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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a mixed methods study of the alleged Americanisation of Australian English as it is perceived by the speakers and evinced in their language use. The study is based on sociolinguistic interview material collected by the author in the small country town of Blayney in New South Wales, with participants from three age groups (adolescent, middle-aged and older speakers). As cross-generational studies of this kind have thus far been relatively scarce, this thesis makes an important contribution in the field of empirical sociolinguistic study of present-day Australian English.

Alongside speaker perceptions of the alleged American influence, this apparent time study investigates the variable pronunciations of a set of lexemes by the interview participants together with morphosyntactic features (subject-verb agreement with *there*-existentials and stative possessive *have* (*got*)) and discourse quotatives. This thesis addresses the following three questions: 1) Do people think there is American English influence in Australian English?, 2) Are American English style usages becoming more common? and 3) Do the different features present different results? In interpreting the findings, speaker age and sex are considered throughout as the central factors conditioning the observed variation. In addition, the effect of selected linguistic constraints is also examined.

The findings of the perceptual part of the study confirm that the speakers of all ages feel that Australian English is being influenced by American English. While the interview participants across generations confirm the existence of such influence, different language features are regarded as comprising Americanisms by different age groups. Thus, while the young speakers mainly see vocabulary as being Americanised, the older interviewees are more inclined to also include examples of spelling and pronunciation in their accounts.

In terms of their actual language use, the investigation of the speakers’ pronunciation reveals that while some of the words are indeed increasingly pronounced in the perceived American style, others show hardly any variation across generations. The distributional analysis of the morphosyntactic features and discourse quotatives, on the other hand, shows generational patterning across all the variables. The findings provide support for the assumption that the younger speakers are more likely to use the more American style variants. Although these changes in the usage patterns cannot be attributed directly to American influence, the possibility of them being perceived as such by the speakers may strengthen their views of Americanisation. By taking into consideration both speakers’ perceptions and their language use the findings presented in this thesis offer significant insights into the alleged American English influence in the Australian English context.
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PART I: BACKGROUND
1 INTRODUCTION

In the book *English in Australia* (edited by Blair and Collins 2001) Taylor proposes the following for studying Australian English (hereafter, AusE):

Any sort of adequate survey would at least have to:
1. use informants throughout Australia and ideally not just in the main cities, but also the country, which may approve to be more resistant to cultural change and so to foreign linguistic influences,
2. compare the different socioeconomic areas of the main cities, and
3. compare the different age groups.

(Taylor 2001: 334)

The quote above introduces several areas of language study that have not attracted much research interest in the Australian context until quite recently, including the study of rural AusE and cross-generational variation within it. The current study will tackle these two aspects in association with the often occurring theme of American influence\(^1\) on Australia and AusE in the public sphere. By combining the study of speaker perceptions of and attitudes towards the alleged American English (hereafter, AmE) influence on AusE and the language use of speakers representing three generations from a small country town\(^2\) this thesis aims at giving a broad picture of the possible spread of the more AmE style features into rural AusE.\(^3\) This is achieved by examining both the speakers’ answers to direct questions about AmE influence and their actual use a set of linguistic features that have been reported to occur with differing frequencies in British English (hereafter, BrE) and AmE. In order to have common ground between these two strands of the study, most of the linguistic features were selected with special attention to speaker comments that occurred in the course of the interviews.

1.1 THE STUDY OF AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH

Much of the previous research on AusE has concentrated on phonetic, phonological and lexical studies (e.g., *inter alia*, Mitchell and Delbridge 1965; Ramson 1966; Horvath 1985; Borowsky 2001; Cox and Palethorpe 2001;

---

\(^1\) In this study, the term American influence is used in reference to influence (linguistic as well as cultural) originating in the United States of America.

\(^2\) A detailed description of the research site, Blayney, and the fieldwork will be given in Chapter 4.

