

## A-level Language theories

| Theorist                          | Area of Research    | Details   |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Naomi Wolf                        | Uptalk<br>Vocal fry | Unlike uptalk, which is a rising intonation pattern, or valleyspeak, which covers a general grab bag of linguistic features, including vocabulary, vocal fry describes a specific sound quality caused by the movement of the vocal folds. In regular speaking mode, the vocal folds rapidly vibrate between a more open and more closed position as the air passes through. In vocal fry, the vocal folds are shortened and slack so they close together completely and pop back open, with a little jitter, as the air comes through. That popping, jittery effect gives it a characteristic sizzling or frying sound. (I haven't been able to establish that that's how fry got its name, but that's the story you hear most often.)   |
| Deborah Cameron                   | Gender              | <p>Deborah Cameron and verbal hygiene</p> <p>Deborah Cameron says that wherever and whenever the matter has been investigated, men and women face normative expectations about the appropriate mode of speech for their gender. Women's verbal conduct is important in many cultures; women have been instructed in the proper ways of talking just as they have been instructed in the proper ways of dressing, in the use of cosmetics, and in other "feminine" kinds of behaviour. This acceptance of a "proper" speech style, Cameron describes (in her 1995 book of the same name) as "verbal hygiene".</p> <p>Cameron does not condemn verbal hygiene, as misguided. She finds specific examples of verbal hygiene in the regulation of "style" by editors, the teaching of English grammar in schools, politically correct language and the advice to women on how they can speak more effectively. In each case Deborah Cameron claims that verbal hygiene is a way to make sense of language, and that it also represents a symbolic attempt to impose order on the social world.</p> <p>For an interesting and provocative comment on Cameron's ideas, you might consider this from Kate Burridge, in Political correctness: euphemism with attitude.</p> <p>Not everyone shares my view of PC language. Deborah Cameron (in Verbal Hygiene 1995) prefers not to describe it as euphemism, arguing there is more to political correctness than just "sensitivity". A term like "sex worker" is not simply a positive expression for tabooed "prostitute", but deliberately highlights certain aspects of this group's identity. PC language is itself a form of public action by drawing attention to form, it forces us to sit up and take notice. Euphemisms are certainly motivated by the desire not to be offensive, but they are more than just "linguistic fig leaves". They can be deliberately provocative too. Think of political allegories like George Orwell's Animal Farm. One of the reasons why such texts are so successful is that they exploit euphemisms to publicly expound taboo topics, while at the same time pretending to disguise that purpose. Like any tease, such disguise may itself be titillating.</p>   |
| Jennifer Coates and Deborah Jones | Gender              | <p>Jennifer Coates and Deborah Jones</p> <p>Jennifer Coates looks at all-female conversation and builds on Deborah Tannen's ideas. She returns to tag questions - to which Robin Lakoff drew attention in 1975. Her work looks in detail at some of the ideas that Lakoff originated and Tannen carried further. She gives useful comment on Deborah Jones' 1990 study of women's oral culture, which she (Jones) calls Gossip and categorizes in terms of House Talk, Scandal, Bitching and Chatting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>House Talk - its distinguishing function is the exchange of information and resources connected with the female role as an occupation.</li> <li>Scandal - a considered judging of the behaviour of others, and women in particular. It is usually made in terms of the domestic morality, of which women have been appointed guardians.</li> <li>Bitching - this is the overt expression of women's anger at their restricted role and inferior status. They express this in private and to other women only. The women who bitch are not expecting change; they want only to make their complaints in an environment where their anger will be understood and expected.</li> <li>Chatting - this is the most intimate form of gossip, a mutual self-disclosure, a transaction where women use to their own advantage the skills they have learned as part of their job of nurturing others.</li> </ul> <p>(The use of these terms shows a new confidence - Deborah Jones is not fearful that her readers will think her disrespectful. She is also confident to use the lexicon of her research subjects - these are category labels the non-linguist can understand.) Coates sees women's simultaneous talk as supportive and cooperative.</p> <p>Coates says of tag questions, in Language and gender: a reader (1998, Blackwells):</p> <p>"...it is not just the presence of minimal responses at the end, but also their absence during the course of an anecdote or summary, which demonstrates the sensitivity of participants to the norms of interaction: speakers recognise different types of talk and use minimal responses appropriately.</p> <p>Lexical items such as perhaps, I think, sort of, probably as well as certain prosodic and paralinguistic features, are used in English to express epistemic modality...women use them to mitigate the force of an utterance in order to respect</p> |

