ATTITUDINAL FACTORS IN CANADIAN ENGLISH USAGE

by

BRIGITTE KATJA GULDEN

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

Linguistics

[redacted]

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

_____

[redacted]

Henry J. Warkentyne

[redacted]

Geoffrey N. O'Grady

[redacted]

Roy E.L. Watson

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

JUNE 1979

Supervisor: Professor Henry J. Warkentyne

ABSTRACT

It is the aim of this study to investigate the relation between certain general attitudes and language behaviour. Variability in Canadian English is unique in quality and extent as a result of linguistic and cultural influences from two different sources - Great Britain and the United States. The selection of one particular variant in a situation of linguistic choice - often between a British and an American form - might either be purely coincidental, in which case we would have free and unstructured variation, or it might be a result of extra-linguistic factors. Possible influences are the geographic location in Canada, various social factors, and the degree of exposure to one variant or one entire dialect compared to the alternative through the mass media, travelling or personal contacts. There is no doubt that such factors do have an effect on speech behaviour, and this has been widely demonstrated in linguistic literature with regard to other speech communities. However, psychological factors, such as general attitudes and possibly the personality of the speaker,

might also be relevant to linguistic choice. Attitudes towards the countries, cultures, and ethnic groups where the relevant dialects of English are spoken - in this case Canada, Great Britain, and the United States - can be factors influencing linguistic behaviour independent of physical factors like social group-membership or extent of exposure to the different dialects. Such attitudes were measured for a group of Canadians by means of a questionnaire together with biographical background information and linguistic choices, and statistical calculations by means of a computer were carried out to discover possible relations.

The introductory chapters present the theoretical framework of the study in comparison to previous linguistic research: the position of variability in linguistic literature, a review of research on language attitudes and a discussion of some characteristics typical of variation in Canadian English. After a general description of the techniques used in the experiment, the individual items in the questionnaire and the variables created for calculations are discussed. A comparison is drawn between the answers to linguistic questions in the present study and the results of a "Survey of Canadian English" which had been conducted in 1972.

Underlying linguistic principles served as a model to explain the consistency of linguistic choices manifested in highly significant intra-linguistic correlations. Correlations between attitudes and speech were found to follow regular patterns, which makes them predictable depending on the kind of linguistic choices offered. The results of this study confirm that variation within Canadian English is not only associated with physical factors such as the biographical background, but also with general attitudes of the speakers about their own personal situation, about different countries and national groups, and about other people in general.

[redacted]

Henry J. Warkentyne

[redacted]

Geoffrey N. O'Grady

[redacted]

Roy E. L. Watson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		*Page*
	Abstract	ii
	Table of Contents	v
	Acknowledgements	vi
	Dedication	vii
I	Variation in Language	1
II	Attitudes and Language	14
III	Variability in Canadian English	32
IV	Methodology	45
	The Subjects	45
	The Questionnaire	45
	The Coding	50
	The Calculations	51
V	The Variables	54
	Attitudinal Variables	54
	Linguistic Variables	61
	Phonology	61
	Variation in the Pronunciation of Individual Words	80
	Lexical Variation	91
VI	The Correlations	114
	Correlations Among Attitudinal Variables	114
	Correlations Among Linguistic Variables	124
	The Influence of Status and Generation	134
	Correlations Between Attitudinal and Linguistic Variables	137
VII	Conclusions	160
	Bibliography	173
	Appendix A - Sample Questions	186
	Appendix B - List of Variables and Their Coding	192

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Henry J. Warkentyne who initiated and guided my work in this field and made his data available to me; the members of my committee, Dr. Geoffrey N. O'Grady and Dr. Roy E.L. Watson, and Dr. Barbara P. Harris for providing me with her manuscript.

I would like to add a special thank you to Dr. Arthur C. Brett, Senior Analyst, Statistical Applications, who assisted me with the computer work; without his help and advice this study would not have been possible.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to the Canadian Government for the invitation to study in this country and the financial support in the form of scholarships by the Canada Council and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

DEDICATION

For my Mother -

and for those who filled my stay in Canada with unforgettable memories.

CHAPTER I

VARIATION IN LANGUAGE

Linguistic variation is a fact of life familiar to all speakers in different forms and to varying degrees depending on the society they live. As the subject matter of linguistic endeavour, however, it is a relatively recent innovation. Only in the last two decades have linguists begun to investigate variability. For most of the discipline's history, variation in the language of individual speakers or within groups was neglected. In fact, for the description of particular languages, variation caused by extralinguistic factors other than place and time was filtered out as a contamination or distortion of the ideal form of language under investigation. Ferdinand Saussure's notion of 'langue' or what Noam Chomsky has more recently called 'competence' was the object of description and analysis. The system defined as "un produit social de la faculté du langage"[1] or as "the speaker-hearer's knowledge of his language"[2] is assumed to be homogeneous by Saussure as well as Chomsky.[3] For many decades linguistic research was restricted to the investigation

of idealized homogeneous linguistic systems. Actual speech samples, "parole" in Saussure's terminology, "performance" for Chomsky were not of primary concern. The assumption of language homogeneity was not given up even if factors like time and geographic location were taken into account. The varieties resulting from the influence of such factors were considered homogeneous systems themselves and described by the same means. The results were static descriptions of stages in the historical process or descriptions of language varieties in a particular geographical region defined by the presence or absence of certain features (isoglosses). Variation itself, the dynamic process of change over time and the linguistic flux at any given moment or the gradual transition of dialect areas and their shift due to extralinguistic factors remained outside the scope of the research of both the structuralists and the supporters of transformational theory.[4]

The subsequent growth of awareness and interest in the basic heterogeneity of language in society as a whole, in any subgroup of society, and even within the speech of a given individual speaker created a new field of linguistics commonly referred to as sociolinguistics. The notion of language as an independent homogeneous system was replaced by a new notion of language as a part

of society and its culture, inseparable from extra-linguistic factors: situational context, social and psychological factors in addition to time and geographic location. The centre of focus is no longer language as a system, but the speech community in which one or more languages with different subvariants are used. "Community-centred studies on the other hand are concerned with how a given speech community draws selectively upon two or more languages, dialects or language varieties," (Pride, 1971: 5) with the aim to relate variation to extralinguistic factors, situational, psychological, social or ethnic. The use of actual speech samples replaced the intuition of a few native speakers in this type of investigation. One of the earliest still very tentative moves in the new direction was the incorporation of a social dimension into the *Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada* which was begun in 1930. Informants were divided into three types according to their education and into two age categories. This information based on the fieldworkers' judgement was not used in any systematic way, however. The social stratification was of secondary importance compared to geographical variation. In 1948, John S. Kenyon published an article entitled "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English". He clearly points out

two sources of variation in language: social factors such as education and group membership resulting in different cultural levels of speech, and situational context resulting in functional varieties. Kenyon's article was theoretical in orientation; ten years later John L. Fischer conducted one of the first empirical studies of linguistic variation in a group, using as a variable the present participle pronounced as -in or -ing. He found a relation between social factors and linguistic choice and concludes: "Although the mechanisms of psychic economy are becoming better understood in diachronic phonemics, they are not always sufficient to explain fully the progressive adaptation of variant forms, and that people adopt a variant primarily not because it is easier to pronounce (which it most frequently is, but not always), or because it facilitates some important distinction in denotational meaning, but because it expresses how they feel about their relative status versus other conversants" (Fischer, 1958: 52). In 1959, Basil Bernstein began to publish a series of articles in England focusing on the correlation between social class and language. He noted differences between the linguistic behaviour of members of the working class and members of the middle class. The two kinds of language usage were referred to as "public" and "formal" in his early work, terms

later replaced by "restricted" vs "elaborated code".[5] Without going into detail about his method or results it can be said that characteristic for Bernstein's approach is his neglect of the linguistic theory at the time, structuralist and transformational, and his orientation towards sociology and psychology rather than linguistics. He understands his work primarily as a contribution to socialization and intelligence research.[6] His method is an innovation in the history of linguistics insofar as he uses larger groups of speakers than had previously been the practice and examines the relation between social class and language use.

The great breakthrough leading to the incorporation of social phenomena into linguistic theory as such came with William Labov in North America. In the great diversity of North American society combining so many different social, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds, the idealization implicit in an assumption of linguistic homogeneity became particularly apparent and unsatisfactory. Labov's studies on Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts (1963), and in New York City (1966a) were based on the intrinsic variability of language. To describe and explain linguistic variation, several adjustments in linguistic methodology had to be made. Labov chose particular linguistic features which differ within the speech community under investigation

as variables. The quality or frequency of such variables was observed for a large number of speakers. Social information about the speakers such as sex, age, education, occupation, income, degree of urbanization, and ethnic group and the linguistic environment, phonological as well as syntactical and stylistic also entered the corpus of primary data. On Martha's Vineyard, Labov studied the distribution of one linguistic feature, the centralization of the diphthongs /aɪ/ and /aʊ/. Speakers of varying ages, occupations, and regions on the island were interviewed. The results showed that centralization was influenced by the linguistic environment[7], the age of the speaker, the degree of urbanization, occupation, and ethnicity. Against the background of the data in the *Linguistic Atlas of New England*[8], the degree of centralization was seen to have increased. Martha's Vineyard appeared as an area in which a sound change involving the centralization of the diphthongs /aɪ/ and /aʊ/ was in progress. Labov tried to find an underlying factor for this development and discovered that the degree of centralization was related to the social orientation of speakers, more specifically, their attitudes toward the island and their own status as islanders. The interviews showed that those with a positive attitude towards the island and its traditional lifestyle

and who wanted to keep the status quo, centralized more than speakers who wanted to leave the island to live and work on the mainland. A hypercorrective behaviour in the form of a particularly high degree of centralization was noted in the case of those who had left the island and later returned to settle there. The sound change occurring on Martha's Vineyard observed in real time (through a comparison with the data of the *Linguistic Atlas of New England*) as well as in apparent time (through a comparison between different age groups) was seen to affect different social groups to varying degrees and to be motivated by social attitudes.

In the next study originally conducted for his Ph.D. dissertation at Columbia University, Labov investigated a linguistically as well as socially much more complex community of New York City (1966a). The general framework remained the same as that of the previous work, but considerable refinement in methodology was achieved. For the first time in the history of linguistics, precise statistical and sociological methods were employed in the study of language. The methodological innovations were, firstly, the use of sociological information taken from a sociological survey which had been conducted in the area previously, secondly, a randomized selection of a

large number of speakers, which made inferences from the sample to the whole population possible, and thirdly, the incorporation of detail concerning stylistic variation. Four stylistic levels labelled as casual, careful, reading style, and the pronunciation used for wordlists and minimal pairs were investigated. Certain so-called "channel cues" (Labov, 1966a: 109) were observed as indicators for the different styles. The linguistic variables used were the height, rounding and diphthongization of the vowels (eh) as in *bad, cap* and (oh) as in *caught, dog,* the presence of final and preconsonantal *r*, and the pronunciation of (th), as in *this, thick* as voiced or voiceless dental stop, affricate or fricative. Education, occupation, income, ethnic group, age, and sex were chosen as social variables. In addition to participation in the linguistic interviews, subjects had been asked to evaluate taped speech samples, to comment on their own speech and on New York City speech in general. Social information rather than the presence or absence of certain linguistic features was the basis of grouping. And the resulting subgroups of the speech community could then be categorized either by presence or absence of certain features, e.g. the pronunciation of dental fricatives as stops, or more often simply by the statistical frequency of a variable such as

wordfinal and preconsonantal *r*. The first case is what Labov called "sharp stratification", the second "fine stratification" (Labov, 1966a: 235, 236). The results showed that language behaviour is related to various social factors not only with regard to differences in the overall values of variables, but also differences in stylistic stratification. The lower middle class, defined by education, occupation and income, shows by far the widest stylistic range. Although the variable values for this group lie between lower class and upper middle class in casual speech, they exceed those of the upper middle class in careful speech. Labov explained this cross-over of the lower middle class, later to become famous in the literature, as hypercorrective behaviour and interpreted it as an indication of a linguistic and possibly social insecurity of the group. Two kinds of hypercorrection are possible: absolute hypercorrection, i.e. the use of certain features in inappropriate environments, and statistical hypercorrection, i.e. simply a higher frequency of the prestigious variable than typical for the model group - in Labov's case, the upper middle class. The connection between what Kenyon (1948) called cultural levels and functional varieties is explained in the following:

> We have seen a pattern of social variation and a pattern of stylistic variation which fit together closely: in general, a variant that is used by most New Yorkers in formal styles is also the variant that is used most often in all styles by speakers who are ranked higher on an objective socio-economic scale. (Labov, 1966a: 450)

Data from speech evaluation by the subjects show that the whole speech community shares a common set of linguistic values. Although actual speech differs greatly in the community, the attitudes exhibit an orientation towards upper middle class speech behaviour. Forms which are exclusively or more commonly used by lower classes are stigmatized in the whole community, most strongly, however, by members of the lower middle class who use them in casual speech but strictly avoid them in formal style. The degree of correction is paralleled by the intensity of negative evaluation. Labov concludes that speech is not only related to, and influenced by, social factors such as class membership because of the higher frequency of linguistic interaction within classes, but also by a set of values and attitudes. To follow up this argument, he compared subgroups within the lower middle class: a socially mobile and upward moving group and a stable lower middle class group.[9] He found that the first group adjusted their speech more definitely to the upperclass model, the prestige group. The structure of linguistic values was

seen to be shared by the entire speech community. Differences in speech behaviour are not a result of ignorance with regard to these values, but rather differences in motivation and determination to conform. Not only actual social position and resulting patterns of interaction influence speech behaviour, but also the aspired position, the social orientation.

> When a New Yorker uses a high degree of a stigmatized form, it is not because he does not recognize the same norms as the other members of society: we have found that he is usually even more aware of the social significance of this variable than others. The forces which preserve the structure of the social differentiation of New York City are probably related to the need for self-identification with particular subgroups in the social complex. (Labov, 1966a: 450)

To summarize, we can say, "variability (then) includes the correlation of speech variation with social behaviour in terms of factors such as stylistic level, class, status, age, sex, and reference group behaviour" (Shiels, 1972: 53). Many other linguists were to follow Labov with investigations of speech variation. For the purpose of this study, however, it is not so much the various results that are of importance, but rather the general framework and methodological innovations largely initiated by Labov: the assumption of an intrinsic heterogeneity of language and the attempt to analyze such variance in the framework

of society as a whole, the use of variables as units of investigation, the statistical quantification of data, the incorporation of methods used in the social sciences - sociology for the social stratification, anthropology and psychology for analyzing group reference behaviour. Language serves not only a reference, but also a social function. David Smith (1973) points out that the social functions of language include a "communicative function", the primary social function of transmitting information between people, an "expressive function", "the use of language to express the particular cognitive orientation of an individual or a societal group by linguistic behaviour", and an "integrative function".

> The integrative function is the use of language in tying individuals into the social system. Basically the amenability of language to this function rests on its intrinsic variability, and it is no accident that developments in variation theory were stimulated by attempts to explain the integrative function of language. (Smith, 1973: 104)

Notes to Chapter I

[1]Ferdinand Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale* (Paris[3] 1962, p. 25).

[2]Noam Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1965), p. 4.

[3]Chomsky's notion of competence though related to Saussure's langue is perceived as more dynamic. This, however, only pertains to the speaker's infinite capacity to create sentences by applying rules, not his possibility to shift or change rules. The system of rules itself is static.

[4]I do not mean to suggest that variation should necessarily be the primary interest of the discipline. In many cases it is valuable and for practical reasons necessary to describe languages without aiming to take variation into account. The degree to which variation can be investigated will depend on the number of trained linguists working in a field and also on the number of speakers available for information. My argument is that as a result of a general increase in linguistic interest and social awareness, intra-speaker and intra-group variation was incorporated into the discipline of linguistics and that it is a legitimate and important aspect of the study of language.

[5]Bernstein has used the new terminology since 1962.

[6]Basil Bernstein, "Aspects of Language and Learning in the Genesis of the Social Process," (Hymes, 1964: 258).

[7]Some phonological environments favour centralization, others don't. The distribution is by no means complementary. For a detailed discussion see Labov, 1963: 289-291.

[8]Hans Kurath, *et al.*, *Linguistic Atlas of New England* (Providence: American Council of Learned Societies, 1941).

[9]Upward mobility was assessed through a comparison between the jobs of father and son in the same family. See Labov, 1966b: 647-648.

CHAPTER II

ATTITUDES AND LANGUAGE

Robert Cooper and Joshua Fishman (1974) offer two definitions of language attitudes:

> It may be useful at this point to attempt to distinguish language attitudes from other attitudes. How can language attitudes be so distinguished? One solution is to define language attitude in terms of its referent . . . . A second solution is to define language attitudes in terms of their consequences, i.e. those attitudes which influence language behavior and behavior toward language. (Cooper and Fishman, 1974: 6)

Language attitudes defined in terms of referent include direct attitudes towards languages, geographical, social, ethnic, and stylistic variants of a language, and towards language as a symbol for its speakers. Various research in this field has been done in the last two decades. Particularly influential were Wallace Lambert's experiments at McGill University. Lambert introduced the so-called matched-guise technique to elicit interlanguage attitudes. He taperecorded bilingual speakers reading a short text in English and in French. The order of the voices was mixed, and subjects did not know that in fact they were listening to each speaker twice. English and French Canadian

students evaluated the supposedly different speakers on the basis of their speech in fourteen traits on a six-point-scale. All students evaluated the speakers higher when they used English. The French voices were rated even lower by French Canadians than by English Canadians (Lambert, 1960, 1967). Wolfgang Wölck (1973) used the same technique to assess attitudes towards Spanish and Quechua in bilingual Peru.[1] He also found quite consistent attitudinal patterns, though more complex ones than those found in Montreal. Quechua was stigmatized socially but rated higher in affective scales. Examples of research on attitudes towards geographically determined variants of one language are presented in K. Strongman and F. Woosley (1967), Howard Giles (1971), Rudolf Schmid (1973), and Gary Underwood (1974). Strongman and Woosley used two matched guises from London and Yorkshire and presented them to subjects from North and South England. Both groups shared the same stereotypes, e.g. they rated the speakers as more honest in the Yorkshire accent, more self-confident in the London accent. The overall values did not differ significantly between the two accents, possibly the result of the roughly equal size of the respective speaker groups in England rather than a situation of majority vs minority as had been the case in the Canadian experiments. Giles

(1971) used matched guises in Standard R.P., the dialect of South Wales, and Somerset accents and discovered that the standard was rated most highly in competence categories, but that a certain amount of loyalty towards the regional variants was present with regard to personal integrity and social attractiveness of the imagined speakers. Schmid (1973) in West Germany tested reactions to Standard German and regional variants as spoken in Berlin, Hamburg, and Munich. Evaluations by high school students in the three cities did not show the significant differences between the regional variants Schmid had expected as a result of stereotypes often heard in Germany.[2] Speakers of Standard German, however, were generally rated higher than those speaking any regional dialect.[3] Underwood (1974) studied the reactions of Arkansawyers to different American dialects including their own which is often ridiculed by other Americans. He found a strong accent loyalty rather than linguistic self-hatred in this group. Richard Tucker and Wallace Lambert (1969) included an ethnic dimension into their investigation of attitudes towards regional accents.[4] White and negro listeners were asked to judge speakers of various geographical accents as spoken by Whites and Negroes as well as what the authors called network American. They found that both groups

rated speakers of the "network accent" highest; the lowest ratings differed: whereas White Educated Southern was least desirable in the ears of the Negroes, Whites did not like the speech of Mississippi Negro students.

In all these cases subjects were asked to rate the personality of speakers on the basis of taped speech samples. In some cases the actual speakers were the same for different language varieties (matched guises), and it is assumed that differences in evaluation must be a direct result of attitudes towards the different linguistic variants. It is impossible, however, to decide whether the kind of language as such triggers the reactions, or whether it is language as a symbol for a speaker group which elicits reactions based on the attitudes towards that group. This possibility becomes especially apparent in a study by Frederick Williams (1973). He filmed Black, White, and Mexican-American children and presented the videotapes to teachers for an evaluation of the children. He also asked them about stereotypes for the three groups involved and found that the videotape ratings depended on the speech of the children but also on such stereotypes, so that Black children have to make up for a negative stereotype and adhere to standard usage more closely than Whites in order to receive the same evaluation as Whites. To prove that

group stereotypes were operative independent of speech, Williams dubbed the same voice tracks onto different children and received different ratings depending on the ethnicity of the children. Ethnically determined speech differences elicit a consistent pattern of attitudes in addition to,or inseparable from,mere group membership.

In another group of experiments, attitudes towards language were assessed more directly; subjects were asked to evaluate speech itself rather than the personality of imagined speakers. W. Mittins, *et al.* (1970) used a questionnaire to assess the acceptability of language variants; other researchers presented tape recorded speech samples to judges. An example is an experiment by Alison d'Anglejan and Richard Tucker (1973) at McGill University, Montreal, exploring the awareness of social speech differences among French Canadians as well as their attitudes towards certain varieties of French. A questionnaire testing the subjects' awareness of special speech differences was followed by an evaluation of tapes. Subjects were asked to evaluate the speech and possible occupation of the speakers comprising upper class French Canadians, lower class French Canadians and European French speakers. The results show an awareness of social and stylistic differences in language and a general feeling that

the French spoken in Quebec needs improvement. Although Europeans are rejected as possible models for Canadian French, the tape evaluations are most positive for the European style French.

> Among the subjects whom we studied, Quebec style speech does not yet appear to serve as a symbol of national identity differentiating French Canadians from other North Americans and also from European speakers of French. We speculated they might reject SEF [Standard European French] as a form of cultural 'imperialism' and show preference for the upper class French Canadian model. They did not . . . (d'Anglejan and Tucker, 1973: 24)

A comparison between the questionnaire and the speech ratings suggests that the tape evaluations are more likely to be reactions to language forms themselves than to language as a symbol of a speaker group. A social stratification of the informants showed some minor differences in the ability to discriminate lower and upper class speech styles and in the rating of lower class speech, but did not affect the general pattern of values. Roger Shuy and Frederick Williams (1973) conducted an experiment in Detroit in which they asked a socially and ethnically diverse group of subjects to evaluate taped speech rather than the speakers. The tapes contained samples of Detroit speech, White Southern, Negro, Standard American and Standard British English. Standard British was evaluated most highly by all groups, especially by subjects of higher social classes.

"In all, the pattern seems to be that in rating a presumably prestigious form such as British speech, positiveness of rating will correspond with the higher the class level of the respondents [sic]." (Shuy and Williams, 1973: 92). In general, Shuy and Williams found quite consistent attitudinal patterns.

> In other words, dialect may have an objective reality in the way people talk, but it seems quite clear that it at the same time has a subjective reality in the kinds of considered attitudes which people hold toward one another's speech. These kinds of attitudes are probably as important a part of the sociolinguistic picture as the objective data which we find in speech corpora. (Shuy and Williams, 1973: 95)

All above-mentioned studies were concerned with linguistic attitudes for their own sake as part of the structure of society and did not involve an attempt to assess the possible effects such attitudes might have on behaviour, linguistic as well as general. The psychological literature is very pessimistic with regard to the possibility of predicting overt behaviour from attitudes as measured in experiments.

> Many of the past attempts to predict overt behaviour from attitude measures have resulted in spectacular failures, and these have been widely publicized in sociological and psychological textbooks . . . . There are a number of reasons why such direct correspondence should not always be expected . . . (Nigel, 1973: 239)

> . . . both attitudes and situational factors could be legitimate determinants of behaviour in their own right. Under these circumstances it is quite reasonable to expect that there should be no perfect relationship between attitude and behaviour, any more than we should expect to find a perfect relationship between situational factors and behaviour. If we were to observe such perfect relationships then we would conclude either that the attitudinal *or* the situational factors were completely dominant, or that they were both pushing in the same direction. To the extent that they are opposed to each other, and each has influence on behaviour, we should expect to find the discrepancies which have in fact been observed. (Nigel, 1973: 251)

Not only situational factors are possible intervening variables in the correlation, but also personal factors such as other attitudes, among them, attitudes towards the behaviour itself[5], competing motives, verbal, intellectual, and social abilities, and activity levels.[6]

In spite of such difficulties a number of linguists have succeeded in discovering correlations between attitudes and linguistic behaviour of various kinds and between linguistic attitudes and general behaviour. One such correlation between linguistic attitudes and language behaviour became apparent in Labov's study of New York City speech (1966a). He found that negative responses towards stigmatized forms correlate with a very marked corrective behaviour in careful speech. "The degree of correction which occurs is thus paralleled by the consistency of

negative response to stigmatized forms" (Labov, 1966a: 448). Shuy (1972) set out to investigate a possible relationship between language attitudes and general behaviour. He played samples of socially stratified speech to employers in the Seattle area and asked them to report whether they would employ the speakers on the basis of their speech and in what position. Speakers of Standard were generally offered higher jobs. Shuy assessed the importance of different non-standard features for the evaluation and found that variables with a sharp stratification were more crucial than those with a fine distribution, generally applied rules more than isolated ones, grammatical more than phonological, social more than regional features, and relatively frequent items more than rare ones (Shuy, 1972: 113, 114). In general, the attitudes evoked by speech in these cases affect behaviour or imagined behaviour such as the hiring of personnel in a direct and consistent way.

