</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>adverbial word order</td>
<td>the order is determined by the types of the adverbials, namely the predicational adverbials, functional adverbials and PPs/DPs</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>topic-comment construction</td>
<td>NP as topic + (topic clitics) + clause as comment</td>
<td>pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>comparative construction</td>
<td>comparee NP + comparative preposition + standard NP + verb + resultative clitic + adverb + (degree expression) or comparee NP + verb + resultative clitic + comparative preposition + standard NP + adverb + (degree expression)</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MC questions with more than one answer</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>causative construction</td>
<td>causer + causative verb + causee + main verb</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>passive construction</td>
<td>undergoer / patient + prepositional passive marker + (actor / agent) + predicate</td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: The content of the Chinese test
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1. The Problem

One of the challenges in collecting articulation data using ultrasound is how to address the fact that both the probe and the head are moveable objects, yet quality data requires that the two be aligned with each other in the same way throughout the data collection session. Without some means of ensuring comparable head-probe relations across a recording, data may give the appearance of variation where none exists, and so obscure instances where there truly is variation, such as the difference between bunched and retroflex /\textipa{x}/ (Mielke et al. 2016) or between alveolar and postalveolar stops (Archangeli et al. 2016).

There are two basic ways in which a reliable head-probe relation achieved, either by fixing the relationship throughout the data collection session (Stone & Davis 1995; Whalen et al. 2005; McLeod & Wrench 2008; Derrick et al. 2015; Sigona et al. 2013) or by post-hoc adjustment of the images (Mielke et al. 2005). Fixed-relationship methods require specialized equipment which can be costly, bulky, and/or difficult to adjust, and even the Mielke et al. (2005) system requires specialized equipment for data collection (to mix video camera images with ultrasound images).

There are some research situations where such equipment is difficult or inappropriate to use, for example in the field (Gick 2002; Bird 2011; Whalen & McDonough 2015) as well as with special populations such as children. Beyond linguistic research, the calibration of head position relative to the ultrasonic probe is critical in the areas of clinical speech research and second-language pronunciation training, in which the assessment of individual-talker patterns must be compared against well-established standards of linguistic performance. However, fixed-head methods of head-probe stabilization are not always feasible in a clinical or educational environment. This has led
to research exploring whether certain types of tongue positions are more or less sensitive to the probe/head relation (Ménard et al. 2012; Zharkova et al. 2015).

In our own work, due to field conditions, we often collect ultrasound data with the head and probe loosely fixed using three mechanical arms developed to hold camera equipment. Two are positioned as a head rest for the participant’s forehead, and a third holds the probe solidly beneath the chin. Participants are asked to maintain their forehead in contact with the arms throughout data collection. Because head and probe are fixed with respect to each other only so far as the speaker can maintain the fixed head position, there is always potential for some spurious variation to appear.

In this paper, we present a type of post-hoc adjustment in contour data that can be used to improve the quality of data collected without a fixed head/probe relation, using low cost, portable equipment. We call the method “swallow alignment” since it relies on wet and/or dry swallows throughout the ultrasound recording. Swallow alignment described here reduces the degree of spurious variation. (As with Mielke et al. (2005), this system can deal only with translation, not with pitch or roll.)

2. Swallow alignment

To realize post-hoc positional adjustment, the tongue contours have to be anchored to a relatively fixed reference, and contour image adjustment can be made on the basis of the movement of the reference. The palate is considered an excellent reference since it retains its shape during production and its position remains constant in relation to the position of the head. Importantly, too, it is visible in ultrasound imaging: the location of the palate can be identified when a speaker dry-swallows or swallows a water bolus (“wet swallow”).

2.1. Method

Speakers were asked to sip a small amount of water at the beginning and end of a data collection session. Video recordings of every speaker were examined carefully to locate both wet and dry swallows. The last frame of every swallow process was considered to be the optimal palate image since the soft palate can be pushed upward during the swallow or by the water bolus; taking the
last frame gives consistency across swallows. For each identified palate frame, a smooth spline was 
fit to the lower edge of the visual palate contour in the frame using EdgeTrak (Li et al. 2005) and 
hand-corrected.

Each speaker’s palate traces were plotted onto a single Euclidean coordinate space; the aggre-
gated contours were inspected for uniformity in position. See examples in Figure 1. In some cases, 
palates aligned well with each other regardless of their temporal position in the recording. In other 
cases, misalignment was visibly obvious, indicating head movements during the recording session. 
Figure 1 (left) shows variability and Figure 1 (right) shows consistency.

Figure 1: Variable palate position shown with speaker S10 (left); consistent position shown with 
speaker S8 (right). Variability correlates to changes in the head-probe relation, and adjustments 
for S10 are shown by contours from before alignment (orange) versus after alignment (blue). Un-
adjusted palate contours for this speaker are shown by black lines.

Misalignment, such as that illustrated in Figure 1 (left), can be codified as differences in x- and 
y-coordinates at one or more specific time points during the recording. To correct the misalignment, 
adjustments are made to the x- and y-coordinates of tongue-trace points occurring after the head 
movement occurred. These adjustments were achieved by identifying the x/y-coordinate position 
of each successive palate trace with the smallest sum of distances to corresponding points along the 
previous palate trace, yielding the optimized readjustment of the palate trace to correct for head 
movement. We assume that all subsequent frames recorded before the time of the next palate trace 
are subject to the same extent of movement and so receive the same conversion via translation 
within the Euclidean space.

This adjustment improves the uniformity of ultrasound data by reducing the variation in the
spatial positions of data points for the talkers with large variability in palate traces, as illustrated in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Tongue contours (colored dotted lines) and palate contours (black solid lines) for participant S10 before adjustment (left) and after adjustment (right). Pale traces in both images indicate contours that were not adjusted. Contours of each color are more uniform after adjustment.](image)

Figure 2: Tongue contours (colored dotted lines) and palate contours (black solid lines) for participant S10 before adjustment (left) and after adjustment (right). Pale traces in both images indicate contours that were not adjusted. Contours of each color are more uniform after adjustment.

### 2.2. Evidence that it works

Archangeli et al. (2016) uses a root-mean square (RMS) calculation of the distances between compared contours within a polar-coordinate grid, depicted in Figure 3, in order to quantify the similarity between lingual articulations. In principle, other measures of similarity/difference between articulatory contours could be taken, such as the mean-distance calculation used in Zharkova & Hewlett (2009). See Archangeli et al. (2016) for some discussion of the relative merits of different methods.

To examine whether our adjustments, as discussed in Section 2.1, actually resulted in more stabilized data, we compare statistics such as the mean and standard deviation of RMSD values in the adjusted data. If positional adjustments to tongue contours effectively corrected for movements of the head during data collection, then we expect the adjusted data to more closely resemble what they would be had the head not moved at all. This means that tongue contours for identical sounds, e.g. [ʨ] in two iterations of the Sasak word *cemplung* [ʨɔmpluŋ] ‘dive’, should have decreased physical distance measured between them. In terms of data reported in Archangeli et al. (2016), RMSD values between tongue contours obtained from the same sound should be lower as a result of reduced noise caused by head movement in the data.
This is indeed the result, as shown for talkers S9, S10, J6, and J7 in Figure 4 (subjects from Archangeli et al. 2016). For same-sound comparisons for each of these talkers, both mean RMSD and standard deviation values decrease as a result of contour adjustment. Not only do these data become more consistent with our understanding of contour-to-contour similarity and RMSD value (i.e. a lower value indicates greater similarity), but the same-sound RMSD values for such talkers become more tightly distributed, with fewer large RMSD values skewing the data toward the right. This result suggests that our adjustments are successful, with noise due to movement of the head during speech production being, at least partially, eliminated from the RMSD data.

3. Discussion: Potential improvements

Having established that the swallow alignment method of adjusting tongue contour positions introduced in Section 2 is to some extent successful, we now discuss further ways in which this kind of data can be improved.

One straightforward approach to reducing noise in the ultrasonic data due to sporadic movements of the head relative to the ultrasonic probe (transducer) during collection is to simply examine...
Figure 4: Comparison of histograms for RMSD values calculated from tongue contours taken from before adjustment (black shapes) and after adjustment (colored shapes), for articulations of the same sound produced in the same word. Slight improvement is shown for S9; data from the other talkers show substantial improvement. For reference, distributions of RMSD values from comparisons involving different/heterorganic sounds, which are relatively large, are shown in gray.

the data collected from each talker and omit data from the talkers exhibiting obvious head movement. Identifying such talkers is not a simple matter and would minimally require an inspection of all extracted tongue-contour splines overlaid on top of each other in order to examine any inconsistencies in the position of the tongue for the articulation of target sounds. Ideally, during the production of the same sound, articulatory positions of the tongue are nearly identical, and identical tongue contour shapes for the same sound without matching spatial positions would strongly indicate a change in head-to-transducer positioning.

Under circumstances in which the omission of data is not desired, the primary strategy for making use of ultrasonic data that contains ample head movement is to ensure that there is greater...
certainty as to where fixed points on the head are located in the ultrasonic imaging signal at all times during the recording. With the swallow method used in Archangeli et al. (2016) and described here, only a few instances of palate-contour traces were collected in each talker’s recording. To increase the certainty about whether each target production in a recording involved repositioning the head relative to the ultrasonic transducer, it would be optimal to instruct the talker to either press their tongue against their palate or simply perform a dry swallow frequently during scanning, such as before every 5–10 target utterances. These techniques for producing traces of the palate traces in the recording are discussed in the “Palate Trace Protocol” appendix found in McLeod & Wrench (2008). However, having talkers perform a dry swallow or press their tongue onto their palate constantly during the session may be infeasible if there are prohibitive time constraints during data collection or if the excessive swallowing makes the subject’s mouth too dry in a longer recording session.

Another improvement to the adjustment method described above is to allow for rotation about a point of origin (representing the location of the ultrasonic transducer) in the adjustment of palate and tongue contours. In our method, palate contours were adjusted via an approximate method of translational correction (in x and y within a Euclidean plane) between ostensibly mismatched contours. Incorporating rotational adjustments would address changes in pitch angle of the head relative to the transducer during data collection, which is quite possible when the head is not entirely fixated relative to the transducer. Additionally, the right type of positional adjustment between palate contours could be determined by using an optimization algorithm that minimizes the overall distance between palate-contour pairs or sets.