|                               |        |  |
|-------------------------------|--------|--|
|                               |        | <p>addressees face needs.”</p> <p>For an explanation of <u>face</u>, see the relevant section of my guide to <u>Pragmatics</u>.</p>  |
| Peter Trudgill                | Gender | <p>Peter Trudgill - gender, social class and speech sounds</p> <p>Peter Trudgill's 1970s research into language and social class showed some interesting differences between men and women. This research is described in various studies and often quoted in language teaching textbooks. You can find more in Professor Trudgill's <i>Social Differentiation in Norwich</i> (1974, Cambridge University Press) and various subsequent works on dialect.</p> <p>Trudgill made a detailed study in which subjects were grouped by social class and sex. He invited them to speak in a variety of situations, before asking them to read a passage that contained words where the speaker might use one or other of two speech sounds. An example would be verbs ending in -ing, where Trudgill wanted to see whether the speaker dropped the final g and pronounced this as -in'.</p> <p>In phonetic terms, Trudgill observed whether, in, for example, the final sound of "singing", the speaker used the alveolar consonant /n/ or the velar consonant /ŋ/.</p> <p>Note: you will only see the phonetic symbols if you have the Lucida Sans Unicode font installed and if your computer system and browser support display of this font.</p> <p>Trudgill found that men were less likely and women more likely to use the prestige pronunciation of certain speech sounds. In aiming for higher prestige (above that of their observed social class) the women tended towards hypercorrectness. The men would often use a low prestige pronunciation - thereby seeking covert (hidden) prestige by appearing "tough" or "down to earth".</p> |
| Deborah Tannen and difference | Gender | <p>Professor Tannen has summarized her book <i>You Just Don't Understand</i> in an article in which she represents male and female language use in a series of six contrasts. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status vs. support</li> <li>• Independence vs. intimacy</li> <li>• Advice vs. understanding</li> <li>• Information vs. feelings</li> <li>• Orders vs. proposals</li> <li>• Conflict vs. compromise</li> </ul> <p>In each case, the male characteristic (that is, the one that is judged to be more typically male) comes first. What are these distinctions?</p> <p>Status versus support</p> <p>Men grow up in a world in which conversation is competitive - they seek to achieve the upper hand or to prevent others from dominating them. For women, however, talking is often a way to gain confirmation and support for their ideas. Men see the world as a place where people try to gain status and keep it. Women see the world as "a network of connections seeking support and consensus".</p>  |
| Dale Spender                  | Gender | <p>Dale Spender advocates a radical view of language as embodying structures that sustain male power. She refers to the work of Zimmerman and West, to the view of the male as norm and to her own idea of patriarchal order. She claims that it is especially difficult to challenge this power system, since the way that we think of the world is part of, and reinforces, this male power:</p> <p>"The crux of our difficulties lies in being able to identify and transform the rules which govern our behaviour and which bring patriarchal order into existence. Yet the tools we have for doing this are part of that patriarchal order. While we can modify, we must none the less use the only language, the only classification scheme which is at our disposal. We must use it in a way that is acceptable and meaningful. But that very language and the conditions for its use in turn structure a patriarchal order."</p> <p>Fortunately for the language student, there is no need closely to follow the very sophisticated philosophical and ethical arguments that Dale Spender erects on her interpretation of language. But it is reasonable to look closely at the sources of her evidence - such as the research of Zimmerman and West. Geoffrey Beattie claims to have recorded some 10 hours of tutorial discussion and some 557 interruptions (compared with 55 recorded by Zimmerman and West). Beattie found that</p>   |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | women and men interrupted with more or less equal frequency (men 34.1, women 33.8) - so men did interrupt more, but by a margin so slight as not to be statistically significant. Yet Beattie's findings are not quoted so often as those of Zimmerman and West. Why is this? Because they do not fit what someone wanted to show? Or because Beattie's work is in some other way less valuable?  |
| Pamela Fishman                           | Gender   | Pamela Fishman argues in <i>Interaction: the Work Women Do</i> (1983) that conversation between the sexes sometimes fails, not because of anything inherent in the way women talk, but because of how men respond, or don't respond. In <i>Conversational Insecurity</i> (1990) Fishman questions Robin Lakoff's theories. Lakoff suggests that asking questions shows women's insecurity and hesitancy in communication, whereas Fishman looks at questions as an attribute of interactions: Women ask questions because of the power of these, not because of their personality weaknesses. Fishman also claims that in mixed-sex language interactions, men speak on average for twice as long as women.   |
| William O'Barr and Bowman Atkins         | Gender   | Christine Christie has shown gender differences in the pragmatics of public discourse - looking, for example, at how men and women manage politeness in the public context of UK parliamentary speaking. In <i>Politeness and the Linguistic Construction of Gender in Parliament: An Analysis of Transgressions and Apology Behaviour</i> , she applies pragmatic models, such as the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson and Grice's conversational maxims, to transcripts of parliamentary proceedings, especially where speakers break the rules that govern how MPs may speak in the House of Commons. See this article at <a href="http://www.shu.ac.uk/wpw/politeness/christie.htm">www.shu.ac.uk/wpw/politeness/christie.htm</a> .  |
| Robin Lakoff 1975                        | Gender   | <p>Robin Lakoff</p> <p>Robin Lakoff, in 1975, published an influential account of women's language. This was the book <i>Language and Woman's Place</i>. In a related article, <i>Woman's language</i>, she published a set of basic assumptions about what marks out the language of women. Among these are claims that women:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hedge: using phrases like "sort of", "kind of", "it seems like", and so on.</li> <li>• Use (super)polite forms: "Would you mind...", "I'd appreciate it if...", "...if you don't mind".</li> <li>• Use tag questions: "You're going to dinner, aren't you?"</li> <li>• Speak in italics: intonational emphasis equal to underlining words - so, very, quite.</li> <li>• Use empty adjectives: divine, lovely, adorable, and so on</li> <li>• Use hypercorrect grammar and pronunciation: English prestige grammar and clear enunciation.</li> <li>• Use direct quotation: men paraphrase more often.</li> <li>• Have a special lexicon: women use more words for things like colours, men for sports.</li> <li>• Use question intonation in declarative statements: women make declarative statements into questions by raising the pitch of their voice at the end of a statement, expressing uncertainty. For example, "What school do you attend? Eton College?"</li> <li>• Use "wh-" imperatives: (such as, "Why don't you open the door?")</li> <li>• Speak less frequently</li> <li>• Overuse qualifiers: (for example, "I think that...")</li> <li>• Apologise more: (for instance, "I'm sorry, but I think that...")</li> <li>• Use modal constructions: (such as can, would, should, ought - "Should we turn up the heat?")</li> <li>• Avoid coarse language or expletives</li> <li>• Use indirect commands and requests: (for example, "My, isn't it cold in here?" - really a request to turn the heat on or close a window)</li> <li>• Use more intensifiers: especially so and very (for instance, "I am so glad you came!")</li> <li>• Lack a sense of humour: women do not tell jokes well and often don't understand the punch line of jokes.</li> </ul> |
| George Keith and John Shuttleworth       | Gender   | <p>George Keith and John Shuttleworth record suggestions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• women - talk more than men, talk too much, are more polite, are indecisive/hesitant, complain and nag, ask more questions, support each other, are more co-operative, whereas</li> <li>• men - swear more, don't talk about emotions, talk about sport more, talk about women and machines in the same way, insult each other frequently, are competitive in conversation, dominate conversation, speak with more authority, give more commands, interrupt more.</li> </ul> <p>Note that some of these are objective descriptions, which can be verified (ask questions, give commands) while others express unscientific popular ideas about language and introduce non-linguistic value judgements (nag, speak with more authority).</p>  |
| William Labov (1966): New York Departmen | <b>Social class</b><br><br>Social Bonding?<br>This theory is | What Labov found was that a small part of a population begins to pronounce certain words that have, for example, the same vowel, differently from the rest of the population. This occurs naturally since humans cannot all reproduce exactly the same sounds. However, at some later point in time, for some reason, this difference in pronunciation starts to become a signal for social and cultural identity. Others of the population who wish to be identified with the group either consciously or (more likely) unknowingly adopt this difference, exaggerate it, and apply it to change the pronunciation of  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| t Store study   | a social one and has been advocated by the eminent American linguist, William Labov. | <p>other words. If given enough time, the change ends up affecting all words that possess the same vowel, and so that this becomes a regular linguistic sound change.</p> <p>Labov's theory of language change sounds much more plausible than other previous theories; and it is the latest theory... Humans are, after all, social animals, and we rarely do things without a social reason. We are also deeply bitten with the idea of superiority and power, and so Labov's social theory of language change – and no doubt others that will follow, do seem to make the most sense.</p>   |
| Peter Trudgill (1974): Norwich study                    | <b>Social class</b>  | <p>British linguist Peter Trudgill investigated the speech of residents of Norwich, England. He was interested in the pronunciation of particular variables in different socioeconomic status groups and different speech styles. One variable was (ng) with its standard and prestigious velar variant [ŋ] and the non-standard variant [ən] in Norwich. The results mirrored those found by Labov in New York City: The higher the socioeconomic status of the speaker, the more frequently (s)he used the standard variant. Style stratification (see Stylistic Pattern: Language and Style) existed in England, as well. All socioeconomic groups used more standard variants with increasing formality of the speech style.</p>   |
| Basil Bernstein (1971): Restricted and elaborated codes | <b>Social class</b>  | <p><b>Language and Social Class – Restricted code and Elaborated code – 1971</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Rather than distinguishing between Standard English and Regional Dialect, a distinction which carries an inherent bias towards the former, Bernstein wanted to look at language variation in a different way</li> <li>– Bernstein came up with the terms Restricted code and Elaborated code in order to distinguish between what he saw as two distinct ways of using language as opposed to the two distinct dialects of Standard English and the Regional Dialect</li> <li>– The Elaborated code has a more formally correct syntax, having more subordinate clauses and fewer unfinished sentences. There are also more logical connectives like “if” and “unless”, as well as more originality and more explicit reference</li> <li>– The restricted code has a looser syntax, uses more words of simple coordination like “and” and “but”, there are more clichés, and more implicit reference so there are a greater number of pronouns than the elaborated code</li> <li>– The codes should not be confused with social dialects because there is nothing in a dialect to inhibit explicit statements of individual feeling or opinion. While dialects are identified by their formal features, and by who their speakers are, codes are identified by the kinds of meaning they transmit and by what the words are used to do.</li> <li>– An elaborated code arises where there is a gap or boundary between speaker and listener which can only be crossed by explicit speech.</li> <li>– A restricted code arises when speech is exchanged against a background of shared experience and shared definitions of that experience; it realises meanings that are already shared rather than newly created, communal rather than individual. The speech is “context dependent” because participants rely on their background knowledge to supply information not carried by the actual words they use.</li> <li>– Whilst the elaborated code is used to convey facts and abstract ideas, the restricted code is used to convey attitude and feeling.</li> <li>– The elaborated code is the one which, in the adult language, would be generally associated with formal situations, the restricted code that associated with informal situations.</li> <li>– E.g. Two five-year-old children, one working-class and one middle-class, were shown a series of three pictures, which involved boys playing football and breaking a window. They described the events involved as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Three boys are playing football and one boy kicks the ball and it goes through the window and the ball breaks the window and the boys are looking at it and a man comes out and shouts at them because they've broken the window so they run away and then that lady looks out of her window and she tells the boys off.</li> <li>(2) They're playing football and he kicks it and it goes through there it breaks the window and they're looking at it and he comes out and shouts at them because they've broken it so they run away and then she looks out and she tells them off.</li> </ul> </li> <li>– In the earlier articles it was implied that middle-class children generally use the elaborated code (although they might sometimes use the restricted code), whereas working-class children have only the restricted code. But Bernstein later modified this viewpoint to say that even working-class children might sometimes use the elaborated code; the difference between the classes is said to lie rather in the occasions on which they can use the codes (e.g. working-class children certainly have difficulty in using the elaborated code in school). Moreover, <b>all children can understand both codes when spoken to them.</b></li> <li>– As well as avoiding the negative and positive stereotypes associated with regional Dialect and Standard English, Bernstein wanted to understand when either code would be used as well as the advantages conferred on the speakers through using one or other of the codes.</li> <li>– In situations where you don't know the person you are speaking to and there is little shared knowledge, most speakers, regardless of class or level of education, will default to a variety of the <b>elaborated code</b>, as it is necessary to getting the message across. However, where there is a lot of shared knowledge between interlocutors who are known to each other, the <b>restricted code</b> is far more efficient, eliding unnecessary grammatical constructions and logical connectives as well as the tiresome formulations of “polite conversation”.</li> <li>– The question is then: when to use the elaborated code? Is it that middle class children are better judges of when to</li> </ul> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>use which code, or that they are trained to automatically default to the elaborated code? Or is it the case that Working Class children aren't fully comfortable with or knowledgeable of the elaborated code?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– This way of looking at the matter can make us look at the <b>John Honey Standard English Debate</b> in a new light. If its not a question of teaching one dialect over any other (Standard English over the local dialect), then who could disagree with the need to teach all children the code they need for professional/working life?</li> <li>– Might there be another issue with the elaborated code in the minds of the lower class children? Might this way of speaking, be seen as somehow "other" and not of their place or lives? Just as Standard English and Received Pronunciation might have negative connotations, and the local dialect have covert prestige, might not the restricted code be seen as distinctive of their group identity?</li> <li>– However, if both codes have a neutral value but are used without prejudice in different contexts by all levels of society and all ages, how can we account for society's use of how people speak to label them and subjugate them?</li> <li>– Is there some kind of '<b>cognitive deficit</b>' in an inability to use the elaborated code, and thereby to think logically? Labov (1969) has argued that young blacks in the United States, although using language which certainly seems an example of the restricted code, nevertheless display a clear ability to argue logically. One example quoted by Labov is a boy talking about what happens after death:<br/> <i>You know, like some people say if you're good an' shit, your spirit goin' t'heaven... 'n' if you bad, your spirit goin' to hell. Well, bullshit! Your spirit goin' to hell anyway, good or bad. (Why?) Why! I'll tell you why. 'Cause, you see, doesn't nobody really know that it's a God, y'know, 'cause I mean I have seen black gods, pink gods, white gods, all color gods, and don't nobody know it's really a God. An' when they be sayin' if you good, you goin' t'heaven, tha's bullshit, 'cause you ain't goin' to no heaven, 'cause it ain't no heaven for you to go to.</i><br/> The speaker is here setting out 'a complex set of interdependent propositions'; 'he can sum up a complex argument in a few words, and the full force of his opinions comes through without qualification or reservation'.</li> <li>– In addition Labov notes the common faults of so-called middle-class speech: 'Our work in the speech community makes it painfully obvious that in many ways working-class speakers are more effective narrators, reasoners, and debaters than many middle-class speakers who temporize, qualify, and lose their argument in a mass of irrelevant detail.' There is no clear relationship between language and logical thought.</li> <li>– Cazden (1970) showed that lower class 10 year olds needed much more prompting to give sufficient information for the interviewer to identify a picture from among a selection. The lack of explicit speech, giving clear information, seemed to support Bernstein's theory.</li> <li>– Bernstein says that lower working class children do not use elaborated speech at all, whereas others prefer to say that differences lie in the degree to which elaborated language is used. Also it is unclear that the ability to use elaborated speech in one type of situation guarantees its successful usage in other types.</li> </ul> |
| Lesley Milroy (1987): social networks and Belfast speech |  | <p><b>Milroy's Belfast Study -Members of a speech community are connected to each other in social networks which may be relatively 'closed' or 'open'.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– A person whose personal contacts all know each other belong to a <b>closed network</b>. An individual whose contacts tend not to know each other belong to an <b>open network</b>. Closed networks are said to be of high density: open networks are said to be of low density. Moreover, the links between people may be of different kinds: people can relate to each other as relatives, as neighbours, as workmates, as friends. Where individuals are linked in several ways, e.g. by job, family and leisure activities, then the network ties are said to be multiplex.</li> <li>– Relatively dense networks, it is claimed, function as norm-enforcement mechanisms. In the case of language, this means that a closely-knit group will have the capacity to enforce linguistic norms.</li> <li>– She investigated the correlation between the integration of individuals in the community and the way those individuals speak. To do this she gave each individual she studied a Network Strength Score based on the person's knowledge of other people in the community, the workplace and at leisure activities to give a score of 1 to 5, where 5 is the highest Network Strength Score. Then she measured each person's use of several linguistic variables, including, for example, (th) as in mother and (a) as in hat, which had both standard and non-standard forms. What she found was that a high Network Strength Score was correlated with the use of vernacular or non-standard forms.</li> <li>– In most cases this meant that men whose speech revealed high usage of vernacular or non-standard forms were also found to belong to tight-knit social networks. Conversely, vernacular or non-standard forms are less evident in women's speech because the women belong to less dense social networks.</li> <li>– However, for some variables, the pattern of men using non-standard and women using standard forms was reversed. In the Hammer and the Clonard, for example, more women than expected tended to use the non-standard form of (a) as in hat. Milroy's explanation for this finding is based on the social pressures operating in the communities. The Hammer and the Clonard both had unemployment rates of around 35 per cent, which clearly affected social relationships. Men from these areas were forced to look for work outside the community, and also shared more in domestic tasks (with consequent blurring of sex roles). The women in these areas went out to work and, in the case of the young Clonard women, all worked together. This meant that the young Clonard women belonged to a dense and multiplex network; they lived, worked and amused themselves together.</li> <li>– The tight-knit network to which the young Clonard women belong clearly exerts pressure on its members, who are <i>linguistically homogeneous</i>.</li> <li>– Over and above gender differences, or class differences, Milroy discovered that it was how closely or loosely knit a</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
|--|--|---|--------------------|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|--|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|------------------|------|------|-------------|-------|-------|------------|-------|------|------------|-------|-------|----------------|-------|-------|
|  |  | <p>social group a person belonged to that determined their use of the local dialect forms. The <i>covert prestige</i> of such forms works in a more complicated way than previously thought.</p> <p>– The idea of <i>closed and open networks</i> can be usefully applied to any case of language variation – e.g. the spread of MLE. Whereas in the past working class London children might have belonged to very closed networks, because of changes to society such as high levels of immigration, exposure to the media and greater sense of identity as teenagers as opposed to class.</p>  |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| Jenny Cheshire (1982): Reading study               |  | <p><b>Jenny Cheshire</b> used long-term participant observation to gain data about the relationship between use of grammatical variables and adherence to peer group culture by boys and girls in Reading. She gained acceptance from three groups (two of boys, one of girls) in two adventure playgrounds in Reading and recorded how often they used each of eleven variables:</p> <table><tr><td>1. non-standard -s</td><td>They calls me all the names under the sun</td></tr><tr><td>2. non-standard has</td><td>You just has to do what the teachers tell you.</td></tr><tr><td>3. non-standard was</td><td>You was with me, wasn't you?</td></tr><tr><td>4. negative concord</td><td>It ain't got no pedigree or nothing.</td></tr><tr><td>5. non-standard never</td><td>I never went to school today.</td></tr><tr><td>6. non-standard what</td><td>Are you the little bastards what hit my son over the head?</td></tr><tr><td>7. non-standard do</td><td>She cadges, she do.</td></tr><tr><td>8. non-standard come</td><td>I come down here yesterday.</td></tr><tr><td>9. ain't = auxiliary have</td><td>I ain't seen my Nan for nearly seven years.</td></tr><tr><td>10. ain't = auxiliary be</td><td>Course I ain't going to the Avenue.</td></tr><tr><td>11. ain't = copula</td><td>You ain't no boss.</td></tr></table> <p>For the girls she made a distinction between the girls who did not have positive attitudes to such group activities as carrying weapons, fighting, participation in minor criminal activities, preferred job, dress and hairstyle and use of swearing (Group A) and those who approved of these features and activities (Group B). She then set out how often the two groups used eight of the variables already defined.</p> <p>These figures are as follows:</p> <p>Frequency indices for eight variables for two groups of girls (Cheshire. 1982b)</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Group A girls</td><td>Group B girls</td></tr><tr><td>non-s 5</td><td>25.84</td><td>57.27</td></tr><tr><td>non-s has</td><td>36.36</td><td>35.85</td></tr><tr><td>non-s was</td><td>63.64</td><td>80.95</td></tr><tr><td>negative concord</td><td>12.5</td><td>58.7</td></tr><tr><td>non-s never</td><td>45.45</td><td>41.07</td></tr><tr><td>non-s what</td><td>33.33</td><td>5.56</td></tr><tr><td>non-s come</td><td>30.77</td><td>90.63</td></tr><tr><td>ain't = copula</td><td>14.29</td><td>67.12</td></tr></table> <p>Similar findings when boys against boys and when boys against girls were compared, showed clearly that those who conformed to the conventions of the group also used the linguistic standards of the group - and that conforming boys conformed most of all.</p> <p>In short, the language of the group was an integral part of the group.</p> | 1. non-standard -s | They calls me all the names under the sun | 2. non-standard has | You just has to do what the teachers tell you. | 3. non-standard was | You was with me, wasn't you? | 4. negative concord | It ain't got no pedigree or nothing. | 5. non-standard never | I never went to school today. | 6. non-standard what | Are you the little bastards what hit my son over the head? | 7. non-standard do | She cadges, she do. | 8. non-standard come | I come down here yesterday. | 9. ain't = auxiliary have | I ain't seen my Nan for nearly seven years. | 10. ain't = auxiliary be | Course I ain't going to the Avenue. | 11. ain't = copula | You ain't no boss. |  | Group A girls | Group B girls | non-s 5 | 25.84 | 57.27 | non-s has | 36.36 | 35.85 | non-s was | 63.64 | 80.95 | negative concord | 12.5 | 58.7 | non-s never | 45.45 | 41.07 | non-s what | 33.33 | 5.56 | non-s come | 30.77 | 90.63 | ain't = copula | 14.29 | 67.12 |
| 1. non-standard -s                                 | They calls me all the names under the sun                  |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| 2. non-standard has                                | You just has to do what the teachers tell you.             |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| 3. non-standard was                                | You was with me, wasn't you?                               |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| 4. negative concord                                | It ain't got no pedigree or nothing.                       |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| 5. non-standard never                              | I never went to school today.                              |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| 6. non-standard what                               | Are you the little bastards what hit my son over the head? |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| 7. non-standard do                                 | She cadges, she do.  |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| 8. non-standard come                               | I come down here yesterday.                                |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| 9. ain't = auxiliary have                          | I ain't seen my Nan for nearly seven years.                |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| 10. ain't = auxiliary be                           | Course I ain't going to the Avenue.                        |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| 11. ain't = copula                                 | You ain't no boss.   |   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
|  | Group A girls  | Group B girls   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| non-s 5  | 25.84  | 57.27   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| non-s has  | 36.36  | 35.85   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| non-s was  | 63.64  | 80.95   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| negative concord                                   | 12.5   | 58.7  |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| non-s never  | 45.45  | 41.07   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| non-s what   | 33.33  | 5.56  |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| non-s come   | 30.77  | 90.63   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| ain't = copula                                     | 14.29  | 67.12   |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |
| Penny Eckert & Sally McConnell-Ginet (1992)& Penny |  | <p>Her research shows that the parents’ socioeconomic class does not affect teens’ speech patterns as much as the groups they hang out with. Eckert classifies these two groups as “Jocks” (school-authority-centered) and “Burnouts” (blue collar job seekers seeking autonomy). Importantly, these social affiliations can lead to explanations for patterns of sound change going on in Detroit.</p> <p>The number one class with phonological changes also happens to be the lower-middle-class group, perhaps due to their “precarious” position in the economy. according to Eckert. The article then raises the question of how adolescent social</p>  |                    |   |                     |  |                     |                              |                     |                                      |                       |                               |                      |  |                    |                     |                      |                             |                           |   |                          |                                     |                    |                    |  |               |               |         |       |       |           |       |       |           |       |       |                  |      |      |             |       |       |            |       |      |            |       |       |                |       |       |