All the above studies dealt with language attitude "defined in terms of its referent", i.e. attitudes towards language itself and their possible effect on behaviour, linguistic as well as general. Language attitudes "defined in terms of their consequences"[7] can comprise any general attitudes which influence linguistic behaviour or behaviour

towards language. The area of second language learning was the first to be investigated for the effect of such attitudes. Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert (1959) and Gardner (1960) studied the correlation between success in second language acquisition and measures of intelligence, linguistic aptitude, and motivation for students of French in Montreal. Factor analysis of the data resulted in intelligence and aptitude as one combined factor and motivation as another one influencing second language performance independently. An "integrative" motivation was more favourable for French language achievement than an "instrumental" orientation.[8] Lambert, Gardner, *et al* (1962) investigated the correlation between anomie, Francophilia, motivation and language success in an intensive French summer course for American students in Montreal. They found that attitudes show significant correlations with success in the case of elementary students, but not for those with advanced knowledge of French. For all students they found a relation between high values on the anomie scale and favourable attitudes towards the other culture as well as increased use of English outside the classes. Moshe Anisfeld and Lambert (1969) investigated the relation between different kinds of motivation, attitudes such as antisemitism, intelligence and linguistic aptitude on one hand, and success in learning

Hebrew in language courses in Montreal, on the other. Aptitude and intelligence turned out to be stable predictors of success, attitude correlations varied from school to school depending on the socio-psychological characteristics of Jews in different districts of Montreal. The authors concede that success might reinforce certain attitudes and thus strengthen the correlation between attitudes and language achievement. In 1972, Gardner and Lambert published the volume *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning* in which they describe a series of experiments testing the relationship between attitudes, motivation, language aptitude and foreign language achievement. They used English-speaking American subjects in Maine, Louisiana, and Connecticut, French-Americans learning French in English schools in Maine and Louisiana, and students of English in Manila, Philippines. Attitudinal variables contained anomie among others, mainly obtained through a scale set up by Leo Srole (1951)[9] with modifications based on Emile Durkheim (1897)[10], preference of America over France, and attitudes towards French Americans both tested through agreement or disagreement to various statements. To assess stereotypes about different groups subjects had to evaluate people on twenty-three traits using seven-point-scales.[11] Gardner and Lambert found a

reliable correlation between intelligence, aptitude and language achievement. Attitudes and motivation act as a factor independent of competence but are culture-specific, i.e., they vary with differences in the cultural setting. Whereas an integrative orientation seemed most favourable for speakers of English learning French in the United States as had been the case in Montreal[12], an instrumental motive turned out to be very successful for French Americans and in the Philippine study. For minority groups where the acquisition of another language means upward mobility, a high instrumental value is successful. Gardner and Lambert have been criticized for their treatment of integrative vs instrumental as a bipolar opposition.[13] In the light of the 1972 results a concept of two kinds of motivation operating independently might be more appropriate. Apart from differences in the effect motivation has due to cultural settings, Gardner and Lambert also noted that different linguistic skills are affected to varying degrees. In some cases oral-aural skills are affected by one variable (e.g. integrative motivation for the Filipinos), grammar, spelling, and reading skills by another or by the same variable in a different way (e.g. instrumental motive for the Filipinos). In all cases negative stereotypes of the speakers of a language were

negatively correlated to the acquisition of that language. Other correlations and more details are presented by Gardner and Lambert, as well as possible consequences for second language instruction. For the purpose of the present study the findings are relevant insofar as they suggest a correlation between general attitudes (e.g. towards speaker groups, a culture, the purpose of language learning) and linguistic behaviour.

The earlier discussed variance studies by Labov (1963, 1966b) indicate another kind of correlation, that between general attitudes and linguistic behaviour in the choice of variants within one language. On Martha's Vineyard a positive orientation towards traditional life on the island made centralization of the vowels /aI/ and /aU/ more likely and was interpreted as a motivation for the sound change observed on the island. In New York City the differences between an upwardly mobile group of the lower middle class and a stable group of the same class suggested that not only actual class membership correlates with certain linguistic choices, but also aspired membership, the social orientation. "In an urban society linguistic stratification is the direct reflection of underlying sets of social values, rather than sets of habits which are produced by close contact and are differentiated by

discontinuities in the communication system" (Labov, 1966b: 659). Several other linguists support the assumption of a correlation between attitudes and linguistic behaviour.

> Much of one's language behaviour, that is to say, is probably normative, in the sense of conforming to one's own ideas of the norms of the group one *aspires* to rather than the performance of the group one *belongs* to . . . . In a sense, a very important key to the schoolchild's language performance is precisely his notions (however ill-confounded) of where, socially, he is (or would like to be) heading. (Pride, 1971: 30)

> That is, people automatically and unconsciously adapt their speech habits in the direction of those they admire. (Wolfram and Fasold, 1974: 19)

"The newly suggested intervening variable of reference group behaviour" (Shiels, 1972: 56) can affect speech in various ways. It can increase the use of variables which are "indicators" of group membership, ethnic or social identity and turn them into "markers" ("change from below"). If such "indicators" or "markers" are not those of the highest prestige group in the speech community, they can become stigmatized and cause "change from above", i.e. a correction of such forms in the direction of the prestige model which is especially strong for those who aspire to membership in the prestige group.[14]

A somewhat different approach to the question of the possible effect of attitudes on linguistic behaviour is that of Maureen Courtney (1972). She interviewed fifteen

immigrant women from Northern England who had lived in Victoria for at least two years about their attitudes towards Canada and Canadian life and tested their language use in items where Canadian usage differs from British usage. Positive attitudes towards Canada and aspects of Canadian life were found to be correlated with a higher proportion of Canadian or North American linguistic items. There was a strong tendency to identify language with culture. "A tendency is observed for linguistic acculturation to be dependent more on the immigrant's emotional involvement with the culture of the new country, than on objective factors such as length of residence" (Courtney, 1972: 263).

Language as well as attitudinal patterns are expressions of a society's culture. The intrinsic heterogeneity of any society includes a linguistic heterogeneity. The variability of language is not completely free and unstructured, but, at least to a large extent, determined by physical as well as psychological factors. The former include variables such as age, sex, education and social group membership of speakers, the latter their personal attitudes and possibly character traits. Language attitudes defined in terms of referent include attitudes or stereotypes evoked by different languages, variants of a language - stylistic, geographical, ethnic and social - or by single features.

The presence of such attitudes as well as their possible effect on behaviour has been indicated by several researchers. Language attitudes defined in terms of consequence are any attitudes which influence linguistic behaviour as has been shown in the case of foreign language achievement, choice of a language, variant, or feature. Theoretically both kinds of language attitudes can occur for any variance in language: reactions on the part of the listener as well as attitudes influencing the behaviour of the speaker.

It will be the aim of the present study to investigate the connection between some general attitudes and linguistic behaviour, i.e. to test which of the attitudes measured are in fact language attitudes as defined in terms of consequence. Canadian English with its unique kind of variance should offer ideal possibilities to study the mechanisms of linguistic choice where variation is possible and to explore the extent to which attitudes might affect such choice. The following chapter is a brief description of the kind of variability present in Canadian English.

Notes to Chapter II

[1]Wolfgang Wölck, "Attitudes Toward Spanish and Quecua in Bilingual Peru" in Shuy and Fasold, 1973: 148-173.

[2]Schmid did not use semantic differentials which, most likely, would have revealed more stereotypes, but had the students comment freely on street interviews presented to them.

[3]Only Bavarians in Munich were accent loyal to such an extent that they rated their own accent even slightly higher than the Standard. cf Schmid, 1973: 130.

[4]Richard G. Tucker and Wallace E. Lambert, "White and Negro Listeners' Reactions to Various American English Dialects" in Bailey and Robinson, 1973: 295-301.

[5]cf Fishbein, 1971.

[6]For a discussion of these factors see Wicker, 1969.

[7]Cooper and Fishman, 1974: 6.

[8]In an integrative orientation "the aim in language study is to learn more about the language group, to meet more and *different* people" whereas in an instrumental orientation "the reasons reflect the mere utilitarian value of linguistic achievement". Gardner and Lambert, 1972: 192.

[9]Leo Srole, "Social Dysfunction, Personality and Social Distance Attitudes" as mentioned in Gardner and Lambert, 1972: 16.

[10]Emile Durkheim, *Le Suicide*, Paris: F. Alcan, 1897.

[11]The scales are presented in Gardner and Lambert, 1972: 157. The groups to be rated were: French people from France, Me, Americans, Me as I would like to be, French Americans, My French teacher. These evaluation scales as well as some of the other attitudinal scales have been used in the present study and will be discussed in Chapter V.

[12]cf Gardner and Lambert, 1959, and Gardner, 1960.

[13]cf A review by John E. Hofman in *Linguistics* 136, 1972: 117-120.

[14]For a discussion of the terms "indicator", "marker", "change from below", "change from above" see Labov, 1972b: 534-535.

CHAPTER III

VARIABILITY IN CANADIAN ENGLISH

Canada is a country with a particularly high degree of linguistic variation: not only variance between different languages such as English, French, native Indian and many immigrant languages becomes very apparent in a Canadian situation, but also variability in the English language itself. It is the latter kind of variation that the present study is focusing on. The effect of the proximity to the United States, manifested in its great economic and cultural influence upon Canada, is modified to some extent by historical and political ties as well as a cultural and personal orientation towards Great Britain. This is especially apparent in Victoria, which is singled out by North Americans because of its "English" character. Through the mass media and a constant influx of tourists, temporary residents, and immigrants, Canadians are constantly exposed to two distinct varieties of the English language - British and American English in their various forms. There is no doubt that such a constant exposure will have effects on the way Canadians themselves speak. In fact,

it was exactly this contrast between American and British variants of English which shaped what we now call Canadian English. Various theories about the exact origins of Canadian English have been presented in the literature - often for political reasons rather than on the basis of sound linguistic arguments. One theory contemptuously called "contamination theory" assumes British English (without reference as to which dialect of British English) to be the origin of Canadian English, which then became modified - "polluted" - by American influences. This view was particularly popular in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. An interesting review of anti-American literature is given by Neil Hultin (1967). For the proponents of the so-called Loyalist theory - the other extreme - the language of the Loyalists who found asylum in Canada after the American Revolution was the origin of Canadian English. Morton Bloomfield is the most radical supporter of this theory.

> The Loyalists had molded Canada, created its ruling caste and set its social standards, among which was its language . . . . There is, of course, speech mixture due to large-scale migration during the last century. Southern Standard, Northern, Scots, and Irish English, for instance, are spoken in Canada among first and second generation immigrants from Great Britain, as well as 'foreign' English dialects, but gradually all varieties of English are being assimilated to the Canadian English of the Loyalists, which,

> in turn, has been modified to some extent by the process. (Bloomfield, 1948: 61, 62)

Modified General American theories claim Canadian English to be primarily though not entirely Loyalist American. Walter Avis stresses the importance of early American English on the language of Canada, but he assumes modifications by the speech of early British immigrants as well as a continuing influence of modern American English.

> The overall similarity between Canadian and American English along the border is not surprising in view of the settlement history of the area and in view of subsequent Canadian-American social and economic intercourse. The Ontario border communities were first occupied by settlers from south of the present border, both the loyalists and the post-loyalists. Thus it seems probable that American patterns of speech were entrenched and dominant in Ontario when the great stream of British immigrants began to flow into the country. (Avis, 1954: 14)

> Although British English may not be the immediate source of the Canadian English of the Ontario border, there can be no question of the many contributions it has made to every department of the language. To a great extent, what is not American about Ontario English has been brought from the Old Country directly. (Avis, 1954: 14, 15)

Mark Orkin (1970) also strongly rejects a "contamination theory" and stresses the importance of American English for Canadian English.[1]

The extreme loyalist theory was attacked by many linguists. M.H. Scargill (1957: 611) pointed out that

"the loyalist theory itself rests upon certain assumptions which may very well turn out to be misguided. And even if they might be true, they cannot possibly be applied to Canadian English everywhere." Scargill suggests what might be called a mixed theory on the basis that "the immediate origins of the English language in Canada are not the same for all areas" (Scargill, 1957: 613). Considering the settlement history of Canada, such an argument seems most plausible. Eighteenth and early 19th century British English - predominantly from Northern speech areas - as well as 18th century American English have contributed to the emergence of Canadian English.

> We must not deny to the English language in Canada the possibility of independent development. In vocabulary, Canadian English has often proceeded independently, and it may well have done so in pronunciation and syntax, at least in certain areas. (Scargill, 1957: 613, 614)

The peculiar mixture of continuing influences of British and American English as well as influences of non-English immigrant and native Indian languages caused a uniquely Canadian development of English.

> For Canadian English is a fairly recent hybrid which resembles American English in some respects and British English in others while exhibiting much that is singularly Canadian. It is, in fact, the composite of these characteristics which gives Canadian English its unique identity. (Avis, 1973: 43)

Linguistically, Canadian English occupies a position somewhere between American English and British English. To Americans, a Canadian sounds somewhat British, to Britons he sounds clearly American. If he speaks typical General Canadian (assuming such a variety as suggested by Avis (1973) and in Chambers (1975) actually exists) his speech should be much closer to the American end of the scale than to the British. Canada is commonly regarded as an "extension of the northern speech area of the United States" (Avis, 1954: 13, 14) distinguished by a bundle of isoglosses running parallel to the national border.

In the present study neither the actual position of Canadian English on the scale between British and American nor its exact origin and the influences leading to this position on the scale are of primary concern. What is relevant is its character as a blend or hybrid which resulted in a particularly high degree of "free" variation in many cases where American and British English differ. What James Polson (1969: 45) calls "a classical Canadian situation" is "a choice between a British variant on the one hand, and an American variant on the other." In addition to some exclusively Canadian items, Canadian English shares some features with British, others with American English; in a large number of cases both British and

American forms can commonly be heard by Canadians.

With regard to vocabulary, typically Canadian items are often modifications or expansions in the meaning of words, abbreviations and compounds with a specifically Canadian meaning or borrowings from other languages mainly French and native Indian.[2] Where the British and American lexicon differs, Canadian usage is divided. In many cases, the American pattern is followed almost exclusively: *aluminum* (Br. *aluminium*), *barber* (*gentlemen's hairdresser*), *candy* (*sweets*), *closet* (for clothes, Br. *cupboard*), *cookies* (*biscuits*), *to do the dishes* (*to wash up*), *flashlight* (*torch*), *garbage* (*rubbish*), *graduate student* (*postgraduate student*), *hardware store* (*ironmonger*), *intersection* (*junction*), *instalment plan* (*hire-purchase*), *jello* (*jelly*), *muffler* (*silencer*), *pedestrian crossing* (*zebra crossing*), *pitcher* (*jug*), *potato chips* (*crisps*), *raise in salary* (*rise*), *sneakers* (*gym-shoes* or *plimsoles*), *to stand in line* (*to queue*), *yield* (*give way* as on traffic signs).[3] "Only rarely does widespread Canadian usage clearly follow the British model" (Orkin, 1970: 71). In addition to the nine items Orkin (1970: 71) lists[4], one could mention *underpants* (Am. *men's shorts*) and *waste-paper* (*basket*) (Am. *trash* (*can*)) although the latter is most commonly referred to as *garbage* whether it consists mainly of paper or not.

Orkin suggests that the usage can depend on semantic fields such that for a person travelling by rail or car, the entire commuting and motoring vocabulary and also the publishing sector are heavily or almost exclusively American in vocabulary whereas political and legal domains "are largely patterned on English models, and the words which clothe them are English rather than American."[5] In many cases both American and British words are common: *apartment/flat, bar/pub, broiled/grilled, cab/taxi, can/tin, dishtowel/teatowel, gradeschool/elementary school, motor/engine, movie/film, janitor/caretaker, termpaper/essay.*[6]

In spelling, Canadian practice shows great variation between British and American varieties.

> A few words might be said about spelling practices, for here, as in vocabulary and pronunciation, Canadian habits are influenced by both British and American usage. In the relatively few areas where British and American spelling differs, Canadian usage is far from uniform. (Avis, 1973: 67)

Traditionally, British spelling was favoured as part of official policy and prescribed for the education sector with a few exceptions such as *connection, curb, jail peddler, recognize, tire, Yugoslavia.*

> In recent years there have been indications that American spelled forms are becoming more acceptable and, consequently, more commonly used in Canada. Many have, for example, been adopted by Canadian newspapers, especially those in the big cities, with the result that

> Canadians encounter these American forms every day in their reading. (Avis, 1973: 67)

> In most respects, government publications and most Canadian book-publishers follow British practices. Newspapers, following the lead of the Canadian Press, use a spelling style that might be called 'modified British' (*centre* but *labor*, *axe* but *encyclopedia*, *catalogue* but *plow*, etc.). Popular magazines also use a modified style but hardly consistently, some leaning heavily toward American forms, others less so; still others seem to allow the style of contributors to stand. (Avis, 1973: 67)

The "free variation" in spelling within Canada and even in the writings of individuals is striking, and there is no doubt that "torn between British and American example, Canadian spelling does not follow a consistent pattern" (Orkin, 1970: 148).

Grammatical differences between the various dialects of English are not very numerous. The British distribution of *shall* and *will* in the future tense is largely lost in favour of *will* as it is in the U.S. *To have* can pattern either as a full verb (U.S. usage) or as an auxiliary (British usage) such that *Do you have X?* and *Have you (got) X?* are both heard though the second might be slightly more common. Avis (1956) found divided usage for various grammatical and syntactical items, in some cases leaning more towards the British, in others towards the American form.[7]

In pronunciation, Canadian English usually parallels American English in the use of /æ/ rather than /ɑ/ in words like *chance, dance, fast, past* with two possible exceptions: *aunt*[8] and *drama*, the former showing divided usage, the latter a strong tendency towards a low back vowel realized as [ɑ] or even [ɒ]. Another feature shared with General American is the very distinct pronunciation of word-final and pre-consonantal *r*. There are some generally applied rules in pronunciation which are neither British nor American, but typically Canadian - at least in the extent and exact environment of application: the famous Canadian diphthong raising, the merging of low back vowels, and the neutralization of certain vowels before *r*. All of these rules have been tested in the present study and are discussed in detail in Chapter V. In other cases, Canadian English differs from American and British English in the frequency of phonological rule application or in fact that some rules are optional. Examples are the use or non-use of a *y*-glide in words such as *student* or *tune*, the distinctiveness of *wh-* in pairs such as *which - witch*, and the flapping or voicing of *-t-* or *-tt-* in certain environments. All of these and other variables as well as varying pronunciations of single words are discussed in Chapter V. The stress pattern of Canadian

English usually follows that of American English in assigning secondary stress to words ending in -ary, -ery, -ory (cf Avis, 1956; Bloomfield, 1948; Hamilton, 1964; Orkin, 1970) but varies between British and American stress patterns in words like:[9]

addréss	(n)	áddress	
adúlt	(n)	ádult	
cómbat	(v)	combát	
defénce	(n)	défence	(sports jargon)
offénce	(n)	óffence	(sports jargon)
detaíl	(n)	détail	
finánce	(n)	fínance	
frontíer	(n)	fróntier	
incógnito	(adv)	incogníto	
magazíne	(n)	mágazine	
reseárch	(n)	résearch	

This short outline exemplifies how Canadian English "bestrides the international gap" (Courtney, 1972: 28) between British English and American English, being more flexible than either of the other variants. There are three main factors which determine the hybrid character of Canadian English and influence particular choices in areas of variability. Firstly, the exposure of Canadians to British and American English, respectively, through immigrants, visitors, the mass media and dictionaries - in this aspect American influences have become particularly strong - secondly, regulations by official bodies in Canada and practices of the Canadian mass media. The education sector shows a traditionally pro-British bias.

D.E. Hamilton (1964: 456) reports that nine provincial Departments of Education suggested the *Oxford English Dictionary* as their standard, only one allowed *Webster's*. With the publication of Canadian dictionaries, this situation has probably changed somewhat. Modern textbooks are often imported from the United States and counteract the British orientation of many educators to some extent. The Candian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) is often seen as a major influence on Canadian English. Whereas some observers have criticized its use of British forms uncommon in General Canadian, others see CBC speech as the model of a typical Canadian standard.

> When Standard English and General American usages differ, the CBC 'recommended' pronunciation almost invariably follows Standard English, regardless of whether or not a majority of Canadians commonly use general American pronunciation for certain words.
> (Orkin, 1970: 121)

> And anyone wishing to know what Canadian English is like when purged of individual peculiarities and accidentals would be well advised to listen to the best CBC announcers and to CBC drama.
> (Priestley, 1968: 77)

Recently CBC and CTV practices have become more flexible and reflect the typical divided usage in Canada involving both British and American forms.

> And it is General Canadian that is the prestige dialect among the educated in most parts of the country. It is also the variety of speech

> most commonly heard on the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation), the government owned radio and television network, which has since 1936 been a significant force in binding Canadians together. It should be added that General Canadian is no less the norm on CTV, the national commercial network, and with some rather slight regional variations - on most local stations. (Avis, 1973: 62)[10]

The third factor influencing Canadian usage is the prestige attributed to the different possible variants. The Canadian situation might be unique in the fact that linguistic variation is not only affected and maintained by the social stratification and resulting reference group behaviour within the speech community as had been the case in New York City (Labov, 1966 a and b). Based on the nature of the variation, we might expect a relation between linguistic choice and attitudes involving preferences which transgress the borders of the speech community, here the nation. It is exactly the nature of this relation that is the aim of the present study. For a small sample of Canadians in Victoria, attitudes which might be relevant in this connection as well as linguistic choice have been recorded and measured, and statistical methods have been used to reveal possible correlations. The general methods of data collecting, coding and interpretation are presented in the following chapter.

Notes to Chapter III

[1]cf Orkin, 1970, III.

[2]For examples see the *Dictionary of Canadianisms* (1967) and Allen, 1959; Avis, 1973; Goetsch, 1963; Lovell, 1955; Orkin, 1970; Scargill, 1957, 1968, 1971.

[3]These and the following examples are based on my own observations.

[4]Out of these one is incorrect: Canadians have their clothes *custom-made* rather than *made-to-measure*.

[5]Orkin, 1970: 80. For examples of words in the different semantic fields cf pp. 79-82.

[6]See also those included in the present study which are listed and discussed in Chapter V.

[7]cf Avis, 1956 as reprinted in Chambers, 1970: 77.

[8]*Aunt* was included in the present study cf Chapter V.

[9]Both patterns can be heard on Canadian radio and television.

[10]Avis points out that British Received Standard is no longer the prestige dialect on the air, that, in fact, a native Canadian CBC announcer had to be released because of protests against her 'phony British accent'.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY[1]

The Subjects

The sample group consisted of 64 students of the University of Victoria in 1977. Out of the 64, 46 or 71.9 per cent were female, 15 or 23.4 per cent, male, and 3 of them did not give any information about their sex. Their age ranged from 17 to 46 years, with a mean at about 23 years. They were taking courses offered by the Deparment of Linguistics, and most of them indicated that they were preparing for a career as teachers of English.

The Questionnaire[2]

Biographical background: All students were asked to state in what generation the family on the father's side first arrived in Canada. The answers appeared to be normally distributed around third generation, i.e. grandfather and father were born in Canada, but great-grandfather not. A question asking for the father's main occupation during the childhood of the subject is used as an indication for the socio-economic status of the family.

All answers were grouped into five levels of socio-economic status: lowest-low-middle-high-highest. The association of father's occupation with socio-economic status in this way follows the index presented in Blishen (1968). The sample appeared as a normal distribution around middle class.

Measures of Attitude: Part II of the questionnaire contains questions which are grouped into attitudinal variables. Each question offers a choice of five different answers on an alphabetical rating scale. The ends of the scales, i.e. A and E are polar opposites, the remaining three choices possible choices between the extremes. The first subpart contains multiple-choice questions where statements and ideas have to be evaluated. In each case subjects are asked to select a point on the scale showing how strongly they agree or disagree with presented statements. Multiple-choice questions of this kind are a common and reasonably reliable measure of attitudes. The inherent danger of the instrument, i.e. common sources of error according to Nigel (1973: 90) are the following: "The frame of reference judges bring to this task will have a profound effect on their ratings." The "extreme response set" refers to a common tendency towards marking the extremes of the scale whereas the "error of central tendency" arises because subjects tend to select the centre of the scale

if they are unfamiliar with the object, uncertain whether they understand the question, or as a result of special training aware of too many details to be able to choose extremes. A so-called "halo effect" is due to the attempt to be consistent, i.e. subjects might answer a question in a certain way only to be consistent with earlier answers or possibly to conform to an imagined hypothesis of the experimenter. Most of the questions are based on those used by Gardner and Lambert (1972) and will be discussed in Chapter V.

The remaining attitudinal variables are set up as semantic differentials for evaluating different groups of people on twenty-three traits identical to those used by Gardner and Lambert. The semantic differential was originally introduced by C.E. Osgood, *et al.* (1957) as a measure of connotative meaning. Its application was later extended to measure attitudes. Nigel (1973: 102) points out that the instrument is especially valuable in instances where familiarity with the object in question can be assumed. In the present context it is not so much actual familiarity with the people to be rated, but familiarity with or presence of stereotypes which is assumed and measured. Encouraging is an observation made by Nigel (1972: 105) in this context: "However, since the

invalidity of scaling assumptions is more likely to lead to acceptance of the null-hypothesis that there are no differences between two measures when such differences are in fact present, the legitimacy of these assumptions in the case of the semantic differential can be reasonably accepted." Sources of error are again bias of the extreme response set and central tendency error as well as a bias towards social desirability of the answer. For example, it might socially be more desirable to rate other people positively and possibly to be modest in self-evaluations. Differences in personality might influence such behaviour more than actual attitudes. In spite of these difficulties, "taken as a whole, the studies of the reliability and validity of the semantic differential give an overall favourable impression of its performance in attitude measurement" (Nigel, 1973: 109).