4. Conclusion

The swallow alignment contour-correction method discussed in Section 2 describes only a rough method of identifying participants whose head moved to a substantial degree during speech production, and a precise, quantitative way of categorizing participants who produced “clean” versus “messy” data has yet to be determined. However, we set forth our method as technique to make improvements on previously-recorded ultrasonic imaging data where there would otherwise be no contour adjustment to correct for physical head movement during collection.
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Abstract

Code-switching offers an interesting angle to explore structural outcomes between two languages. Research on bilingual phonetics conveys that the phonetic elements of L1 and L2, the base and guest language in code-switching per se, exert influence on each other (Flege, 1995), thus phonetic outcomes from such interactional phenomena as code-switching merit investigation. Cantonese-English code-switching is a prevalent linguistic phenomenon in Hong Kong, whereby prior studies were conducted largely from sociolinguistic and educational perspectives (Li, 1999; Lin, 1996; Luke, 1998). In the literature, speakers with higher English proficiency were shown to demonstrate flexibility in switching between the productions of phonological features in code-switching and those in the monolingual English environment (Ng & Chen, 2016). To gain a rudimentary insight into the phonetic outcomes of Cantonese-English code-switching and to take advantage of the objectivity of acoustic analysis and gradient nature of phonetic data, this pilot study examines the VOT productions of three voiceless aspirated stops and a voiced stop across contexts. Findings revealed an absence of differences in such phonetic productions when comparing the code-switching and monolingual English environments, suggesting that code-switching might not be impactful on the phonetic productions of the guest language. However, the voiceless aspirated velar stop in monolingual English exhibits a significantly higher, more English-like VOT in code-switching than in monolingual Cantonese, as observed in these L2-dominant speakers. Also, the voiced bilabial predominantly experienced devoicing in Cantonese-English code-switching. Implications regarding bilingual language production theories are discussed. This study invites follow-up research on
other features (e.g., vowel quality) for a better picture of the phonetics of Cantonese-English code-switching in HK.

**Keywords:** code-switching, VOT, Cantonese-English bilinguals, bilingual language production.

1. **Code-switching**

Code-switching (CS) is a language contact phenomenon broadly defined as the alternation between at least two languages, involving readily identifiable constituents from both languages. It is thus often a topic of interest in studies of bilingualism, and less commonly, in bilingual language production studies. Different types of CS have been observed among bilinguals, including inter-sentential and intra-sentential CS. Inter-sentential CS means the switching from one language to another language at clause boundaries, usually between the first language (L1) and second language (L2) of a speaker. Intra-sentential CS typically takes place within a sentence. According to a typology of CS patterns (Muysken, 2000), a strategy employed by bilingual speakers is *insertion*, involving the embedding of a constituent (e.g., a word, a phrase) in a “nested” A-B-A structure (Muysken, 2000). With reference to the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model proposed by Myers-Scotton (2001), A and B are the matrix language (ML) and the embedded language (EL) respectively, while A is referred to as the “base language” and B as the “guest language” in the phonetics and phonology of CS (e.g., Bullock, 2009). However, the base language might not necessarily be the phonetic equivalent of the morpho-syntactic matrix language. Sociolinguists have been interested in speakers’ attitudes towards CS (e.g., Dewaele & Wei, 2014) while others are fond of the influence of CS on syntactic outcomes (e.g., Cacoullos & Travis, 2016; Yeung et al., 2012). Such a contact phenomenon as CS always yields investigation into the structural outcomes that arise. The morpho-syntax of CS was widely studied, while limited efforts have been dedicated purely to the sound structure of CS.

Hong Kong is arguably a diglossic city where a significant portion of speakers are bilinguals speaking both Cantonese and English (Census and Statistics Department of HKSAR, 2011). Hong Kong has been experiencing a profound history of language contact with English since the 17th century (Luke, 1998). Inevitably, Cantonese and English interact with each other morphologically, phonologically, syntactically, and even sociolinguistically. CS, one of the most common contact phenomena in Hong Kong, offers an interesting angle on the structural outcomes of language
contact in Hong Kong, one of the motives being the typological distinction between Cantonese and English.

CS in Hong Kong is generally defined as a Cantonese utterance or sentence interspersed with an English lexical item or phrase (Li, 2000; Hyland, 1997; Hoet al., 2007), thus being equivalent to intra-sentential CS. An example of CS in Hong Kong is shown in the following, adapted from Li (2002).

(1) 我 想 book 三點 一號場
    I want book 3=о’clock no.1=court

   “I want to book court no. 1 at 3 o’clock.”

The English word “book” was selected instead of its Chinese equivalent as it helped to communicate the intended meaning of ‘to make a reservation’ more unambiguously. Pioneering studies on CS in Hong Kong (e.g., Gibbons, 1987) showed that this kind of CS was commonplace among Cantonese-speaking Hongkongers, whereas the prevalence of CS among these speakers can be confirmed by evidence ranging from pioneering studies (e.g., Gibbons, 1987) to recent endeavours (Li, 2017). Particularly, it has been found that speakers are often not even aware that they are performing CS (e.g., Li & Tse, 2002).

According to a comprehensive review of major studies of CS in Hong Kong (Li, 2000), research on CS in Hong Kong were predominantly from the sociolinguistic or educational perspectives (e.g., Li, 1999; Lin, 1996; Luke, 1998). CS research between this Y2K review and the recent period has seen a similar trend in topics being investigated (e.g., attitudes towards CS) and the approaches adopted (e.g., discourse analysis), though a more rigorous review is needed to arrive at a more precise conclusion. Still, studies on CS that looked into the structural outcomes or adopted the structural approach were relatively rare, and largely employed the morpho-syntactic level of analysis (Leung, 1988; Chan, 1998, 2009). Insufficient attention is given to the phonetic or phonological level. On another note, bilingual phonetics itself has remained a much alive area among studies of bilingualism. In particular, the interaction and segregation of two languages on the phonetic level has been scarcely investigated (Fabiano-Smith & Barlow, 2010), not to mention such a typologically distant pair as Cantonese and English.
2. Phonetics of Code-Switching

The majority of prior studies on the phonetics of CS used voice onset time (VOT) as a measure. The VOT values of bilinguals tend to ‘drift’ in the speech context surrounding it, e.g., in CS (Sancier & Fowler, 1997; Bullock et al., 2006). One of the first attempts of investigating the phonetics of CS was Grosjean & Miller (1994). They set out to explore whether the “phonetic momentum” of the base language would be carried over into the guest language in CS. French-English bilinguals were experimented with three sets of stimuli, including monolingual French and monolingual English as the control stimuli, and the experimental ones were French (base language) utterances with inserted English (guest language) tokens (i.e., French-English CS). The VOT durations of the onset consonant in the code-switch itself were measured. These measurements in the three conditions were compared against one another. Results showed that the phonetics of the base language exerted no impact on the inserted guest-language word in CS production, concluding that bilinguals are both “flexible” and “precise” when entering and exiting CS. With reference to the Matrix Language Framework, this conclusion also implies that the base language did not serve as the phonetic matrix language.

Bullock et al. (2005) later studied Spanish-English bilinguals and specified that the speakers possessed advanced proficiency in both languages. They reported that the VOT value of the guest language in a code-switch was significantly different from that in a monolingual context. This contrasted with the results in Grosjean & Miller (1994) who supported the idea of bilingual flexibility. This also means that the base language could be inferred as the phonetic equivalent of the matrix language in CS. Later, Bullock (2009) demonstrated that degree of difference potentially exist between the sound structure of two participating languages in CS, where this justifies the need to perform acoustic analysis of sounds, heavily centered around VOT productions. Among the few but scrutinized studies, Bullock & Toribio (2009b) studied whether VOT variations as the evidence of cross-linguistic influence of “a subtle nature” would emerge in CS. They found that a significant inter-lingual effect of CS on phonetic production was observed. Antoniou et al. (2011) investigated the phonetic productions of Greek-English CS and demonstrated a “pervasive” influence of L1 on the guest-language phonetic production in CS among L2-dominant bilinguals.

Regarding bilingual language production, the classical Inhibitory Control Model (Green, 1986) hypothesized that in Language A-Language B codeswitching, if the phonetic realization of B is
selected by the speaker, then A would be inhibited or suppressed. While Flege (1995) working on bilingual speech production conveyed that phonetic elements of L1 and L2 must exert influence on one another, the case of phonetic productions from interaction between these two languages in Hong Kong merits an exploration through CS, one of the most common interactional phenomena. Despite the lack of studies on the sound structure of CS in HK, Ng & Chen (2016) nonetheless offered a novice account. The study attempted to identify how Hong Kong ESL learners demonstrated phonological changes in English (guest language) words in Cantonese-English CS, and also their attitudes towards CS. There are however several methodological flaws in their study. First and foremost, the study focused largely on identifying discrete phonological features (e.g., presence or absence of voicing in word-initial consonant, etc.) instead of the phonetic features. Structurally speaking, phonetics possesses the gradient nature that could help to explore bilinguals’ production of CS along an acoustic dimension, whereas phonological features are regarded as categorical. Since code-switches are expected to “manifest only marginal cross-linguistic assimilation or, ideally, none at all” (Bullock, 2009, p. 165), the interaction between CS and sound structure should better be explored by examining the discrete phonetic properties in an utterance. Also, their study employed auditory judgment, which could lead to inevitable biases. This would otherwise have been at least mitigated, if not avoided through adopting acoustic analysis, which could give more objective evidence for the potential phonetic outcomes of CS. Since “accent”, as studied in Ng & Chen (2016), advances to the paradigms in sociolinguistics, this study reserves to the layer of phonetics and thus aims at yielding implications on the phonetic flexibility with regard to CS.

Previous studies (e.g., Chen, 2013; Ng & Chen, 2016) show that voiced consonants such as the voiced alveolar fricative /z/ experienced devoicing to become its allophone /s/. These consonants, however, do not possess a VOT value as they are not stops. The question as to whether voiced stop consonants (e.g., /b/, /d/, /g/) would undergo devoicing, in the Cantonese-English CS context, have been left unanswered. Bullock & Toribio (2009b) once addressed the need for researching the phonetics of code-switching between Chinese and English in the sense that these two languages have different “implementations” of voicing contrast. Particularly, Ng & Chen (2016) included the token ‘book’ as one of their stimulus words, but not much about its phonetic outcomes of this word in code-switching is known. It was shown that bilabial stops (e.g., /b/ in ‘book’) were, despite rarely, still prone to being devoiced as a consequence of its following certain vowels (Pape et al., 2003).

In view of these gaps, the present pilot study hopes to gain a rudimentary insight on the VOT as
one of the phonetic outcomes of Cantonese-English intra-sentential code-switching in Hong Kong.
The following research questions are established:

1. Are the VOT values of word-initial voiceless aspirated stop consonants of an English word in Cantonese-English code-switching different from their counterparts in monolingual English?

2. Does a word-initial voiced bilabial stop consonant of an English word get devoiced in Cantonese-English code-switching?