|   |        |  |
|---|--------|--|
| Eckert (2000): communities of practice/"Jocks and Burnouts" study |        | structures begin to replace family connections in junior high, and that during this process, peer pressure acts like a normative factor in groups. The study takes three years of following around six hundred secondary school students as they change linguistically, discovering several important points. First, in these developmental years students would split into two social categories, one characterized by the acceptance of adult authority, and the other characterized by the rejection of this authority. The next section of this article is filled with conjectures and descriptions of Jocks and Burnouts, describing how the school system is analogous to the corporate world. Jocks value upward mobility in this framework, while Burnouts seek an emphasis on freedom and mobility. Burnouts don't get enough vocational training and don't pick up skills that would help them in finding blue collar jobs, so the deference to authority is a useless measure. The extreme polarization of these groups at the time allowed Eckert to determine that the pressure of norms causes an impetus for sound change. The identity of these groups is statistically significantly correlated with phonological change, so after a brief discussion of gender differences, Eckert drops the mike on this article. The article ends with a call for greater focus on ethnological variables to show how social factors can affect these sound change patterns.   |
| Howard Giles et al (1970s): Matched Guise experiments             | Region | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accommodation Theory – Howard Giles – 1973<br/>Describes how speakers change their language to resemble that of their listener: <b>convergence, divergence, upwards/downwards/mutual</b></li> </ul>   |
| William Labov (1963): Martha's Vineyard study                     | Region | <p><b>William Labov –Martha's Vineyard Study – individual speech patterns are "part of a highly systematic structure of social and stylistic stratification"</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Martha's Vineyard is an island lying about 3 miles off New England on the East Coast of the United States of America, with a permanent population of about 6000. However over 40,000 visitors, known somewhat disparagingly as the 'summer people', flood in every summer.</li> <li>In his study, Labov focused on realisations of the diphthongs [aw] and [ay] (as in mouse and mice). He interviewed a number of speakers drawn from different ages and ethnic groups on the island, and noted that among the younger (31-45 years) speakers a movement seemed to be taking place away from the pronunciations associated with the standard New England norms, and towards a pronunciation associated with conservative and characteristically Vineyard speakers – the Chilmark fishermen.</li> <li>The heaviest users of this type of pronunciation were young men who actively sought to identify themselves as Vineyarders, rejected the values of the mainland, and resented the encroachment of wealthy summer visitors on the traditional island way of life. Thus, these speakers seem to be exploiting the resources of the non-standard accent. The pattern emerged despite extensive exposure of speakers to the educational system; some college educated boys from Martha's Vineyard were extremely heavy users of the vernacular vowels.</li> <li>A small group of fishermen began to exaggerate a tendency already existing in their speech. They did this seemingly subconsciously, in order to establish themselves as an independent social group with superior status to the despised summer visitors. A number of other islanders regarded this group as one which epitomised old virtues and desirable values, and subconsciously imitated the way its members talked. For these people, the new pronunciation was an innovation. As more and more people came to speak in the same way, the innovation gradually became the norm for those living on the island.</li> <li>Rather than the increased exposure to the standard New-England accent leading to <b>dialect / accent levelling</b>, the islanders exaggerated the pronunciation of vernacular vowels leading to a more pronounced difference and thus a greater level of variation</li> <li>This tendency noted by Labov – how <b>covert prestige</b> pronunciations can take hold and further entrench themselves – can be noted with many current variants in England. For example, the <b>scouse accent</b> is becoming more entrenched. Also, as young people are seeking to define themselves more and more as a group, outside of their gender or class types, the use of <b>MLE</b> can be seen to be getting more exaggerated, which happens either consciously or subconsciously.</li> </ul> |
| Peter Trudgill (1974): Norwich study                              | Region | <p>looking at "walking" &amp; "talking" as the standard form and "walkin'," "talkin'" as the non-standard form peculiar to the local accent. Also considering at the presence or absence of the third person –s ending, as in "he go to the shop" or "he goes to the shop".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>differentiated between relaxed and careful speech in order to assess participants awareness of their own accents as well as how they wished to sound – which saw the non-standard pronunciation quickly decline</li> <li>Found that class is more of a determiner of non-standard usage than gender, though women in all social classes are more likely to use the overt prestige or RP form</li> <li>Men over-reported their non-standard usage – implying that men wished to sound more non-standard, assuming that they used more of the covert prestige forms</li> <li>Women over-reported their standard usage – implying that women wished to sound more standard, assuming that they used more of the overt prestige forms</li> <li>Concluded that women are more susceptible to overt prestige than men (and men more susceptible to covert prestige)</li> <li>In the "lower middle class" and the "upper working class" the differences between men's and women's usage of the standard forms were greatest in formal speech, thereby identifying these classes as most susceptible to the prestige of the</li> </ul>  |