Linguistic Questions: There are three types of linguistic questions, rhymes of the type XY (Do X and Y sound the same or different?) for phonological material, rhymes of the type ABX (Does X sound like A or like B?) for morphophonemic items, and definitions with a choice of two or more words to test lexical usage. Several sources of error have to be taken into consideration when lingusitic data are collected by means of a questionnaire rather than

actual observation. All error sources affect the phonological and morphophonemic more than the lexical questions. A specific problem of the rhyme technique is the fact that any of the presented rhymes could be pronounced by subjects in a different way than expected and assumed by the experimenter, which can make the answers invalid. In XY-rhymes a bias towards "same" might be operative as Eugene Briere (1967) observed with regard to phonological tests used to assess foreign language achievement. The fact that the items are presented in written form will evoke a stronger than usual bias towards spelling, i.e. differences in spelling are likely to be reflected in the reported pronunciations. Another problem is a common unawareness of one's own speech habits and difficulties in discriminating fine phonological differences. Whereas morphophonemic variations are relatively easy to hear, features such as diphthong raising, distinctiveness of vowels before *r* and low back vowels in general, and *t*-flapping might be beyond the capacity of an untrained ear.[3] Since all subjects in the pilot study were language students this problem should not be too prominent. On the other hand, trained linguists aware of very fine distinctions might avoid reporting pronunciations as identical and favour central positions on the scale. Two other factors bias

any kind of linguistic data collecting other than natural observation. When asked directly, subjects usually report their most formal style of speech and tend to favour forms of higher social prestige whether they normally use such forms or not. In spite of these considerable shortcomings of the questionnaire method, it is still widely used for practical reasons and the interlinguistic correlations in the present study revealed quite consistent answering patterns - presented in Chapter VI - which suggest an acceptable connection with reality or at least with what linguists claim to be close to actual speech patterns commonly referred to as dialects.

The Coding

To make mathematical calculations possible, the answers to each question were recoded and given a numerical instead of alphabetic value. The five points were arranged as a scale and assigned the values /_+1_/_+0.5_/ _0_/_-0.5_/_-1_/. In a next step, the questions were grouped into larger variables, each comprising the answers of several questions. To calculate variable values for each informant, the values of the answers to questions forming a particular variable were added. The resulting sum was then divided by the number of questions comprising

the variable. In short, variable values are the means of the answers to questions forming the variable. In some cases the sign value of the answers to certain questions had to be adjusted to ensure the internal consistency of the variables. For example, all positive attributes for Americans had to receive a positive value, no matter whether a given answer was coded as A or E in the raw data, i.e. whether the positive attribute was on the left or the right end of the scale in the questionnaire.

The Calculations

All data were stored by the computer, and the *Statistical Package For the Social Sciences (SPSS)*[4] program was used for the calculations. Frequency distributions were calculated as well as Pearson product-moment correlations of zero-order and partial correlations of higher order controlling for up to five other variables. For all possible pairs of variables correlation co-efficients have been calculated at least in zero-order two-way correlations. Correlations involving one linguistic and one attitudinal variable were then tested further in different higher-order correlations. For each case cross-product deviation, variance covariation, correlation co-efficient and the level of significance were calculated. Those correlations

with an error chance of less than 10 per cent, less than 5 per cent, and less than 1 per cent were extracted. The main discussion will be based on correlations with an error chance smaller than 5 per cent. Those with a significance level between 5 per cent and 10 per cent will be reported only if they support tendencies observed elsewhere.

Notes to Chapter IV

[1]The data on which this study is based are taken from a pilot study "Survey of Canadian English" conducted by members of the Department of Linguistics under the supervision of Dr. Henry J. Warkentyne. I did not use all the information available but selected variables which seemed most relevant for my purposes.

[2]Samples of each type of question in the attitudinal and linguistic categories are presented in Appendix A.

[3]This was mentioned by Avis, 1956: 42, 54, 55.

[4]cf Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Ale H. Bent: *SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

CHAPTER V

THE VARIABLES

Attitudinal Variables

1A[1] *Anomie:* Eleven questions are grouped under the variable *anomie* testing the social satisfaction of subjects through questions about the present state of Canadian society, the subjects' position in this society, and their hopes or fears concerning the future.[2] With anomie, i.e. social dissatisfaction coded as +1, the sample mean for this variable is -0.303.

1C Preference for Canada Over US
1D Preference for US Over UK
1E Preference for Canada Over UK
1F Preference for US Over UK in Matters Concerning Canada: The variables 1C, 1D and 1E are based on Gardner and Lambert's "Preference for America Over France Scale" (1972: 151). They compare the subjects' attitudes towards Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom. Each variable compares one possible pair of countries: 1C Canada and the United States, 1D the United States and the United Kingdom, and 1E Canada and the United Kingdom. The statements to be evaluated deal with the people of the countries in question, their honesty, imagination,

appreciation of arts, manners of their children, the importance of family life, the way of life in general, and the relative importance and influence of the U.S. and U.K. for Canada, historically. Variable 1F rates the importance or desirability of U.S. and U.K. influence in Canada today. Like 1D, preference for U.S. over U.K., it is again a comparison between the two countries, but in this case in relation to a Canadian situation. Four questions comprise this variable. One question assesses the subjects' opinion whether Canada has benefitted more from the association with the United States than from its historical ties with Great Britain - a rating involving political, cultural, and economic considerations. The remaining three questions are directly related to language. Subjects are asked whether they agree that an American accent is more pleasant to listen to than a British accent. Another question asks for a reaction towards a native Canadian speaking with an accent closer to British than to American English: Is he or she affected? The last question under 1F is concerned with spelling: Should Canadians use the American way of spelling?

The results from a comparison of these variables are interesting and somewhat surprising. The Canadians of this sample rated their own country lowest in the sequence of

preferences. They preferred the U.S. over Canada with a value of -0.219 (-1 being a total preference for the U.S., +1 a total preference for Canada). The highest single variable value Canada received was +0.313 whereas the student who most strongly favoured the U.S. did so with a value of -0.75. In a comparison with the United Kingdom, Canada came out even less favourably with a value of -0.382 (minimum -0.929, close to a total preference for the U.K., and maximum +0.071, very little more than indifference). An interpretation of such behaviour is difficult. Providing the questions were understood and answered correctly, the results could either be a manifestation of a Canadian modesty preventing the subjects from praising their own country, or they might show a Canadian insecurity, a lack of self-confidence as a nation. The scope of the present study does not permit an interpretation of this issue. It is not the interpretation of particular values of variables that is of concern, but a possible correlation between different variables, especially between attitudes and linguistic behaviour.

In a comparison between the U.S. and the U.K., Great Britain is rated more positively. This result is consistent with the fact that the U.K. was preferred over Canada more definitely than the U.S. The direct

comparison in 1D favours Great Britain with a value of -0.395 (minimum -0.938 - a very definite preference for the U.K., maximum +0.188 - only a slight preference for the U.S.). In a decision between the U.S. and the U.K. with regard to a Canadian context, variable 1F, there is also a bias towards the U.K. - only slightly less pronounced (mean -0.307). This variable is interesting because it shows the widest range of answers from -1.0, a total preference for the British way, to +0.75, a quite definite preference for an American influence.[3] The Canadians of this sample and most likely Canadians in general disagree on the matter.[4]

1I Canadian National and Linguistic Identity: Variable 1I combines two groups of questions, one aiming to measure opinions about a Canadian national identity in general, the other directly connected with attitudes about a Canadian linguistic identity. The general national identity value is obtained from questions about an obligation to buy Canadian products, an evaluation of Canadian-produced TV programmes, and a direct question about the existence of a Canadian national identity.[5] Questions related to linguistic issues are the following: Is the language of CBC announcers the standard for spoken Canadian English? Should a Canadian be offended if people from other countries consider him to be an American? How should he feel if taken for British? Does it make sense at all

to speak of Canadian English as different from American and British English?

The overall mean of Variable 1I was +0.252, only a moderate tendency in favour of the idea of a Canadian identity. It is interesting here to consider the means of the two subparts of the variable separately. For the linguistic items the mean turned out to be lower, namely +0.193. This group of Canadians does not feel very strongly about speaking a distinctive variety of English called Canadian English. The mean of the general national identity questions is higher at +0.292. The general awareness of being Canadian seems to be stronger and more important than linguistic distinctiveness. The difference is not drastic enough[6] to keep the two subparts as separate variables. For further calculations they will therefore remain joined. It is interesting to note that in both subgroups the questions asking about a Canadian identity directly show the most positive answers. For the national identity question the value is +0.563, for the linguistic identity +0.344. Canadians, or at least the present group, seem to believe in their national and linguistic identity, possibly more so than the low value of the entire variable would suggest.[7]

2A Attitude Towards Americans
2B Attitude Towards Scots
2C Attitude Towards the English
2D Attitude Towards Canadians: The variables 2A to 2D are semantic differential scales. Subjects are asked to rate the different ethnic groups on twenty-three traits using five-point-scales.[8] The results of these variables are the following:[9] People from the United States received a mean of +0.129 (minimum -0.239; maximum +0.5); people from Scotland were rated at +0.252 (minimum 0, maximum +0.739); people from England at +0.191 (minimum -0.130, maximum +0.696); and Canadians themselves received a mean evaluation of +0.205 (minimum -0.152, maximum +0.717). Scots were rated most positively on the scale. In fact, they are the only group which did not receive any negative value for the mean if calculated for each student separately. Canadians are second in a comparison of ratings, followed by the English and lastly Americans.[10] The more positive rating received by people from Scotland as compared to English people confirms the intuitive expectations that these groups are kept apart and enjoy varying degrees of popularity in Canada. It is interesting to note that both British groups are favoured over Americans who rank lowest on the scale of popularity.

2E Subjects' Self-Rating as Others See Them
2F Subjects' Self-Rating as They Believe They Are:

In variables 2E and 2F subjects' are asked to rate themselves rather than ethnic groups using the same scales as in the preceding semantic differentials. In 2E they are asked to rate themselves in the way they think others see them and would rate them. In 2F they then state how they really think they are. Variable 2E gives an indication of the subjects' feelings about their place in society, of their contentedness and security in society. Variable 2F is a more personal measure of self-estimation, identity and security. The means of the self-evaluation scales are definitely in the positive range. 2F, the self-rating as the subjects believe they really are is higher than that given to any ethnic group: +0.280. 2E measuring how the subjects believe others see them is lower than their own evaluation with a mean of +0.249. However, it is only slightly less than for the most positive ethnic group, the Scots, with +0.252 and higher than for Canadians in general with +0.205 or any other group. The relatively high values for the self-rating scales and the fact that 2F is higher than 2E suggest that, at least for these variables, modesty cannot have been a very strong intervening factor for the sample as a whole.

Linguistic Variables

Phonology

There are eight different variables comprising the phonological component of the questionnaire; the distinctiveness of vowels before *r*, syllabicity, the distinction of low back vowels, diphthong raising, the presence of a *y*-glide, the distinctiveness of the *wh*-feature, vowel deletion, and *t*-flapping.

4A vowel before r: Variable 4A is set up to measure the distinctiveness of vowels before *r*. In some varieties of English, especially among those heard in North America, certain vowels tend to merge before *r*. The classic example is the set *Mary, marry, merry* which are distinguished in British Received Pronunciation, but not in many varieties of North American English, as observed by Reed (1961) for the Pacific North West of the United States and by Gregg (1957), Polson (1969), and Walker (1974) for Canada. Twelve different pairs have been included in this questionnaire to represent and measure these possible tendencies of the English language. The pairs are the following:

spirit	-	spur it
spirit	-	spear it
Mary	-	merry
Mary	-	marry
merry	-	marry
hairy	-	ferry
hairy	-	carry
ferry	-	carry
ferry	-	furry

Possible distinctions are those between /i/, /I/, /ɛ/, /æ/ and /ə/, and in some cases distinctive lengthening of the vowel. The use of the rhyming technique will not elicit how, exactly, the words are pronounced, i.e. if there is a distinction, what kind it is, or if they sound the same, which sound became the common one. The variable is only meant to measure the extent to which certain vowels before *r* merge in the variety of English spoken by the students. In other words, how strong is the general tendency to merge these vowels in the given environment? With "exactly the same" coded as -1 and "completely different" coded as +1, the variable mean lies at -0.221 - a moderate tendency of the group not to make distinctions between mid-central vowels before *r*.

4B syllabicity: Variable 4B examines whether syllabicity is distinctive in seven pairs of words with one or two syllables. The pairs presented are the following:

mere	-	mirror
reel	-	real
line	-	lion
girl	-	squirrel
hire	-	higher
warn	-	warren
film	-	fill'em

Most words in the first column are prescribed as monosyllabic by dictionaries, those in the second column as bisyllabic (cf OED, DCE, RHD, Webster's). An exception in the first

column is *hire*. Webster's transcribes both *hire* and *higher* in exactly the same way inserting an optional schwa before the /r/ in both cases. DCE, OED and RHD indicate a difference in syllabicity. The DCE transcribes *hire* with a diphthong followed by *r*, *higher* with diphthong followed by schwa plus *r*. OED and RHD insert a raised schwa before the *r* in *hire* - presumably representing a non-syllabic transition to /r/ - whereas *higher* contains a full schwa - a syllabic unit. *Film* is represented as monosyllabic by all dictionaries consulted; only Webster's records a bisyllabic pronunciation in addition, but labels it as substandard. Bloomfield (1948: 62) suggests that the bisyllabic pronunciation of *film* might be quite common in Canadian English. "There is a strong tendency among Canadian speakers of English - stronger, I believe, than the same tendency among American speakers - to diphthongize final vocalic *e*, *m*, and *n*." Among his examples Bloomfield lists *film* pronounced as "[fIlam]". This item was also part of the *Survey of Canadian English* in 1972[12] (henceforth referred to as *Survey*), which showed a bisyllabic pronunciation about one third of the time. Two syllables were most common in Newfoundland and gradually decreased towards the West. Among the words in the second column above, *squirrel* is an exception. In contrast to all other

dictionaries, Webster's offers an additional monosyllabic pronunciation. In the *Survey*, "an overwhelming majority use(d) the one-syllable pronunciation" (Scargill and Warkentyne, 1972: 60) - fairly evenly distributed over all provinces. All words under this variable end in /e/, /r/, /n/, or /m/ with the bisyllabic ones in the second column normally being transcribed with a schwa preceding these consonants. However, all of the final consonants can be syllabified, which results in a loss of the schwa, as Edward Atin, the pronunciation director of Webster's, points out in his "Guide to Pronunciation" (Webster's: 35a). From the answers to the questionnaire it is impossible to decide how the words are actually pronounced[13], whether those words which are prescribed as monosyllabic receive an extra syllable in the form of a syllabified consonant - as testified for *film* - or whether the second unstressed syllable of the bisyllabic words loses the vowel schwa or even its syllabicity - as in the case of *squirrel*. In order for a total merging to occur, a combination of these procedures is likely: The monosyllabic word becomes bisyllabic through syllabification of the consonants *l*, *r*, *n*, and *m*; the bisyllabic word loses the unstressed schwa, but retains syllabicity leading to the same consonantal syllables. A merging to a monosyllabic

word and a variety of stages in between are conceivable. A distinction between the pairs was coded as +1, a merging in pronunciation as -1. The result was a sample mean of -0.032 - an almost even split with a slight tendency towards merging.

4C low back vowel: Some dialects of the English language differ in the distinctiveness and quality of their low back vowels. The pair *caught - cot* is frequently used in the literature to exemplify this phenomenon and has been included in the questionnaire together with *bother - father*. In Received British Pronunciation and all southern English speech areas both pairs are quite distinctive through the use of three different vowels: a low and rounded vowel, usually long, [ɔ:] for *caught*, a very low, less rounded and short vowel [ɒ] for *cot* and *bother*, and an unrounded or open low back vowel [ɑ:] for *father*. In most North American dialects, the completely rounded representative [ɔ:] is absent except before /r/ or /I/. The vowel which most North Americans use in words like *caught, taught, saw, talk,* is very close in quality to the Southern British sound used in *cot, not, bother,* only longer.[14] This seems to be common to most North American dialects including Canadian English. The North American pronunciation of the vowel in *cot* and

bother differs, however, as Bronstein states in the introduction to the RHD.

> In Eastern New England and western Pennsylvania there is general homophony of all the vowel sounds in such words as tot and taught, collar and caller resulting in (o) - IPA [ɒ] for most speakers in those areas. In other areas the distinction is made between cot (kät) or (kôt) and caught (kot).
> (Bronstein, 1966: xxiv)

Most U.S. speakers do distinguish between the pair *caught - cot* although in a way that differs from the British. Choosing the medium rounded low back vowel [ɒ] for *caught*, they use even less rounding in *cot* which results in a vowel very similar in quality to that used in *father* and *cart* in British English thus making the shift involving an unrounding process complete for those speakers. They use the same vowel in *cot* and *cart*, but the words remain distinctive because the *r* is pronounced in American English and can cause *r*- colouring of the vowel. With only two distinctive low back vowels plus distinctive *r*, the same number of distinctions is possible as in British English. Some local dialects of the U.S., however, as pointed out by Bronstein, do not unround the vowel in *tot, cot, not,* etc., which leads to a loss of distinction between pairs like *caught-cot, taught-tot, nought-not.* This phenomenon occurs widely in Canadian English; in fact, it is one of the most typical characteristics of Canadian

phonology and received much attention in the literature.[15] In the 1972 *Survey* a large majority of subjects merged the pair, as was the case in the present study. In spite of the bias towards the written, which, in this case, would favour a distinction, 50 out of the 64 students or 78.1 per cent indicated that they merge *caught* and *cot* completely, 9 others or 14 per cent reported that the words sounded similar. Whereas British English has a different vowel sound in *bother* and *father*, many North Americans merge the two either by unrounding and slightly centralizing the vowel of *bother* or by rounding the vowel of *father* so that it approaches that of *bother*. Americans generally tend to use the first option. For most Canadians, the completely open low to centre back vowel [ɑ] only occurs before /r/, /I/, and /U/ such as in *farther, farm, my, lie, cloud, now,* etc. The difference between the sounds in *bother* and *father* either disappears or becomes merely one of length, *father* having the longer vowel. Forty-six students of my sample or 71.9 per cent treated the vowels in *bother* and *father* as exactly the same (43.8 per cent) or similar (28.1 per cent).[16] Some speakers in the United States show the same usage, but it seems to be confined to certain areas. The following charts indicate the differences between British, American, and Canadian behaviour in this respect.

Table I

Distinctions Between *Caught*, *Cot* And *Cart*

	ɔ:	ɒ(:)	ɑ(:)	ɑr
British Standard	caught	cot	cart	
General American		caught	cot	cart
General Canadian		caught, cot		cart

Table II

Distinctions Between *Bother*, *Father* And *Farther*

	ɒ	ɑ	ɑr
British Standard	bother	father, farther	
General American		bother, father	farther
General Canadian	bother, father		farther

Dictionary entries reflect the fact that the total merger under [ɒ] is typically Canadian. The OED prescribes both distinctions using three different symbols to transcribe the vowels. Webster's prescribes a distinction between *caught* and *cot*, but uses the same symbol for *bother* and *father*. Only the DCE offers the possibility of using the same vowel in all four words.[17] With merging coded as -1, a distinction coded as +1 the sample mean lies at -0.605 - the most extreme mean value received for any linguistic variable.

4D diphthong raising: Diphthong raising in English refers to a variation between [aI], [aU] and [əI], [əU].[18] The latter raised variants, i.e., diphthongs in which the first part of the sound is centralized and raised to a mid-central vowel often transcribed as schwa, are used in various linguistic environments as unconditioned allophones or as predictable phonetic realizations of the phonemes /aI/ and /aU/, or even as separate phonemes. There are a number of dialects where both low and raised diphthongs are used: dialects in Virginia (cf Kurath, 1964; Allen, 1973), South Carolina and Georgia (cf Allen, 1973), on Martha's Vineyard (Labov, 1963), Scottish and Irish-Scottish dialects (Gregg, 1973), and Canadian English (Joss, 1942; Bloomfield, 1948; Allen, 1956, 1959; Gregg,

1957, 1973; Lehn, 1959; Goetsch, 1963; Halle, 1964; Avis, 1972, 1973; Chambers, 1973, 1975). "Canadian Raising" - a term often used for the phenomenon in Canada - does not imply that the feature occurs only in Canada, but rather that the conditions and extent of occurrence are specific to Canada.

> The appropriateness of the term resides in the relative role the rule plays in Canadian English, where its effect is the most readily identifiable trait of the dialect. Thus, speakers of Canadian English are often identified by the speakers of adjoining dialects by their pronunciation of words like *wife* and *south*, which are usually misheard by speakers of General American as *weef* and *sooth*. (Chambers, 1973: 113)

In fact, the term does not even imply that the historical process was 'raising' rather than 'lowering'. Gregg (1973) argues with regard to /aI/ that the low variant is actually later in the historical process.[19] The fact that out of the variants [aU] and [əU], respectively, the centralized ones are limited and thus more salient, and often phonologically strictly conditioned - at least in Canadian English - , and the fact that the differentiation is general in Canada, but regionally restricted in British and American English, gave popularity to the term "Canadian Raising" - if only for "mnemonic purposes" (Chambers, 1973: 113). The first article devoted to the phenomenon was written by Martin Joos as early as 1942. According to Joos, the

phonological environment allowing centralized variants to occur is the position before voiceless consonants with zero-juncture. He distinguishes two different subdialects with regard to the phonemicization of raising. In one dialect, the distribution of the diphthong alternants is complementary and thus not phonemic; in another dialect a phonemicization took place as a result of the rule voicing intervocalic *t*, which, in this case, applies after the raising such that *writer* and *rider* are distinctive through the use of different diphthongs although both are pronounced with medial /d/.[20] Chambers (1973) discusses diphthong raising using the notational conventions of generative phonology to describe the linguistic environment of the alternants, rather than a notation based on structuralist theory. Compared to Joos's data, he found more stability in Canadian English with regard to raising. Out of the two subdialects Joos had described, one has become dominant or even exclusive: *t*-voicing is later in the derivation than raising, resulting in a phonemicization of the raised diphthongs. *Writer* and *rider* are distinct even though there is merging between /t/ and /d/.

In the present questionnaire one word pair has been included for each diphthong: *ride-right* and *loud-lout*. Subjects are asked to state whether these pairs sound alike

or different, disregarding the final consonant. The shortcomings of the questionnaire method have a particularly strong effect on this variable in two different ways. The bias towards spelling is reinforced by the bias towards answering "the same". Another source of error might be the fact that not many people have an ear perceptive enough to catch such a difference which - although quite apparent to the linguist or speakers of another dialect of English - seems to be very slight or even unnoticeable for a native Canadian (Avis, 1956: 42). Quite a number of Canadians who do apply the rule are unaware of it and show surprise when it is pointed out to them. For this variable no distinction was coded as +1, raising of the diphthongs as -1. The resulting sample mean was -0.239 - a moderate tendency towards raising. For the reasons outlined above it can be assumred that this figure under-represents the actual phenomenon by far. The variable might be a measure of perceptiveness or linguistic training rather than a measure of linguistic behaviour.

4E y-glide: Daniel Jones describes the standard British English use of the y-glide: "In words spelled with u, ue, ui, ew and eu representing long u: j [his symbol for y-glide] is sometimes inserted before the u: (as in uniform 'ju:nifɔ:m, few fju:) and sometimes not (as in rule

ru:l, chew tʃu:)" (Jones, 1972: 209-210). He proceeds to give rules for such a glide insertion. The glide is never used after [tʃ], [dʒ] and [r] (chew, June, rule). It is regularly inserted after the sounds [p] (pew), [b] (beauty), [k] (queue), [g] (argue), [f] (few), [v] (view), [h] (huge), [m] (music), [n] (new), [t] (tune), and [d] (due). The use of the y-glide varies after the sounds [s] (suit), [z] (presume), [θ] (enthusiasm), and after initial [l] (lute).[22] For American English Jones's rules have to be altered. In general, the y-glide is used less frequently. Sounds optionally followed by a y-glide in British English never receive one in American English.[23] Words like *suit, lute* and *enthusiasm* are generally pronounced without a glide. Some of the sounds which are regularly followed by a y-glide in British English, form a new category of varied use in the United States including [t], [d] and [n] so that the words *student, tune, due, dew* and *new* can be heard with or without the y-glide. Canadian English operates on the same rules as American English with a difference in frequency among the optional cases. A glide after [t], [d], [n] is - though optional - quite common in Canada whereas it seems to be dying out in the U.S.

> The (y) after (t,d, and n) survives to some extent in New England and in the New York City area and is the common pronunciation

> in the South. In all other areas (y) drops out after these consonants, although individual speakers may retain it to a greater or lesser degree. The pronunciations (toon), (doon), and (nooz) with (oo) or a somewhat centralized (oo) - IPA [u] - are normal for most Americans. (Bronstein, 1966: xxiii)

The insertion of the glide after [t], [d], [n] is prestigious in Canada and therefore used to a larger extent than in the U.S. This difference in the frequency of rule application between American and Canadian English has been mentioned by many researchers (Ayerst, 1939; Avis, 1956, 1973; Aelen, 1959; Goetsch, 1963; Hamilton, 1964; Orkin, 1970). Among young Canadians the use of a y-glide seems to decline, however (cf Gregg, 1957; Hamilton, 1964; Scargill and Warkentyne, 1972.

The following word pairs were included in this questionnaire and had to be judged as to their similarity in sound: *tune-tomb* (excepting the final consonant); *student-stool* (only the first part of the word); *dew-do; due-do; suit-soon* (excepting the final consonant); *news-noose; lute-loot*. For the pairs *suit-soon* and *lute-loot* none of the North American dictionaries including the DCE offer even the possibility of a distinction, the OED marks the optional use of a y-glide. As expected, the pairs were treated as homophones or at least similar in sound by most students of the sample. Fifty-seven or

90.5 per cent of the subjects pronounce *lute* without a glide, and 47 or 74.6 per cent do not use a glide in *suit*.[24] For the remaining pairs the OED prescribes a full distinction, the North American dictionaries offer an optional glide-insertion in all cases. The word *news* received the highest proportion of y-insertion: 48 or 76.2 per cent claim to distinguish the word from *noose*; only one student reported pronouncing the pair exactly alike. For most Canadians [n] before [u:] representing the spelling u, ue, ui, and ew triggers y-glide insertion. The relative scale of increasing glide insertion in this sample is: *lute* (4.8%), *suit* (15.9%), *student* (33.3%), *dew* (33.4%), *due* and *tune* (34.9%), and *news* (76.2%).[25] The use of a y-glide was coded as +1, its deletion as -1; the sample mean for the entire variable was -0.239 - a moderate tendency to drop the glide.