\(^3\) While I refer to the variety investigated as AusE throughout this study, it needs to be understood as the variety spoken by the people in a rural area of New South Wales (NSW). Thus, my intention is not to claim that the results would necessarily be applicable to neither other rural nor urban areas of Australia.
Tollfree 2001; Moore 2008). It is, indeed, in these areas of language that AusE reportedly differs the most from other varieties of English. Grammatically, AusE does not differ to any significant degree from other varieties but, nevertheless, grammar has also attracted research interest. Earlier studies on grammatical features were largely based on elicitation tests (Collins 2009: 1), but the availability of corpus material (such as the *Australian Corpus of English*, the Australian component of the *International Corpus of English* (ICE-AUS) and the *Australian Radio Talkback Corpus*) has facilitated the investigation of the grammatical practices in AusE. Furthermore, the comparable corpora of the ICE family allow for comparisons between varieties (see e.g., Collins 1991a, 1991b, 2005, 2007, 2012; Peters 2001a, 2008; and especially Peters, Collins and Smith 2009). The findings of these corpus-based studies have shown how AusE relates to other varieties, particularly AmE, BrE and New Zealand English (hereafter, NZE) in its usage patterns and thus provide a backdrop against which to consider the findings of the present study.

Much of the previous research on spoken AusE has largely concentrated on the language used in the cities, mainly Sydney (e.g., Eisikovits 1991; Horvath 1985) and Melbourne (e.g., Ferguson 2008; Penry Williams 2011; Tollfree 2001) with Perth recently entering the scene as well (e.g., Rodríguez Louro 2013, 2016). Studies of AusE as spoken in more rural areas are scarce, although research conducted by Shnukal (1978, 1982) in Cessnock (Hunter Valley, New South Wales) and by Tollfree (2001) in rural Victoria can be classified as such. However, there is an obvious lack of recent linguistic studies in a small country town context. The examination of the language use outside the main cities is, nevertheless, important as often the “True Blue Aussie” is pictured as a country person rather than someone living in a city. This contradiction is noticed by Penry Williams (2011: 84) when she states that “while discussions of national identity appeal to rural life, linguistic work in Australia has largely focused on the capital cities while drawing on these associations.” In order to complement the picture drawn by the previous research of the current state of AusE, rural speakers’ language use deserves to be taken into account as has been called for by Taylor (2001: 334) as well as Bradley (1989: 269).

Despite the fact that age and gender have been considered as two of the most important social factors affecting people’s language use (e.g., Labov 1966; Trudgill 1974), these have relatively rarely been systematically investigated in AusE. Although different age groups have been included in various studies, comprehensive studies in the (variationist) sociolinguistic tradition are scarce. This lack of quantitative sociolinguistic research is also

---

4 Some studies of spoken AusE have also been conducted in Adelaide, Brisbane, Hobart, Mount Gambier and Canberra (see Tollfree 1996; Borowsky 2001; Horvath and Horvath 2001).

5 The term ‘true blue’ as used in Australia is defined in the *Macquarie Dictionary* as follows: “in Australia associated with the working class and Labor with the emphasis on the loyalty of mates to each other”.

noted by Schneider (2012: 349), who reports it to be close to non-existent in the Australian context. However, in order to chart the possible linguistic features representing ongoing changes, the examination of the linguistic behaviour of different age groups is essential as Horvath (1985: 47) notes: “Any study of language change in progress requires an age range in order to look at generational differences.”

Recently the variationist approach has, however, been gaining ground in AusE research especially with Rodríguez Louro’s studies (e.g., 2013, 2016) on the use of quotatives in Perth English concentrating on cross-generational variation (among other constraints). However, studies of this type are still in the minority in comparison with other major varieties of English (see References for, e.g., Tagliamonte’s work). When language use across generations has been studied in AusE, the investigations have mainly concentrated on the younger end of the age range (e.g., Eisikovits 1989, 1991; Ferguson 2008), included very large age brackets (e.g., Horvath 1985) or concentrated on a particular linguistic feature (e.g., Guy et al. 1986; Rodríguez Louro 2013, 2016). In light of these observations, the present cross-generational study comprising of multiple features makes a valuable contribution to the sociolinguistic study of present-day AusE.