|   |        | <p>RP form, with women leading the way on this front</p> <p><i>(-ng) in Norwich by social class and sex for Formal Style (Trudgill. 1974a)</i></p> <table> <tr> <th></th><th>Male</th><th>Female</th></tr> <tr> <td>middle middle class</td><td>96</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr> <td>lower middle class</td><td>73</td><td>97</td></tr> <tr> <td>upper working class</td><td>19</td><td>32</td></tr> <tr> <td>middle working class</td><td>9</td><td>19</td></tr> <tr> <td>lower working class</td><td>0</td><td>3</td></tr> </table>   |  | Male | Female | middle middle class | 96 | 100 | lower middle class | 73 | 97 | upper working class | 19 | 32 | middle working class | 9 | 19 | lower working class | 0 | 3 |
|---|--------|--|--|------|--------|---------------------|----|-----|--------------------|----|----|---------------------|----|----|----------------------|---|----|---------------------|---|---|
|   | Male   | Female   |  |      |        |                     |    |     |                    |    |    |                     |    |    |                      |   |    |                     |   |   |
| middle middle class                             | 96     | 100  |  |      |        |                     |    |     |                    |    |    |                     |    |    |                      |   |    |                     |   |   |
| lower middle class                              | 73     | 97   |  |      |        |                     |    |     |                    |    |    |                     |    |    |                      |   |    |                     |   |   |
| upper working class                             | 19     | 32   |  |      |        |                     |    |     |                    |    |    |                     |    |    |                      |   |    |                     |   |   |
| middle working class                            | 9      | 19   |  |      |        |                     |    |     |                    |    |    |                     |    |    |                      |   |    |                     |   |   |
| lower working class                             | 0      | 3  |  |      |        |                     |    |     |                    |    |    |                     |    |    |                      |   |    |                     |   |   |
| Paul Kerswill (2003): <i>th</i> -fronting study | Region | <p>This study examines the lexical and grammatical diffusion of TH-fronting amongst adolescents in London, where TH-fronting is well established, and Edinburgh, where it is a relatively new phenomenon. Our results reveal that the application of TH-fronting is constrained in Edinburgh in ways that are not relevant for London, and vice versa. Specifically, whereas TH-fronting is sensitive to phonotactic context and prosodic position in Edinburgh, we observe no such effects amongst the London speakers. Morphological complexity, on the other hand, is a significant predictor of TH-fronting in both regions; however, we also find evidence of significant gender differences in the use of fronting in London that do not emerge in our Edinburgh data. We argue that these results attest to the more established nature of TH-fronting in London as compared to Edinburgh. We also address the question of how speech perception influences the emergence and spread of innovative neutralisation phenomena like TH-fronting. The results of this study further highlight the usefulness of a comparative variationist approach to understanding patterns of dialectal variation and change.</p>  |  |      |        |                     |    |     |                    |    |    |                     |    |    |                      |   |    |                     |   |   |
| Kevin Watson (2008 & 2010): Liverpool study     | Region | <p>A preliminary analysis of change points in these data suggests that there are significant shifts in evaluative reaction towards all 5 regional varieties on both dimensions (status and solidarity). There are also some significant similarities in the points at which reactions take place. For instance, 30% of listeners reacted very dramatically only 4-5 seconds in to the Liverpool English audio stimuli (extreme early shifters). 1 second prior to this there is a clear instance of h-dropping in the audio stimulus. As this pilot experiment was conducted on listeners from Scotland (where h-dropping is not typically found), it is plausible that this stark change in the data represents a reaction not only to Liverpool English in general but to h-dropping in particular. In other words, we suggest that these shifts can be correlated with the occurrence of particular linguistic features and so used as a way of uncovering which linguistic features are salient for different listeners in a given variety. To finish, we highlight some limitations with the design of this pilot study and suggest a number of ways in which the technology could be developed in future work.</p>   |  |      |        |                     |    |     |                    |    |    |                     |    |    |                      |   |    |                     |   |   |
| David Rosewarne (1984): Estuary English         | Region | <p><b>Estuary English-David Rosewarne describes a newly observed variety of English pronunciation.</b></p> <p>The British are well-known for being extremely sensitive about how they and others speak the English language. Accent differences seem to receive more attention here than is general anywhere in the world, including other English-speaking countries. It may be for this reason that native and non-native teachers of English view the matter with considerable interest. Additionally, their own pronunciation is important because it is the model for their students to imitate. The teacher of British English as a foreign language typically chooses Received Pronunciation as the model (or BBC English, Standard English, Queen's English or Oxford English as it is sometimes called). RP (for short) is the most widely understood pronunciation of those in the world who use British English as their reference accent. It is also the type of British English pronunciation that Americans find easiest to understand. It seems, however, that the pronunciation of British English is changing quite rapidly. What I have chosen to term Estuary English may now and for the foreseeable future, be the strongest native influence upon RP.</p> <p>"Estuary English" is a variety of modified regional speech. It is a mixture of non-regional and local south-eastern English pronunciation and intonation. If one imagines a continuum with RP and London speech at either end, "Estuary English" speakers are to be found grouped in the middle ground.</p> <p>The heartland of this variety lies by the banks of the Thames and its estuary, but it seems to be the most influential accent in the south-east of England. It is to be heard on the front and back benches of the House of Commons and is used by some members of the Lords, whether life or hereditary peers. It is well established in the City, business circles, the Civil Service, local government, the media, advertising as well as the medical and teaching professions in the south-east. "Estuary English" is in a strong position to exert influence on the pronunciation of the future.</p> <p>It appears to be a continuation of the long process by which London pronunciation has made itself felt. This started in the later Middle Ages when the speech of the capital started to influence the Court and from there changed the Received Pronunciation of the day.</p> <p>On the level of individual sounds, or phonemes, "Estuary English" is a mixture of "London" and General RP forms. Although there are individual differences resulting from the speech background and choices of pronunciation made by the speaker, there is a general pattern. An example of this is the use of w where RP uses l in the final position or in a final consonant cluster. An "Estuary English" speaker might use an articulation like a w instead of the RP l as many as four times in the utterance: 'Bill will build the wall.'</p> <p>Non-Londoners often comment on what they see as the jerkiness of the speech of the capital. This is because of the use of a glottal stop in the place of the t or d found in RP, as in the stage Cockney phrase: "A li'le bi' of breab wiv a bi' of bu'er on i'." This process seems to be analogous to the loss of the t in such words as "Sco'land", "ga'away", "Ga'wick", "sta'ement", "sea'-belt", "trea'ment", and "ne'work". Not all RP speakers would sound these ts. As would be expected, an "Estuary English" speaker uses fewer glottal stops for t or d than a "London" speaker, but more than an RP speaker.</p> |  |      |        |                     |    |     |                    |    |    |                     |    |    |                      |   |    |                     |   |   |



Similarly the proverbial "Cockney" would be unlikely to pronounce the phonetic /j/ which is found in RP after the first consonant in such words as "news" or "tune". The process of shedding /j/s is now established in RP. Many speakers of current General RP do not pronounce a /j/ after the l of "absolute", "lute", "revolution", or "salute". They would say "time off in loo" rather than "time off in lieu". For many speakers "lieu" and "loo" are now homophones. Similarly it is common not to pronounce the /j/ after the /s/ of "assume", "consume", "presume", "pursuit" or "suit(able)". It could be argued that these are now the established form of current General RP and that those who pronounce the /j/s in these environments are what Professor Gimson would term "Conservative RP speakers". It was he who drew attention to this change in RP. It seems unnecessary to look across the Atlantic for the origin of this change when this pronunciation is so well entrenched in London speech. The likeliest explanation is maybe that of imitation of an "Estuary" pronunciation reinforced by exposure of RP speakers to American English through films and television.