4F wh-feature: For some speakers of English there is a difference in pronunciation between w and wh. For them, pairs like *weather* and *whether* sound different. This *wh*-feature is regularly used by most speakers in Scotland, Ireland, North England and the United States, but not in Southern England (cf Jones, 1972: 208; Webster's: 42a). Bronstein (1966: xxiii) points out that while many Americans differentiate *w* and *wh* some don't, especially speakers of

the coastal Middle Atlantic area, coastal New England, and the coast of South Carolina and Georgia. "Both types may be heard throughout the country at all social levels, although the use of [*w*] for these *wh* words is growing, especially in urban areas" (Bronstein, 1966: xxiv). All over Canada the distinction is optional and less frequent than in the U.S. (cf Gregg, 1957; Allen, 1959; Lehn, 1959; Orkin, 1970). From my own observations, I would say the distinction is decreasing especially among young people. The questions used for this variable present the following pairs:

which	-	witch
wheel	-	weal
where	-	wear
whale	-	wail

A distinctive *wh-* feature was coded as +1, no distinction as -1. The resulting sample mean is -0.539 - a fairly definite answer. The Canadians of this sample do not tend to make the distinction. This conforms to the results of the *Survey* where the distinction was outnumbered 2:1 and even less common for the younger generation.

4H vowel deletion: Non-stressed vowels in poly-syllabic words are regularly reduced to schwa (ə). They thus become non-distinctive, and it would be a small step further to delete them completely - a fairly common feature in fast informal speech. In the case of such a vowel deletion, the

first parts of the following word pairs would sound identical:

believe	-	bleed
garage	-	gradual
towards	-	twaddle

The subjects were asked to compare the first parts of the pairs only. Because the words are in isolation, a possible vowel deletion is not the mere result of rapid speech, in which it occurs quite regularly, but would indicate a more general tendency. More so than in 4B, syllabicity, which also involved schwa-deletion, spelling will introduce a strong biasing effect in this case. *Garage* is transcribed with an unstressed vowel in the first syllable by all dictionaries. *Believe* is treated the same way by the OED, RHD, and DCE. Only Webster's offers a possible deletion of the vowel, but tags it as rapid speech. In the case of *toward*, all dictionaries offer a deletion of the first vowel and in addition also a complete deletion of the *w*. The use of this latter variant without the *w* will change the value of the variable and should probably not have been used to measure the tendency to delete vowels. A difference was coded as +1, vowel deletion as -1, the sample mean is +0.453 - a definite tendency towards retaining the schwa in unstressed syllables or at least towards claiming the retention.

4I t-flapping: Intervocalic - *t-* or *tt-* - pronounced as a voiceless fortis in Standard British English - undergoes a voicing rule in the speech of most Americans if the preceding vowel is stressed (Jones, 1972: 359). It might be added that Jones' rule also applies if a syllabified consonant such as *l, r, n, m* follows and possibly in the case of intervocalic [tʃ]. The outcome of the voicing rule varies between speakers and has been described as voiced fortis, voiced lenis or voiced flap.

> Most U.S. speakers do not use closure (stop) consonants in the words *ladder* and *latter*, but a voiced flap consonant, and the two words cannot be distinguished out of context. This flap consonant is either very similar to or identical with the sound often heard from British speakers for the *r* of *very*, the spelling 'veddy' often being used by Americans to mimic this pronunciation. (Webster's: 41a)

Canadian English contains the same voicing and/or flapping rule as an optional rule (cf Joos, 1942; Avis, 1956, 1972; Gregg, 1957; Lehn, 1959; Orkin, 1970; Chambers, 1973; Allen, 1973-76).[26] As in the case of *y*-glide insertion and the use of a *wh-* feature there is a difference in frequency of rule application between American English and Canadian English (cf Allen, 1959, 1973-76). Whereas Americans generally apply the rule, it has connotations of informal, slovenly and sometimes even socially inferior speech in Canada (cf Avis, 1956; Orkin, 1970). Many Canadians

show stylistic variation such that voiceless *t* is heard more often in formal situations, public speeches, lectures, etc., whereas one of the voiced representatives is more common in casual speech. The application of the voicing and/or flapping rule normally results in a loss of distinction between pairs such as *ladder* and *latter*.[27]

Two pairs comprise the variable in this questionnaire: *shudder-shutter* and *congratulate-flagellate*. The first pair would regularly trigger rule application in American English. Flapping was coded as -1, a distinction as +1. The mean for the first pair only is -0.070 - almost exactly between the American and the British usage with a slight bias towards flapping. In the case of *congratulate* voicing is less common, generally. None of the dictionaries record the possibility apart from Webster's where it is labelled substandard. Actual usage seems to depart from the dictionary norm at least in North America.

> Although dictionaries fail to record it, the -dge- [dʒ] pronunciation of *congratulate* is regularly heard on American radio, television, and in film production. The use of the voiced -dge- [dʒ] pronunciation has increased in one generation in Canada to the extent that more of the young people use it than not.
> (Scargill and Warkentyne, 1972: 69)

The sample of the present study seems to be more conservative. With a mean of +0.188 these students tend to favour the

voiceless pronunciation slightly more. The mean for the entire variable is +0.059 - an almost even split. The nature of the study, with its bias toward spelling and a notion of correctness in this case reinforced by social prestige will probably have affected the results such that a higher incidence of *t*-flapping or voicing can be assumed in actual usage.

Variation in the Pronunciation of Individual Words

4J U.S.-U.K. dichotomy: The questions testing variation in the pronunciation of individual words are based on the ABX-type rhyming technique. In each case a key word has to be compared with two rhymes, one of them representing a pronunciation usually associated with American English, the other one with British English. The items and their rhymes are listed below in the order in which they occur in the questionnaire.

Keyword	American Rhyme	British Rhyme
aunt	ant	want
lever	never	beaver
schedule (the sch only)	skill	shoe
genuine	fine[28]	fin
the letter *z*	zee	zed
semi-final (*mi* only)	my	me
anti-pollution (*ti* only)	tie	tea
arctic	"artik"	"arktic"
greasy	fleecy	easy
lieutenant (*lieut* only)	loot	left
leisure	seizure	pleasure
roof (the *oo*)	rook	moon
either (*ei* only)	bead	bide
fertile	turtle	her tile
ate	gate	get
route	shout	shoot
ration (*a* only)	rate	rat
calm (*a* only)	Sam[28]	bomb, farm
soot	boot, but[28]	foot

Although "it must be admitted that on pronunciation dictionaries are less satisfactory than on spelling, meaning, or etymology", (Hulbert, 1955: 55) the following discussion will rely heavily on dictionary information for lack of better evidence. In most of the cases included in the questionnaire, the difference between British and American pronunciation habits is represented in the dictionaries consulted. Some items are transcribed differently in British and American dictionaries with or without mentioning the other pronunciation variant which is then labelled as "chiefly British" and "chiefly U.S.", respectively. In other cases, both variants are offered, but in a reversed order of preference. In some instances, the British

dictionaries offer only one variant, the American ones give a choice of pronunciations.

Aunt: The OED and Concise Oxford offer only one pronunciation for *aunt* involving a low back vowel not agreeing with that of *ant*. The Oxford Advanced lists both, but labels the *ant*-rhyme as U.S. usage. Webster's and the RHD present both variants with [æ] being their first choice, Kenyon and Knott only suggest [æ] and label the low back vowel Eastern and sporadically present in the south and north of the U.S. The DCE only lists the low front vowel. But in the 1972 *Survey* 38 per cent of the subjects claimed that they did not rhyme *ant* and *aunt* - among them the majority of Maritimers. In B.C. the percentage of *ant-aunt* rhymes was considerably higher at 86 per cent. In the present study 93.8 per cent chose this rhyme.

Lever: The two pronunciations for *lever* [liˈvər] and [lɛˈvər][29] are listed in all American dictionaries with the latter pronunciation being first choice. The OED, the Concise Oxford, and Daniel Jones only list the first pronunciation, the Oxford Advanced gives both but labels [lɛˈvər] U.S. The DCE lists [i] as most common but notes the presence of [ɛ] in Canada. The *Survey* confirmed this claim, but showed a slight increase of the American form for the students. In this study a majority of 81 per cent follows the British pattern.

Schedule: Daniel Jones offers only [ʃ] for the pronunciation of *schedule*. All British dictionaries list [ʃ] together with [sk] which is marked as U.S. usage. Kenyon and Knott and the RHD follow this pattern offering [sk] as the normal pronunciation and [ʃ] as British. Webster's lists [sk] for the U.S., [ʃ] as British and points out that Canadian usage is divided. The DCE lists both variants with the American one as first choice.

> The pronunciation with [sk] was by no means unknown in England. As quoted in the OED, Smart (1836) in his dictionary offers only the present British pronunciation and regrets in his introduction that the [sk] is not in greater use, since the word is Greek. 'Schedule' entered Middle English from Old French as 'cedule' and was respelled on the analogy of latin schedula. The spelling 'schedule' has been the normal spelling since the middle of the seventeenth century. (Scargill, 1974: 56)

The majority of Canadians in the 1972 *Survey* used the American pronunciation; in the present study they account for 68.7 per cent.

Genuine: All British dictionaries, Kenyon and Knott, the RHD, and the DCE only list the *fin*-rhyme for *genuine*. Webster's records, in addition to that, the occasional use of the [ai] - pronunciation. In the *Survey*, a majority of 69 per cent[30] favoured the *fine* - rhyme - a surprising result considering that this variant is not even mentioned in the DCE and many other dictionaries. In the present

study, 42.2 per cent report the use of [aI]. The variant seems to be established in Canada and should be entered into Canadian dictionaries.

The letter z: All dictionaries agree that the pronunciation of the name of the letter *z* is *zee* in the U.S. and *zed* in Britain.[31] The *zed* pronunciation is by analogy to Greek zeta, French zède, German Zet, and the name of the letter in other languages; the *zee* is by analogy to the English pronunciation of other letters of the alphabet, *b, c, d,* etc. The DCE records *zed* as the common Canadian pronunciation and *zee* as chiefly U.S. In the *Survey, zed* was followed by all Canadians except in Newfoundland. In the present study 89.1 per cent use *zed.*

Semi- and anti-: The prefixes *semi-* and *anti-* receive only an [i], [I], or [ə] pronunciation in all British dictionaries,[32] Kenyon and Knott, and the DCE. RHD and Webster's list the diphthong [aI] in addition. Whereas the RHD makes the diphthongized pronunciation second choice in both instances and in all combinations, Webster's transcribes only *semi-* in this way and reverses the order of preference for *anti-* listing the diphthongized version as first choice in this case. It is to be expected that there is not only a possible difference between the two prefixes, but also an influence of the stems they are attached to (Scargill and Warkentyne, 1972: 55). The

results of the *Survey* showed a difference between the two prefixes in Canadian usage. Less than 8 per cent used the diphthong in *semi-* (3.3 per cent were undecided), but over 18 per cent did so in *anti-* (with 6.5 per cent undecided). In the present study only 1.6 per cent diphthongize *semi-*, 3.2 per cent do so for *anti-*.

Arctic: The word *arctic* entered English via French "artique" and was respelled in the 17th century on the basis of Latin (Scargill, 1974: 63). The OED records the spelling "artik" in a 1678 entry. All dictionaries list the pronunciation with /k/ in the first syllable as their first choice. Whereas it is the only choice in the British dictionaries, all North American dictionaries list the pronunciation [*rt*] as a second variant. According to Webster's [*rt*] was the original pronunciation and has "centuries of oral tradition behind it." The majority of the 1972 *Survey* population reported the use of this older and simpler form - almost 75 per cent (another 14 per cent reported to use it "sometimes"). In the present study the percentage is 48.5 per cent for the same form.

Greasy: British and American dictionaries list two pronunciations for *greasy*, but in opposite orders. Whereas [z] is the first choice in Britain,[33] [s] is first choice

in the U.S. dictionaries.[34] Daniel Jones and Kenyon and Knott mention a possible difference in meaning, the voiceless pronunciation referring to actual grease as a substance, the voiced pronunciation mainly stressing the slippery nature of something greasy, e.g. a greasy road. The DCE only lists the voiceless variant. In the 1972 *Survey* 87 per cent opted for [s], in the present study the number has increased to 92.2 per cent.

Lieutenant: The OED and Daniel Jones transcribe the first syllable of *Lieutenant* as [lɛft]. Jones points out that the pronunciation [lu:t] used to be common in the British Navy, but is now obsolete replaced by [lɛft] or [lɛt]. All American dictionaries transcribe the syllable as [lut] and mention the British alternative. The Oxford Advanced and DCE record [lɛft] and add [lut] as U.S. usage. In the *Survey*, however, a slight majority of the parents favoured the U.S. form and a marked majority of the students did so - a definite trend towards American usage which makes a change in the DCE entry necessary.[35] The present study confirms this trend with 70 per cent preferring the [lu:t] pronunciation.

Leisure: The favoured British pronunciation of *leisure* rhymes with *pleasure*. Daniel Jones and the Concise Oxford offer only this pronunciation; the OED and the Oxford

Advanced list the *seizure* - rhyme as a second choice, with the label U.S. in the Oxford Advanced. American dictionaries list both variants with [i] as first choice. The DCE follows the order of the OED listing [ɛ], [i]. In the *Survey* 72 per cent favoured [i] (in addition to 7.6 per cent undecided); in the present study the number dropped to 42.4 per cent.

Roof: The most general pronunciation of *roof* is [ruf]. In the U.S. a second variant [rUf] is also quite common. All dictionaries list [u] rhyming with *moon* as the first pronunciation choice; only American dictionaries add the second variant. Although the DCE does not offer [rUf], almost 19 per cent favoured this variant in the *Survey*. In the present study 11.1 per cent do so.

Either: Daniel Jones offers the *bide* - rhyme as the normal British pronunciation of *either* with [i] being used less frequently. Webster's lists [i] as dominant and mentions that [aI] is "sometimes" present in the U.S. and dominant in England and Wales. The RHD, DCE, and surprisingly the OED list [i], [aI] in that order. This probably represents the Canadian situation and maybe the American one, but is inaccurate for Britain. The Oxford Concise and Oxford Advanced both list [aI], [i] the latter labelling [i] as U.S. usage. In the *Survey* about two-thirds

of the parents preferred [i], and the students increased the percentage to almost 78 per cent. The present study shows divided usage between the two variants (42.3 per cent [aI], 57.7 per cent [i]).

Fertile: Daniel Jones records [aI] for the second syllable in *fertile* as the only Standard British pronunciation. The Concise Oxford and the Oxford Advanced list [aI], [I] in that order with a U.S. label for [I] in the Oxford Advanced.[36] All American dictionaries consulted list [I], [ə] or [l̩] as the preferred pronunciations. In Kenyon and Knott [aI] is not mentioned, Webster's and the RHD tag it as chiefly British. The DCE lists both variants [aI] and [ə] in that order. This item was not part of the *Survey*. In the present study 76.6 per cent of subjects follow the British pattern, i.e. they diphthongize the vowel.

Ate: The most frequent pronunciation of *ate* in Britain is [ɛt]. This is the only transcription in the Concise Oxford. The OED, Oxford Advanced and Daniel Jones record [et] in addition as an occasionally occurring variant or U.S. usage (Oxford Advanced). In the American dictionaries the order is reversed. [e] is the more common form, [ɛ] is labelled as British in the RHD, as substandard or British in Webster's, and as occasional by Kenyon and Knott. The DCE only lists [e], and an overwhelming majority of

96 per cent chose that variant in the *Survey*; 98.5 per cent do so in this study.

Route: For the pronunciation of *route* [u] as rhyming with *shoot* is the first choice in all dictionaries consulted. In the OED and the Oxford Advanced it is the only variant, Daniel Jones and the Concise Oxford record [aU] in addition, but restrict it to army usage. All American dictionaries list [aU] as second choice without restrictions or labels. The DCE records [u] as preferred Canadian usage, but mentions that [aU] is in common usage for delivery routes, e.g. newspaper route. In the *Survey* almost 73 per cent used [u] and the number was increasing for the younger generation. In this study the percentage has gone up to 95.3 per cent.

Ration: Daniel Jones transcribes *ration* in analogy to *rat* only, without listing other variants. The Concise Oxford gives [æ] as the normal pronunciation, [e] as chiefly U.S.; the Oxford Advanced only records [æ].[37] All North American dictionaries record [æ] and [e] in that order. Seventy-seven per cent of the *Survey* population opted for [æ] (7.7 per cent used both pronunciations) with the students increasing the [e] pronunciation considerably. In the present study 79.7 per cent prefer [æ].

Calm: For the pronunciation of *calm* all dictionaries suggest [ɑ] or [a] and [ɒ] (Webster's and DCE). Only Webster's mentions the pronunciation [æ] as rhyming with *Sam* and labels it sporadic and old-fashioned. Kenyon and Knott use the symbol [a] for a sound half-way between [æ] and [ɑ]. In the *Survey* 19 per cent opted for a rhyme with *Sam* - a far larger number than dictionary entries would suggest. In the present questionnaire, however, only one student (1.6 per cent) chose the rhyme *Sam*.

Soot: *Soot* is transcribed as rhyming with *foot* as a first choice by all consulted dictionaries. Whereas this is the only choice in British dictionaries, the American ones offer [u] rhyming with *boot* as a second choice.[38] The third variant rhyming with *but* is mentioned in Webster's and Kenyon and Knott, only in the latter labelled less frequent. In the *Survey*, 24.9 per cent opted for [u] or [ʌ]; in the present study only 9.4 per cent of the students do so.

United States rhymes were coded as -1, U.K. rhymes as +1. The resulting mean is +0.198 - a slight bias towards British English usage. This value should not be interpreted as an indication of the actual position of Canadian English between British and American English. A different choice of questions would effect the value

drastically. In some cases, as pointed out above, U.K.-coded rhymes are not exclusively used in Great Britain, but are also very common and in some cases dominant in the U.S. The reason for the applied coding system lies in the fact that additional variants exist which are only present or much more common in the U.S. Such variants were coded as U.S.-rhymes no matter whether they are actually majority usage in the United States or not. As in the case of all other variables the primary concern of this study is not an investigation of Canadian behaviour, as had been the case in the *Survey*, but the attempt to explain or at least correlate intra-Canadian differences, i.e. shifts in frequency, with non-linguistic factors.

Lexical Variation

The last part of the questionnaire contains questions asking for lexical information. Two variables have been used in this study, a U.S.-U.K. dichotomy and a group containing Canadianisms. Two questions which had originally been in this part of the questionnaire were excluded from the calculations. One asks whether the "metal or plastic container used to carry water" is called a *pail* or a *bucket*. The question had been included in the U.S.-U.K. dichotomy with *pail* being the U.S. choice. All the dictionaries consulted record that the difference between

pail and *bucket* - if existing - is a question of the material rather than a question of British vs American usage. Incidentally, the answers to this question are evenly divided with exactly 50 per cent using both names equally frequently. The other item which was excluded is the choice of *basement* or *cellar* for "the underground or partially underground part of the house beneath the ground floor." *Basement* had been coded as Canadian usage. The definition used for the question containing the phrase "underground or partially underground" is almost identical to the definition of *basement* in all consulted dictionaries. *Cellar*, on the other hand, is below the ground for all dictionaries (if it is part of a house) and used as a storage place e.g. for food, coals, etc. Webster's states that it sometimes has an unfinished interior and can be distinguished from basement. The OED describes *basement* as "the lowest storey (not a cellar) of a building, especially when sunken below the ground." Answers to this question will either reflect the type of house the subjects were thinking of, specifically the use of underground space in that house, or the clue "partially underground"will automatically trigger the choice *basement*. In both cases the question would be pointless. The overwhelming result of 94.5 per cent[39] in favour of *basement*

is most likely the result of both considerations.

4L U.S.-U.K. dichotomy: The following is a list of the items used to test Canadian lexical variation with regard to U.S.-U.K. differences. The order is that of the questionnaire:

American Choice	British Choice
mailman	postman
frosting (hard substance)	icing
frosting (soft substance)	icing
fries, french fries	chips
gutters	eaves troughs
fall	autumn
creek	brook
toward	towards
suspenders	braces
faucet	tap
depot (for train)	station
depot/terminal (for bus)	station
stove/range	cooker
pot	saucepan
vacuum (cleaner)	hoover
swim suit	bathing suit
pants	trousers
sack	bag
rent	let
shades	blinds

Mailman/postman: The RHD, Webster's, the OED and the DCE all contain both entries, define them in the same way, and sometimes give cross-references. Only the Oxford Advanced specifies under both entries that *mailman* is U.S. usage whereas *postman* is the form normally used in Great Britain. In the *Survey* 84.3 per cent preferred mailman, with the students even increasing that number. In the

present study 82 per cent favour *mailman*.

Frosting/icing: The choice between *frosting* and *icing* is given twice in the questionnaire to investigate possible usage differences depending on the consistency of the substance. The British dictionaries do not suggest a difference in meaning. The entry *frosting* is explained through a reference to *icing*, under which the definition is then offered. This treatment suggests that *icing* is the more common term in Great Britain. Webster's and the DCE do not differentiate the pair. Both entries are defined and contain mutual cross-references. The RHD although giving cross references in both cases suggests a possible difference in meaning. Whereas *frosting* is defined as being used for "coating or filling" a cake, *icing* is explained as being the "covering". With fillings generally being soft, there might be a nuance in meaning which would make *icing* the preferred word for hard substances. The *Survey* confirmed such a possible difference in a Canadian situation. Whereas only 25 per cent chose *frosting* for the hard substance covering cakes, 41 per cent did so if the covering was soft. About 16 per cent of the Canadians surveyed use both terms with a difference in meaning which is not explicitly given in any dictionary. In this study the number of subjects using *frosting* is considerably

smaller, but the trend to differentiate is still present: 8.6 per cent choose frosting for the hard substance compared to 14.1 per cent who do so if it is soft.

(French) fries/chips: *(French) fries* is a term typical for North America. All North American dictionaries (RHD, Webster's, DCE) list the term and define it. The British sources either do not contain it at all or explain it as being the U.S. term for *chips*. *Chips* is defined in this meaning without labels in the Oxford Advanced, and described as the British term for *french fries* by the American dictionaries. The DCE defines *chips* only as "thin fried slices of potato" for which the British would use *crisps*. The *Survey* did not confirm the DCE. Thirty-five per cent used *chips* in the sense of *french fries*. Among students this percentage decreased slightly, but "on the Prairies and in B.C. *chips* is the preferred term among adults" (Scargill and Warkentyne, 1972: 94). In this study 45 per cent opt for *chips* in the sense of *french fries*.

Gutters/eavestroughs: All dictionaries define *gutters* without labels. The term *eavestroughs* is not listed in the British dictionaries or the RHD. Webster's and the DCE list and define it by reference to gutters. *Troughs* in this sense is defined in the OED, RHD, Webster's and the

DCE. *Eavestroughs* seems to be receding in all of the countries concerned, but possibly faster in the U.S. (cf Scargill and Warkentyne, 1972: 99). The Oxford Advanced, the most recently published dictionary, lists neither *eavestroughs* nor *troughs* in this sense. In Canada the term is used quite commonly. In the 1972 *Survey* 60 per cent of all informants chose *eavestroughs*, only 25 per cent opted for *gutters* and 15 per cent - among them many students - reported their use of another name. In this study which only offered a choice between *gutters* and *eavestroughs* 52 per cent favoured the latter. It seems that this usage is more typically Canadian than British or U.S., and the question should probably be removed from this variable.

Fall/autumn: The British dictionaries label *fall* as U.S. usage. *Autumn* is defined by all dictionaries. Both American sources refer to *fall*, the Oxford Advanced mentions that the U.S. term for *autumn* is *fall*, and the OED gives a definition without reference to *fall*. The DCE defines both terms without labels or cross-reference. The definitions are almost identical. One metaphorical meaning, however, is only listed for *autumn:* "time of maturity and beginning of decay." It seems that whereas the U.S. and the U.K. definitely favour one term over the other, Canadians use both with a possible difference in nuances of meaning

emerging. In the *Survey* 64 per cent preferred *fall*, only 10 per cent opted for *autumn*, and 26 per cent used both names among them more students than adults. In this study 29.7 per cent mark choice C indicating they use both terms with equal frequency. Choice B received most answers (35.9 per cent) implying a higher frequency of *fall* but with *autumn* also occurring. On the basis of the method of calculation used so far (cf note 39) the percentages are 72.6 per cent in favour of *fall*, 27.4 per cent in favour of *autumn*.

Creek/brook[40]: The DCE and Webster's define *creek* in the sense of a small river without restricting labels. The OED, the Oxford Advanced and the RHD specify this definition as "U.S. and British colonies", "North American", and "U.S., Canada, and Australia", respectively. In British English the term is used with different meanings, e.g. for a small inlet of the sea or a river emptying into such an inlet. *Brook* is defined by all dictionaries with Webster's pointing out that it is "in general literary usage but as a common term only [used] in Britain and New England." The DCE defines *creek* without cross-reference and refers to *creek* after a definition of *brook*. The *Survey* showed divided usage in Canada as a whole with 56 per cent for *creek*, 44 per cent for *brook*. In a break-up of the

provinces only Quebec showed this kind of divided usage; in the Atlantic provinces *brook* was definitely dominant; in the Canadian West the same holds for *creek*. This study having been conducted in the West shows a strong preference for *creek* (82 per cent).