Following the conventions of prior studies on CS phonetics, this study focuses on the VOT values of embedded guest-language (i.e., English) words in CS productions. Extant literature has shown that Cantonese as a first language (L1) in Hong Kong interferes with the phonological features of English as a second language (L2) (e.g., Deterding et al., 2008), and this interference was also demonstrated in the phonological features of inserted English words in CS (Ng & Chen, 2016). Supplemented with the findings in Bullock & Toribio (2009a) and Bullock & Toribio (2009b), it is hypothesized that the VOT values of word-initial voiceless stops in English words in CS will be significantly different from their counterparts in the monolingual English context. Chen (2013) and Ng & Chen (2016) showed that consonants of English words in CS were devoiced. Moving on from the previous hypothesis, this study also hypothesizes that word-initial voiced bilabials will be devoiced in Cantonese-English CS. Ultimately, it is hypothesized that Cantonese would be the phonetic matrix language in CS.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

A total of 10 Cantonese-English bilinguals were recruited to participate in this study through convenience sampling. All participants grew up in Hong Kong, speaking Cantonese as their native language and received formal school-based language education, particularly learning English since kindergarten. None reported any speech or hearing disorders or difficulty. Local university students in Hong Kong were shown to be speakers with frequent CS (Chen & Carper, 2005). Participants were therefore recruited at a large comprehensive university in Hong Kong and they participated in this study voluntarily without compensation. They were aged between 20 and 24 years old.
(mean = 20.7), where 6 of them were female and 4 were male. Ethical consents were obtained for their participation. They all achieved Band 7.0 or above in their overall score of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) examinations, or achieved Level 5* or above in the English Language subject of the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education (HKDSE), or Grade B or above in the Use of English subject of the Hong Kong Advanced Levels Examination (HKALE). The performance levels equated across IELTS and the two public examinations in Hong Kong were provided by the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority (HKEAA, 2004). Participants’ performance in such examinations instead of their self-rated competence in the target language was used for determining their proficiency, as self-ratings are more prone to inevitable biases.

3.2. Instruments and Procedures

A short CS monologue with 376 words (Chinese/Cantonese and English, Appendix I) was first written by the researcher based on his personal experience. Monologues are advantageous over conversations in that CS in conversations would derive sociolinguistic consideration, out of the scope of this study. It was written from the perspective of a local undergraduate student in Hong Kong so that participants, who were also undergraduates, would find the content relatable to their own background. Along with the informal style, the monologue contains colloquial Cantonese expressions (e.g., “勁神秘” meaning “super mysterious”) to offer a sense of locality. This design was to make the monologue appear less fabricated, hoping to model a casual monologue despite the unavailability to collect naturalistic CS data owing to the costs and ethical concerns involved.

The monologue contained either pure Cantonese clauses or such clauses inserted with English words (the CS clauses). These code-switches (N = 23) included single-words that were either monosyllabic (e.g., friend) or bi-syllabic (e.g., report) and two instances of two-word phrases (“small potatoes”, “print notes”). Minimal pairs of stop-voicing (e.g., /p@/ vs /b@/) or stop-aspiration sharing the same place of articulation, were not arranged consecutively in order to minimize the effects of hyper-articulation. For the first research question, 3 code-switches were chosen as stimulus words (“paper”, “taste”, “cake”), each beginning with a voiceless aspirated stop consonant (i.e., /p/, /t/, /k/) followed by the same diphthong /eı/ for the sake of similar phonological environments. Following are the excerpts from the monologue, each containing a stimulus word:
For the second research question, there was one stimulus word ("book"), beginning with a voiced bilabial stop consonant. The corresponding excerpt is shown below:

(5) 未 = yet book 場 打波
Not= yet book court playing=basketball

“(I) have not yet booked a basketball court.”

Other code-switches acted as the fillers in this pilot study. The monologue was translated to a monolingual English (guest language in CS) version (Appendix II), where all the stimulus words appearing in the original CS monologue were maintained. An English major student who is also a Cantonese-English bilingual and did not participate in the study was involved in checking the fluency, grammatical accuracy and choice of diction of the monologue before using it on participants.

As opposed to prior studies offering several settings including CS, monolingual base language, and monolingual guest language, a pure monolingual Cantonese (i.e., base language) version of the monologue was not prepared because CS is a highly common and natural linguistic phenomenon in Hong Kong. An entire monologue in Cantonese would make participants feel unnatural (e.g., Li & Tse, 2002).

The 23 code-switches were also extracted into a word list containing the 25 English words, similar to a list of vocabulary item used in ordinary English classrooms in Hong Kong. This word list served as the monolingual setting for the first research question of this study owing to an accidental omission of the token “paper” in the English version of the monologue, while the English
version of the monologue served as the monolingual setting for the second research question. The production of a token in isolation might be able to offset the effects of the preceding sound on a target stop, which might lead to a larger variance in the resultant VOT values.

Each participant first filled in a short questionnaire on their personal and background information, including their gender, age, and their scores in IELTS, HKDSE or HKALE. They were then asked by the Cantonese-speaking researcher, in Cantonese, to read aloud the CS monologue, its English version and the word list (Appendix I, II and III) separately in the form of three reading tasks. To ensure that participants demonstrated their most comfortable pace and volume, no specific instructions were given before participants did the reading. All the reading was audio-recorded in a quiet environment on campus. An optional de-briefing session was conducted after the reading tasks if participants would like to know more about the study.

3.3. Data Analysis

A recording was segregated into chunks on both the sentential level and the word level, for acoustic analysis using Praat. The researcher carried out the data pre-processing, inspection of both the waveforms and spectrograms, and measurements (e.g., VOT measurements) for all productions to ensure consistency. 2.7% of stops were discarded from the dataset as they were inaudible due to unclear pronunciation or skipping of a sound. To answer the first research question, VOT values of each stimulus word of each participant in the two target contexts, namely CS and monolingual English, were measures. For the second research question, the VOT of the voiced stop consonant in the token was measured, also in the two target contexts. At the same time, the spectrogram of the token for the second research question was also inspected, to explore whether its onset stop consonant would be “devoiced”. These quantitative data were later analyzed using SPSS. Statistical significance was taken and indicated at the levels of $p < .05^*$ and $p < .01^{**}$.

4. Results

4.1. VOT of Word-initial Voiceless Aspirated Stops

Among the ten participants of this study, /p/ in CS entailed a larger range of VOT values than its counterpart in monolingual English. A similar phenomenon on the range difference also applies to
the VOT of /k/ in CS and in English. On another note, the VOT measurements of /k/ in both CS and monolingual settings gave rise to the highest SD among those of the three stops. Also, the maximum values of VOT across the three stops in both settings also belonged to /k/.

Figure 1 displays the mean VOT values of the word-initial stop consonants in both the settings of CS and in the monolingual setting. A paired-samples t-test was conducted for comparing the VOT values of each stop in the two settings, yielding no statistically significant difference (p > .05).

![Figure 1: Mean VOT of English words with word-initial voiceless stops in two settings of HP participants](image)

Later, a revisit of the CS monologue revealed that it contains the word ‘其’ (/keı4/) that could be taken into account. It appeared in one of the Cantonese sentences in the CS monologue. Since it does not precede or follow any English elements, it is regarded as a word in the monolingual Cantonese context.

(6) 佢 其實 都 係 撈錢
He actually just is making=a=living

“He’s just making a living.”

The voiceless aspirated velar stop /k/ and its following diphthong /eı/ imply a similar phonological environment with the stimulus word ‘cake’ (/keık/). This enables comparison among the
instances of this stop in not only the monolingual English and CS but also the monolingual Cantonese context. Subsequently, the VOT values of the onset consonant of ‘其’ were measured. In the monolingual Cantonese setting, participants demonstrated a range of VOT values from 27.17 ms to 75.26 ms (SD = 15.19 ms). Modelling the pioneering research design of Grosjean & Miller (1994), the VOT values of /k/ across the three settings were compared. The SD of the VOT of /k/ in Cantonese was actually the lowest among that in the three settings. Figure 8 shows the mean VOT across the three settings. Results were 48.86 ms in Cantonese, 74.95 ms in English, and 74.40 ms in CS. A one-way ANOVA test was conducted on the VOT values of /k/ across the three settings. A strong statistical significance at \( p = .005^{**} \) was yielded. Post-hoc tests for pairwise differences showed that the VOT values of /k/ in Cantonese and in English are significantly different (\( p = .003^{**} \)), while the difference between that in Cantonese and CS is also significant (\( p = .007^{**} \)). However, the VOT of /k/ in CS and that in English are shown to be statistically indifferent (\( p = .750 \)).

![Figure 2: VOT of /k/ under different settings](image)

4.2. Devoicing of Voiced Stop

All instances of /b/ in the token ‘book’ in CS were devoiced, while in the monolingual English setting, 88.9% of the instances were devoiced. Figure 3 displays the acoustic representation of /b/ in English without devoicing and Figure 4 shows a devoiced counterpart with the lowest positive VOT value among participants. VOT values of the devoiced /b/ were considered for analysis.
Participants demonstrated a larger range of VOT for /b/ in English than that in CS. The VOT values of /b/ in CS nonetheless had the smallest SD and also the smallest value (5 ms) among all observations in this study. An independent samples t-test showed that the per-participant average VOT of /b/ in CS (8.529 ms) and that in monolingual English (14.196 ms) were significantly different ($p = .045^*$). For data from each of the ten individual participants, please refer to Appendix IV.

Figure 3: Voiced /b/ in “book” produced by Participant 3 in monolingual English

Figure 4: Devoiced /b/ in “book” produced by Participant 5 in monolingual English
5. Discussion

The VOT values of the voiceless aspirated bilabial /p/ and voiceless aspirated velar /k/ in the CS context were diverse. This indicates that these two specific stops were not phonetically stable in CS. This is in alignment with previous findings that the VOT production of a stop produced by bilinguals were not static owing to the speech environment (Sancier & Fowler, 1997; Bullock et al., 2006). For /p/ in the token “paper” in CS, auditory inspection yielded that some speakers produced the token as /peı-pA:/ in CS and /peı-pA:/ in monolingual English. Though there is only a difference in the vowel quality of the second syllable, this vowel lengthening in CS can be seen as an influence from Cantonese since various English loanwords in Cantonese have a similar phonetic adaptation before transforming to a Cantonese word (Bauer & Wong, 2008). Phonetic realization of the entire token (i.e., the code-switch) with the influence from the base language would therefore lead to variance in its onset consonant. For /k/ in “cake” in CS, another round of auditory inspection suggested that speakers produced its following diphthong /eı/ in at least two identifiable ways. It was realized as either /eı/ or a phonetic variant between /eı/ and /ı/. The variance in the vowel following a stop therefore gave rise to the phonetic instability of the stop, since the VOT of a stop is shown to be influenced by its following vowel (Pape et al., 2003). The Cantonese context was included at a later stage of the study. Interestingly, a low dispersity was found in /k/ in the Cantonese context for participants. This depicts that /k/ was phonetically stable when realized as a Cantonese consonant, regardless of the dominance of the guest language. Another eye-opening finding was that the maximum VOT value of /p/ in CS was even higher than the its maximum value in English. These speakers proficient in English might have acquired their production capability in the aspirated /p/ in English by deliberately extending their aspiration in /p/ in the Cantonese phonetic inventory. These speakers being English majors might have been meta-linguistically aware of their pronunciation and exhibited over-controlling on their phonetic production. This phenomenon was also observed in Bullock et al. (2006), and was interpreted as hyper-correction in Bullock & Toribio (2009b). The present study thus shows that this phenomenon on L2-dominant individuals also occurred in Cantonese-English CS in Hong Kong.