A feature of "Estuary English" which seems to have received no attention to date is the r. This feature is to be found neither in RP nor "London" pronunciation. It can sound somewhat similar to a general American r, but it does not have retroflexion. For the r of General RP, the tip of the tongue is held close to the rear part of the upper teeth ridge and the central part of the tongue is lowered. My own observations suggest that in the typical "Estuary" realization the tip of the tongue is lowered and the central part raised to a position close to, but not touching, the soft palate.

Vowel qualities in "Estuary English" are a compromise between unmodified regional forms and those of General RP. For example, vowels in final position in "Estuary English" such as the /i:/ in "me" and the second /l/ in "city", are longer than normally found in RP and may tend towards the quality of a diphthong.

The intonation of "Estuary English" is characterized by frequent prominence being given to prepositions and auxiliary verbs which are not normally stressed in General RP. This prominence is often marked to the extent that the nuclear tone (the syllable highlighted by pitch movement) can fall on prepositions. An example of this would be: "Let us get TO the point". There is a rise fall intonation which is characteristic of "Estuary English" as is a greater use of question tags such as "isn't it?" and "don't I?" than in RP. The pitch of intonation patterns in "Estuary English" appears to be in a narrower frequency band than RP. In particular, rises often do not reach as high a pitch as they would in RP. The overall effect might be interpreted as one of deliberateness and even an apparent lack of enthusiasm.


The term "Estuary English" comprises some general changes which have hitherto received little attention. In what is perhaps the most famous work in this area: An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English, Professor Gimson suggested that Advanced RP "may well indicate the way in which the RP system is developing and be adopted in the future as General RP". He described Advanced RP forms as "mainly used by young people of exclusive social groups - mostly of the upper classes, but also for prestige value in certain professional circles". He continues by saying that in the most extreme variety Advanced RP "would usually be judged 'affected' by other RP speakers". An Advanced speaker might say something which sounded as follows: "So tarred darling; ar harred car's been in the mar for an ar." ("So tired darling; our hired car's been in the mire for an hour.") Whereas General RP has three vowel sounds in "hour", for example, Advanced would have one long /a:/. It could be argued that just as this group has long ceased to be the model for general imitation in clothes fashion, it has lost its role in linguistic trend setting. This observation aside, Professor Gimson's view of the role of advanced RP seems to have remained orthodox for over two decades.

Over these two decades, Professor Gimson's description of general RP as "typified by the pronunciation adopted by the BBC," even appears to have become debatable. More and more the General RP of the BBC has been under pressure from modified versions of RP, and perhaps now predominates only in enclaves in Radio 3 and possibly Radio 4, and of more importance internationally, in the World Service of the BBC. In addition to this, the children of parents who speak Advanced or General RP are likely to speak rather differently from their elders. This is truest of those in state schools, but it is also commonly found in public schools.

In the circles of those privileged young people who are likeliest to be influential in the future, the accepted pattern is very often set by the children of the upwardly mobile socially. For these groups the standard pronunciation is often "Estuary English". My contention is that "Estuary English" describes the speech of a far larger and currently more linguistically influential group than "Advanced" RP speakers. The popularity of "Estuary English" among the young is significant for the future.

Speculation as to the reasons for the development and present growth of "Estuary English" is necessarily somewhat impressionist at this stage. Sociolinguistically it gives a middle ground between all types of RP on one side and regional varieties on the other. "Estuary English" speakers can cause their original accents to converge until they meet in the middle ground.

Because it obscures sociolinguistic origins, "Estuary English" is attractive to many. The motivation, often unconscious, of those who are rising and falling socio-economically is to fit into their new environments by compromising but not losing their original linguistic identity. Again, often unconsciously, those RP speakers who wish to hold on to what they have got are often aware that General RP is no longer perceived as a neutral accent in many circles. They are also aware that "Conservative" and more so "Advanced" RP can arouse hostility. What for many starts as an adaptation first to school and then working life, can lead to progressive adoption of "Estuary English" into private life as well. Complicated as this may sound to a foreign user of English, these developments may be seen as a linguistic reflection of the changes in class

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
|   |                               | <p>barriers in Britain.</p> <p>It is interesting to speculate on the future of "Estuary English". In the long run it may influence the speech of all but the linguistically most isolated, among the highest and lowest socio-economic groups. Both could become linguistically conservative minorities. The highest may endeavour to retain their chosen variety of speech and the lowest their unmodified regional accents. The majority may be composed of speakers of "Estuary English" and those for whom it may form part of their pronunciation. The latter group might use certain features of "Estuary English" in combination with elements of whatever their regional speech might be.</p> <p>For many, RP has long served to disguise origins. "Estuary English" may now be taking over this function. For large and influential sections of the young, the new model for general imitation may already be "Estuary English", which may become the RP of the future.</p>  |
| <p>Braj Kachru (1992): Circle model</p>  | <p><b>World Englishes</b></p> | <p><b>Kachru's Three Circles of English</b>[edit]</p> <p>Braj Kachru's Three Circles of English.</p> <p>The most influential model of the spread of English is Braj Kachru's model of World Englishes. In this model the diffusion of English is captured in terms of three Concentric Circles of the language: The Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle.<sup>[14]</sup></p> <p>The <b>Inner Circle</b> refers to English as it originally took shape and was spread across the world in the first diaspora. In this transplantation of English, speakers from England carried the language to Australia, New Zealand and North America. The Inner Circle thus represents the traditional historical and sociolinguistic bases of English in regions where it is now used as a primary language: the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, anglophone Canada and South Africa, and some of the Caribbean territories. English is the native language or mother tongue of most people in these countries. The total number of English speakers in the inner circle is as high as 380 million, of whom some 120 million are outside the United States.</p> <p>The <b>Outer Circle</b> of English was produced by the second diaspora of English, which spread the language through imperial expansion by Great Britain in Asia and Africa. In these regions, English is not the native tongue, but serves as a useful lingua franca between ethnic and language groups. Higher education, the legislature and judiciary, national commerce and so on may all be carried out predominantly in English. This circle includes India, Nigeria, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Malaysia, Tanzania, Kenya, non-Anglophone South Africa, the Philippines (colonized by the US) and others. The total number of English speakers in the outer circle is estimated to range from 150 million to 300 million.<sup>[15]</sup></p> <p>Finally, the <b>Expanding Circle</b> encompasses countries where English plays no historical or governmental role, but where it is nevertheless widely used as a medium of international communication. This includes much of the rest of the world's population not categorized above, including territories such as China, Russia, Japan, non-Anglophone Europe (especially the Netherlands and Nordic countries), South Korea, Egypt and Indonesia. The total in this expanding circle is the most difficult to estimate, especially because English may be employed for specific, limited purposes, usually in a business context. The estimates of these users range from 100 million to one billion.</p> <p>The inner circle (UK, US etc.) is 'norm-providing'; that means that English language norms are developed in these countries. The outer circle (mainly New Commonwealth countries) is 'norm-developing'. The expanding circle (which includes much of the rest of the world) is 'norm-dependent', because it relies on the standards set by native speakers in the inner circle.<sup>[16]</sup></p> |
| <p>Schneider (2007): Dynamic model</p>  | <p><b>World Englishes</b></p> | <p><b>Edgar Schneider's dynamic model</b> of postcolonial Englishes adopts an evolutionary perspective emphasizing <u>language ecologies</u>. It shows how language evolves as a process of 'competition-and-selection', and how certain linguistic features emerge. The Dynamic Model illustrates how the histories and ecologies will determine language structures in the different varieties of English, and how linguistic and <u>social identities</u> are maintained</p> <p>Five underlying principles underscore the Dynamic Model: <sup>[21]</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The closer the <u>contact</u>, or higher the degree of <u>bilingualism</u> or <u>multilingualism</u> in a community, the stronger the effects of contact.</li> <li>2. The structural effects of language contact depends on social conditions. Therefore, history will play an important part.</li> <li>3. Contact-induced changes can be achieved by a variety of mechanisms, from <u>code-switching</u> to code alternation to <u>acquisition strategies</u>.</li> <li>4. <u>Language evolution</u>, and the emergence of contact-induced varieties, can be regarded as speakers making selections from a pool of linguistic variants made available to them.</li> <li>5. Which features will be ultimately adopted depends on the complete "ecology" of the contact situation, including factors such as demography, <u>social relationships</u>, and surface similarities between languages etc.</li> </ol> <p>The Dynamic Model outlines five major stages of the evolution of <u>world Englishes</u>. These stages will take into account the</p>   |