Toward/towards: All consulted dictionaries list both spellings for the preposition *toward(s)* with no difference in definition or indication of geographically varied usage. The original coding of the variable was based on publishing practices in the U.S. and the U.K. Only the *American Heritage Dictionary*[41] gives an indication that *toward* might be more common in the U.S. *Toward* is the major entry followed by "also *towards*". The present study shows a 78.9 per cent preference for the spelling with *s*.

Suspenders/braces: Webster's defines *suspenders* without a label. The OED, Oxford Advanced and RHD agree that it is a chiefly U.S. term for which the British equivalent is *braces*. *Braces* is defined in all dictionaries and labelled as British by the RHD and the Oxford Advanced. The DCE lists and defines both terms without labels. The pair was not part of the *Survey;* only 11 per cent use *braces* in this study.

Faucet/tap: All North American dictionaries define *faucet* without a label and refer to *tap*. The OED labels *faucet*

as dialectal and U.S., the Oxford Advanced as especially U.S. The North American dictionaries refer to *faucet* after a definition of *tap*, the OED merely defines the word, and the Oxford Advanced points out that the usual word in the U.S. is *faucet*. The *Survey* gave a choice of four terms - *spigot* and *valve* in addition to *tap* and *faucet* - and presented the choice twice, once referring to the device outdoors, the other time indoors. In both cases *tap* received the highest percentages - though slightly less for the outdoor device (Scargill and Warkentyne, 1972: 87). In this study subjects are only asked to name the indoor device and the percentage favouring *tap* over *faucet* is 92 per cent. Among those who chose either *tap* or *faucet* for the indoor device in the *Survey* exactly the same percentage favoured *tap*.

Depot, terminal/station: *Terminal* is defined by all dictionaries as the *end* of a transportation line, rail, bus, or air. *Station* is defined as any stopping place with railway being used as an example in most dictionaries. *Depot* is defined by Webster's and the DCE as a rail or bus station or terminal. The RHD claims general use of *bus depot* but restricts the use of *depot* for railways in this sense to the U.S. The Oxford Advanced defines bus or railway *depot* as U.S. usage. The OED mentions the use

of *depot* only for a railway station and labels it U.S.

The results of the *Survey* were the following:

> While almost all Canadians refer to the place where one catches a train as *station* (train or railway station), they are divided on the name for the stopping place for buses. About 35 per cent refer to both as *station*, and the rest use *bus depot* and *bus terminal*, with *depot* being the preferred usage in the West (Manitoba to the Pacific) and *terminal* highest for the Eastern Provinces. (Scargill and Warkentyne, 1972: 90)

In the present study 93 per cent use *station* in connection with trains, but only 25 per cent do so when speaking about buses.

Stove, range/cooker: All dictionaries define *stove* and *range* in the required meaning, some of them specifying *range* as larger (OED, RHD). In their definition of *cooker*, however, the dictionaries vary. British dictionaries define it as a stove. Webster's also offers this meaning but restricts it to British usage. The RHD and DCE define it as a small apparatus or container to cook food *in*, for example, a pressure cooker, but not in the sense of stove. The question was not part of the *Survey*. The present results show an unanimous use of *stove* or *range*. Only one student (1.6 per cent) claims to use *cooker* in this sense.

Pot/saucepan: Dictionaries do not give any indication of nationally stratified usage of the two terms. Both terms

are defined in all dictionaries without any cross-reference. However, based on my own experiences which conform to the original coding of the question I decided to leave it under this variable. The item was not part of the *Survey*, and the present results show a 76.6 per cent preference for *pot*.

Vacuum (cleaner)/hoover: *Vacuum (cleaner)* is listed and defined by all dictionaries. *Hoover* in the same sense is not recorded in any of them apart from the Oxford Advanced where it is listed in capitalized form as a "kind of vacuum cleaner". Only two informants in this study do not mark the exclusive use of *vacuum cleaner*, one of them is undecided, the other claims to use *hoover*. The question was not part of the *Survey* and should not have been included in this questionnaire either. The unanimous answers will bias the variable mean of 4L in favour of American usage but do not affect calculations where an absolute value is unimportant because it cannot influence correlations.

Swim suit/bathing suit: Both American dictionaries list and define *bathing suit*. Webster's adds a cross-reference to *swim suit*. *Swim suit* is listed in both American dictionaries but only explained through a reference to *bathing suit*. None of the terms is listed in the OED.

The Oxford Advanced defines both without cross-reference but labels *bathing suit* as "now dated". Presumably the dominant and fashionable term in Britain is now *swim suit* or a more specific term such as *bikini* or *swimming trunks*. The DCE lists and defines both without a distinction.[42] For the Canadians of this sample *bathing suit* does not seem to be outdated at all. It is the preferred name for 91.5 per cent of the students. The coding of this question under 4L is not backed up by dictionaries and seems problematic. The results might show a typically Canadian behaviour not following either American or British patterns - at least according to dictionary information. The result of this question will bias the variable mean towards the British end of the scale, but not affect the correlations to a noticable extent.

Pants/trousers: *Trousers* is defined by American and British dictionaries; only the RHD gives a cross-reference to *pants*. Both American dictionaries list *pants* without labels or restrictions. The OED calls *pants* a "vulgar abbreviation of pantaloons, chiefly U.S." The Oxford Advanced does not label it as vulgar or American, but gives a more restricted definition using the word "tight-fitting". The DCE lists and defines both terms and explains in a usage note: "In formal usage the word for

men's breeches is *trousers*; on the other levels the word is *pants*." It might be added that parallel to a differentiation according to linguistic style, i.e., formal vs informal language usage, there is a differentiation affected by the style of the garment for some speakers: What men wear to formal occasions is more likely to be called *trousers* than a pair of jeans.[43] The question was not part of the *Survey*; in this study 87.5 per cent opted for pants.

Sack, bag: *Bag* is defined in all dictionaries in a very general way which easily includes the grocery bag as required here. *Sack*, however, is not defined in this meaning in the British dictionaries, but is restricted to large bags made of strong material, usually cloth. Only Webster's records the paperbag meaning for *sack* without labelling it and even shows an illustration of a paperbag under *sack*. RHD and DCE define *sack* in the British way and add that it can refer to any bag in the U.S. The results of this study show that almost all Canadians (98.5 per cent) prefer *bag* in this context.

Rent/let: *Let* is defined in the required sense by all dictionaries; Webster's labels it as chiefly British. *Rent* is listed in all dictionaries in this sense of granting the use of property. Whereas all other dictionaries record

this meaning second after the meaning to pay for the use of property, the RHD reverses the order. Only 4 per cent of the present sample report preferring the British term *let*.

Shades/blinds: All dictionaries define *blinds* without labels. Both American dictionaries also define *shades* without labels, and Webster's chose to use an illustration under *shades* only. The British dictionaries label *shades* in this sense as U.S. usage. The DCE defines both without restrictions and gives cross-references. The present sample shows a definite preference for *blinds* (72 per cent).

With U.S. usage coded as -1, U.K. usage as +1, the sample mean of the entire variable is -0.054. Again this value is not an indication of the actual position of Canadian lexical use between American and British patterns, but only reflects the particular choice of questions, purposely selected to investigate areas of divided usage.

4N Canadianisms: After the exclusion of *cellar/basement* variable 4N only contains three questions.

Serviette/napkin: The choice between *napkin* and *serviette* accounts for two questions, asking subjects to name the item made of paper and that made of cloth separately to assess a possible semantic difference between the two terms.

All dictionaries list both names. Whereas British dictionaries define both with mutual cross references, both American dictionaries define only *napkin* and refer to that definition under *serviette*. Webster's labels *serviette* as the chiefly British term for *table napkin*. According to the OED, however, *serviette* "has latterly become to be considered vulgar." None of the dictionaries suggest a possible difference in meaning except for the Oxford Advanced which includes the following quote under the entry for serviette: "I prefer a linen napkin to a paper serviette." In the *Survey*, there was an even split among adults naming the paper item; *napkin*, however, was preferred for the cloth variety. To some of these Canadians *serviette* was only the paper article. The students of that sample increased the use of *napkin* and levelled out the distinction. The overall percentages were 37.5 per cent *serviette* for the paper article, 44.7 per cent for a cloth one. In the present study 38.3 per cent name the paper item *serviette* compared to 28.15 per cent who do so if the item is made of cloth. Just over 10 per cent distinguish between the two words. Because the decline in the popularity of *serviette* in British English as documented by the OED is paralleled by a Canadian preference for *napkin* the coding of this item under 4N seems problematic.

Chesterfield/sofa, davenport: Both American dictionaries list *chesterfield* in the sense of a *sofa* but label this meaning as chiefly Canadian in the case of the RHD and as British in the case of Webster's. The label 'British' does not seem to be very accurate. The OED does not record this sense of *chesterfield* at all, the Oxford Advanced makes it second choice after the definition in the sense of an overcoat. Only the DCE lists the sofa meaning of *chesterfield* as first choice and without labels. It is also interesting to note that the DCE refers to *chesterfield* in the definition of both other terms, *sofa* and *davenport*. No other dictionary gives any cross-reference to *chesterfield*. *Sofa* is defined by all dictionaries without labels and apart from the DCE without cross-references. *Davenport* is labelled as U.S. usage by the RHD and Oxford Advanced. Webster's does not label it, and the OED does not even list it in this sense. *Sofa* is the most generally used and understood term, *davenport* is typical for the U.S., and *chesterfield* definitely most common in Canada. In the *Survey* 87.1 per cent of those who marked one of the choices offered in this study decided for *chesterfield* (75.6 per cent of all Canadians surveyed). In the present study 85.1 per cent favour *chesterfield* out of which 57.8 per cent use it exclusively.

The "Canadian" choice was coded as +1, the other choices as -1. The resulting mean value of 4N is -0.029 - a not overly strong Canadian reaction caused by the problematic double coding of *serviette*.

Notes to Chapter V

[1]The variable labels have been created for computational purposes and do not have any significance. All attitudinal variables from multiple choice type questions are labelled 1 plus a letter, those rating people with semantic differentials 2 plus a letter, and the linguistic variables 4 plus a letter. For reasons of consistency and brevity the same labels are used in this study. A list of all variables with labels, names and coding value is given in Appendix B.

[2]As pointed out in the previous chapter, this scale is based on Gardner and Lambert, 1972: 149.

[3]The usual range of attitudinal variables is around 1.

[4]One might speculate that this reflects either balanced influence from both sides or typically Canadian ways distinct from both American and British.

[5]Originally an additional question was coded under this category: "Should Canada's ties with the British monarchy be severed?" A positive answer was interpreted and coded as a positive national identity. The results showed a negative correlation between the answers to this question and all other questions under the same variable. Suspecting that this inconsistency was due to the nature of the question, I asked other Canadians about their understanding of the question and reasons for their answers. Most of those who answered negatively, consider a severing of the ties with Britain detrimental to Canada's independence and identity. They see the United States as the main threat to Canadian identity not the U.K. In these cases a negative answer would have to be coded as positive identity. The question as presented cannot be interpreted and was therefore excluded from the variable.

[6]It is one of intensity rather than direction of attitude.

[7]The fairly low overall value of variable 1I might be caused by an unfortunate choice of questions and/or by intervening factors such as modesty or insecurity.

[8]The attributes for the semantic differentials are identical to those used by Gardner and Lambert, 1972: 157.

[9]Positive attributes were coded as +1, negative ones as -1 in all semantic differential scales.

[10]The fact that Canadians do not rate themselves as a group highest conforms to a pattern present throughout the study. Compare the preference of the U.S. and even more strongly the U.K. over Canada. Whether this pattern is the result of insecurity, a lack of self-confidence as a nation, or simply modesty cannot be decided from the data and is not of any great relevance as far as the aims of this study are concerned.

[11]The dictionaries which have been consulted and the abbreviations used in the text are listed as the first part of the bibliography.

[12]The results are published in Scargill and Warkentyne, 1972 and Scargill, 1974.

[13]It should be noted that the method of the original survey which provided the data for this study did call for an examination of audio recordings made of the respondents. (In addition to answering the questionnaire, each respondent was taped while reading a story which included all pronunciation variables.)

[14]Dictionaries use the IPA symbol [ɔ:] for the American sound as well as the British in spite of the difference in quality.

[15]cf Joos, 1942; Gregg, 1957; Polson, 1964; Orkin, 1970; Avis, 1972, 1973; Kurath, 1972; Scargill and Warkentyne, 1972; Chambers, 1973; Scargill, 1974.

[16]This is again paralleled by the results of the *Survey*.

[17]The same symbol is used in all four words; for *caught* a more rounded vowel is offered as a second optional variant. In his foreword Avis mentions that the *caught-cot* distinction is one made by very few Canadians (DCE, 1967: vii).

[18]Avis (1972, 1973) mentions the possibility of the third diphthong /ɔI/ also being affected. From my own casual observations I would say that this is present, but certainly not very common among Canadians.

[19]He points out that dialects of English differ in the extent to which the diphthongs are *lowered*. Whereas Standard British and General American do not restrict the application of the lowering rule in any way such that all diphthongs resulting from the Great Vowel Shift are lowered, other dialects restrict the application of the rule to certain phonological environments. Scottish and Scottish-Irish dialects, on the one hand, and Canadian English, on the other, differ in the phonological conditions for the rule.

[20]In the first dialect described by Joos, *t*-voicing would prevent raising so that *writer* and *rider* would be homophones. Morris Halle (1964) used these data presented by Joos as an argument for his proposal to explain certain kinds of language variation in terms of differences in rule ordering.

[21]An exception is the word *figure* which is pronounced without a glide in British English. In American English, however, it frequently receives a glide, and Canadian English allows both options.

[22]If [l] is preceded by a consonant, *y* is never inserted; if it is preceded by a vowel with primary or secondary stress, a glide regularly appears; and if [l] follows an unstressed vowel, the use of the glide is optional.

[23]With the possible exception of [z].

[24]The numbers reported for the pronunciation variants are based on the sum of those who marked the scale left or right of the centre. The choices A, B and D, E, respectively, are not distinguished in this context. The number of C answers, though part of the total, was not used in the arguments. It can therefore be assumed that the actual occurrence of pronunciation variants is higher rather than lower than the percentages reported here.

[25]Since the use of a y-glide after [l] and [s] is almost obsolete in Canada as well as the United States, the inclusion of *lute* and *suit* biased the mean of the entire variable considerably. On the other hand, bias towards reporting prestigious form might have been particularly strong in this variable.

[26]It should be noted that [t] is frequently omitted in intervocalic - *nt* - clusters in Canadian English such as in *Toronto, twenty, interview*. If *t, tt* or *nt* is preceded by a vowel and followed by syllabified [n], [t] is replaced by a glottal stop as in *button, fountain*, etc.

[27]Possible distinctions in spite of rule application have been suggested by Pilch (1955: 25, 86) as a contrast in the length of the preceding vowel in the case of American English, and by Lehn (1959: 91, 92) as a contrast between voiced fortis and voiced lenis in the case of Canadian English.

[28]In these cases the U.S. rhymes are by no means American Standard or majority usage, but rather minority pronunciations primarily or exclusively used in the U.S. and only recorded in American dictionaries.

[29]The presence of two pronunciation variants is the result of a difference in syllabification as pointed out by Scargill (1974: 51).

[30]Percentages reported for the 1972 *Survey* are my calculations from the raw numbers published. Whenever other choices were given in addition to those used in this study, they were disregarded in the calculation of percentages. The same holds for answers like "either way". The percentages of those who marked "either way" are given in parentheses in the text.

[31]According to the OED the pronunciation *zee* also had "some early currency in England".

[32]The Oxford Advanced lists [aI] as a possible U.S. variant for *anti-* only.

[33]The Oxford Advanced, however, lists only [ɛ].

[34]The two pronunciations are regionally distributed in the U.S. with [z] being more common in the south, [s] more common in the north. cf Hempl, 1896 and Atwood, 1950.

[35]From casual observation, most Canadians seem to be aware of this difference, and some adjust their pronunciation to the nationality of the *lieutenant* in question. Canadian Government positions such as lieutenant-governor are always pronounced with [lɛft].

[36]By listing [əI] as the second variant after [I] the OED does not represent modern British usage.

[37]In the OED [e] and [æ] are recorded in that order which does not reflect British usage as described in the other dictionaries.

[38]Caroll Reed observed with regard to the Pacific North West that the second variant is primarily used by "cultivated speakers" (1961: 562).

[39]For the calculation of percentages in the lexical section the following procedures were used unless otherwise mentioned. If the 1972 *Survey* had offered other words in addition to those used in this study, the number of such answers did not enter the calculations. In the case of "either way" answers, half of the category was added to either of the two choices in question. For the percentages of this study the answers favouring one name over the other ("always" one name plus "more often" one name) and half of those who answered "both equally frequently" were added. This method allows for a comparison between the two studies.

[40]*Creek/brook* was originally coded under a variable standard/non standard lexical choice which is not used in the present study. Based on the information described below, I changed the coding and included the item under this variable.

[41]*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. Boston: American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 1969.

[42]Based on casual observations it might be added that some speakers make a semantic distinction between the two terms. Female athletes are more likely to wear *swim suits* whereas old-fashioned garments worn by old ladies are *bathing suits*.

[43]Ladies never wear trousers in Canada unless the style of the garment is meant to resemble men's trousers, e.g. heavier material with pleats and cuffs.

CHAPTER VI

THE CORRELATIONS

Correlations Among Attitudinal Variables

As a test of the internal consistency of the questionnaire and a possible explanation for later correlations, Pearson product-moment correlations have been computed between all attitudinal variables. Among those variables which are based on responses to ideas, statements, and comparisons between Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States, the following pairs of variables correlate on a significance level of at least 5 per cent. A preference for Canada over the U.S. correlates highly significantly with a preference for Canada over the U.K. The same variable, preference for Canada over the U.S. also correlates at the 5 per cent level with a strong Canadian sense of identity, and interestingly at the 1 per cent level with a preference for the U.S. over the U.K. A preference for Canada over the U.K. also correlates with the same variable 1D, preference for U.S. over U.K., and with the related variable 1F, a positive attitude towards the U.S. relative to the U.K. in matters concerning Canada. 1D and 1F, a preference

for the U.S. over the U.K. in general and the same preference in matters concerning Canada, correlate with each other, as one might expect, at the 1 per cent level.

(1) r (1C, 1E) > 0 p = 0.001[1]
(2) r (1C, 1I) > 0 p = 0.013
(3) r (1C, 1D) > 0 p = 0.002
(4) r (1E, 1D) > 0 p = 0.001
(5) r (1E, 1F) > 0 p = 0.001
(6) r (1F, 1D) > 0 p = 0.001

Summing up these correlations it can be said that those who prefer Canada over the U.S. are likely to have a strong sense of a national identity, and to prefer Canada over the U.K. as well. In comparisons between the U.S. and the U.K., the same group rates the U.S. higher as a country in general as well as in matters concerning Canada.

In a comparison between the above variables measuring general attitudes towards the three countries, and the variables 2A-2D which measure attitudes towards ethnic groups, the following correlations are significant. A preference for Canada over the U.S. correlates with a negative attitude towards Americans, or in other words, a positive attitude towards Americans correlates with a preference for the U.S. over Canada (at the 5 per cent level). The preference for Canada over the U.K. does not correlate significantly with ratings of any ethnic group.

Strong feelings for a Canadian identity correlate at the 5 per cent level with a positive rating of Canadians. A more positive attitude towards the U.S. than the U.K. in matters relevant to Canada correlates with a positive attitude towards Americans on a 1 per cent level. A general preference for the U.S. over the U.K. correlates with a negative attitude towards Canadians.

(7) $r\ (1C, 2A) > 0 \quad p = 0.010$

(8) $r\ (1I, 2D) > 0 \quad p = 0.035$

(9) $r\ (1F, 2A) < 0 \quad p = 0.007$

(10) $r\ (1D, 2D) < 0 \quad p = 0.036$

The last correlation is somewhat surprising, considering that the same variable, preference for the U.S. over the U.K., also correlates with a preference for Canada over any other country (correlations 3 and 4). A possible explanation can be obtained from an examination of the correlations among the attitudinal ratings themselves. All of these rating variables correlate very significantly with each other, in fact, with one exception all correlations are significant at the 1 per cent level. The only correlation at the 5 per cent level is that between the attitude towards Americans and the attitude towards Scots.

(11)	r	(2A, 2B)	>	0	p = 0.001
(12)	r	(2A, 2C)	>	0	p = 0.013
(13)	r	(2A, 2D)	>	0	p = 0.002
(14)	r	(2B, 2C)	>	0	p = 0.001
(15)	r	(2B, 2D)	>	0	p = 0.001
(16)	r	(2C, 2D)	>	0	p = 0.001

These very strong correlations among all ethnic and national ratings suggest that the variables in question do not only indicate differences in attitudes towards certain groups, they also measure something which had not been intended originally. The correlations show that those who rate one group positively are very likely to rate all others positively too. What is being measured is the general attitude towards other people, which is probably affected by the personal psychological condition of the informants, their happiness, their feeling of being accepted in society, and similar factors. A few other correlations back up this theory. The two other variables using the same semantic differential scales elicit the informants' self-image. 2E shows how informants think others would rate them, and 2F how they think they really are. Both self-rating scales correlate positively at a significant level with all the ethnic or national ratings, and with each other.

(17) r (2E, 2A) > 0 p = 0.001
(18) r (2E, 2B) > 0 p = 0.007
(19) r (2E, 2C) > 0 p = 0.043
(20) r (2E, 2D) > 0 p = 0.001

(21) r (2F, 2A) > 0 p = 0.020
(22) r (2F, 2B) > 0 p = 0.003
(23) r (2F, 2C) > 0 p = 0.044
(24) r (2F, 2D) > 0 p = 0.001

(25) r (2E, 2F) > 0 p = 0.001

Those who have a high opinion of themselves are likely to think that others share that high opinion and are more prepared to rate all other people positively, too. Well-adjusted individuals have positive attitudes towards all groups named.

The correlation between a preference for the U.S. over the U.K. and a negative attitude towards Canadians (correlation 10) which seemed inconsistent at first can now be explained in different terms. At the 10 per cent level the same variable (1D) also correlates with a low attitude towards the Scots and towards the English. It can be concluded that a preference for the U.S. over the U.K. is associated with a generally low attitude towards other people. The highly significant correlations between such a preference and low self-rating values support this hypothesis.

(26) r (1D, 2B) < 0 p = 0.077
(27) r (1D, 2C) < 0 p = 0.097
(28) r (1D, 2E) < 0 p = 0.005
(29) r (1D, 2F) < 0 p = 0.019

The only ethnic or national rating not correlating negatively with 1D is variable 2A measuring the attitude towards Americans. This fact is not surprising since 1D measures a preference for the U.S. The positive correlation between a preference for the U.S. over the U.K. and a high attitude towards Americans makes the negative correlation between this variable and attitudinal ratings in general insignificant. These results confirm the earlier hypothesis that variables 2A-2D measure two different phenomena: not only the actual differences in attitude towards the ethnic groups, but also a general feeling of well-being, a feeling of being accepted in society which leads to an acceptance of other people.

Variable 1A, anomie, measures another aspect of well-being: the individual's social dissatisfaction as manifested in his feelings about situations, the present, the future, society in general. As expected, this variable correlates negatively with the two measuring personal satisfaction.

(30) r (1A, 2E) < 0 p = 0.006
(31) r (1A, 2F) < 0 p = 0.022

The higher a person's self-esteem, the less likely he will have feelings of anomie. There are no significant correlations between anomie and any of the ethnic or national ratings, suggesting that the variable measures a phenomenon which is related to the satisfaction resulting from a high self-esteem but not identical to it. The correlation pattern involving anomie is different from that of 2E or 2F. The latter two variables show exactly the same correlation pattern, with 2F generally correlating at a slightly lower level of significance. Apart from correlating with all ethnic ratings (correlations 17-24) and with 1D, the preference for the U.S. over the U.K. (correlations 28, 29), both 2E and 2F correlate positively with a strong Canadian identity.

(32) $r\ (2E, 1I) > 0 \quad p = 0.048$

(33) $r\ (2F, 1I) > 0 \quad p = 0.069$

Only correlation 32 involving 2E is significant at a level accepted in this study, but correlation 33 supports the trend. Anomie 1A is related to differences in attitude towards three countries: Canada, the U.S., and the U.K. At the 5 per cent level there are correlations with a preference for Canada over any other country. In a direct comparison between the U.S. and Great Britain, high anomie correlates with a preference for the U.S. in general (at 5 per cent) and in matters concerning Canada (at 10 per cent).

(34) r (1A, 1C) > 0 p = 0.049
(35) r (1A, 1E) > 0 p = 0.027
(36) r (1A, 1D) > 0 p = 0.031
(37) r (1A, 1F) > 0 p = 0.037

The higher feelings of anomie, i.e., the less secure and socially satisfied a person is, the more likely he is to prefer Canada over the U.S. and the U.K. Comparing the U.S. and the U.K., the same person will tend to favour the U.S.

The conclusions from correlations among attitudinal variables can be summed up in the following hypotheses:

(1) The variables, rating and comparing the three countries, Canada, Great Britain, and the United States are internally consistent. Preferences for the same country in different variables correlate with each other. The two variables comparing the U.S. with the U.K. are highly significantly correlated. There is no evidence that the variables might measure a phenomenon drastically different from the originally intended one.

(2) Three variables can be grouped as measures of satisfaction and contentedness: 2E, 2F, and negative 1A. They are all significantly correlated with each other. 2E and 2F seem to measure something very similar. They both show the same correlation pattern with other

attitudinal variables. 1A, however, though related, measures a different phenomenon - social rather than personal satisfaction - and shows different correlations.