The mean VOT values of word-initial voiceless aspirated stops were non-significant across contexts. This demonstrated that this phonetic property of the guest language (English) in CS was no different from that in the monolingual context, rejecting that the hypothesis to the first research question. However, the conclusion as to whether CS is impactful on the guest-language VOT cannot
be drawn at this point, since it is not known whether the phonetic productions of English words, before taking CS into consideration, were already influenced by the base language (Cantonese). Results were unable to show whether the language switch from the base language (Cantonese) to the guest language (English) was completed. Prior studies showed that the VOT value of the guest language in CS differed significantly from that in the monolingual environment (e.g., Bullock, 2009; Bullock et al., 2005) while the present study showed otherwise. It was also suggested that CS exerted an impact on the phonetic productions of the guest language. Nonetheless, they studied pairs of languages closer in the family of languages, such as French-English (Grosjean & Miller, 1994), and Spanish-English (Bullock et al., 2005), while the present study explored CS of two typologically distinct languages, having phonologies with a number of contrastive differences (Chan & Li, 2000). A preliminary implication is that the phonetic outcomes of L2 on its own and those of L2 as the guest language in CS are not significantly different from each other if the L2 (English, in the Hong Kong case) is typologically distant from the base language that is also the L1 (Cantonese).

There are two ways of looking into the sound structure of CS. The objective acoustic analysis can derive phonetic outcomes of CS while auditory judgment helps identify its phonological features (e.g., Chen, 2013; Ng & Chen, 2016). Still, the gradient nature of phonetic features might generate more useful implications on bilingual speech production, when compared with the discrete categories of phonological features. While it is evident that the phonological features of English in Cantonese-English CS are different from those of English on its own (Ng & Chen, 2016), this study nonetheless shows that such phonetic properties as VOT in the two contexts might be very similar. This is a first attempt highlighting the importance of subtle but significant structural changes reflected from CS (Bullock & Toribio, 2009b) as in the context of Hong Kong. For instance, Ng & Chen (2016) showed the deletion of an onset or word-final consonant in several tokens (e.g., “present” as a verb) of the guest language in CS, though consonants might not necessarily get completely dropped and there could be a continuum between the “presence” of a consonant and its “absence”, like the variation of VOT which helps to infer the degree of aspiration of a stop.

An unexpected discovery emerged during the process of investigating preliminary findings for the first research question. The context of monolingual Cantonese (i.e., the base language) was also involved for the voiceless aspirated velar stop /k/. Results showed that its mean VOT in CS was no different from that in a monolingual English environment. However, its mean VOT value in Cantonese (48.86 ms) was significantly lower than that in English (74.95 ms, \( p = .003^{**} \)) and in CS (71.40 ms, \( p = .007^{**} \)) while VOT of /k/ in English and CS were not significantly different (\( p \))
This implies that the phonetic momentum of the base language (Grosjean & Miller, 1994) failed to be carried over to the guest language in CS, at least for the said onset consonant. The language switch from Cantonese as the base language to English as the guest language was therefore completed at the onset of the code-switch. Countering the argument by Bullock et al. (2006), results of this study implies the speakers did not interpret such embedded words as borrowings as they were not integrated into the base-language phonology.

Nonetheless, this at least depicts that when speakers with a higher L2 proficiency code-switch, their phonetic outcomes of CS tend to be productions in the guest language and away from the base language. Participants were English majors who were immersed in an English-dominant environment, thus producing English-like VOT in CS. These speakers could therefore be inferred as not suffering from phonetic interference from L1 in the CS context, at least at the onset. They managed to suppress the impact of L1 on L2 in at least this particular phonetic production at the code-switch boundary and prevented “phonetic bleeding”. This aligned with the Inhibitory Control Model (Green, 1986) that hypothesized the inhibition or suppression of Language A (i.e., Cantonese in this study) if the phonetic realization of Language B (i.e., English) is selected in A-B codeswitching. Following how Bullock & Toribio (2009b) framed the phonetics of CS with the MLF model, Cantonese is therefore not the phonetic matrix language in Cantonese-English CS in Hong Kong. This consideration is at least valid for the speakers with a higher proficiency in the embedded language and further in-depth investigation is necessary to validate the relationships between the base language and the matrix language. Also, findings at this point could be coupled with an argument posited by Olson (2012) who studied bilingual language switching at the phonetic level. Assumed that these L2-dominant bilingual speakers were able to differentiate between phonetic norms, phonetic activation of English did occur after lexical selection in English, i.e., when switching from Cantonese into an English token.

This study presented acoustic evidence for more objective findings. In addition to the voiced fricative /z/ of an English word in CS (Ng & Chen, 2016), results for the second research question suggested that voiced bilabial stops /b/ also largely experienced devoicing in CS, where only a small portion of instances were not devoiced in the monolingual English context. This validates the hypothesis to the second research question. The inherent phonological differences between Cantonese and English can account for the predominance of devoicing. For instance, voicing contrast exists in English but not Cantonese. Voiced stops such as the bilabial /b/, the alveolar /d/, and the velar /g/, and unvoiced ones (i.e., /p/, /t/, /k/; each can be further categorized into aspirated
and unaspirated) contribute to minimal pairs, while voicing distinction of stops is phonetically not meaningful in Cantonese. This could explain why even these speakers with higher proficiency in English devoiced bilabials. These findings thus demonstrated the opposite to earlier findings on voiceless stops, and those from prior studies (e.g., Flege et al., 2002) where bilinguals dominant in their L2 (a.k.a. proficient in L2) were immune to L1-L2 interference. Nevertheless, findings still strengthen the empirical support towards the theoretical existence of “language-specific” phonetic categories (Antoniou et al., 2011) for voiced bilabials. In the case of Hong Kong ESL speakers in this study, an interlanguage /b/ category houses the voiced and unvoiced /b/ as two language-specific phonetic variants, in which the unvoiced /b/ seems more dominant in this phonetic inventory. Moreover, since the VOT values of unaspirated stops range from 0 to 25 ms (Lisker & Abramson, 1964), most of the participants can be inferred as realizing /b/ as a Cantonese unaspirated stop.

6. Limitations

This study has several limitations. Firstly, a limited number of participants were recruited. Findings are not intended for generalization. Regarding the research design, read-aloud tasks from prescribed materials might not yield the most naturalistic spoken data. This is however an inevitable option due to high costs and ethical concerns involved in obtaining first-hand naturalistic CS data. Notably, the inherent variance of VOT across individuals was also a methodological shortcoming. For the research instruments, the number of stimulus words might be insufficient to reflect a big picture of the phonetic outcomes of CS. Also, the setting of a base language was absent for the voiceless aspirated alveolar stop, the voiceless aspirated velar stop, and the voiced bilabial stop. Further implications on the bi-directionality notion were therefore not drawn. Therefore, caution has to be taken in interpreting preliminary findings of this pilot study.

7. Conclusion and future work

The sound structure of code-switching in Hong Kong is unique in that it involves the interaction of two typologically distinct languages. In an attempt to gain a rudimentary insight into the phonetic outcomes of Cantonese-English code-switching, the present study examined the voice onset time (VOT) durations of three English words each with a voiceless aspirated stop, in the context of Cantonese-English code-switching against the context of monolingual English. Findings
revealed that this phonetic property presented no significant differences between the two contexts, while in the literature, phonological features exhibited differences across contexts (Ng & Chen, 2016). A preliminary implication is that these bilinguals demonstrated phonetic inflexibility between code-switching and the monolingual guest-language environment. This study also explored whether devoicing occurred in the voiced bilabial stop of an English word in CS. Findings showed that most Hong Kong bilinguals in this study demonstrated devoicing likely due to the inherent difference in terms of voicing contrast between the two participating languages. This also led to the interpretation that an interlanguage category for this voiced bilabial contained a voiced and a unvoiced phoneme as two language-specific phonetic variants. Unforeseen findings emerged later in this study after considering the Cantonese context for the voiceless aspirated velar stop. Hong Kong bilinguals with a higher proficiency in their L2 (English) demonstrated similarities in its VOT between code-switching and English, and significant differences between code-switching and Cantonese. Code-switching was therefore inferred as posing no impact on the phonetic production of this stop in English. Suppression of the base language in the phonetic realization of this stop in the guest language served as an explanation.

Since this study focused entirely on the observations in the word-initial position, future research can inspect word-medial stops of code-switches, as studied in Antoniou et al. (2011) in other languages. To come up with a more comprehensive picture of the phonetics of Cantonese-English code-switching, other phonetic features including but not limited to the vowel quality in code-switches also merit further exploration. Suprasegmental features, as investigated in Olson (2012), also deserves examination in the unique context of Cantonese-English code-switching in Hong Kong. Finally, efforts can be devoted to investigate the phonetic interaction between other pairs of typologically distinct language. Forthcoming studies will consider attitudinal data from bilinguals and analyze the relationships between their perceptions of code-switching and their phonetic production in code-switching, with the aim to derive sociophonetic implications.
Appendix I: The monologue with Cantonese-English code-switching
(The actual material was without formatting. Tokens have been italicized here for easier reference.)

我係個大學生，又係個 small potato，中學嘅陣好多 friend 架，冇啲而家喺外國讀書，好似 happy，有佢攞完 oral 之後都無見過，變神秘。但不得不提嘅，係個嘅你明明無佢電話 number 但佢又揼到你嘅「舊同學」。無錯，佢係會無啦啦打俾你，嘅來俾要 sell 你嘅咩最新防水、防火、防塵、防臭嘅高科技 jacket，仲話男嘅著啲會好 man，女嘅就會俾姊妹大讚有 taste。我心諗，嚟，明星咩，著件嘅嘅嘅，就會有好多 fans 嘅個時候，佢地會問埋你著啲咩 size，跟住，佢會突然醒覺，佢其實都係想錢姐。但係，你望住眼前嘅張補習社老細尋日開俾你嘅 check，再凝望住電郵，嘆息自己做 paper 既速度仲慢過舊壞嘅 RAM，諗吓自己其實係咪應該努力讀書。無奈嘅係，當你響起自己未 book 場打波，又想落大中買返件 cake 食，又要今晚十二點前覆 email，又要去 print notes，又俾班上面嘅擲嘅 fake 嘅，原來聯日已經要 present 唔知邊科 report，仲記得夢日 claim 少啲上吃嘅宣傳費……唉，都係抖多陣，起身叫個 pizza 再算。

Appendix II: The translated English version of the monologue
(The actual material was without formatting. Tokens have been italicized here for easier reference.)