|   |                 |   |
|---|-----------------|---|
|   |                 | <p>perspectives from the two major parties of agents –<u>settlers</u> (STL) and <u>indigenous residents</u> (IDG). Each phase is defined by four parameters:<sup>[2]</sup></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extralinguistic factors (e.g. historical events)</li> <li>2. Characteristic <u>identity</u> constructions for both parties</li> <li>3. <u>Sociolinguistic</u> determinants of <u>contact</u> setting</li> <li>4. Structural effects that emerge</li> </ol>   |
| Jennifer Jenkins (2002):<br>Lingua Franca Core                                      | World Englishes | <p><b>First, let's recap:</b></p> <p>The concept of ELF (English as a Lingua Franca) is simple: many learners of English today do not want/need to use English with people whose first language (L1) is English. They are more likely to use English in situations where nobody shares an L1 (e.g. a native speaker of French, a native speaker of Japanese and a native speaker of Arabic might use English to communicate with each other).</p>   |
| Joanna Przedlacka's study of "Estuary" Vowel fronting   Glottaling   L-vocalisation |                 | <p>Perhaps the most authoritative recent research is that of Joanna Przedlacka. Between 1997 and 1999 Dr. Przedlacka studied the sociophonetics of what she calls "a putative variety of Southern British English, popularly known as Estuary English." In fieldwork in four of the Home Counties (Buckinghamshire, Kent, Essex and Surrey) she studied fourteen sociophonetic variables, looking at differences among the counties, between male and female speakers and two social classes. She studied sixteen teenage speakers, using a word elicitation task. (Dr. Przedlacka's report, Estuary English and RP: some recent findings, is available as a portable document file (PDF), while a summary, with some of the more important interpretation, is on her homepage, along with digital audio files to exemplify the speech sounds in the study.</p> <p>Joanna Przedlacka compared her examples to data taken from the Survey of English Dialects (SED). She found that:</p> <p>glottaling (supposedly a distinctive feature of Estuary English) showed a pattern not dissimilar to that of fifty years ago, as shown in the SED data, but that l-vocalisation had increased.</p> <p>She compared the Estuary English data and recordings of RP and Cockney speakers. This demonstrated that Estuary speakers were intermediate between RP and "Cockney" as regards the incidence of t-glottaling and l-vocalisation. She suggests that this may be an oversimplification of the issue: one should also consider factors such as geographical variation or idiosyncratic characteristics of the speakers.</p> <p>Vowel fronting - The word blue uttered by a speaker from Buckinghamshire, has a front realisation of the vowel, while other front realisations can be heard in boots, pronounced by a Kent female and roof (Essex female). A central vowel can be heard in new, uttered by a male teenager from Essex. Back realisations of the vowel, as in cucumber, uttered by a Kent teenager are infrequent. The vowel in butter has a back realisation in the speech of an Essex speaker, but can be realised a front vowel, as in dust or cousins, both uttered by teenage girls from Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>Back to top</p> <p>Glottaling - Glottaling of syllable non-initial /t/ is not the main variant in Estuary English. Here the word feet, spoken by a Kent female, exemplifies it. Realisations where the /t/ is not "dropped" are more frequent - as in bat, (Surrey speaker). Intervocalic /t/ glottaling is virtually absent from the Estuary English data. Here is one of the very few instances of it in the word forty, uttered by a Buckinghamshire female. (Here Dr. Przedlacka has a link to an audio file to exemplify the speech sound.) It is frequently found in Cockney, as in daughter, said by a teenager from the East End of London.</p> <p>Back to top</p> <p>L-vocalisation - The majority of tokens with a syllable non-initial /l/ have a vocalised realisation, as in milk (Kent speaker). Dark l, which is the usual RP realisation (as in an RP speaker's pronunciation of ankle), is also present in Estuary English, alongside clear tokens, as in pull (Essex teenager). However, clear realisations of /l/ are infrequent in the data. Joanna Przedlacka's conclusion is that "Estuary" does not correspond to anything very coherent:</p> <p>"The study showed that there is no homogeneity in the accents spoken in the area, given the extent of geographical variation alone. Tendencies observed include: vowel fronting, as in goose or strut, and syllable non-initial t-glottaling, which are led by female speakers. Contrary to speculation in other sources, th-fronting is present in the teenage speech of the Home Counties, the variant being used more frequently by males. Generally, social class turned out not to be a good indicator of change, there being little differences between the classes."</p> <p>This would tend to support Jane Setter's view, that "Estuary" is not so much a variety as an umbrella term that covers a range of accents. While she identifies them as belonging to the south east, one should also note Paul Kerswill's tracking of their movement to the Midlands and further north.</p> |
| Viv Edwards (1986):<br>Jamaican English in  | Ethnicity       | <p><u>English</u> is the <u>official language</u> of the former British West Indies, therefore African-Caribbean immigrants had few communication difficulties upon arrival in Britain compared to immigrants from other regions.<sup>[1]</sup> Nevertheless, indigenous Britons were generally unused to the distinct <u>Caribbean dialects</u>, <u>creoles</u> and <u>patois</u> (<i>patwah</i>) spoken by many African-Caribbean immigrants and their descendants, which would be particularly problematic in the field of education. In a study</p>   |

|   |                  |   |
|---|------------------|---|
| West Midlands   |                  | <p>by language and education specialist Viv Edwards, <i>The West Indian language issue in British schools</i>, language – the Creole spoken by the students – was singled out as an important factor disadvantaging Caribbean children in British schools. The study cites negative attitudes of teachers towards any non-standard variety noting that;</p> <p>"The teacher who does not or is not prepared to recognise the problems of the Creole-speaking child in a British English situation can only conclude that he is stupid when he gives either an inappropriate response or no response at all. The stereotyping process leads features of Creole to be stigmatised and to develop connotations of, amongst other things, low academic ability."<sup>[65]</sup></p> <p>As integration continued, African-West Indians born in Britain instinctively adopted hybrid dialects combining Caribbean and local <u>British dialects</u>.<sup>[66]</sup> These dialects and accents gradually entered mainstream British vernacular, and shades of Caribbean dialects can be heard among Britons regardless of cultural origin. A <u>Lancaster University</u> study identified an emergence in certain areas of Britain of a distinctive accent which borrows heavily from Jamaican creole, lifting some words unchanged.<sup>[67]</sup> This phenomenon, disparagingly named "Jafaican" meaning "fake Jamaican", was famously parodied by comedian <u>Sacha Baron Cohen</u> through his character <u>Ali G</u>.<sup>[67]</sup></p>  |
| Mark Sebba (1993): London Jamaican  | <b>Ethnicity</b> | <p>From the early days of 'London Jamaican' through to recent remarks by the historian David Starkey that rioters in English cities were communicating in 'wholly false... Jamaican patois', authenticity and ownership have been problematic for both linguists and users of Creole in Britain. In this paper we review the changing issues connected with authenticity and ethnicity, based on empirical research spanning the period 1981-2011.</p> <p>Second-generation speakers of Creole in London in the 1980s were conscious that they could not pass for natives when in the Caribbean, but could nevertheless claim to be authentic 'Black British' by virtue of commanding both the local British vernacular and a local version of Jamaican Creole (Sebba 1993). By the end of the century, claims of authenticity linked to ethnic identity had been undermined by the emergence of a non-ethnically specific youth variety incorporating Creole grammatical and phonological features, as parodied by the fictitious character Ali G (Sebba 2003, 2007), sometimes called 'Jafaican' by the media. In a study of ethnically diverse young people in Manchester, Dray and Sebba (2011) were able to conclude that 'authenticity' was indexed by involvement in particular practices involving specific speech styles, some of which were Caribbean or partly Caribbean in origin; at the same time, there was little or no use of the local Creole which had been prevalent in the 1990s and earlier, as multi-ethnic vernaculars have come to predominate among the youth (Cheshire et al. 2011).</p> <p>We conclude that as 'Creole' manifests itself less and less as a linguistic system and more and more as an additional linguistic resource in a complex semiotic system, 'authenticity' is achieved through practices rather than inherited ethnicity or native-like use of a specific variety.</p>   |
| Devyani Sharma & Lavanya Sankaran (2011): Punjabi Indian English in West London | <b>Ethnicity</b> | <p>It's often thought that as they grow up, the children of immigrants begin to sound like their locally-born friends rather than their parents. <u>Devyani Sharma</u> and <u>Lavanya Sankaran</u>, though, found that things are more complex than this – language change between different generations is more gradual than might be expected, and it's also more complex.</p> <p>Sharma and Sankaran worked in the Punjabi community in Southall, London, where, over the course of the last 60 years, South Asians have shifted from being a minority group to a majority one which now makes up more than 60 per cent of the local population. The researchers analysed the English of three groups of South Asians, totalling 42 individuals. One group consisted of first generation immigrants who had migrated from India as adults, and the two other groups were locally-born second generation South Asians, one older (aged between 35 and 60) and one younger (aged between 18 and 35). The older second generation group had grown up in Southall at a time when South Asians were still a minority group there and when race relations in the area were hostile. By the time the second, younger, group (aged 18-35) was growing up, South Asians were no longer such a minority in Southall and, perhaps as a result, race relations had shifted to a cooperative coexistence.</p> <p>The researchers focussed on the pronunciation of /t/, which has a distinctive local pronunciation as well as a South Asian pronunciation. The local London pronunciation of /t/ is glottalised (with the pronunciation of words like <i>water</i> or <i>feet</i> sometimes represented in popular writing as <i>wa'er</i> and <i>fee'</i>). As you might expect, the first generation South Asian speakers had almost no glottalised pronunciations of /t/. By contrast, both second generation groups used glottalised /t/; furthermore, they followed the same pattern, using this pronunciation more often at the end of a word than the middle of a word (so, more often in <i>feet</i> than <i>water</i>). In their use of glottalised /t/, then, the second generation were speaking more like locally-born people of their age than their parents – just as we might expect.</p> <p>However, the South Asian speakers sometimes pronounced /t/ as a retracted or retroflex consonant, as in Punjabi, the Indian language that they also spoke. Here the tip of the tongue is curled back to touch the ridge just behind the top teeth (or close to the ridge). You can hear this pronunciation in the stereotyped English of Apu, the Indian immigrant in <i>The Simpsons</i>. The first generation immigrant group used retroflex /t/ 35 per cent of the time. The second generation groups also used this pronunciation, albeit less often: 16 per cent of the /t/'s in the English of the older second generation were</p> |