(3) The national group ratings 2A-2D are all highly correlated with each other and with the self-rating scales. This indicates that in addition to their originally intended purpose they comprise a fourth happiness or satisfaction measure which can be grouped with those described under hypothesis 2. Differences in their correlation pattern show that they also serve their intended purpose, i.e., measure differences in national ratings. For the further discussion, the combined appearance of all or many national rating variables in correlations will be interpreted as a correlation with personal satisfaction, the single appearance of one or a difference in the level of significance as a correlation with actual attitudes towards national groups.

(4) All correlations between ethnic semantic differentials and multiple-choice-type variables are consistent. A positive attitude towards Canadians correlates with a strong sense of a Canadian national and linguistic identity. A high opinion of Americans correlates with a preference for the U.S. over the U.K. in

matters concerning Canada. The positive attitude towards Americans is indirectly related to a preference for the U.S. over the U.K. in general in the fact that it makes the overall negative correlations with the attitudes towards all other national groups, i.e. towards other people in general, insignificant in the case of Americans.

(5) A striking combination of 14 different significant correlations, all described above, can be summed up in the following tendencies. Those who favour Canada over the U.K. also favour her over the U.S.; they are likely to prefer the U.S. over the U.K. in all variables and tend to have a fairly strong sense of a Canadian identity. This entire pattern is positively correlated to anomie, i.e., the higher feelings of social dissatisfaction, the more likely all of the above choices. The preference for the U.S. over the U.K. only, is negatively related to both self-rating scales and to all national ratings apart from the variable involving Americans. In other words, those who do not have a very high opinion of themselves or any other people (except Americans) are more likely to favour the U.S. over the U.K. Of course, the reverse of all the above holds too, e.g., positive ratings for people in general and a high self-

evaluation are correlated with a preference for the U.K. over the U.S.

Correlations Among Linguistic Variables

Many linguistic features correlate significantly with one another. If the resulting likely combinations of linguistic properties show consistent patterns, they manifest 'dialects' in a wide sense of the word. To test possible underlying principles of linguistic behaviour, the variables can be grouped. Correlations between features associated with an underlying principle are then expected to be significant. My particular choice of principles and features associated with them is arbitrary though consistent with the set-up of the questionnaire and with generally accepted notions about the existence of such language varieties as American English and British English and their characteristics.[2] Four underlying principles were established, and correlations among the groups of features characteristic of each principle were tested. The first group contains features which are usually associated with American English: a lack of *y*-glides (4E), a tendency to voice and/or flap *t* (4I), the use of U.S. pronunciation for certain words (4J), and the use of U.S. lexical items (4L). The second group combines

linguistic behaviour typical for British English such as a distinction of vowels before *r* (4A), the use and distinction of low back vowels (4C), the presence of a *y*-glide (4E), no *t*-flapping (4I), the use of British pronunciations for individual words (4J), and British lexical items (4L). The third group consists of typically Canadian features not present in either American or British English: complete absence of low back vowel distinctions (4C), diphthong raising (4D), and typically Canadian lexical choices (4N). The last group is a combination of all those features which can be seen as the result of an underlying principle we might call "correctness principle" for the lack of a better term. Often these linguistic choices are prescribed by dictionaries; in most cases they are pronunciation variants following the spelling more closely. The label "correctness-principle" is not meant to imply that these features characterize proper English speech. In fact, some of them are minority pronunciations exhibiting more distinctions and following the spelling more closely than is typical for the standard defined as majority usage. The features used to test such an underlying principle are the following: distinctive vowels before *r* (4A), consistent syllable distinctions (4B), the use of a distinctive low back vowel (4C), the

use of a *y*-glide (4E), presence of a *wh*-feature (4F), vowel retention (4H), and absence of *t*-flapping (4I). All variables of the linguistic part of the questionnaire are contained in at least one of the above four groups; some variables can be used to test more than one principle.

Out of the six possible combinations of features characterized as American, five pairs correlate at a significant level. The absence of a *y*-glide correlates with the use of U.S. pronunciations of certain words and the use of U.S. lexical items at the 1 per cent level of significance. *T*-flapping correlates with both U.S. pronunciation variants and U.S. lexical choices at the 5 per cent level. And finally the use of U.S. pronunciation variants for individual words increases the chances of also using U.S. vocabulary at the 1 per cent level of significance.

(38) r (4E, 4J) > 0 p = 0.001
(39) r (4E, 4L) > 0 p = 0.003
(40) r (4I, 4J) > 0 p = 0.040
(41) r (4I, 4L) > 0 p = 0.036
(42) r (4J, 4L) > 0 p = 0.001

This high incidence of significant correlations within the group of "American" features confirms that an underlying principle of following American English speech habits consistently is present in the sample at least for some of the subjects.

The same can be said for a tendency to use British speech forms consistently. Out of fifteen different possible pairs of features, eleven correlate at a significant level. The use of distinctive vowels before *r* correlates with the use of a low back vowel at the 1 per cent level, with the presence of a *y*-glide at the 10 per cent level, with a lack of *t*-flapping at the 1 per cent level, with the preference for U.K. pronunciation variants at the 5 per cent level of significance, and with a preference for U.K. lexical items at the 1 per cent level. The use of a low back vowel correlates with U.K. lexical choices (5 per cent), as does the presence of a *y*-glide which also correlates with the use of U.K. pronunciation variants for individual words (both at 1 per cent). The lack of *t*-flapping correlates with both U.K. pronunciation variants and U.K. lexical choice at the 5 per cent level. The preference for U.K. pronunciation variants correlates with the preference for U.K. lexical choices.

(43) r (4A, 4C) > 0 p = 0.001
(44) r (4A, 4E) > 0 p = 0.069
(45) r (4A, 4I) > 0 p = 0.002
(46) r (4A, 4J) > 0 p = 0.033
(47) r (4A, 4L) > 0 p = 0.001
(48) r (4C, 4L) > 0 p = 0.014
(49) r (4E, 4J) > 0 p = 0.001
(50) r (4E, 4L) > 0 p = 0.003
(51) r (4I, 4J) > 0 p = 0.040
(52) r (4I, 4L) > 0 p = 0.036
(53) r (4J, 4L) > 0 p = 0.001

Of the features exclusively typical of Canadian English two correlate, although only at the 10 per cent level. Diphthong raising is correlated to Canadian lexical choices.

(54) r (4D, 4N) < 0 p = 0.096[3]

The group of variables used to test the underlying principle of "correctness" allows for 21 different pairs of features. Thirteen of those did show correlations at a significant level. The use of distinctive vowels before *r* correlates with syllabicity distinctions (1 per cent level) with the use of a distinctive low back vowel (1 per cent), and *y*-glide (10 per cent), the presence of a *wh*-feature (1 per cent), and the lack of *t*-flapping (1 per cent). Distinctive syllabicity correlates with the presence of a low back vowel (5 per cent), use of the *y*-glide (1 per cent) and the *wh*-feature (1 per cent). It correlates negatively with vowel deletion (5 per cent) and *t*-flapping (1 per cent). Presence of a *y*-glide correlates with presence of a *wh*-feature (1 per cent), which in turn correlates negatively with *t*-flapping (1 per cent). An avoidance of vowel deletions also correlates negatively with *t*-flapping (1 per cent).

(55) r (4A, 4B) > 0 p = 0.001
(56) r (4A, 4C) > 0 p = 0.001
(57) r (4A, 4E) > 0 p = 0.069
(58) r (4A, 4F) > 0 p = 0.009
(59) r (4A, 4I) > 0 p = 0.002
(60) r (4B, 4C) > 0 p = 0.024
(61) r (4B, 4E) > 0 p = 0.004
(62) r (4B, 4F) > 0 p = 0.002
(63) r (4B, 4H) > 0 p = 0.017
(64) r (4B, 4I) > 0 p = 0.001
(65) r (4E, 4F) > 0 p = 0.006
(66) r (4F, 4I) > 0 p = 0.005
(67) r (4H, 4I) > 0 p = 0.001

Eight of the linguistic correlations above have been listed twice: five of them once under the American group and once under the British group (38 and 49, 39 and 50, 40 and 51, 41 and 52, 42 and 53), and the remaining three once under the British group and once under the correctness principle (43 and 56, 44 and 57, 45 and 59). On the basis of all the above outlined correlation patterns the hypothesis is strengthened that there are underlying principles which influence speech and make it consistent overall. This does not imply that all of the subjects, much less all Canadian speakers follow one or more of the underlying principles in all cases, that some people are consistently American in their speech behaviour, some consistently British, some super-correct, others always 'sloppy'. It only suggests that

some combinations of speech habits are statistically more likely than others, or, in other words, if, for example, somebody uses one typically American feature in his speech, he is more likely to use more characteristics of American speech. Each additional feature which is part of an underlying principle increases the statistical probability for all the other features belonging to the same principle. The originally arbitarily chosen underlying principles have been demonstrated to be a powerful model for the explanation of linguistic behaviour. A very high number of intra-principle correlations show that most features are related. No single correlation with a significance level of up to 10 per cent error risk was found to contradict one of the principles. For example, no typically British feature correlated with a typically American one, no 'super-correct' feature correlated negatively with any other correctness feature, etc. A third argument in support of the idea of underlying principles and the actual choice of these specific principles is the fact that 22 out of all 25 significant correlations occurring could be explained as correlations between features of the same principle. The remaining three correlations are: the presence of the *wh*-feature is correlated with British pronunciation variants of individual lexical items and with British lexical choices,

and the use of British pronunciation variants correlates with the use of Canadian words (all at 5 per cent).

(68) r (4F, 4J) > 0 p = 0.020
(69) r (4F, 4L) > 0 p = 0.027
(70) r (4J, 4N) > 0 p = 0.021

Correlations 68 and 69 associate the *wh*-feature with British choices in pronunciation and vocabulary. This cannot be explained by the actual usage of the feature in Great Britain. Only in some parts of the U.K. is the feature present, whereas it is more frequent in the U.S. in general (Jones, 1972: 208). Another explanation is more plausible. The use of the *wh*-feature makes more distinctions possible and is closer to the spelling. The feature was therefore included in my "correctness" principle. Jones (1972: 208) supports this view, stating that "the use of M or wh is sometimes being taught as more 'correct'." The association between *wh*-use and U.K. choices might be the result of the assumption that U.K. speech is more proper and correct English than American English. More evidence for this assumption is the use of four features for the correctness principle as well as to demonstrate British English usage: distinctive vowels before *r*, presence of a low back vowel, use of the *y*-glide, and lack of *t*-flapping. These four features are involved in eighteen correlations out of which three correlations are

among the features themselves (43 = 56, 44 = 57, 45 = 59), eight between one of the four and the other correctness features (55, 58, 60, 61, 64 - 67), and seven between the four and other typically British features (46 - 52). The high correlations between these features and others of the "correctness" group as well as the British group justify their place in both principles and will effect an association between the two principles and even some correlations between other variables the two principles do not share, as is the case in correlations 68 and 69. The remaining correlation cannot be explained easily on linguistic grounds only: the use of typically Canadian lexical items correlates with British pronunciation of individual words.[4]

In summary, the following conclusions can be drawn from correlations among linguistic variables:

(1) There are certain principles which underly speech and tend to make linguistic behaviour consistent.

(2) The underlying principles in this case can be called American English and British English speech behaviour, possibly a Canadian English principle, and a principle I have called "correctness" principle for the lack of a more accurate term.

(3) The proof for the hypotheses (1) and (2) is threefold. Firstly, features combined under one principle are highly correlated with one another. Secondly, there are no contradicting correlations on any significant level. Thirdly, intra-principle correlations account for almost all of the significant correlations found between any linguistic variables.

(4) There seems to be a connection between the principle 'British English' and the "correctness" principle. Four features were grouped under both variables because in addition to three correlations among the four, they correlate eight times within the correctness principle and seven times within the British English principle. Two additional correlations between features of the "correctness" principle and features of the British English principle were significant and support the notion of a commonly made connection between the principles, whether on a conscious or unconscious level.

(5) The principles seem to constitute an adequate model for explaining the data. There is no evidence as to whether and to what degree the described principles operate on a conscious or unconscious level - supposing they actually do operate. All that can be offered in

this context is a possible tool for describing patterns of linguistic behaviour.

The Influence of Status and Generation

Behavioural patterns like attitudes and linguistic choices might be affected by, or at least correlate with, biographical variables. Two variables were tested as to their possible influence: the subjects' generation in Canada, as an indication of their linguistic and general integration into Canadian society, and the variable socio-economic status suggesting their position in that society. Correlations of both with all attitudinal and all linguistic variables have been computed with the following results: generation in Canada does not correlate significantly with any attitudinal variables. Status correlates negatively with anomie; the higher the socio-economic status, the less likely are feelings of anomie, dissatisfaction with the situation in general (5 per cent). Status also correlates negatively with a positive attitude towards Scots (at 5 per cent) and toward the English (just over 5 per cent), i.e. the lower the socio-economic status, the more likely a positive attitude towards the British groups. On the other hand, status correlates highly positively with a preference for the U.K. over Canada and also with a preference

for the U.K. over the U.S. in matters concerning Canada. The higher the socio-economic status, the stronger the orientation towards Great Britain rather than the United States. The British ideal becomes so strong that Great Britain is rated higher than Canada. In the light of these last two correlations, the positive attitude towards people from Great Britain, Scots and English associated with lower status might have to be interpreted as a generally higher evaluation of other people connected with lower status, rather than a specifically ethnic rating. There is no explanation, however, why the same correlations are not significant for the North American groups. The alternative interpretation would be: people of high socio-economic status favour British influence in Canada and even rate Great Britain higher than Canada as a country, but do not like British people as a group - a rather bizarre distinction.

(70) r (stat, 1A) < 0 p = 0.044
(71) r (stat, 2B) < 0 p = 0.024
(72) r (stat, 2C) < 0 p = 0.053
(73) r (stat, 1E) < 0 p = 0.009
(74) r (stat, 1F) < 0 p = 0.024

The following correlations between generation and linguistic variables were significant. The longer their families have lived in Canada, the more likely subjects merge vowels before *r* (5 per cent) and do not distinguish

low back vowels (5 per cent). A greater number of generations in Canada also increases the chances of Canadian vocabulary items being used (5 per cent).

(75) r (gen, 4A) < 0 p = 0.044
(76) r (gen, 4C) < 0 p = 0.012
(77) r (gen, 4N) > 0 p = 0.010

Status shows only two significant correlations with linguistic variables. At the 5 per cent level, it correlates negatively with vowel deletion; the higher the socio-economic status, the less likely a deletion of certain vowels in unstressed position. On a 1 per cent level, it correlates negatively with *t*-flapping: the higher the status, the smaller the tendency to flap *t* in certain environments.

(78) r (stat, 4H) > 0 p = 0.029
(79) r (stat, 4I) > 0 p = 0.007

The surprisingly low incidence of status correlations does not suggest that socio-economic factors are not very important, linguistically, in Canada. What can be assumed, however, is that most variables do not measure speech behaviour which is socially marked, but rather offer choices which are equally likely to be used in all levels of society and might be influenced by other factors such as attitudes.

Correlations Between Attitudinal and Linguistic Variables

The attitudinal variables as described in Chapter V can be grouped into two different categories, one consisting of ethnic-political attitudes, the other measuring happiness or satisfaction. The first category can be subdivided into variables testing attitudes connected with Canada, with Great Britain, and with the U.S. The happiness category also contains three subcomponents: one labelled anomie measuring feelings towards society in general and the subject's own position therein, the others measuring attitudes towards people, a self-evaluation, on the one hand, and an evaluation of other people in general, on the other. In an attempt to describe Canadian speech behaviour in areas where British English and American English differ and where both options are possible and used in Canada, the ethno-political attitudes are of great interest. To be able to test correlations between variables of this group and linguistic variables without a possible influence of the happiness category, partial correlations were computed. The desired correlations were tested controlling for variable 1A, anomie, and 2E and 2F, the self-rating scales. In a third step all correlations were re-calculated controlling for the biographical variables, generation and

socio-economic status, to assess the possible hidden influence those factors might have on linguistic behaviour and/or attitudes, even if it didn't reach a significant level. In a last step, the correlations between ethno-political attitudes and linguistic variables were tested controlling for all other variables: anomie, the self-rating scales, status, and generation. The following is a discussion of the significant correlations for each linguistic variable.

4A Vowel Before r: 4A shows three significant correlations with ethnic political variables. A preference for Canada over the U.K. increases the tendency to merge certain vowels before *r* (at 5 per cent). In other words, if the U.K. is given preference over Canada those vowels remain distinctive. On the other hand, a merging of the vowels is highly correlated to a positive attitude towards English people (1 per cent) and also - in this case consistent with the first correlation - with a positive attitude towards Canadians (at 5 per cent). Of the biographical variables, generation shows a significant correlation - such that a higher number of generations in Canada makes merging of the vowels more likely.

(80) r (4A, 1E) < 0 p = 0.032
(81) r (4A, 2C) < 0 p = 0.005
(82) r (4A, 2D) < 0 p = 0.044
(83) r (4A, gen) < 0 p = 0.044

Correlations 80, 82 and 83 are all consistent, suggesting that the merging of vowels before *r* is a Canadian behaviour, which is more likely, the longer the family has been in Canada, and which is associated with positive attitudes towards Canada and Canadians. Correlation 81, however, is hard to explain in this context. Partial correlations did not shed much light on the situation. Controlling for generation did not have any effect upon the correlation pattern, it did not even change the levels of significance. Neither did controlling for status. To assess the importance of the happiness factor, which might have influenced correlations 82 and 83, anomie and the self-rating scales were held constant. The effect was a slight weakening of correlation 80 (p = 0.055), but correlations 82 and 83 both reached a significance level of 1 per cent. Controlling for both biographical variables and all non-political attitudes did not change much. The correlations in this case do not follow a consistent and easily explainable pattern. On the one hand, vowel merging is correlated positively with Canadian factors, among them a preference for Canada over the U.K., on the other hand with a positive

attitude towards the British which cannot be interpreted as a manifestation of a generally positive evaluation of other people.

4B Syllabicity: A dropping of certain unstressed syllables which are prescribed in the pronunciation guides of dictionaries is more common among subjects who rated Americans positively - a correlation significant at 5 per cent - and also among those who show feelings of anomie.

(84) r (4B, 2A) < 0 p = 0.019
(85) r (4B, 1A) < 0 p = 0.034

When controlling for generation and status, correlation 84 remains significant at 5 per cent, 85 is weakened to 10 per cent (p = 0.066). In addition, correlations with all other ethnic ratings reach a significance level of at least 10 per cent.

(86) r (4B, 2B) < 0 p = 0.045
(87) r (4B, 2C) < 0 p = 0.061
(88) r (4B, 2D) < 0 p = 0.069

controlling for generation and status

Controlling for all non-political or ethnic variables, this pattern remains almost unchanged. The variable is connected with a positive attitude towards Americans, but no other ethno-political attitudes. Feelings of anomie suggesting low ratings on a happiness scale increase the chances of syllables being dropped. Partial correlations show that a positive evaluation of other people in general

has the same effect. Although both factors have been grouped under a happiness scale, these correlations do not contradict each other. As pointed out in the first part of this chapter, anomie and the evaluation of people are not correlated significantly; they measure different aspects of happiness or satisfaction. In this case, those who are happy with other people, i.e. evaluate them positively, but are unhappy with their present situation are most likely to drop syllables, even more so if they like Americans.

4C Low Back Vowel: The lack of a distinctive low back vowel and resulting merging of pairs like *caught-cot, bother-father* is a typically Canadian behaviour (cf Chapter V). The correlation pattern of this variable shows that it is also directly connected with positive attitudes towards Canada and Canadians. Those with strong feelings for a Canadian national and linguistic identity are more likely to merge low back vowel distinctions (5 per cent level), and the longer their family has been in Canada, the more frequently they do so (5 per cent). At the 10 per cent level two more correlations are significant: a preference for Canada over the U.S. and a positive attitude towards Canadians are connected with a loss of the vowel distinction. Controlling for status and generation does not change the other correlations much. If anomie and the self-

rating scales are controlled for, both 10 per cent correlations become stronger, the one involving a preference for Canada over the U.S. reaching the 5 per cent level.

(89) r (4C, 1C) < 0 p = 0.033 controlling for anomie and the self-rating scales

(90) r (4C, 1I) < 0 p = 0.012

(91) r (4C, 2D) < 0 p = 0.072 same as above

(92) r (4C, gen) < 0 p = 0.012

Variable 4C, measuring a typically Canadian linguistic behaviour, is related to positive attitudes towards Canada and Canadians and to the number of generations the family has lived in Canada. No other attitudinal or biographical variables correlate significantly.

4D Diphthong Raising: Diphthong raising is another typically Canadian feature, often used as a shibboleth to detect a Canadian. The correlation pattern, however, is much less conclusive than in the case of 4C. There is only one significant zero-order correlation involving an ethno-political variable. A positive attitude towards Americans correlates negatively with diphthong raising, the higher the evaluation of Americans, the less diphthong raising occurs or is reported. The variable is highly correlated with both self-rating scales. The higher the self-ratings as the subjects think others would see them

and in their own opinion, the less diphthong raising is likely - both correlations significant at a 1 per cent level. A positive correlation between the number of generations in Canada and the raising of diphthongs is possible, but the chances of making an error in this observation are very close to 10 per cent.

(93) r (4D, 2A) > 0 p = 0.035
(94) r (4D, 2E) > 0 p = 0.003
(95) r (4D, 2F) > 0 p = 0.003
(96) r (4D, gen) < 0 p = 0.092

If anomie and the self-rating scales are controlled for, all other correlations lose their significance. This inconsistent correlation pattern might be due to problems connected with the eliciting of the raw data. The medium of the questionnaire requires that people are aware of their speech habits. That this is not always the case is obvious to anybody trying to teach his native language to foreigners without having been trained to do so. As pointed out in the linguistic discussion of the variable, the low mean value for 4D might have been the result of such an unawareness or of a bias towards spelling. Whatever the reasons, the questionnaire results do not seem to capture this feature adequately. Self-rating variables are the only ones which show significant correlations. Conclusions are difficult if not impossible, but the data do suggest one interesting

hypothesis: linguistic behaviour which is not conscious, which cannot be reported because the speaker is not aware of it, is not related to any attitude of an ethno-political nature. Although this feature is typically Canadian, many Canadians do not seem to be aware of it, and its use or at least reporting its use does not correlate with any "Canadian" attitudes.

4E Y-Glide: The absence of the *y*-glide in certain environments as tested in this variable is typically associated with American English, and the correlation patterns show that it is connected with "North American" attitudes. At the 5 per cent level the variable correlates negatively with a positive attitude towards Americans. The higher the attitude towards Americans, the fewer glides are used. A positive attitude towards Canadians correlates in the same way at just over 5 per cent. At the 10 per cent level, a preference for the U.S. over Great Britain and also a preference for Canada over Great Britain increase the likelihood of glide-dropping. Status and generation do not show significant correlations, but if their effects are controlled for, the correlation between the dropping of the glide and a positive attitude towards Canadians reaches the 5 per cent level whereas that involving a positive attitude towards Americans drops to the 10 per cent

level. The country-comparison correlations undergo similar changes. The one rating Canada higher than the U.K. is strengthened and almost reaches 5 per cent, while the one comparing the U.S. and the U.K. drops below 10 per cent. In the happiness dimension dropping of the *y*-glide correlates with a positive self-evaluation, on a 5 per cent level with the subjects' own high opinion of themselves, and at just over 5 per cent with the high opinion they think others have of them. Related to that, positive ratings of all ethnic groups correlate at least at the 10 per cent level if status and generation are controlled for. Only correlations involving the evaluation of Americans (without a control) and Canadians (if status and generation are controlled for) reach the 5 per cent level. This difference in the strength of correlations suggests that only positive ratings of the North American groups reflect ethnic preferences; the others exhibit a generally positive view of all other people which goes along with a high self-opinion. Interestingly, strong feelings of anomie also increase the chances of *y*-glide dropping (at 10 per cent). Anomie and the attitude towards people in general, i.e. all happiness factors seem to have a strong effect on the variable 4E. A control for the biographical and all non-ethnic or political variables leaves only one

correlation significant (at 10 per cent): the preference for the U.S. over the U.K. is correlated with an absence of *y*-glides:

(96)	r	(4E, 2A)	<	0	p = 0.042	
(97)	r	(4E, 2D)	<	0	p = 0.045	controlling for
(98)	r	(4E, 2B)	<	0	p = 0.066	status and
(99)	r	(4E, 2C)	<	0	p = 0.064	generation
(100)	r	(4E, 1D)	<	0	p = 0.094	
(101)	r	(4E, 1E)	<	0	p = 0.054	controlling for status and generation
(102)	r	(4E, 2E)	<	0	p = 0.055	
(103)	r	(4E, 2F)	<	0	p = 0.023	
(104)	r	(4E, 1A)	<	0	p = 0.058	

Correlations 96, 97, 100, and 101 show a connection between positive attitudes towards North America and North Americans and the absence of the *y*-glide in certain environments. This phenomenon, however, seems to be inseparable from correlations 96 to 99 taken together and 102 to 104 - involving variables connected with the happiness factor - to such an extent that a control for anomie and the self-rating scales makes all other correlations, except (100) insignificant. It is interesting that feelings of anomie, a negative attitude towards the situation on a personal, national, and general level are related to a positive attitude towards other people and a high self-evaluation. Both phenomena, in turn, are related to positive feelings towards North America, the U.S. and Canada, and toward

North Americans. All of these attitudes increase *y*-glide dropping.

4F Wh-Feature: Strong feelings of a Canadian identity correlate with the use of the *wh*-feature at the 5 per cent level. There are no other significant ethno-political correlations. At the 10 per cent level there is a connection between a high number of generations in Canada and the lack of a *wh*-feature. A very strong correlation exists between feelings of anomie and the lack of a *wh*-feature. Those who are not content in the present situation are less likely to use a *wh*-feature (at 1 per cent). A control for anomie and the self-ratings as well as for status and generation does not affect the only ethno-political correlation, that between a strong sense of Canadian identity and the distinctive use of the *wh*-feature. In addition, the same group of controls shows a connection between positive ethnic ratings and the lack of a *wh*-feature.