I’m a university student and also a small potato. But I’ve got many friends in secondary school. Some of them are now studying abroad. How happy! Some mysteriously disappeared after taking their oral exams. And there are always some former classmates who you’ve never got their phone numbers. Still, they can find you out of nowhere. Guess what they want? To sell a hi-tech jacket to you. They would say something like ‘you’ll be more like a man’ if you’re a boy, or ‘your sisters will praise your taste’ if you’re a girl. Wow. If I can get fans after wearing this thing, then I’m already a pop star. They’ll then ask which size you prefer. And you’ll suddenly realize they just want to earn some money. At this moment, you’re looking at the check your boss gave you yesterday. You stare at your computer, feeling that you work more slowly than the RAM of a defected computer. You are thinking whether you should work harder. But life isn’t fair. Because you forgot to book a basketball court. Then you’re hungry and you want a cake. But you need to reply to an email before mid-night and to print notes. But J said something fake to trick you. Oh, you realize you have to present a report tomorrow. Well, you also forgot to claim the expenses for the students’ association. Sigh! You should sleep for a little longer and order pizza later.
Appendix III: The list of tokens in separation
(The actual material was presented in the form of a vertical list of words.)

1. small  2. potato  3. friend  4. happy  5. oral
6. number  7. sell  8. jacket  9. man  10. taste
16. books  17. cake  18. email  19. print  20. notes
21. fake  22. present  23. report  24. claim  25. pizza

Appendix IV: VOT values (in milliseconds) of each stop in different contexts in the HP group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/p/</th>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/b/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP1</td>
<td>27.09</td>
<td>23.807</td>
<td>78.323</td>
<td>61.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP2</td>
<td>44.265</td>
<td>51.972</td>
<td>109.19</td>
<td>56.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP3</td>
<td>49.209</td>
<td>45.698</td>
<td>78.929</td>
<td>90.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP4</td>
<td>68.316</td>
<td>76.241</td>
<td>88.308</td>
<td>89.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP5</td>
<td>49.161</td>
<td>55.391</td>
<td>75.249</td>
<td>76.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP6</td>
<td>50.105</td>
<td>50.506</td>
<td>53.533</td>
<td>69.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP7</td>
<td>59.925</td>
<td>21.213</td>
<td>88.273</td>
<td>91.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP8</td>
<td>78.474</td>
<td>27.709</td>
<td>81.882</td>
<td>78.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.23</td>
<td>44.824</td>
<td>67.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP10</td>
<td>48.77</td>
<td>72.131</td>
<td>92.579</td>
<td>31.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>78.474</td>
<td>76.241</td>
<td>109.19</td>
<td>91.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.213</td>
<td>44.824</td>
<td>31.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean2</td>
<td>48.8315</td>
<td>46.5898</td>
<td>79.109</td>
<td>71.4145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>18.7401</td>
<td>18.8631</td>
<td>18.5824</td>
<td>18.6591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The minimum VOT value of /b/ was taken among the devoiced instances.
2 The mean VOT value of /b/ was taken at the mean value of all devoiced instances.
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Abstract

This paper examines the factors affecting the choice between two word orders in Cantonese complex predicate constructions: the object-medial \([V_1 \text{Obj } m \ V_2]\) and the object-final \([V_1 \ m \ V_2 \text{Obj}].\) Data were collected using Google Search and the probability of choosing the object-medial construction under different situations was estimated using nonparametric statistical methods. It is discovered that the choice depends on many factors, including the object’s position on the referential hierarchy, verbal semantics, and the degree of lexicalisation of the complex predicate. Potential synchronic and diachronic explanations of these effects are then proposed.
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1. The explicandum

In modern Cantonese, there exist complex predicates where the object may be sandwiched between the two verbs only when second verb, traditionally known as the complement (buyu) in the Chinese literature, is negated, i.e. preceded by the negation marker \(m4\) (or \(dak1\); see discussion in section 5).\(^1\)

\(^1\)There exist complex predicates where the second verb simply cannot be negated regardless of object position, e.g. \(*giu3 \ m4 \ co3 \ keoi5/*giu3 \ keoi5 \ m4 \ co3\) (call no wrong 3sg/call 3sg no wrong, ‘cannot call him by his wrong name’), corresponding to the affirmative construction \(giu3 \ co3 \ keoi5\) (call wrong 3sg, ‘call (him/her) by the wrong name’); such predicates will not be discussed.

\(^2\)We shall adopt the Jyutping system of Cantonese romanisation (Tang et al., 2002).
Such constructions are historically derived from serial verb constructions that exhibit asymmetry between the verbs - the so-called asymmetric SVCs (Matthews, 2006). In this paper, we shall refer to the dominant verb as $V_1$ and the restricted verb as $V_2$. We are therefore concerned with $[V_1 \text{ Obj } m \ V_2] / [V_1 \ m \ V_2 \text{ Obj}]$ alternations.

As has been previously noted Li (2013), similar alternations exist in other Chinese varieties, such as Xiang, Hakka, Min and Wu. For instance, the Yiyang variety of Xiang exhibits the following alternation (Xu, 2001).

From Xu’s data, all three construction types seem fully productive in Yiyang. This is not

---

3 Xu does not provide phonetic transcriptions for each word; as such, cognate-by-cognate Mandarin romanisations using pinyin were used here.

4 The semantics of the $\text{dao}$ particle ($\text{dou2}$ in Cantonese) will be discussed below.
the case in Cantonese. If (2-3) are translated morpheme-by-morpheme to Cantonese, the forms in (2c), (3b) and (3c) will be ungrammatical. The ungrammaticality of the object-medial (c) constructions and grammaticality of the object-final (a) constructions are categorical in Cantonese (with exceptions to be discussed below); however, less is known about the situations under which the object-medial (b) patterns are acceptable:

(4) a. joeng5 m4 daai6 keoi5
    feed NEG big 3sg
    ‘to not raise (a child, a pet, etc.) successfully’

b. joeng5 keoi5 m4 daai6

c. *joeng5 m4 keoi5 daai6

(5) a. daap3 m4 dou2 ce1
    ride NEG DOU vehicle
    ‘to not succeed at riding on a vehicle’

b. *daap3 ce1 m4 dou2

c. *daap3 m4 ce1 dou2

This paper focuses on this issue: What factors explain the variability in acceptability of the object-medial order [V1 Obj m V2] in Cantonese?

We assume that [V1 Obj m V2] is a marked word order in Cantonese. This is because object-medial order has a more restricted distribution. The object-final order can usually be used in place of the object-medial order (4ab), but the reverse is not always true (5ab); it is rare to find cases where the object-medial order is acceptable but the object-final one is not. Thus the object-medial order is more marked according to one of the criteria detailed in Comrie (1976). Nonetheless, local markedness reversals do exist, and will be touched on below.

With reference to previous studies of constructional competition (inter alia Gries, 2006; Bresnan et al., 2007; Arppe, 2009), we hypothesise that an account of the object position alternation in Cantonese may consider the contribution of at least seven groups of factors, not all of which may turn out to be useful:

- Main effect of V1: phonological weight, TAM value, verbal semantics
• Main effect of V₂: phonological weight, level of grammaticalisation, verbal/adjectival semantics

• Main effect of Obj: phonological weight, topicality, animacy, definiteness

• Interaction effect between V₁ and V₂: level of lexicalisation of the V₁-V₂ pair

• Interaction effect between V₁ and Obj: semantic ‘closeness’ between V₁ and Obj, level of lexicalisation of the V₁-Obj pair

• Interaction effect between V₂ and Obj: whether Obj can serve as the subject or object of V₂

• Interaction effect among all three: construction-specific idiosyncracies

2. Methodology

2.1. Data collection

This short paper cannot explore all the effects outlined above; instead, we will examine them by presenting data from three classes of Cantonese complex predicates: those with the highly grammaticalised *dou2* as V₂, the resultative construction, and constructions with a highly co-lexicalised V₁/V₂ pair. In each class, we will perform exploratory data analysis based on the frequency counts obtained.

We looked for objects according to a simplified version of the Silverstein hierarchy (Silverstein, 1987) that excludes plural referents:

(6) First-person singular pronoun (*ngo5*) > Second-person singular pronoun (*nei5*) > Third-person singular pronoun (*keoi5*) > Singular kinship terms/Proper nouns (*aa3* X) > Singular definite NPs (*go3* X) > Singular indefinite NPs (*jat1 go3* X)

All data came from Google search and were based on the number of search results obtained. For example, to investigate speakers’ preference for the object-medial *gin3 ngo5 m4 dou2* viz-à-viz the object-final *gin3 m4 dou2 ngo5*, the search string “見我唔到” or “見唔到我” was used, and each token of each construction type was counted.
For full NPs, the wildcard character * was used to aid in searching. For kinship terms and proper nouns, we used the morpheme aa3 along with the wildcard character, yielding kinship terms and terms of endearment like Aa3 Ming4 for someone called Ming; thus “見阿*唔到” or “唔唔到阿*” was used to look for tokens of gin3 aa3 X m4 dou2 (see AA * NEG DOU) and its object-final counterpart. For definite NPs, we used the bare generic classifier go3 with the wildcard character, which generally results in definite NPs (Cheng & Sybesma, 2005). For indefinite NPs, we used the generic classifier go3 with the numeral jat1 (‘one’).

Several kinds of tokens were not included in our counts. Firstly, in the object-final case, if the object in the search string is not the true object of the sentence (but, say, the possessor of some head noun or the first element of a compound), then the token is discounted. For example, gin3 m4 dou2 ngo5 aa3maa1 (see NEG DOU 1sg mother, ‘to not be able to see my mother’) and gin3 m4 dou2 ngo5 sik6 hoeng1ziu1 (see NEG DOU 1sg eat banana, ‘to not be able to see me eat bananas’) are not counted as instances of gin3 m4 dou2 ngo5 (see NEG DOU 1sg, ‘to not be able to see me’).