|   |                   |  |
|---|-------------------|--|
|   |                   | <p>retroflex, and 8 per cent in the English of the younger speakers. The second generation, then, had not altogether abandoned the pronunciation of their parents: although language change was taking place across the generations in these immigrant families, it was a more gradual process than is often supposed.</p> <p>The change was also more complex than expected. Unlike both their parents and the older second generation group, the younger speakers used retroflex /t/ more often at the beginning of a word, where it is more noticeable (for example, in <i>tea</i> or <i>toffee</i>). They also pronounced it with a “fortis” (more energetic) phonetic quality.</p> <p>In interviews with the researchers younger second generation male speakers used retroflex /t/ more often than younger female speakers. Even here, though, the picture is more complicated than this gender difference suggests. Female speakers used a surprisingly high number of pronunciation features influenced by Punjabi, including retroflex /t/, when they were speaking English at home. For female speakers, then, there seems to be a sharper compartmentalisation of styles across their repertoire.</p> <p>Sharma and Sankaran point out that other pronunciation features pattern in a similar way in the English of these three groups of speakers. They explain that for the older second generation group, surviving at school and in public meant they had to downplay Indianness and pass as British, so they acquired local pronunciations and weakened their use of South Asian ones. Many individuals in this group then went into their fathers’ businesses and had continuing ties with India. Depending on where they were and who they were talking to, they needed to signal that they belonged either to a British or an Indian group. As a result, they were able to control two distinct pronunciations of English. The younger generation not only had less regular contact with India, but by the time they were growing up race relations in the area were less hostile, so they did not need to try to pass as British. Instead, using a focused, Punjabi-inflected speech style allows them to signal their allegiance to the now sizeable local British Asian community.</p> <p>Sharma and Sankaran note that in immigrant communities elsewhere – in North America, for example – there may be more rapid assimilation to local patterns of pronunciation since, as they have shown, linguistic assimilation depends in part on social factors such as community relations and the size of the migrant community.</p> |
| Jenny Cheshire, Paul Kerswill, Sue Fox and Eivind Torgersen (2000 - 2011): Multicultural London English | <b>Ethnicity</b>  | <p><b><i>Jenny Cheshire – 1982 Reading Study – relationship between use of non-standard variables and adherence to peer group norms</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Identified 11 non-standard features and measured their frequency of use in boys and girls in a Reading playground, differentiating between those who approved or disapproved of minor criminal activities</li> </ul> <p><b><i>“They calls me names.”</i></b><br/> <b><i>“You just has to do what the teacher says.”</i></b><br/> <b><i>“You was with me, wasn’t you?”</i></b><br/> <b><i>“It ain’t got no pedigree or nothing.”</i></b><br/> <b><i>“I never went to school today.”</i></b><br/> <b><i>“Are you the ones what hit him?”</i></b><br/> <b><i>“I come down here yesterday.”</i></b><br/> <b><i>“You ain’t no boss.”</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– All children who approved of peer group criminal activities were more likely to use non-standard forms, but boys more so</li> <li>– All children who disapproved of such activities use non-standard forms less frequently, but the difference between the groupings of girls was more stark</li> <li>– Suggests that variation in dialect is a conscious choice, influenced by (declared) social attitude</li> <li>– Males are more susceptible to covert prestige, but social attitude is more of a determining factor than gender</li> <li>– A more negative attitude to the peer group’s criminal activities can be seen as aspirational, and therefore those children would be less susceptible to the covert prestige forms (and more susceptible to the overt prestige of standard forms)</li> </ul>  |
| Drew and Heritage (1992): Institutional Talk  | <b>Occupation</b> | <p>there is a well-established tradition for the study of institutional interaction in conversation analysis (for overviews, see Boden and Zimmerman 1991; Drew and Heritage 1992a; Heritage 1997; Drew and Sorjonen 1997). The study of institutional interaction aims at explicating the ways in which institutional tasks are carried out in various settings through the management of talk-in-interaction. In particular, Drew and Heritage (1992a) have edited a key collection of studies on institutional interaction which provides a systematic exploration of this distinctive field. In terms of institutional interaction, CA’s reverse-engineering program aims to identify the unique “fingerprint” of each institutional practice (ibid.). Significantly, this fingerprint is not the outcome of analysis, but its starting point. By examining this fingerprint, CA studies how specific institutional tasks, identities, and inferences are achieved. Therefore, analysis of institutional interaction ultimately examines elaborate issues, such as the strategic aspects of interaction, the achievement of collaboration, or procedures whereby participants’ differing perspectives are brought into alignment. In this respect, studies of institutional interaction are very close to Sacks’ original idea of studying members’ methodical ways of accomplishing social tasks in interaction. The study of institutional interaction is essentially comparative, whereby institutional practices are compared with their counterparts in everyday interactions. This comparative approach aims at defining the specificity of a particular type of institutional interaction. The analyst demonstrates the ways in which the context plays a role in a particular aspect or a segment of interaction, thus allowing us to examine the role the institution has in and for the interaction in the setting. Schegloff (1991) has called this “defining the procedural relevance of context”</p>  |

|  |                      |  |
|--|----------------------|--|
|  |                      | (to be discussed in Chapter 2), with the aim of providing criteria and a toolkit against arbitrary invocation of a countless number of extrinsic, potential aspects of context.  |
| John Swales (2011): Discourse Communities                              | Occupation           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Swales - 1990 – Once you start work, you become a member of a professional community, which has a set of professional practices and shares specialist knowledge and certain values. Language plays a key role here, as people working together in the same organization or field have mechanisms of intercommunication and use professional genres and specialist lexis. Linguists refer to such professional groups as <b>discourse communities</b> in order to emphasize the important role language plays in their constitution.</li> </ul>  |
| Janet Holmes (2006): Relational Practice chapter (after Fletcher 1999) | Occupation           | Workplaces constitute one of the more interesting sites where individuals ‘do gender’, while at the same time constructing their professional identities and meeting their organisation’s expectations. Drawing on interactional data recorded in New Zealand professional organisations, this paper focuses in particular on how participants manage and interpret the notion of ‘femininity’ in workplace discourse. In much current usage, the concepts ‘feminine’ and ‘femininity’ typically evoke negative reactions. Our analysis suggests these notions can be reclaimed and reinterpreted positively using an approach which frames doing femininity at work as normal, unmarked, and effective workplace behaviour in many contexts. The analysis also demonstrates that multiple femininities extend beyond normative expectations, such as enacting relational practice (Fletcher 1999), to embrace more contestive and parodic instantiations of femininity in workplace talk. |
| Hornyak  | Occupation           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hornyak - 1994? - The shift from work talk to personal talk is always initiated by the highest-ranking person in the room.</li> </ul>   |
| Herbert & Straight   | Occupation           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Herbert &amp; Straight – 1989 - Compliments tend to flow from those of higher rank to those of lower rank.</li> </ul>   |
| Drew and Heritage 1992   | Occupation           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study of Workplace Talk – Drew and Heritage, 1992<br/>Summarised differences between everyday conversation and workplace talk: goal orientation, turn taking, allowable contributions, professional lexis, structure, asymmetry</li> </ul>  |
| Various  | Occupation           | - 1998–2003 - The way co-workers use small talk is defined by the power relationship between them. Superiors tend to initiate and delimit small talk, as well as defining what subject matters are acceptable subjects for conversation.   |
| Various  | Occupation           | - 1998–2004 - When giving a directive to an equal, workers tend to use more indirect devices (such as we instead of you, hedged structures and modals). When giving directions to a subordinate, workers are often more direct.  |
| Wenger   | Occupation (?)       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wenger - <b>Communities of practice</b> are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly.</li> </ul>  |
| Herring 1992   | Workplace and Gender | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Herring – 1992 - In an email discussion which took place on a linguistics ‘distribution list’, five women and 30 men took part, even though women make up nearly half the members of the Linguistic Society of America and 36% of subscribers to the list. Men’s messages were twice as long, on average, as women’s. Women tended to use a personal voice, e.g. ‘I am intrigued by your comment ...’. The tone adopted by the men who dominated the discussion was assertive: ‘It is obvious that ...’.</li> </ul>   |
| Holmes 1998  | Workplace and Gender | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Holmes - various studies from 1998 - Women managers seem to be more likely to negotiate consensus than male managers, they are less likely to just ‘plough through the agenda’, taking time to make sure everyone genuinely agrees with what has been decided.</li> </ul>   |
| Holmes 2005 & Marra 2002   | Workplace and Gender | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Holmes – 2005 and Holmes and Marra – 2002 - Contrary to popular belief, women use just as much humour as men, and use it for the same functions, to control discourse and subordinates and to contest superiors, although they are more likely to encourage supportive and collaborative humour.</li> </ul>   |
| Eakins & Eakins – 1976   | Workplace and Gender | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eakins &amp; Eakins – 1976 - In seven university faculty meetings, the men spoke for longer. The men’s turns ranged from 11 to 17 seconds, the women’s from 3 to 10 seconds.</li> </ul>   |
| Edelsky – 1981   | Workplace and Gender | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Edelsky – 1981 - In a series of meetings of a university department faculty committee, men took more and longer turns and did more joking, arguing, directing, and soliciting of responses during the more structured segments of meetings. During the ‘free-for-all’ parts of the meetings, women and men talked equally, and women joked, argued, directed, and solicited responses more than men.</li> </ul>   |
| cy and Eisenberg - 1990/1991   | Workplace and Gender | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tracy and Eisenberg - 1990/1991 - When role-playing delivering criticism to a co-worker about errors in a business letter, men showed more concern for the feelings of the person they were criticizing when in the subordinate role, while women showed more concern when in the superior role.</li> </ul>   |
| Almut Koester  | Studies              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Almut Koester is one of the researchers working in this area in higher education. Her book <i>The Language of Work</i> in Routledge’s Intertext series provides as much studies material and references as are needed by teachers for most AS purposes. Even at this level it is important students use research findings critically.</li> </ul>  |
|  | Studies              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>‘Language in the National Curriculum’ – 1989-1992, ‘A Day in the Language Life of a Hospital’ summarised</li> </ul>   |