(105)	r	(4F, 1I)	>	0	p = 0.044	
(106)	r	(4F, gen)	<	0	p = 0.069	
(107)	r	(4F, 1A)	<	0	p = 0.008	
(108)	r	(4F, 2A)	<	0	p = 0.061	controling for
(109)	r	(4F, 2B)	<	0	p = 0.026	anomie, self-
(110)	r	(4F, 2C)	<	0	p = 0.071	ratings, status,
(111)	r	(4F, 2D)	<	0	p = 0.071	and generation

High ethnic ratings and feelings of anomie decrease the chances of a *wh*-distinction, a strong sense of Canadian identity increases them.

4H Vowel Deletion: The pronunciation of all prescribed vowels including those in unstressed position correlates with a preference for Canada over the U.S. (at 5 per cent). Status also makes a retention of unstressed vowels more likely (at 5 per cent). When controlling for status and generation, the first correlation remains significant; it is even strengthened within the same level of significance. A positive attitude towards Americans and also towards Scots show correlations with vowel deletion at 10 per cent. If anomie and the self-rating scales are controlled for, these reach the 5 per cent level; so does the correlation between a positive attitude towards Canadians and the deletion of vowels.

(112)	r	(4H, 1C)	>	0	p = 0.031	
(113)	r	(4H, stat)	>	0	p = 0.029	
(114)	r	(4H, 2A)	<	0	p = 0.049	controlling for
(115)	r	(4H, 2B)	<	0	p = 0.047	anomie and self-
(116)	r	(4H, 2D)	<	0	p = 0.045	rating scales

If generation, status, anomie, and the self-rating scales are controlled for, only (112) remains significant at 5 per cent, is even strengthened slightly (p = 0.012), all other correlations are significant at 10 per cent. Correlation 114

is consistent with (112): a preference for Canada over the U.S. decreases vowel deletion, likewise, a preference for the U.S. over Canada increases it; so does a positive attitude towards Americans. However, correlations 115 and 116 are just as strong, which suggests that all three correlations involving ethnic ratings show a connection between a generally positive evaluation of other people and the deletion of certain vowels. The only rating which does not correlate involves the English, and this can be assumed to be the result of an ethnic preference. The higher the attitude toward the English, the less vowel deletion occurs. This compensates for the effect of an association between a generally high attitude towards all other people and an increase in vowel deletion, so that the correlation between vowel deletion and the attitude towards the British does not reach any level of significance. By way of summing up this correlation pattern, one can say that there are four significant correlation tendencies - three attitudinal and one biographical. High status decreases the chances of vowel deletion, so does a preference for Canada over the U.S. and a positive attitude towards the English. Generally high evaluations of other people, however, make vowel deletion more likely.

4I T-Flapping: In zero-order two-way correlations *t*-flapping correlates more highly with status than with any attitudinal variables. The higher the status, the less *t*-flapping occurs or at least is admitted (at 1 per cent). Strong feelings of anomie are positively related to *t*-flapping at the 5 per cent level. Three ethnic ratings, attitudes towards Americans, English and Scots correlate positively with *t*-flapping at the 5 per cent level, and the attitude towards Canadians does so at 10 per cent. Apparently, a generally positive attitude towards other people makes *t*-flapping more likely. The fact that the attitude towards Canadians does not show as strong a correlation as that towards other ethnic groups, suggests an intervening relation involving a preference for Canadians as a national group. A high attitude towards Canadians as compared to any other group decreases the chances of *t*-flapping. Two other correlations back up this hypothesis. A strong sense of a Canadian national and linguistic identity and a preference for Canada over the U.S. are both negatively correlated to *t*-flapping (at 10 per cent).

(117)	r	(4I, stat)	>	0	p = 0.007
(118)	r	(4I, 1A)	<	0	p = 0.033
(119)	r	(4I, 2A)	<	0	p = 0.042
(120)	r	(4I, 2B)	<	0	p = 0.019
(121)	r	(4I, 2C)	<	0	p = 0.044
(122)	r	(4I, 2D)	<	0	p = 0.095
(123)	r	(4I, 1C)	>	0	p = 0.057
(124)	r	(4I, 1I)	>	0	p = 0.076

If status and generation are controlled for, correlation 123 reaches a 5 per cent level of significance (p = 0.031), (124) becomes slightly stronger within the 10 per cent level, and all correlations involving ethnic ratings (119-122) are weakened. (119) and (120) drop to the 10 per cent level, and the others become insignificant. The correlation between anomie and *t*-flapping (118) disappears, too. Status seems to affect those variables labelled as 'happiness' indicators more than those measuring ethno-political attitudes. If all non-ethnic or political attitudes are controlled for, correlation 123 reaches the 1 per cent level of significance (S = 0.006), while (124) remains at 10 per cent. Of the ethnic ratings those involving Americans (119) and Scots (120) remain significant at 5 per cent, those involving the English (121) and Canadians (122) both only appear at 10 per cent significance. In a five-way control keeping status, generation, anomie, and the self-rating scales constant, correlation 123 becomes

even stronger at 1 per cent, only (119) remains at 5 per cent, (120) drops to 10 per cent and the others disappear. In uncontrolled two-way correlations the only correlation actually involving an ethnic or national preference appeared to be that between a positive evaluation of Canadians and the avoidance of *t*-flapping. It was manifested in a weakening of the correlation between positive ratings of all other people and an increase in *t*-flapping in the case of 2D where Canadians are evaluated. If either generation and status or anomie and the self-rating scales are controlled for, a preference for Canadians and for English people seems to be negatively related to *t*-flapping and to counteract the overall positive correlation between high evaluations of other people and *t*-flapping. If all non-political or ethnic variables are held constant, the only actual ethnic preference correlation seems to be that between a positive evaluation of Americans and the tendency to flap *t* (119) at 5 per cent. Possibly the same holds for the Scots (120) although the significance of the correlation drops to 10 per cent. This correlation does not directly reflect a Scottish speech behaviour. In Scottish English *t* in the environment in question is not voiced or flapped, but frequently replaced by a glottal stop. The attitudinal correlation pattern of variable 4I

is quite complex. First, there is a negative correlation between Canadian attitudes and *t*-flapping (123, 124, and the weakness of 122). A positive correlation can be found between anomie and *t*-flapping, and between a generally high rating of other people and *t*-flapping (118 and 119-122 taken together). If status which is negatively correlated with *t*-flapping and generation are controlled for, a negative correlation between a high evaluation of the English and *t*-flapping counteracts (121) and makes it insignificant. If anomie and the self-rating scales are held constant in addition to status and generation, only (119) remains significant: a positive correlation between *t*-flapping and a high opinion of Americans. In short, the statistical chances of *t*-flapping are increased by strong feelings of anomie, a high evaluation of other people in general, and a positive attitude towards Americans and possibly Scots, specifically. The likelihood of *t*-flapping is decreased by "Canadian" attitudes - the preference for Canada over the U.S., a strong sense of Canadian identity, and a positive evaluation of Canadians - and by a positive attitude towards the English.

4J Variation in the Pronunciation of Individual Words - U.S./U.K. Dichotomy: As might be expected, the use of British pronunciation variants correlates with positive attitudes towards Great Britain. At the 5 per cent level, British pronunciation correlates with a preference

for Great Britain over the U.S., or likewise, those who favour the U.S. over the U.K. are more likely to use American pronunciation. The same holds for a comparison between the U.S. and the U.K. in matters concerning Canada. Those who favour U.S. influence are more likely to use U.S. pronunciations, and those who prefer British influence also show this in their linguistic choice (10 per cent). A very strong correlation is that between a preference for the U.K. over Canada and the use of British pronunciation variants, or in other words, those who favour Canada over the U.K. use more U.S. pronunciations (1 per cent). On the other hand, a strong sense of a Canadian identity correlates with the use of U.K. pronunciation (just over 5 per cent). On a 10 per cent level, anomie is related to U.S. usage.[5]

(125) r (4J, 1D) < 0 p = 0.038
(126) r (4J, 1F) < 0 p = 0.050
(127) r (4J, 1E) < 0 p = 0.008
(128) r (4J, 1I) > 0 p = 0.058
(129) r (4J, 1A) < 0 p = 0.071

A control of status and generation has hardly any effect on the above correlations. Controlling for anomie weakens all of them; and if anomie and the self-rating scales are held constant, they all disappear except (127) which drops to the 5 per cent level. Controlling for status, generation, anomie, and self-ratings results in (125) and (126) being

significant at 10 per cent, only (127) at 5 per cent. A preference for the U.S. over the U.K. results in the use of U.S. pronunciation variants and vice versa. In this case a preference for Canada over the U.K. patterns analogously - a correlation which remains significant in all partial correlations. A strong sense of a Canadian identity, however, triggers more U.K. pronunciations. The preference for North America in general evokes U.S. pronunciations; the need to be specifically Canadian, triggers British usage which seems less dangerous for a Canadian identity than an assimilation to U.S. usage. Anomie increases U.S. usage.

4L U.S./U.K. Lexical Choice: A preference for American or British lexical items correlates significantly with attitudes towards the United States as compared to Great Britain in two cases. Those who prefer the U.S. over the U.K. in general and those who favour a U.S. influence in Canada over a U.K. influence are more likely to use U.S. vocabulary and vice versa (both correlations at 5 per cent). There is also a correlation between a strong sense of a Canadian identity and the use of British words - parallel to the situation described under 4J. As a zero-order correlation this is only significant at the 10 per cent level ($p = 0.061$). However, if status and generation

are controlled for, it reaches 5 per cent. A control for status alone weakens the correlation slightly ($p = 0.069$), a control for generation alone puts it into the 5 per cent range ($p = 0.041$). The connection between generation and 4L is such that a high number of generations in Canada increases the chances of American lexical items to be chosen (10 per cent). The same relationship holds for anomie; the stronger the feelings of anomie, the more definite a preference for American words (5 per cent).

(130) r (4L, 1D) < 0 p = 0.034
(131) r (4L, 1F) < 0 p = 0.028
(132) r (4L, 1I) > 0 p = 0.045
(133) r (4L, gen) < 0 p = 0.068
(134) r (4L, 1A) < 0 p = 0.038

Controlling for status and generation

If anomie and the self-rating scales are controlled for, (131) remains the only significant correlation (at 5 per cent): the preference for the U.S. over the U.K. in matters relevant to Canada and the corresponding choice of vocabulary. If status and generation are controlled for, in addition to anomie and the self-rating scales, (132) emerges again in the 10 per cent range; (131) remains at 5 per cent. The correlation pattern for this variable shows a definite connection between attitudes comparing the U.S. and the U.K., especially in a Canadian context, and the lexical choice these Canadians make between American and

British items. Other factors connected with such a choice are a sense of Canadian identity which makes British choices more likely, and the number of generations in Canada which has the opposite effect. Feelings of anomie are again associated with American usage in this case as could be shown for other variables.

4N Canadian Lexical Choice: A positive attitude towards Canadians and towards the English makes the choice of typically Canadian words more likely. High values in both self-rating scales and a high number of generations in Canada have the same effect (all significant at 5 per cent). Two other "Canadian" correlations are significant at 10 per cent: the use of Canadianisms correlates with a strong sense of Canadian identity and with a preference for Canada over the U.S.

(135) r (4N, 2D) > 0 p = 0.014
(136) r (4N, 2C) > 0 p = 0.023
(137) r (4N, 2E) > 0 p = 0.027
(138) r (4N, 2F) > 0 p = 0.035
(139) r (4N, gen) > 0 p = 0.010
(140) r (4N, 1I) > 0 p = 0.081
(141) r (4N, 1C) > 0 p = 0.065

These zero-order correlations show a definite connection between "Canadian" attitudes and the use of Canadian lexical items (135, 140, and 141). The number of generations in Canada increases the chances of Canadian lexical choices

significantly. If generation and status are controlled for, (135) remains significant, in fact, is strengthened to the 1 per cent level of significance ($p = 0.008$).[6] The same happens to (136), the correlation between a positive attitude towards the English and the use of Canadianisms, it reaches the 1 per cent level with $p = 0.009$. All other Canadian correlations seem to have been the result of a correlation between the number of generations in Canada and lexical choice. They disappear if status and generation are controlled for. If anomie and the self-rating scales are held constant in addition to status and generation, both (135) and (136) are weakened. (135) drops to the 10 per cent level ($p = 0.077$) and (136) to the 5 per cent level ($p = 0.029$). One fact which is disturbing is the emergence of a new correlation associating a preference for the U.S. over the U.K. with the use of Canadianisms.

(142) $r\ (4N, 1D) > 0 \quad p = 0.041$ controlling for status, generation, anomie and the self-ratings

Notes To Chapter VI

[1]Typical values for the correlation coefficient of zero-order two-way correlations are at the 1 per cent level with n=64 and p = 0.002 r = 0.36 (for correlation 3), at the 5 per cent level with n = 64 and p - 0.013 r = 0.28 (for correlation 2), and at the 10 per cent level with n = 64 and p = 0.077 r = -0.18 (for correlation 26).

[2]Only those variables have been included in a particular principle in which the typical feature in question scores as either +1 or -1, i.e. as either end of the scale rather than as a central value. For example the *y*-glide was included under the American principle (as -1) and the British principle (as +1) but not under the Canadian principle because typically Canadian usage would be scored as a central value.

[3]The negative value of this correlation is caused by the coding of the two variables. Presence of diphthong raising was coded as -1, use of Canadian lexical items as +1. cf Appendix B.

[4]If *serviette* had been coded as British (as was done by Avis, 1954 and Hamilton 1958) rather than Canadian, this correlation would be consistent and easily explainable.

[5]I mention this 10 per cent correlation because it is similar to tendencies described under 4B, 4E, and 4I, where anomie and a positive attitude towards the United States showed similar correlations.

[6]A control for status alone did not have much effect on any of the correlations.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

After the discussion of correlation patterns for each individual linguistic variable, it is now possible to make comparisons and draw parallels. Variables can be compared in a variety of ways based on different criteria. It is interesting that the biographical and attitudinal variables occur in regular combinations associated with linguistic behaviour in a certain way. Whenever status and generation in Canada correlate with the same linguistic variable, they have opposite effects: a low socio-economic status will show the same correlation as a high number of generations in Canada. Both typically have the same influence as pro-American, anti-British attitudes. Or vice versa, a high socio-economic status, a relatively recent immigration of the family into Canada and pro-British, anti-American attitudes regularly correlate with speech patterns in the same way. Within the happiness dimensions, there is also a very consistent pattern of co-occurrence. High values on the self-rating scales always show the same correlations as a generally high evaluation

of other people. Because the two factors have been shown to correlate with each other, this is not surprising. Whenever anomie correlates with the same linguistic variable as the evaluation of people, strong feelings of anomie have the same effect as a high self-opinion and a positive evaluation of other people in general. In other words, general social satisfaction and personal satisfaction as indicated by a positive attitude towards the self and other people have the opposite effect on linguistic behaviour. Low feelings of anomie, that is a satisfaction with the situation in general correlate the same way as a critical attitude toward people. Both typically co-occur with pro-British, anti-American attitudes. For the ethno-political attitudes the pattern of co-occurrence in correlations is not as regular as for the other two categories of variables. However, it can be said that pro-American attitudes regularly occur in the same kinds of correlations as anti-British attitudes and vice-versa. Pro-Canadian attitudes sometimes pattern like pro-American, anti-British, other times as pro-British, anti-American attitudes.

It might be interesting to examine and compare the correlations for different groups of linguistic variables. One possible basis of grouping are the four underlying linguistic principles described in the last chapter:

American, British, and Canadian usage and a "correctness" principle. In the group of American features each biographical variable correlates once on a significant level. Socio-economic status is negatively related to U.S. usage with regard to *t*-flapping, the number of generations in Canada correlates positively with U.S. lexical choice. A very consistent correlation present for all variables is that between anomie and U.S. features. The stronger the feelings of social dissatisfaction, the more likely a linguistic orientation towards the American model. There are correlations between U.S. usage and a positive self-evaluation (for the *y*-glide) and generally positive ratings of other people (for the *y*-glide and *t*-flapping). Those who like themselves and others tend to apply these American phonological rules. The ethno-political attitudes correlating positively with U.S. usage can be described as pro-U.S. and anti-British: a direct preference for the U.S. over the U.K. (five correlations for variables 4E, 4J, 4L), a positive attitude towards Americans (two correlations for variables 4E and 4I), and a negative attitude towards the English (one correlation for variable 4I). Correlations involving "Canadian" attitudes are more complex. There is a definite connection between the lack of a Canadian sense of identity and U.S. usage (three correlations for 4I, 4J

and 4L). A linguistic assimilation to the United States is especially common among speakers who do not believe in a Canadian national and linguistic identity - and in the case of variable 4I even prefer the U.S. over Canada and dislike Canadians. In other cases, however, pro-Canadian attitudes correlate with U.S. usage: a high evaluation of Canadians in the case of 4E and 4J and a preference for Canada over the U.K. in the case of 4J. To sum up the ethno-political correlation pattern of this group, it can be said that typically American linguistic features increase with pro-North American attitudes in general (U.S. and Canada) which are connected with anti-British attitudes and with pro-U.S. attitudes, specifically, even if directed against Canada. Strong feelings about a Canadian identity correlate with an avoidance of U.S. features. Those who place importance on the North American aspect of Canada, who prefer North America in general over the U.K., tend to use American linguistic features, but those who prefer Canada over the U.S. and feel strongly about a Canadian national and linguistic identity avoid such features.

The second underlying principle of speech behaviour comprises features typical for British English. In the biographical category there are correlations between a low number of generations and British usage (4A, 4C, 4L) and

between a high socio-economic status and British usage (4I). The attitudinal correlation pattern for this group is to a large extent exactly the reverse of that described under the American principle. British usage increases with low feelings of anomie (4E, 4I, 4J, 4L), with low self-evaluations (4E), and with a generally negative attitude towards other people (4E, 4I). In the ethno-political dimension the use of British forms increases with a preference for Great Britain over North America, especially over the U.S. but also over Canada (4A, 4E, 4I, 4J, 4L) and with strong feelings about a Canadian national identity (4I, 4J, 4L). However, variable 4C shows significant correlations between anti-Canadian attitudes and U.K. usage.[1] A preference for the U.S. over Canada, a lack of a Canadian sense of identity, and a low attitude towards Canadians correlate with increased use of typically British low back vowel distinctions. This seems to contradict the above correlations between strong feelings about a Canadian identity and British usage. If variable 4C is examined more closely, such an apparent contradiction can be explained. Whereas variables 4E, 4I, 4J, and 4L offer choices between typically American and typically British extremes, 4C allows for a Canadian choice different from American and British usage not only in frequency but also

in quality. Low back vowel distinctions are different in all three dialects, in fact the variable value for U.S. usage is closer to the British value in this case than that typical for Canadian English,[2] which explains why anti-Canadian attitudes and even a preference of the U.S. over Canada correlate with British usage in this case.

All three features comprising the Canadian English principle increase with the number of generations the subjects' family has been in Canada. Attitudes of the happiness dimension do not seem to affect the Canadian English category much. Anomie and the general evaluation of other people do not show significant correlations. The self-rating scales correlate once positively (4N), once negatively (4D). In the ethno-political dimension Canadian features are related to pro-Canadian, anti-American attitudes: a positive attitude towards Canadians (4C, 4N), a strong sense of a Canadian identity (4C, 4N), a preference for Canada over the U.S. (4C, 4N), and a negative attitude towards Americans (4D). In the case of 4N, a high evaluation of English people correlates positively with Canadian usage. However, this correlation is not very indicative because it could be the result of the double coding of *serviette*.

Features comprising group four, the "correctness" principle, increase with a high socio-economic status (4H, 4I) and with a low number of generations in Canada (4A, 4C, 4F). Correlations with attitudes of the ethno-political dimension are very complex and inconsistent for the group as a whole. Individual features correlate with ethno-political attitudes in different ways depending on the distribution and prestige of the feature in question in Canadian, British, and American English. For example, the use of the *y*-glide increases with pro-British, anti-North American attitudes; the absence of a voicing rule for *t* correlates with pro-Canadian, pro-British and anti-U.S. attitudes; the low vowel distinctions correlate with anti-Canadian attitudes. Overall, there is a tendency for pro-British attitudes to increase the use of correctness features more often than decrease it. Pro-Canadian attitudes have a balanced effect, and pro-American attitudes are more often negatively correlated with the same features. This pattern is the result of the particular variables comprising the principle. In all cases, features prescribed by dictionaries and reinforced through the spelling are closer to the Standard British pronunciation of English than to General American. It has to be noted, however, that not the underlying principle as a whole but individual features

correlate with ethno-political attitudes. Attitudes of the happiness dimension are more promising. There is a consistent correlation pattern for all correctness features suggesting that the entire underlying principle correlates with certain personal attitudes. Those who are satisfied with society and their place therein, but who have a low opinion of themselves and other people are most likely to exhibit speech habits which can be described as "correct", conservative, or distinction-preserving (4B, 4E, 4F, 4H, 4I).

There does not seem to be much difference in the way various linguistic levels are affected by attitudes. The uneven distribution of variables (eight for phonological rules, one for the pronunciation of specific morpheme sequences, and two for lexical choice) makes the comparison problematic. Both ethno-political and personal attitudes correlate on all linguistic levels tested. Whereas the morphophonemic and the lexical level exhibit very consistent attitudinal correlations, variables testing the application of phonological rules show more variation. Some patterns are very consistent internally as well as with the distribution of the feature in question, others show less regular relations. This can be the result of data-eliciting problems due to a lack of awareness of linguistic behaviour

on the part of the subjects (cf variable 4D). The same unawareness, the fact that phonological rules are the least conscious part of linguistic behaviour, might also make such rules somewhat less susceptible to attitudinal manipulation (cf the inconsistency of the correlations involving variable 4A). This does not hold for all phonological rules, however. More salient features such as the *y*-glide or *t*-flapping show very definite associations with consistent attitudinal patterns.

Differences in the correlation patterns are not so much related to different linguistic levels but are affected by the kind of choice the variables offer. If the questions present a choice with a British and an American alternative and stages of relative frequency in between, pro-U.S. attitudes will be associated with options closer to the American end of the scale, pro-British attitudes with options closer to the British end. Pro-Canadian attitudes have to be divided: those stressing the North American aspect of Canada as compared to the United Kingdom correlate with U.S. usage, those stressing Canada's individuality and identity within North America correlate with U.K. usage. If variables offer a typically Canadian choice differing from American and British English in quality rather than frequency, pro-Canadian attitudes

will always correlate with such an option. Neither pro-American nor anti-British attitudes ever correlate with an increase in the use of a typically Canadian feature; pro-British and anti-American attitudes do so in some cases. If the options offered in a variable are not a matter of national dialects but rather purely a choice between prescribed, conservative, distinction-preserving forms following the spelling more closely and innovative, simplified forms often involving the deletion of a distinction and/or a sound, ethno-political correlations cannot be predicted. Other attitudinal correlations, however, are quite regular: social satisfaction, i.e. low feelings of anomie, correlate with prescribed, conservative forms. A high self-evaluation and positive attitude towards other people in general correlate with innovative, simplifying forms.

It could be shown that variation in Canadian English is not only influenced by physical factors, for example, the biographical background of speakers, but also by psychological factors such as attitudes. The relation between different attitudinal patterns and linguistic choice is fairly consistent and predictable, depending on the kind of variation. This does not mean that for any given individual there is the same correlation between

attitudes and linguistic choice such that attitudes make speech predictable or speech necessarily conveys attitudinal patterns. It only implies that for the given sample the occurrence of certain attitude-speech combinations is statistically more frequent and thus more likely.

Whereas this study focussed on intra-group variation associated with attitudes of speakers, there is, of course, also variation in the speech of any individual. It would be interesting to analyze such variation on an even lower level to investigate to what extent it is totally free, or structured in such a way as to show stylistic stratification and/or differences connected with shifts in attitudes or rather the relative importance of attitudes due to situational changes. The standard joke about a Canadian being considered American by British people and British by Americans, is most likely not only the result of the nature of Canadian English as a dialect between American and British English, but also the result of actual shifts in the frequency of certain linguistic features within Canadian English. My own observations confirm that some Canadians visiting the United States actually sound more British than they do at home. The results of this study suggest that the need to stress the North American aspect of Canada in one situation, the Canadian identity within

North America in another, might be connected with such differences in linguistic choice. Further research incorporating situational factors is needed to test this possible connection between attitudinal shifts and intra-speaker variation in Canadian English.

Notes to Chapter VII

[1]There are also correlations between a negative attitude towards Canadians and even towards the English and U.K. usage in the case of variable 4A. The internal inconsistency of this correlation pattern does not allow any conclusions or interpretation.

[2]British English has three distinctive vowels distinguishing both pairs *caught-cot* and *bother-father* (variable mean +1). American English would distinguish *caught-cot* as [ɒ] vs [a], but would use the same vowel in *bother* and *father*, usually [a(:)], which would be coded as a variable mean of 0. Canadian English merges both pairs under [ɒ] and would receive a typical variable value of -1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dictionaries

American:

Kenyon, J.S. and T.A. Knott. *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English.* Springfield: Merriam, 1953.

The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (RHD). Unabridged Edition, New York: Random House, 1966.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. (Webster's) Springfield: Merriam, 1966.

British:

The Concise Oxford Dictionary (Concise Oxford), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Jones, Daniel. *English Pronouncing Dictionary.* London: Everyman, 1964.

The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Oxford Advanced) London: Oxford University Press, 1974.