Secondly, when V\textsubscript{1} takes more than one argument (7a-b), or when there is an additional ‘complement’ verb V\textsubscript{3} which carries less semantic weight than V\textsubscript{1} (7c), the object-medial order seems categorically ungrammatical:

\begin{align*}
(7) \quad &a. \quad ^*\text{gaau3} \quad \text{keoi5} \quad m4 \quad \text{dou2} \quad \text{pou2tung1waa2} \\
&\quad \text{teach} \quad 3sg \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{DOU} \quad \text{Putonghua} \\
&\quad \text{‘to not be able to teach him Mandarin’} \\
&b. \quad ^*\text{gaau3} \quad \text{keoi5} \quad m4 \quad \text{dou2} \quad \text{jung6} \quad \text{Excel} \\
&\quad \text{teach} \quad 3sg \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{DOU} \quad \text{use} \quad \text{Excel} \\
&\quad \text{‘to not be able to teach him to use Excel’} \\
&c. \quad ^*\text{bong1} \quad \text{keoi5} \quad m4 \quad \text{dou2} \quad \text{sau2} \\
&\quad \text{help} \quad 3sg \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{DOU} \quad \text{hand} \\
&\quad \text{‘to not be able to lend him a helping hand’}
\end{align*}

As such, when these constructions appear in their object-final form, the tokens are not counted.

The only significant exception to this general rule is gu2 + Obj + m4 dou2 (guess Obj NEG DOU, ‘to not be able to guess Obj’), which is acceptable even when the verb subcategorises for an additional complement clause.\footnote{We did find one single example outside of gu2, with the bong1 ... dou2 (help ... DOU) predicate, but this very} This is likely because of a constructional idiosyncrasy. Gu2
was found to highly prefer the object-medial order: the object-final *gu2 m4 dou2 + Obj is simply unattested when the object is pronominal and no additional arguments or verbs are present (8a). When an additional complement clause is present, both orders are possible (8c-d), though the object-final construction is then indistinguishable from a sentence with a single complement clause with an overt subject (8d):

(8) a. *Gu2 m4 dou2 nei5.
guess NEG DOU 2sg
‘to not expect someone (to do something)’
b. Gu2 nei5 m4 dou2.
guess 2sg NEG DOU
c. Gu2 nei5 m4 dou2 gam3 hou2waan2.
guess 2sg NEG DOU so fun
‘to not expect you to be so much fun’
d. Gu2 m4 dou2 nei5 gam3 hou2waan2
guess NEG DOU 2sg so fun

For consistency, however, we still discounted all tokens with additional arguments.

Note, however, that V3 is only incompatible with the object-medial order when it is less prominent than the V1. This does not exclude the possibility of including a third serial verb which is comparable in semantic importance to the first verb (and thus does not form part of the complex predicate). This is fairly common in the data:

(9) a. ding2 keoi5 m4 seon6 m4 lou1
endure 3sg NEG along.the.flow.of NEG work
‘(Carmen Cheung) could not stand her and stopped working for her.’

2.2. Data analysis

After collecting frequency data, we examined the proportion of object-medial tokens for each group (each group generally comprises all tokens with the same V1, V2 and Obj), which is used to estimate rare.

6Taken from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5q8b2zhkHJY, accessed 4/27/2017.
the probability that a speaker will choose the object-medial order:

(10) a. Parameter: P(Object-medial—V₁, V₂, Obj)

b. Estimator: \( n_{\text{medial}} / (n_{\text{final}} + n_{\text{medial}}) \) (number of object-medial tokens divided by the total number of tokens per construction)

To estimate the probabilities with greater certainty, exact Clopper-Pearson confidence intervals were used because the counts of some treatment groups were insufficient for the Central Limit Theorem to justify standard normal confidence intervals.\(^8\) We also corrected for multiple testing within each group of constructions. Since the sample proportions are assumed independent, all confidence intervals have been corrected by Šidák’s method - i.e. when there are \( g \) intervals, all intervals are given at the \( 100\%(0.9^{1/g}) \) confidence level - yielding slightly sharper intervals than Bonferroni’s method at a family confidence level of 90%.

In addition, when we examined predicates with the V₂ \( \text{dou2} \), we used Fisher’s exact test with the Bonferroni correction, a more conservative method, along with bootstrap resampling, a less conservative method, for pairwise comparison between different V₁s; the reason for doing these comparisons will shortly be clear.

All the statistical results are presented in the appendix; we shall describe the more important results in the next section.

3. Three sample construction types

3.1. Highly grammaticalised V₂: \( \text{dou2} \)

Some V₂s are so frequent and grammaticalised that they act like particles in English phrasal verbs, like up in *write it up / write up the paper*. These are known as satellites (Talmy, 2007). One such verb in Cantonese, \( \text{dou2} \) (lit ‘arrive’, glossed DOU), denotes success, similar to the French periphrastic *arriver à + V* construction, though more grammaticalised. In fact, it is so semantically bleached that it probably cannot be considered a verb any more, but is more like a

\(^8\)One additional advantage of this is that when only one order is observed (i.e. all observed tokens are object-medial or object-final), we can still have an interval estimate.
Here, we investigate the tendency of speakers to produce the \([V_1 \text{ Obj } m \text{ dou}]\) construction under eight values of \(V_1\): \textit{bong1} (‘help’), \textit{gaau3} (‘teach’), \textit{gau3} (‘rescue’), \textit{gin3} (‘see’), \textit{gu2} (‘guess’), \textit{jing2} (‘photograph’), \textit{wan2} (‘look for’) and \textit{zuk1} (‘catch’).

When the object is a personal pronoun, both orders were widely attested. Confidence intervals for the proportions can be found in (23) of the appendix. Overall, the object-medial order seems to be the most common when the object is in the second person. The value of the point estimate \(\hat{p}\) is higher than 0.5 for all verbs but \textit{gaau3} (‘teach’). The lower bounds of these verbs’ confidence intervals lie above 0.25, and two of the verbs (\textit{gu2} and \textit{gau3}) have lower bounds above 0.5. By contrast, the third-person pronoun is least likely to occur in the medial position: apart from \textit{gu2} (‘guess’), all of the proportions seem to lie near 0.5. (As we have mentioned above, \textit{gu2} seems to categorically prefer the object-medial order when the object is pronominal.)

Perhaps the most interesting case is the first-person pronoun. The most variable \(V_1\)s seem to be verbs taking benefactive objects (\textit{bong1} ‘help’, \textit{gau3} ‘rescue’, henceforth \textit{benefactive verbs}) and those related to capturing (\textit{jing2} ‘photograph’, \textit{wan2} ‘look for’ and \textit{zuk1} ‘catch’, henceforth \textit{capturing verbs}). When the object is the second-person pronoun, the proportions of \([V_1 \text{ Obj } m \text{ dou}]\) are high for both groups of verbs; when the object is the third-person pronoun, the proportion is fairly low for both. Yet when the object is the first-person pronoun, predicates with benefactive verbs have a far lower tendency to be object-medial than those with capturing verbs. Both Fisher’s exact test and bootstrap resampling show this difference to be highly significant between \textit{bong1} and \textit{gau3} of the benefactive group and and \textit{wan2} and \textit{zuk1} of the capturing group (see (24) and (25) of the appendix for \(p\)-values obtained).

Full nominals (kinship terms/proper nouns, definite NPs, indefinite NPs) are rarely fronted. The only example found that does not involve the verb \textit{gu2} is the following:

\[
\text{(11) } \text{baan6 } \text{gin3 } \text{go3 } \text{gwai2-po4 } \text{m4 } \text{dou2}
\]
pretend see CL ghost-old.lady NEG DOU

\footnote{An anonymous reviewer pointed out that \textit{dou2} cannot be considered a verb based on its tone, as it never occurs with tone 2 in unambiguously verbal contexts.}
‘(I) pretended not to see the white woman.’

3.2. The resultative

The second set of constructions examined was the resultative, where the V₂ has the object of V₁ as its subject and indicates the result of V₁. We examined four V₂s:

(12) Resultative predicates studied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V₁</th>
<th>V₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>saat3</em> ('kill'), <em>ngo6</em> ('hungry'), <em>daa2</em> ('hit'), <em>haak3</em> ('scare'), <em>siu3</em> ('laugh')</td>
<td><em>sei2</em> ('die')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fing6</em> ('fling'), <em>daa2</em> ('hit'), <em>mit1</em> ('pinch'), <em>sai2</em> ('wash'), <em>caat3</em> ('rub')</td>
<td><em>lat1</em> ('come off')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ji1</em> ('heal'), <em>gaau3</em> ('teach'), <em>zou6</em> ('do'), <em>se2</em> ('write'), <em>hok6</em> ('learn')</td>
<td><em>hou2</em> ('good')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fong3</em> ('release'), <em>daa2</em> ('hit'), <em>gaai2</em> ('untie'), <em>geu6</em> ('wrench'), <em>teoi1</em> ('push')</td>
<td><em>hoi1</em> ('open')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps because of semantic reasons, very few constructions with pronominal objects were found, apart from those with the X ... *sei2* and *ji1* ... *hou2* predicates. Because of the high semantic similarity among the *sei2* predicates and apparent homogeneity in the data obtained, we treated all of the predicates as one homogeneous group: we combined all the predicates with *sei2*, regardless of V₂, and estimated the proportions of object-medial tokens for each object type. Relevant statistics are presented in (26) of the appendix.

When the V₂ is *sei2* ('die') and the object is pronominal, the objects are overwhelmingly in medial position, regardless of person. The case of *ji1* + Obj + m₄ *hou2* is more equivocal, and this time, the third-person pronoun is the most likely to appear in medial position.

Regarding the rest of the constructions, there seems to be evidence that the object-medial *fing6 keoi5 m₄ lat1* (eight tokens) and *se2 keoi5 m₄ hou2* (nine tokens) are significantly preferred to the object-final *fing6 m₄ lat1 keoi4* and *se2 m₄ hou2 keoi5* (both unattested; Clopper-Pearson: (0.525543, 1) for *fing6 keoi5 m₄ lat1* and (0.5644842, 1) for *se2 keoi5 m₄ hou2*). Moreover, if we

---

combine the data from the three persons, the construction *fong3 m4 hoi1 + Obj* (11 tokens) is almost significantly more frequent than its object-medial counterpart (1 token) (Clopper-Pearson: (0.4996252, 0.9994696)).

For full NP objects (kinship terms, definite and indefinite NPs), the object-medial order is never attested, but we did find a good number of tokens with the object-final order. For such objects, then, the object-medial order seems categorically bad.