|                        |  |   |
|------------------------|--|---|
|                        |  | <p>features of language use in this context: grammatical complexity, technical vocabulary, power issues, equality issues, social vs informational talk, unequal encounters</p>  |
| Suzanne Romaine (1998) |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refers to the Internal and External history of Language:</li> </ul> <p>Internal = formation of new words and the influence of dictionaries etc. Looks at what happens inside the language with no external factors.<br/> External = the changing social contexts – language as an ongoing process.</p>   |
| Bex (1996)             |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generic Labels = used to describe groups of texts which seem to have similar language features and perform similar social functions.</li> </ul> <p>Genres as communicative texts indicate what is regarded as important in society. Genres change over time because society does.<br/> Generic labels are just that; they label texts. Genre is connected to change in 3 ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change within genre – the way a text is created / presented - e.g. recipes</li> <li>2. New sub-genres - e.g. celebrity cook books</li> <li>3. New discourse communities develop that are not represented within existing genres – e.g. recipes on the Internet.</li> </ol>  |
| Sharon Goodman (1996)  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>She notes that we are living in a time of increased Informalisation = the process whereby language forms that were traditionally reserved for close personal relationships are now used in wider social contexts.</li> </ul> <p>Referring to Fairclough She says:<br/> “Professional encounters are increasingly likely to contain informal forms of English”<br/> - what Fairclough termed ‘Conversationalised’</p> <p>Some would argue that increased ‘Informalisation’ in a range of contexts breaks down barriers between ‘them’ and ‘us’. Others would argue that barriers remain but we are more likely to be manipulated if they appear not to be.</p>  |
| Sharon Goodman (1996)  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that the letter X which appears infrequently in written words is a ‘supercharged typographic icon’ The signifier X is a grapheric symbol and is used to create a range of meanings.</li> </ul> <p>E.G.<br/> X = a kiss<br/> X = incorrect<br/> X = an unnamed person<br/> X = name for one who can’t write<br/> X = mark for a vote<br/> X = a draw on the football pools<br/> X = sign in algebra<br/> X = a cancellation written across other words<br/> X = a site on a map<br/> X = 10 in Roman numerals<br/> X = times mathematically<br/> X = deleted letters in taboo language<br/> X = a replaced prefix in contemporary English – Xpress etc in a company name</p> <p>Other grapheric symbols include: P = parking, A – E = grades, F = female. These are all culturally specific.</p> <p>Texts no longer rely on words alone as they are becoming increasingly multimodal. As Goodman states:<br/> “ They use devices from more than one semiotic mode of communication simultaneously”<br/> She notes that finding a term to describe visual elements of a text is problematic.</p> <p>Use of lower case letters where traditionally upper case had been used was popularised in the 1960s and has now been revived. E.G. BP has become bp recently in order to influence the way in which they are perceived; wanting to appear more in line with advancing technology and business.</p> |
| Hopper (1992)          |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified a pattern to telephone opening routines which alter according to context: In conversational phone calls, which are not co-present, greetings are not the first exchange as they are when the encounter is face-to-face.</li> </ul> <p>Summons - answer sequence:<br/> Caller - tone<br/> Answerer - hello<br/> Therefore the answerer speaks first.</p> <p>Identification / recognition sequence:<br/> Caller - is that X?<br/> Answerer - speaking<br/> Therefore the answerer is identified.</p>  |



|                          |  |  |
|--------------------------|--|--|
|                          |  | <p>Greeting sequence (what Hopper calls 'greeting tokens'):<br/>         Caller - Hi, this is X<br/>         Answerer - Hi X.<br/>         Therefore self-identification of caller.</p> <p>3 is then followed by what Hopper terms 'initial enquiries':<br/>         Caller - how are you?<br/>         Answerer - fine, and you?</p> <p>These are increasingly changing due to the use of mobile phones as the name of the caller can appear before the call is taken so the answerer can know the identification of the caller.</p> <p>Multi-modal forms of communication such as e-mail, text messages, speakerphones and chatrooms are essentially new. The term multi-modal refers to how the sender can 'speak' to several people at once - a characteristic only previously enabled by a face-to-face encounter in speech.</p> <p>Electronic postcards are nothing like traditional postcards but retain through the name a metaphorical connection with the older form of communication.</p> <p>A similar process is seen in many aspects of computer technology, which operates in what Tim Shortis (2001) calls 'a virtual environment of extended imagery'.</p> |
| David Crystal (2001)     |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Language and the Internet, Crystal refers to the 'dialogic character of e-messaging'. The word dialogic suggests many e-mails are part of an exchange of communications in the way traditional letters are not. E-mails have a sense of immediacy of reply. Crystal claims it is the dialogic nature of e-mail, which is more significant than lexical informality.</li> </ul> <p>Crystal uses the term 'asynchronous' to describe groups where 'postings' are placed on 'boards' in chatrooms and 'synchronous' to describe groups who chat in real time.</p> <p>He also states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">" In chatrooms silence is ambiguous. It may reflect a deliberate withholding, a temporary inattention, or a physical absence (without signing off) "</p> <p>Pragmatically in a face-to-face encounter, if someone is silent their presence is still registered</p>  |
| Donald Mackinnon (1996)  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Categorises the attitudes people may have to language use:<br/>         As incorrect or correct<br/>         As pleasant or ugly<br/>         Socially acceptable or socially unacceptable<br/>         Morally acceptable or morally unacceptable<br/>         Appropriate in context or inappropriate in context<br/>         Useful or useless</li> </ul> <p>Change generally takes place over time but Political Correctness involves a conscious process. Donald Mackinnon's 5th category - moral acceptability, is relevant here, but it is rarely clear-cut and context is everything. Whilst thought of as a positive thing because of the word 'correct' in its title, it is largely associated with the negative and there is no neutral way of seeing this term.</p>   |
| Philip Hensher (2002)    |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Writing in The Independent, highlighted the complexity of the situation that people in a group can call each other names, e.g. nigger, queer etc. but that when called these names from someone outside the group it becomes offensive.</li> </ul>  |
| Philip Howard (1977)     |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"The revolving cycle of euphemism has turned full circle in the U.S. – black has become acceptable, replacing Afro-American, which replaced Negro, which replaced coloured, which replaced darky, which in turn replaced black."</li> </ul> <p>Robin Lakoff (1975)<br/>         States that lady has become a euphemism for woman.</p>  |
| Harvey and Shalom (1997) |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A problem area in language is often identified by the fact that there are lots of variations of a concept, which lacks a single form.<br/>         E.G.<br/>         ☐ Technical – sexual intercourse, fornication<br/>         ☐ Euphemistic – go to bed, sleep with<br/>         ☐ Dysphemistic – fuck, shag, bonk</li> </ul> <p>The effects of this are linked strongly to use and context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Newspapers will use bonk rather than fuck.</li> <li>☐ Mark Ravenhill's play Shopping and Fucking caused problems with advertising</li> <li>☐ The Swedish film Fucking Amal (Amal is a Swedish town) became Love Me on UK release</li> <li>☐ FCUK had problems initially with their logo promotion</li> </ul>  |



|                                    |  |  |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
|                                    |  | <p>The word fuck may carry power to shock but it is no longer as taboo as it used to be.</p> <p>Harvey and Shalom also note that taboo language has a different function in its public and private contexts.</p>   |
| Robert Burchfield (1981)           |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advised BBC announcers on pronunciation. E.G. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adult – stress 1st syllable</li> <li>Controversy – stress 1st syllable</li> <li>Trait – the final t is silent</li> <li>Ate – rhymes with bet not bait</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>In making these judgements there is the acknowledgement of alternatives. Burchfield writes:</p> <p>“It is assumed that the speaker uses Received Standard English in its 1980s form. The form of speech recommended is ...Home Counties and educated at one of the established southern universities.”</p> <p>He gives preference to the ‘social package’ of region, education and, by implication, class.</p>   |
| Jean Aitchison – BBC Reith Lecture |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is Our Language in Decay? <p>“All languages have their ‘rules’ in the sense of recurring subconscious patterns. In English we place the verb inside the sentence and say ‘the spider caught the fly’ but real rules need to be distinguished from artificially imposed ones. E.G....an old illogical belief that logic should govern language has led in English to a ban on the double negative”</p> <p>Aitchison argues against a prescriptive view of language, which identifies a vast network of rules and checks usage against these rules. Those, therefore, who know the rules, stand in judgement. Complaints by Prescriptivists are often not about failure to communicate but failure to communicate in a certain way.</p> <p>Aitchison would argue that young people are not lazy in their speech. The only lazy speech is when you’re drunk and lose full control.</p> </li> </ul> |
| The Queen’s English Society        |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocates Prescriptivism: <p>“The Society aims to defend the precision, subtlety and marvellous richness of our language against debasement, ambiguity and other forms of misuse...Although it accepts that there is always a natural development of any language, the Society deplores those changes which are the result of ignorance and which become established because of indifference.”</p> <p>They represent an autocratic movement and information can be found at <a href="http://www.author.co.uk/qes">www.author.co.uk/qes</a></p> <p>Descriptive approaches, such as advocated by Jonathan Green in his Introduction to the Cassell Slang Dictionary in 2000, analyse, comment on and present language change without valued judgements.</p> </li> </ul>   |
| Plain English Campaign             |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are not concerned with ‘good’ or ‘correct’ English but with an avoidance of ‘gobbledygook’ which makes communication of any kind unnecessarily difficult.</li> <li></li> <li>They represent a democratic movement and information can be found at <a href="http://www.plainenglish.co.uk">www.plainenglish.co.uk</a></li> </ul>   |
| David Crystal (1995)               |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contemporary English uses words borrowed from over 120 languages</li> </ul>   |
| Pamela Fishman (1992)              |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English is less well loved but more used because it has econo-technical superiority.</li> </ul>   |