The Oxford English Dictionary(OED) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

Canadian:

Dictionary of Canadian English (DCE) Senior Dictionary Toronto: W.J. Gage, 1967.

Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles. Toronto: W.J. Gage, 1976.

Books and Articles

Allen, Harold B. (1959) "Canadian-American Speech Differences Along the Middle Border," *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association* 5.1, 1959, pp. 17-24.

_____ (1971) and Gary N. Underwood (eds.) *Readings in American Dialectology*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

_____ (1973-76) *The Linguistic Atlas of the Upper Midwest*. Minneapolis; University of Minnestoa Press.

Anderson, T.W. and Stanley L. Sclove (1978) *An Introduction to the Statistical Analysis of Data*. Boston: Houghton Mufflin Company.

d'Anglejan, Alison and Richard G. Tucker (1973) "Socio-linguistic Correlates of Speech Style in Quebec" in Shuy, Roger W. and Ralph W. Fasold: *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects*, Georgetown University Press, 1973, pp. 1-27.

Anisfeld M. and W.E. Lambert(1962) "Social and Psychological Variables in Learning Hebrew," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 65, 1962, pp. 223-231.

Atwood, E. Bagby (1950) "Grease and Greasy: A Study of Geographical Variation," in Allen, Harold B. and Gary N. Underwood (eds.) *Readings in American Dialectology*, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1971, pp. 160-168, also in Williamson, Juanita and Virginia M. Burke (eds.) *A Various Language. Perspectives on American Dialect*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971, pp. 424-433.

Avis, Walter S. (1954) "Speech Differences Along the Ontario-United States Border: I Vocabulary," *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 1.1, 1954, pp. 13-18.

_____ (1955) "Speech Differences Along the Ontario-United States Border: II Grammar and Syntax," *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 1.1, 1955, pp. 14-19, part II and III also in:

Chambers, J.R. (ed.) *Canadian English: Origins and Structures*, Toronto: Methuen, 1975, pp. 67-77.

_____ (1956) "Speech Differences Along The Ontario-United States Border: III Pronunciation," *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 2.2, 1956, pp. 41-59.

_____ (1965) *A Bibliography of Writings on Canadian English 1857-1965*, Toronto, W.J. Gage.

_____ (1972) "So Eh? is Canadian, Eh?" *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 17.2, 1972, pp. 89-104.

_____ (1973) "The English Language in Canada: A Report," *Current Trends in Linguistics*, 10, 1973, pp. 40-71.

Ayerst, Morley (1939) "A Note on Canadian Speech," *American Speech*, 14, 1939, pp. 231-233.

Bailey, Charles-James N. (1972) "The Patterning of Language Variation," in Bailey, Richard W. and Jay L. Robinson (eds.). *Varieties of Present Day English*, New York: MacMillan Co., 1972, pp. 156-186.

_____ (1973) *Variation and Linguistic Theory*. Arlington.

Bailey, Charles-James N. and Roger W. Shuy (eds.) (1973) *New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English*. Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.

Bailey, Richard W. and Jay L. Robinson (eds.) (1973) *Varieties of Present Day English*. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Berdan, Robert (1973) "The Necessity of Variable Rules," in Fasold, Ralph W. and Roger W. Shuy, *Analyzing Variation in Language*, Georgetown University Press, 1975.

Blishen, Bernard R. (1967) "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 1967, pp. 41-53.

Bernstein, Basil (1959) "A Public Language: Some Sociolinguistic Implications of a Linguistic Form," *British Journal of Sociology*, 10, 1959, pp. 311-326.

Bickerton, Derek (1971) "Inherent Variability and Variable Rules," *Foundations of Language*, 7, 1971, pp. 457-492.

Bloomfield, Morton W. (1948) "Canadian English and its Relation to 18th Century American Speech," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 47, 1948, pp. 59-67. Also in Chambers, J.K. (ed.) *Canadian English: Origins and Structures*, Toronto, Methuen, 1975, pp. 3-11.

Briere, Eugene J. (1967) "Phonological Testing Reconsidered," *Language Learning*, 17, 1967, pp. 163-171.

Bronstein, Arthur J. (1966) "The Pronunciation of American English," *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, New York, Random House, 1966, pp. xxiii-xxiv.

Chambers, J.K. (1973) "Canadian Raising," *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 18, 1973, pp. 113-135. Also in Chambers, J.K. (ed.) *Canadian English: Origins and Structures*, Toronto: Methuen, 1975, pp. 83-100.

_____ (ed.) (1975) *Canadian English: Origins And Structures*. Toronto: Methuen.

Cooper, Robert L. and Joshua A. Fishman (1974) "The Study of Language Attitudes," *Linguistics 136*, 1974, pp. 5-20.

Couch, Arthur and Kenneth Keniston (1960) "Yeasayers and Neasayers: Agreeing Response Set as a Personality Variable," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60.2, 1960, pp. 151-174.

Courtney, Maureen (1972) "Lexical Choice as an Index of Acculturation," M.A. Thesis in the Department of Linguistics, University of Victoria.

Darnell, Regna (ed.) (1971) *Linguistic Diversity in Canadian Society*. Edmonton: Linguistic Research Inc.

_____ (ed.) (1973) *Canadian Languages in Their Social Context*. Edmonton: Linguistic Research Inc.

Dawes, Robyn M. (1972) *Fundamentals of Attitude Measurement.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Dittmar, Norbert (1973) *Soziolinguistik.* Frankfurt: Athenäum.

Fasold, Ralph W. and Roger, W. Shuy (eds.) (1975) *Analyzing Variation in Language.* Washington: Georgetown University Press.

_____ (eds.) (1977) *Studies in Language Variation.* Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Fischer, John L. (1958) "Social Influences on the Choice of a Linguistic Variant," *Word,* 14, 1958, pp. 47-56.

Fishbein, Martin (1971) "Attitude and the Prediction of Behaviour," in Thomas, Kerry (ed.) *Attitudes and Behaviour,* Penguin, 1971, pp. 52-83.

_____ and Ajzen Icek (1975) *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behaviour. An Introduction to Theory and Research.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Fishman, Joshua A. and Rebecca Agheyisi (1970) "Language Attitude Studies," *Anthropological Linguistics,* 12, 1970, pp. 137-157.

Gardner, Robert C. and Wallace E. Lambert (1959) "Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition," *Canadian Journal of Psychology,* 13, 1959, pp. 266-272.

Gardner, Robert C. (1960) "Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition," unpublished Dissertation at McGill University summarized in Gardner, Robert, C. and Wallace E. Lambert: *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning,* Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, 1972, pp. 199-216.

_____ and Wallace E. Lambert (1972) *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning,* Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.

Giles, Howard (1971) "Patterns of Evaluation to R.P. South Welsh and Somerset Accented Speech," *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology,* 10, 1971, pp. 280-281.

Goetsch, Paul (1963) "Das kanadische Englisch," *Anglia*, 81, 1963, pp. 56-81.

Gregg, R.J. (1957) "Notes on Pronunciation of Canadian English as Spoken in Vancouver, B.C.," *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 3.1, 1957, pp. 20-26. Revised version in Chambers, J.K. (ed.) *Canadian English: Origin and Structures*, Toronto: Methuen, pp. 133-144.

_____ (1973) "The Dipthongs ɔi and ai in Scottish, Scotch-Irish and Canadian English," *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 18.2, 1973, pp. 136-145.

Gumperz, John J. and Dell, Hymes (eds.) (1972) *Directions in Sociolinguistics. The Ethnography of Communication.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Guttman, Louis (1944) "A Basis for Scaling Quantitative Data," *American Sociological Review*, 9, 1944, pp. 139-150.

Halle, Morris (1964) "Phonology in a Generative Grammar," in Fodor, Jerry A. and Jerrold J. Katz (eds.) *The Structure of Language*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1964, pp. 334-352.

Hamilton, D.E. (1964) "Standard Canadian English: Pronunciation," *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguistics*, The Hague: Mouton, 1964, pp. 456-459.

Harris, Barbara P. and Roberta C.Stevenson (1979) "Sociophycological Variables as Predictors of Linguistic Variants," manuscript to be published based on a paper given at the third International Conference on Methods in Dialectology, University of Western Ontario, August 1978.

Hempl, George (1896) "Grease and Greasy", in Allen, Harold B. and Gary N. Understood (eds.) *Readings in American Dialectology*, New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1971.

Hulbert, J.R. (1955) *Dictionaries: British and American.* London: Deutsch.

Hultin, Neil C. (1967) "Canadian Views on American English," *American Speech*, 42.4, 1967, pp. 243-260.

Hymes, Dell (ed.) (1964) *Language in Culture and Society*. New York: Harper and Row.

_____ (1972) "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life," in Gumperz, John J. and Dell Hymes, *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972, pp. 35-71.

Jones, Daniel (1972) *An Outline of English Phonetics*. Cambridge: Heffer and Sons, first published in 1912.

Jones, E.E. and P. Segal (1971) "The Bogus Pipeline: A New Paradigm for Measuring Affect and Attitude," *Psychological Bulletin*, 76, 1971, pp. 349-364.

Joos, Martin (1942) "A Phonological Dilemma in Canadian English," *Language*, 18, 1942, pp. 141-144. Also in Chambers, J.K. (ed.) *Canadian English: Origin and Structures*, Toronto: Methuen, 1975, pp. 79-82.

_____ (1962) *The Five Clocks*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Kenyon, John S. (1948) "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English," *College English*, 10, 1942. pp. 31-36. Also in Williamson, Juanita and Virginia M. Burke (eds.) *A Various Language*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971, pp. 30-38.

Kurath, Hans (1964) "British Sources of Selected Features of American Pronunciation: Problems and Methods," in Allen, Harold B. and Gary N. Underwood, *Readings in American Dialectology*, New York, Appleton Century Crofts, 1971, pp. 265-272.

_____ (1972) *Studies in Area Linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Labov, William (1963) "The Social Motivation of a Sound Change," *Word*, 19, 1963, pp. 273-309.

_____ (1962) "Phonological Correlates of Social Stratification," *American Anthropologist*, 66.6, part 2, 1964, pp. 164-176.

_____ (1966a) *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D.C.: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

_____ (1966b) "The Effect of Social Mobility on Linguistic Behavior," in Williamson, Juanita and Virginia M. Burke (eds.) *A Various Language*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971, pp. 640-659.

_____ (1969) "Contraction, Deletion and Inherent Variability of the English Copula," *Language*, 45, 1969, pp. 715-763.

_____ (1972a) "The Study of Language in its Social Context," in Pride, J.B. and Janet Holmes (eds.) *Sociolinguistics*, Penguin, 1972.

_____ (1972b) "On the Mechanism of Linguistic Change," in Gumperz, John J. and Dell Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972, pp. 512-538.

_____ (1972c) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennyslvania Press.

Lambert, Wallace E., R.C. Hodgson, R.C. Gardner and S. Fillenbaum (1960) "Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 0, 1960, pp. 44-51.

_____, R.C. Gardner, H.C. Bank and K. Turnstall (1960) "Attitudinal and Cognitive Aspects of Intensive Study of a Second Language," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psycholgy*, 66, 1962, pp. 358-368.

_____ (1967) "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism," *Journal of Social Issues*, 23, 1967, pp. 91-109.

Larsen, Thorleif and Francis C. Walker (1930) *Pronunciation: A Practical Guide to Spoken English in Canada and the United States*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Lehn, Walter (1959) "Vowel Contrasts in a Saskatchewan English Dialect," *Journal of Canadian Linguistics*, 5, 1959, pp. 90-98. Also in Chambers, J.K. (ed.) *Canadian English: Origins and Structures*, Toronto: Methuen, 1975, pp. 109-116.

Lemon, Nigel (1973) *Attitudes and Their Measurement*. London: BT Batsford Ltd.

Lovell, Charles (1955) "Whys and Hows of Collecting for the Dictionary of Canadian English: I Scope and Source Material," *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 1.2, 1955, pp. 3-8.

_____ (1956) Whys and Hows of Collecting for the Dictionary of Canadian English II," *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 2.1, 1956, pp. 23-32.

McDavid, Raven I., Jr. (1954) "Linguistic Geography in Canada: An Introduction," *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 1.1, 1954, pp. 3-8.

_____ (1971) "Dialect Geography and Social Science Procedures," in Allen Harold B. and Gary N. Underwood (eds.) *Readings in American Dialectology*, New York, Appleton Century Crofts, 1971, pp. 357-364.

Mittins, W.H., M. Salu, M. Edminson and S. Coyne (1970) *Attitudes to English Usage*. London: Oxford University Press.

Nader, Laura (1962) "A Note on Attitudes and the Use of Language," *Anthropological Linguistics*, 4.6, 1962, pp. 24-29.

Orkin, Mark M. (1970) *Speaking Canadian English: An Informal Account on the English Language in Canada*. Toronto, General Publishing Co. Ltd.

Osgood, C.E., G.J. Suci and P.H. Tannenbaum (1957) *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois.

Partridge, Eric and J.W. Clark (1968) *British and American English Since 1900*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Pilch, Herbert (1955) "The Rise of the American Vowel System," *Word* 2, 1955, pp. 57-93.

_____ (1976) *Empirical Linguistics*. München, Francke.

Perloe, S.S. (1963) "The Relation Between Category Rating and Magnitude Estimation Judgements of Occupational Prestige," *American Journal of Psychology*, 76, 1963, pp. 395-403.

Polson, James (1969) "A Linguistic Questionnaire for British Columbia: A Plan for a Postal Survey of Dialectal Variation in B.C., With Account of Recent Research," M.A. Thesis in the Department of English, University of Victoria.

Porter, John (1965) *The Vertical Mosaic - An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Pride, J.B. (1971) *The Social Meaning of Language*. London: Oxford University Press.

_____, and Janet Holmes (1972). *Sociolinguistics*. Penguin, 1972.

Priestley, F.E.L. (1968) "Canadian English," in Partridge, Eric and J.W. Clark, *British and American English Since 1900*, New York, Greenwood Press, 1968.

Reed, Caroll E. (1961) "The Pronunciation of English in the Pacific North West," *Language*, 37, 1961, pp. 559-564. Also in Allen, Harold B and Gary N. Underwood (eds.), *Readings in American Dialectology*, New York, Appleton Century Croft, 1971, pp. 115-121.

_____ (1967) *Dialects of American English*. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1967, revised edition, 1977.

Scargill, M.H. (1954) "A Pilot Study of Alberta Speech: Vocabulary," *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 1.1, 1954, pp. 21-22.

_____ (1955) "Canadian English and Canadian Culture in Alberta," *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 1.1, 1955, pp. 26-29.

_____ (1957) "Sources of Canadian English," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 56, 1957, pp. 610-614. Also in Chambers, J.K. (ed.) *Canadian English Origins and Structures*, Toronto, Methuen, 1975, pp. 12-15.

_____ (1968) "Canadianisms From Western Canada, With Special Reference to British Columbia," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 6, series 4, 1968, pp. 181-185.

_____ and Henry J. Warkentyne (1972) "The Survey of Canadian English: A Report," *English Quarterly*, 5.3, 1972, pp. 47-104.

_____ (1974) *Modern Canadian Usage*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, Ltd.

_____ (1977) *A Short History of Canadian English*. Victoria: Sono Nis Press, Ltd.

Schmid, Rudolf (1973) "Dialekt und Vorurteil: Zur Beurteilung von Dialektsprechern," *Papiere zur Linguistik*, 5, 1973, pp. 116-135.

Shiels, Marie (1972) "Sociolinguistics: Old Wine in New Skins? An Analysis of Linguistic Methodology and Its Relation to General Linguistic Theory," *Languages and Linguistics Working Papers 4*, Georgetown University Press, 1972, pp. 50-60.

Shores, David L. (ed.) (1972) *Contemporary English: Change and Variation*. New York: JB Lippincott Co.

_____ and Carole P. Hines (1977) *Papers in Linguistic Variation*. Samla-Ads Collection, University of Alabama Press.

Shuy, Roger W. (1972) "Language and Success: Who are the Judges?" in Bailey, R.W. and J.L. Robinson (eds.) *Varieties in Present Day English*, New York: The MacMillan Co., 1972, pp. 303-315.

_____ and Ralph W. Fasold (eds.) (1973) *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

_____ and Frederick Williams (1973) "Stereotyped Attitudes of Selected English Dialect Communities," in Shy, Roger W. and Ralph W. Fasold, *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects*, Georgetown University Press, 1973.

_____ (1975) "What's the Study of Variation Useful For?" in Fasold, Ralph W. and Roger W. Shy, *Analyzing Variation in Language*, Georgetown University Press, 1975, pp. 312-327.

Smith, David M. (1973) "Language, Speech and Ideology: A Conceptual Framework," in Shuy, Roger W. and Ralph W. Fasold, *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects*, Georgetown University Press, 1973, pp. 97-112.

_____ and Roger W. Shuy (1973) *Sociolinguistics in Cross-Cultural Analysis*. Georgetown University Press.

Strevens, Peter (1972) *British and American English*. London: Collier-MacMillan Publishers.

Strongman, K.T. and J. Woosley (1967) "Stereotyped Reactions to Regional Accents," *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 6, 1967, pp. 164-167.

Thomas, Kerry (1971) *Attitudes and Behaviour*. Penguin.

Trudgill, Peter (1974) *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction*. Penguin.

Tyler, Stephen A. (1972) "Context and Alternation in Koya Kinship Terminology," in Gumperz, John J. and Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972, pp. 251-269.

Underwood, Gary N. (1974) "How Do You Sound an Arkansawyer," *American Speech*, 49, 3-4, 1974, pp. 208-215.

Walker, Douglas C. (1975) "Another Edmonton Idiolect. Comments on an Article by Professor Avis," in Chambers, J.K. (ed.) *Canadian English: Origins and Structures*, Toronto: Methuen, 1975, pp. 129-132.

Wicker, A.W. (1969) "Attitudes vs Actions: The Relationship of Verbal and Overt Behavioural Responses to Attitude Objects," *Journal of Social Issues*, 25, 1969, pp. 41-78. Also in Thomas, Kerry (ed.) *Attitudes and Behaviour*, Penguin, 1971, pp. 135-178.

Williams, Frederick (1973) "Some Research Notes on Dialect Attitudes and Stereotypes," in Shuy, Roger W. and Ralph W. Fasold (eds.) *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects*, Georgetown University Press, 1973, pp. 113-128.

Williamson, Juanita and Virginia M. Burke (eds.) (1971) *A Various Language. Perspectives on American Dialect.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wolfram, Walt and Ralph W. Fasold (1974) *The Study of Social Dialects in American English.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc.

APPENDIX A

1. Sample of Multiple Choice Attitudinal Questions

The following statements are opinions occasionally expressed by some Canadians. You may agree with some of these statements and you may disagree with others. You are asked to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the five-point scale below the statement as follows:

Mark "A" if you strongly support the statement (strongly agree),
"B" if you moderately support the statement (moderately agree),
"C" if you have no opinion one way or the other (neutral),
"D" if you are moderately opposed (moderately disagree), or
"E" if you strongly oppose the statement (strongly disagree), or

"Victoria has the best weather of any city in Canada."

agree /__A__/__B__/__C__/__D__/__E__/ disagree

If you agree strongly with this statement, you would choose the response "A" on the scale below it, as follows:

agree /__X__/__B__/__C__/__D__/__E__/ disagree

On the other hand, if you disagree moderately with the statement, you might choose response "D".

agree /__A__/__B__/__C__/__X__/__E__/ disagree

If you have no opinion one way or the other, you would give the neutral response "C".

agree /__A__/__B__/__X__/__D__/__E__/ disagree

There are no right or wrong answers. You are asked only to express your opinion. If you have no opinion, or if you are neutral with respect to any statement, then give the neutral response; however, be sure to respond to every statement.

There are a number of statements and it is important that you make a separate and independent judgement on each one. Do not look back to check what you marked on earlier statements; try to keep your attention on the scale at hand. Work as quickly as you can and do not puzzle or worry over individual items. It is your first impressions, your immediate feelings, that are of interest. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we are very interested in your true impressions.

Remember that your answers will not be seen by anyone except the directors of this research project.

2. Sample of Semantic Differential Questions

In the items which follow, you will be asked to give your impressions of several groups of people. A group of people will be named, and you will be asked to give your immediate feelings about people in general in that group on a set of five-point scales.

For example, you might be asked to rate your feelings about people in Victoria in general as to how interesting or boring they might seem to you. The scale would appear as follows:

Interesting /__A__/__B__/__C__/__D__/__E__/ Boring

If you find Victorians in general extremely boring, you would select response "E", and mark the scale as follows:

Interesting /__A__/__B__/__C__/__D__/__E__/ Boring

If you felt that they were moderately interesting, you would choose response "B".

Interesting /__A__/__B__/__C__/__D__/__E__/ Boring

If you were neutral in your feelings about whether people in general in Victoria were interesting or boring, or if you felt they were neither interesting nor boring, you would choose response "C".

Interesting /__A__/__B__/__C__/__D__/__E__/ Boring

There are a number of such scales and it is important that you make a separate and independent judgement on each one. Do not look back to check what you marked on earlier scales; try to keep your attention on the scale at hand. Work as quickly as you can and do not puzzle or worry over individual items. It is your first impressions, your immediate feelings, that are of interest. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we are very interested in your true impressions.

Remember that your answers will not be seen by anyone except the directors of this research project.

3. Sample of Phonological Questions

Each of the following items consists of a pair of words, or one word together with two others. You are asked to show the extent to which the words rhyme or sound alike to you.

Consider the following example:

spirit -- spear it

the same /__A__/__B__/__C__/__D__/__E__/ different

Mark "A" if spirit and spear it sound exactly the same, or
"E" if they sound completely different to you.
Use the letters, "B", "C" and "D" between the extremes "A" and "E" to indicate the degree of similarity or difference. Therefore, mark
"B" if they sound similar (but not exactly the same),
"D" if they sound very different (but not completely so), or
"C" if they sound moderately different.

Please respond to every item. Mark "C" if you can't tell whether the words rhyme or not, or when you can't decide if the indicated parts of the words sound the same or different to you.

4. Sample of Morphophonemic Questions

The following items each consist of one word, below which is a scale. At the ends of this scale are two other words (or one word and a pair of words). You are asked to show with which of the two alternates on the scale does the word in the item more nearly rhyme, or to which of the two alternates does part of the word in the item sound more similar.

For example,

aunt

ant /__A__/__B__/__C__/__D__/__E__/ want

Mark "A" if aunt rhymes with, or sounds more nearly like ant to you,
"B" if aunt almost rhymes with ant, but not quite,
"C" if aunt sounds like neither ant or want, but it sounds as if it might be midway between them,
"D" if aunt sounds something like want, but not quite, or
"E" if aunt rhymes with, or sounds nearly like want to you.

5. Sample of Lexical Questions

Each of the following items is concerned with words which most people take to mean the same thing. We ask you to report as accurately as possible how often you use one of the words compared with how often you use the other.

Consider the following example:

"a man who delivers letters"

mailman /__A__/__B__/__C__/__D__/__E__/ postman (postie)

Mark "A" if, of the two words, you use mailman almost exclusively and you rarely if ever use postman;
"B" if you use mailman more frequently than postman, but you do use postman occasionally;
"C" if you use mailman and postman equally often;
"D" if you use postman more often than mailman, but you do use mailman sometimes; or,
"E" if, of the two words, you use postman almost exclusively and you use mailman rarely if ever.

APPENDIX B

LIST OF VARIABLES AND THEIR CODING

1A Anomie	+1 strong feelings of social dissatisfaction
1C Preference for Canada over the U.S.	+1 total preference for Canada
1D Preference for the U.S. over the U.K.	+1 total preference for the U.S.
1E Preference for Canada over the U.K.	+1 total preference for Canada
1F Preference for the U.S. over the U.K. in matters concerning Canada	+1 total preference for the U.S.
1I Canadian linguistic and national identity	+1 strong feelings for a Canadian identity
2A Attitude towards Americans	+1 positive attitude
2B Attitude towards Scots	+1 positive attitude
2C Attitude towards the English	+1 positive attitude
2D Attitude towards Canadians	+1 positive attitude
2E Subjects' self-rating as others see them	+1 positive attitude
2F Subjects' self-rating as they think they are	+1 positive attitude
4A Vowel before *r*	+1 distinctive vowels
4B Syllabicity	+1 distinctive syllabicity
4C Low back vowel	+1 distinctive low back vowels
4D Diphthong raising	+1 no raising

4E *Y*-glide	+1 presence of *y*-glides
4F *Wh*-feature	+1 presence of *wh*-feature
4H Vowel deletion	+1 no deletion
4I *T*-flapping	+1 no flapping
4J U.S./U.K. pronunciation variants	+1 U.K. usage
4L U.S./U.K. lexical choice	+1 U.K. usage
4N Canadian lexical choice	+1 Canadian usage

VITA

Surname: GULDEN Given Names: BRIGITTE KATJA

Place of Birth: KONSTANZ, W. Germany

Date of Birth: September 7, 1954

Educational Institutions Attended, with Dates of Entering and Leaving:

UNIVERSITÄT FREIBURG, W. GERMANY	1973 to 1975
UNIVERSITY OF STIRLING, SCOTLAND	1975 to 1976
UNIVERSITÄT FREIBURG, W. GERMANY	1976 to 1977
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, B.C.	1977 to 1979

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded, with Dates and Names of Institutions:

Zwischenprüfung in Anglistik und Germanistik	1975	Universität Freiburg, W. Germany

Honors and Awards:

German Academic Exchange Service Scholarship 1975/76

Canada Council Scholarship 1977/78

German Academic Exchange Service Supplement 1977/78

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Scholarship 1978/79

Publications:

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make *single copies only* for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other University, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis

ATTITUDINAL FACTORS IN CANADIAN ENGLISH USAGE

Author [redacted]

Brigitte Katja Gulden
Name

August 8, 1979
Date