### 3.3. Highly lexicalised \(V_1-V_2\) pair

Finally, we chose four predicates which are relatively lexicalised, in that they exhibit syntacto-semantic idiosyncrasies:

(13) Lexicalised predicates examined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V1</th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ceoi1</em> (‘blow’)</td>
<td><em>zoeng3</em> (‘inflate’)</td>
<td>to be helpless about (someone else)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ding2</em> (‘endure’)</td>
<td><em>seon6</em> (‘along the flow of’)</td>
<td>to stand (someone’s temper, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>seon3</em> (‘trust’)</td>
<td><em>gwo3</em> (‘pass’)</td>
<td>to trust (someone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>tai2</em> (‘look’)</td>
<td><em>hei2</em> (‘lift’)</td>
<td>to look up to (someone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first two are highly idiomatic, as is clear from the disparity between the meanings of the individual verbs and the entire predicate. *Hei2* usually means ‘finish’ as a grammaticalised \(V_2\), but here, the entire predicate *tai2 ... hei2* means ‘to look up to (someone)’. The *seon3 ... gwo3* predicate is the least lexicalised of the four, but even it exhibits idiosyncrasies: *seon3* is probably the only \(V_1\) that can take a non-topicalised object when *gwo3* is present. Consider *ni1 gin6 si6 zou6 m4 gwo3* (DEM CL thing do NEG GWO, ‘this thing is not worth doing’), which is grammatical, and *zou6 m4 gwo3 keoi5* (do NEG GWO 3sg, ‘it is not worth doing it’), which is not.\(^{11}\)

Unlike the case of *dou2* or resultatives, there seems to be no categorical rule against the object-medial order when the object is a kinship term, proper noun or definite NP, and thus, we include confidence intervals for the first five points on our simplified Silverstein hierarchy in (24). From these

\(^{11}\)Constructions like *daa2 m4 gwo3 keoi5* (hit NEG surpass 3sg) are attested on Google, but the *gwo3* does not carry the same meaning.
statistics, it is clear that ceoi1 ... zoeng3 must always be object-medial regardless of object. Ding2
... seon6 has a strong but non-categorical preference for the object-medial order for pronominal
objects, and prefers the object-final order for full NP objects. Seon3 ... guo3 and tai2 ... hei2 have
no clear preference for pronominal objects, and prefer the object-final order for full NP objects.

Indefinite object NPs are still unattested at medial position; they are always found in final
position. Even the ceoi1 ... zoeng3 predicate, which categorically prefers the object-medial order
for other NP types, was no exception:

(14) Seng4 go3 zing3fu2 dou1 ceoi1 m4 zoeng3 jat1 go3 Gwok3 Siu3
    Git6?
    Kit?

‘The whole government could not do anything about one Alex Kwok?’

4. Discussion

4.1. Synchronic explanations

A synchronic explanation of the object preposing phenomenon may be able to account for syntactic
variation through functional motivations for each of the two construction types. Each construction
type should serve some purpose, such as facilitating the production or comprehension of the
construction.

An obvious motivation in favour of the object-medial order is phonological weight. Heavier
constituents are widely known to prefer the sentence-final position Hawkins (1994). The negated
V2 takes up two syllables, so it is preferable to append the NEG + V2 pair to the end of the verb
phrase. Yet this hypothesis predicts that if an expletive like lan2 (‘fucking’) or gwai2 (‘bloody’,
lit. ghost) intrudes between the negative m4 and the second verb, the object-medial order will be
even more preferred - a prediction that seems false. A Google search for X keoi5 m4 lan2 dou2
(X 3sg NEG fucking DOU) and X keoi5 m4 gwai2 dou2 (X 3sg NEG bloody DOU) returns very
few results, all of them with the verb gu2 which, as we have seen above, categorically prefers the

---

12 In fact, several instances of ceoi1 m4 zoeng3 + definite NP were found; however, these constructions did not
carry the idiomatic meaning we are targeting here, and were not counted.

---
object-medial order. By contrast, \textit{X m4 lan2 dou2 keoi5} (X NEG fucking DOU 3sg) and \textit{X m4 gwai2 dou2 keoi5} (X NEG bloody DOU 3sg) yield a fair number of results with a variety of V\textsubscript{1} types, such as \textit{kau1} (‘pursue (a girl)’), \textit{teng1} (‘hear’), \textit{jing2} (‘recognise’), \textit{wan2} (‘look for’), \textit{bei2} (‘give’), \textit{zo2} (‘obstruct’), \textit{bong1} (‘help’) and \textit{daa2} (‘hit’). Consider the following examples:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(15)] a. \textit{Ngo5}\textsubscript{1sg} \textit{tung4} CONJ \textit{aa3mui2} little.sister \textit{heoi3} go \textit{dou3} DOU \textit{keoi5} 3sg \textit{hok6haau6} school \textit{go2zan2}, TEMP, \textit{wan2} find

\textit{m4 gwai2 dou2 keoi5}/. NEG bloody DOU 3sg

‘When my little sister and I went to her school, we could not bloody find her.’

b. \textit{Daan6} but \textit{nei1} DEM \textit{jat1} one \textit{fong1min6} aspect \textit{nei5} you \textit{jau6} also \textit{bong1} help \textit{m4 lan2 dou2} NEG fucking DOU \textit{keoi5}/ wo3.

3sg MIR.

‘But you can’t fucking help her in this regard.’
\end{enumerate}

Since the influence of phonological weight seems small, a better phonological motivation is foot binarity Prince (1980); McCarthy & Prince (1995). Assuming that all elements are monosyllabic, [\textit{V\textsubscript{1} Obj m \textit{V\textsubscript{2}}}] can be parsed as [(\textit{V\textsubscript{1} Obj}) (\textit{m \textit{V\textsubscript{2}}})], where parentheses indicate foot boundaries. [\textit{V\textsubscript{1} m \textit{V\textsubscript{2} Obj}] by contrast, would be parsed as [(\textit{V\textsubscript{1}} (\textit{m \textit{V\textsubscript{2}}}) (Obj)] to produce two degenerate feet, which is dispreferred for phonological reasons. If it were instead parsed as [(\textit{V\textsubscript{1} m}) \textit{(V\textsubscript{2} Obj})], then there would be a mismatch between prosodic and syntactic parsing, an undesirable consequence for comprehension.

If this motivation were correct, then we would expect the effect to disappear when \textit{V\textsubscript{1}} is disyllabic and the rest of the constituents remain monosyllabic, since both orders create a degenerate foot ([\textit{(V\textsubscript{1} m \textit{V\textsubscript{2}}) (Obj)}] vs. [(\textit{V\textsubscript{1} Obj}) (\textit{m \textit{V\textsubscript{2}}})]). Indeed, an informal Google search with the disyllabic verbs \textit{faat3jin6} (‘discover’), \textit{lei5gaai2} (‘understand’) and \textit{dung6jiu4} (‘shake (of someone’s goals, willpower, etc.)’) as \textit{V\textsubscript{1}}, \textit{dou2} as \textit{V\textsubscript{2}} and \textit{keoi5} (3sg) as \textit{Obj} reveals that these verbs overwhelmingly prefer the object-final order: only one example of \textit{faat3jin6 keoi5 m4 dou2} and one of \textit{dung6jiu4 keoi5 m4 dou2} were found, and \textit{lei5gaai2 keoi5 m4 dou2} was unattested.

Another possible motivation for object fronting in Cantonese is to highlight a topical object. We have seen that objects higher on the referential hierarchy are more likely to be preposed. With the exception of benefactive verbs, it can be seen from \textit{dou2} predicates that the third-person singular
pronoun is less likely to be fronted than the first or second persons, full NPs are less likely to be fronted than pronouns, and indefinite noun phrases are never fronted. This suggests a topicality effect. Consider the following pair of sentences with *seon3 ... gwo3*. (16a) has *keoi5* as the object and *keoi5* is acting as a resumptive pronoun for a left-dislocated proper noun, whereas (16b) has a definite NP as an object which has not appeared in previous discourse (it was likely definite by virtue of its presence in the shared ‘aeroplane emergency’ schema):

(16) a. Wo4gei3 HGC zan1 real hai6 is trust seon3 keoi5 3sg m4 gwo3! NEG pass
   ‘HGC really can’t be trusted!’

   b. ngo5 gok3dak1 1sg feel go3 CL gei1si1 seon3 m4 gwo3 go3 tou4sang1 trust CL escape.for.life
daan6se6 eject hai6tung2... system...
   ‘I feel the pilot did not trust the emergency ejection system...’

A slightly different interpretation of such a phenomenon is may hold that the *animacy* of objects favours fronting. This may be particularly relevant for the ‘capturing’ verbs and *saat3 ... sei2* (kill ... die), as many of the example sentences imply that the referent of the object is actively trying to avoid being affected by the action denoted V1. Consider this caption of a video showing a footballer running around in circles to avoid another footballer, who was chasing him:

(17) Tuen4tuen4zyun3, going.round.in.circles guk1faa1 chrysanthemum jyun4! garden Nei5 zuk1 ngo5 m4 dou2,
   nei5 zuk1 ngo5 m4 dou2!
   2sg catch me no DOU
   2sg catch me no DOU
   ‘Going round in circles, chrysanthemum garden! You can’t catch me, you can’t catch me!’

In contrast to motivations for the object-medial order, the motivation for the object-final order is fairly obvious. The two components of the complex predicate are conceptually close, and so placing them together creates an isomorphism between formal proximity and conceptual proximity.

---

(Givón, 2001). For instance, *dou2* expresses the completeness and success of the $V_1$. This also explains why *dou2*-predicates favours object fronting more than resultatives do.

However, the synchronic account fails to account for idiosyncrasies. Why, for instance, does object preposing seem to be far more frequent in certain lexicalised predicates like *ding2 ... seon6* and *ceoi1 ... zoeng3*? If anything, we would expect the two verbs in these predicates to be conceptually close, and thus more likely to be adjacent to each other. A diachronic explanation may be necessary to explain some of the data.

### 4.2. Diachronic explanations

One of the most detailed elucidations of the diachrony of complex predicates is Givón (2009). Givón gives two main diachronic pathways of development: the $V_2$ may develop from a VP complement to another verb, or from the weaker verb of a serial verb construction through grammaticalisation or colexicalisation. He presents a three-stage diachronic process for the latter pathway:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Stage I - Paratactic source: Main clause + chained complement clause
  \item Stage II - Complex clause: Serial-verb clause
  \item Stage III - Complex word: Complex verbal word
\end{enumerate}

Givón also writes that in verb-serialising languages, it is harder for constructions to fully develop into complex predicates because of object intrusion between the two verbs. For instance, in Saramaccan, a VO language, the object-medial order is used with the $V_2$ *kaba* (‘finish’) (Givón, 2009):

\begin{verbatim}
3sh TNS-paint DEF-house finish
\end{verbatim}

‘He finished painting the house.’ (Saramaccan, Givón (2009))

It appears that Cantonese is passing from Stage II to III, i.e. going through the process of converting serial verb constructions into fully-fledged complex predicates through grammaticalisation and lexicalisation. During this process, the object must be moved to the end of the construction to allow for adjacency between the two verbs. Cantonese is more conservative than Mandarin...
but more innovative than Yiyang in this regard. Unlike Mandarin, where the two verbs of the resultative have been inseparable since the fifteenth century (Shi, 2002), the older object-medial order does remain in Cantonese. But unlike Yiyang, as discussed above, the object-medial order in Cantonese has become the more marked order already. In the future, to complete this diachronic process, Cantonese speakers may generalise the object-final order to the remaining constructions through extension (Harris & Campbell, 1995), i.e. applying the syntactic rule governing most complex predicate constructions to outliers like saat3 X m4 sei2 and ding2 X m4 seon6, at which stage the complex predicates can be said to be V-V compounds.

This agrees with known facts about the development of Chinese. Historically, at around the time of the Sui and early Tang Dynasties, complex-predicate constructions were nearly exclusively object-medial (Shi & Li, 2004):16

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(20) a. } & \text{Xunmi Aniang bu jian.} \\
& \text{find mum no see} \\
& \text{‘(Mulian) could not find his mother.’ } (\text{Damuqianlian mingjian jiu mu bian wen, Shi & Li (2004)}) \\
\text{b. } & \text{Quan sui zha she si yan.} \\
& \text{dog then bite snake die SFP.} \\
& \text{‘The dog then bit the snake, killing it.’ } (\text{Taiping Guangji 43, Shi & Li (2004)})
\end{align*}
\]

It thus appears not unlikely that the object-medial order in modern Cantonese - and by extension in other Chinese varieties exhibiting this alternation - are vestiges of this older word order.

The fact that highly lexicalised pairs discussed in 3.3 prefer the object-medial order is thus easily explained by frequency: As is well known, more frequent forms are more resistant to change (Croft, 2002), and as lexicalised V1-V2 pairs are more likely to co-occur, they also tend to preserve the older word order.

The reason why the order is better preserved in negative clauses than affirmative ones is clear too: Negative clauses are more resistant to change because of their greater cognitive complexity (Givón, 1979). Looking at the predicates with very strong preference for the object-medial order, many seem to appear fairly rarely in the affirmative. For instance, gu2 keoi5 m4 dou2 laa1 (guess

---

16Object-final constructions did exist before Sui-Tang; the object-medial order appears to have reached its apex during the Tang Dynasty because of the rigidification of argument structure Shi & Li (2004).
returns seven pages of results on Google; gu2 dou2 keoi5 laa1 returns merely eight results. Similarly, ceoi1 dak1 keoi5 zoeng3 (blow DAK 3sg inflate), the affirmative version of the idiom discussed above, yields only five pages, whereas its negative counterpart returns 34. This is perhaps no coincidence: If a predicate is more frequent in the negative form, then it is less likely for a speaker to generalise the verb-final order from the more innovative positive form to the more conservative negative form. Future research can further explore this hypothesis by regressing the relative frequency of object-medial tokens on the relative frequency of the negative form.

5. Conclusion and directions for future research

In this paper, we have shown that the object position alternation, rather than being completely random and unpredictable (in ‘free variation’), does follow rules. Some of the rules are categorical, but most are gradient. This supports the views of writers who view grammatical competence as stochastic rather than deterministic (Bresnan et al., 2001; Manning, 2003; Bresnan, 2007).

In developing hypotheses that can explain the data collected, we made extensive use of phonological, semantic and pragmatic factors. This is in line with the position that grammar, far from being an isolated system, is actually shaped by other aspects of language, with semanto-pragmatic concepts like iconicity and topicality underlying syntactic choice (Givón, 2001; Croft, 2002).

Moreover, we discovered construction-specific idiosyncrasies such as the gu2 + Obj + m4 dou2 construction, suggesting that Cantonese complex predicates are best treated as a family of constructions (Goldberg & Jackendoff, 2004) rather a single group. This supports, in Goldberg and Jackendoff’s terms, a ‘constructional’ view of grammar: there is a cline of grammatical phenomena ranging from general to idiosyncratic, and there’s no sharp divide between lexicon and syntax.

Methodologically, we have demonstrated the value of nonparametric statistical methods such as the bootstrap and exact methods in investigating linguistic phenomena with sparse data. They allowed us to make inferences about grammaticality preferences, without relying on theoretical asymptotic assumptions like the Z-test and Pearson’s $\chi^2$-test do.

It must be noted that the observations made and conclusions drawn in this paper are necessarily tentative. As the phenomenon is rather poorly understood at present, our analysis of the data had to be exploratory in nature: we conducted post-hoc tests and constructed post-hoc confidence
intervals. Future research can take the points discussed above as starting points and subject them to rigorous testing in a hypothetico-deductive framework, whether with corpora or experimental work.

Furthermore, the alternation phenomenon is highly complex, and we have only touched on the tip of the iceberg: we investigated just a small inventory of monosyllabic verbs and three construction types. Future research can expand the range of constructions covered. There remains a large number of grammaticalised $V_2$s we are yet to cover, such as saai3 (‘all’), maai4 (‘as well’), faan1 (literally ‘return’; see Chor (2013)) and cit3 (‘on time’). It is also interesting to compare the resultative constructions and the corresponding constructions with the causative zing2 (‘make’) as $V_1$.

In addition, it is worth investigating analogous alternations in the affirmative, whether involving the particle dak (21) or not (22):

(21) a. daa2 dak1 keoi5 sei2
    hit DAK 3sg die
    ‘to be able to beat him to death’

    b. daa2 dak1 sei2 keoi5
    hit DAK die 3sg

(22) a. fong3 keoi5 zau2
    release 3sg go
    ‘to release him’

    b. fong3 zau2 keoi5
    release go 3sg

Ultimately, it is hoped that a complete model of Cantonese complex predicates can be built, taking into account all relevant factors and discarding all irrelevant ones.
Appendix: Statistical results

Statistics for the dou construction

(23) Šidàk-corrected ($g = 24$) 90% Clopper-Pearson confidence intervals for the proportion of $[V_1 \text{Obj m dou}]$ by verb:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>$\hat{p}$</th>
<th>$l$</th>
<th>$u$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bong</td>
<td>0.29167</td>
<td>0.11917</td>
<td>0.52146</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaau</td>
<td>0.28571</td>
<td>0.00722</td>
<td>0.85423</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gau</td>
<td>0.30612</td>
<td>0.13055</td>
<td>0.53394</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gin</td>
<td>0.57692</td>
<td>0.35830</td>
<td>0.77602</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.80194</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jing</td>
<td>0.50000</td>
<td>0.24999</td>
<td>0.75001</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wan</td>
<td>0.78378</td>
<td>0.52509</td>
<td>0.94213</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zuk</td>
<td>0.80882</td>
<td>0.62904</td>
<td>0.92764</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>$\hat{p}$</th>
<th>$l$</th>
<th>$u$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bong</td>
<td>0.62319</td>
<td>0.43193</td>
<td>0.79067</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaau</td>
<td>0.17647</td>
<td>0.01213</td>
<td>0.57057</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gau</td>
<td>0.74138</td>
<td>0.53595</td>
<td>0.89142</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gin</td>
<td>0.57143</td>
<td>0.36099</td>
<td>0.76499</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.90008</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jing</td>
<td>0.58824</td>
<td>0.31852</td>
<td>0.82440</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wan</td>
<td>0.68293</td>
<td>0.43262</td>
<td>0.87481</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zuk</td>
<td>0.71111</td>
<td>0.47340</td>
<td>0.88705</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(24) Bonferroni-corrected \((g = 28)\) \(p\)-values obtained by pairwise comparison of the tendency to use the object-medial order with \(ngo\) using Fisher’s exact test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>bong</th>
<th>gaau</th>
<th>gau</th>
<th>gin</th>
<th>gu</th>
<th>jing</th>
<th>wan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gaau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gin</td>
<td>0.13963</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25274</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.00117***</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.00013***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00003***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wan</td>
<td>0.00024***</td>
<td>0.4774</td>
<td>0.00034***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17612</td>
<td>0.41978</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zuk</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.20828</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.22745</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.04405*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(25) \(p\)-values obtained by bootstrap (30000 resamples):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>bong</th>
<th>gaau</th>
<th>gau</th>
<th>gin</th>
<th>gu</th>
<th>jing</th>
<th>wan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gaau</td>
<td>0.92140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gau</td>
<td>0.88046</td>
<td>0.88080</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gin</td>
<td>0.00366***</td>
<td>0.15600</td>
<td>0.00560***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.01280***</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jing</td>
<td>0.05806*</td>
<td>0.29900</td>
<td>0.07314</td>
<td>0.47950</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wan</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.02660***</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.03820*</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.01114**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zuk</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.02086***</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.00680***</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0.00166***</td>
<td>0.77760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistics for the resultative

(26) Šidáček-corrected \((g = 9)\) 90% Clopper-Pearson confidence intervals for the proportion of object-medial tokens by resultative construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Proportion of ([V_1 \text{ keoi } m V_2]) by resultative construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(V_1 \ldots \text{sei} + \text{ngo})</td>
<td>(0.8846154) (0.7131791) (0.9727622) (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V_1 \ldots \text{sei} + \text{nei})</td>
<td>(0.9725275) (0.9199488) (0.9947819) (182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V_1 \ldots \text{sei} + \text{keoi})</td>
<td>(0.8163265) (0.6226495) (0.9381407) (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{ji} \ldots \text{hou} + \text{ngo})</td>
<td>(0.4000000) (0.1556585) (0.6870195) (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{ji} \ldots \text{hou} + \text{nei})</td>
<td>(0.5945946) (0.3579784) (0.8033468) (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{ji} \ldots \text{hou} + \text{keoi})</td>
<td>(0.8666667) (0.4885575) (0.9946766) (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{fing} \ldots \text{lat} + \text{keoi})</td>
<td>(1.0000000) (0.5255543) (1.0000000) (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{se} \ldots \text{hou} + \text{keoi})</td>
<td>(1.0000000) (0.5644842) (1.0000000) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{fong} \ldots \text{hoi} + \text{any Obj})</td>
<td>(0.0909091) (0.0005304) (0.5003748) (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics for lexicalised \(V_1-V_2\) pairs

(27) Šidáček-corrected \((g = 20)\) 90% Clopper-Pearson confidence intervals for the proportion of \([V_1 \text{ Obj } m V_2]\) by construction:
Proportion of \([V_1 \text{aa} X m V_2]\) by predicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>(\hat{p})</th>
<th>(l)</th>
<th>(u)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ceoi... zoeng</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.03579</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ding... seon</td>
<td>0.21053</td>
<td>0.07790</td>
<td>0.40882</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seon... gwo</td>
<td>0.07143</td>
<td>0.00009</td>
<td>0.48595</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tai... hei</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.48626</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of \([V_1 \text{go} X m V_2]\) by predicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>(\hat{p})</th>
<th>(l)</th>
<th>(u)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ceoi... zoeng</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.26393</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ding... seon</td>
<td>0.07143</td>
<td>0.00187</td>
<td>0.33343</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seon... gwo</td>
<td>0.02222</td>
<td>0.00003</td>
<td>0.18239</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tai... hei</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.24234</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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