While cross-generational studies onAusE may be scarce, investigations taking speaker attitudes and perceptions into account are even rarer. One of the few attitudinal studies on AusE was conducted by Bradley and Bradley (2001) who investigated Australian speakers’ changing attitudes towards their own language variety. As regards to AmE influence, Ferguson (2008) investigates the attitudes of young informants (aged 18–30) towards AmE influence. However, a generational study of speaker perceptions of and the attitudes towards the alleged Americanisation ofAusE is so far lacking.

In light of this short synopsis of previous studies on AusE, the need for studying the language use across generations of speakers in rural Australia and including a perceptual component becomes evident. In this thesis, this need is approached by examining the perceived phenomenon of Americanisation of AusE which is briefly introduced in the following section.

1.2 AMERICANISATION AND AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH

The essence of this study is presented in a quote from Ferguson (2008: 29): “If speakers perceive a linguistic feature to be an Americanism, it does not matter whether it actually is or not, for their belief will affect their language choice”. The aim of this study is not to examine linguistic features as being strictly American or British (or any other), but to try and see the language through the eyes of the language users. Thus, what may be perceived as AmE

---

* Horvath’s (1985) study on the social variation in Sydney included two age groups, teenagers (13-18 years) and their parents (31-64 years).
usage by the speakers is of interest. Therefore, the features studied may not have originated in America, but they are used to varying degrees in the two major varieties of English (i.e., BrE and AmE) and may thus be seen as differentiating these two varieties by speakers.

Americanisation of Australia and AusE has been a hot topic in the minds of Australians for decades and continues to be so. As noted by Peters (1998: 32), “few topics generate more heat and indignant calls to talkback radio than the Americanisation of Australian English.” And it is not only the laypeople who have shown interest in this influence. The impact AmE may (or may not) have on AusE has been discussed by, for example, the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) as early as 1956 (Leitner 1984, cited in Penry Williams 2011: 79) and it has also attracted scholarly research. The book edited by Bell and Bell (1998), *Americanization and Australia*, is dedicated to the topic, but does not only (or even mainly) concentrate on linguistic influence but also on the American influence found in many other fronts, such as television, sport and music. Previous linguistic studies on AmE influence have been conducted in all areas of language: vocabulary (Baker 1965; Peters 2001b and references therein), pronunciation (Sussex 1978, 1989; Taylor 1989, 2001) and grammar (e.g. Peters and Fee 1987; Taylor 1989; Peters 1993a, 1993b) with Ferguson (2008) charting the attitudes and actual usage of AmE features by young Melbournians in her honours thesis.

Although much of the previous research has shown that AusE is not being Americanised as such, reactions from the speakers are, as Burridge (2010: 7) puts it, “typically hostile”. The fear of Americanisation is sometimes belittled by the researchers when they, for example, state that the features people judge as American are not actually American inventions (see e.g., Baker 1978). However, it is precisely these types of features, which are more often employed by the AmE speakers, that people perceive as being American and thus are the source of commentary on AmE influence. The fact that people often consider any new linguistic items or changes in language as originating in America adds to this perception. Therefore, linguists and the speakers of the language are often at odds in what comes to Americanisation of AusE (see also Burridge 2010). Australians are certainly not alone with their concerns about the Americanisation of their language and culture. Similar kinds of sentiments are aired the world over, both in countries where English is spoken as an official language as well as in countries where it is not (see e.g., Anchimbe 2006).

1.3 Aim and Scope of the Study

This doctoral dissertation is a collection of empirical studies on the speaker perceptions on and views of the alleged AmE influence on AusE together with the speakers’ actual language use. It is conducted in the Labovian sociolinguistic tradition starting with data collection using the sociolinguistic interview method and analysing the features of interest in relation to the social
variables of age and gender together with other conditioning factors. Thus, the present study attempts to fade out the distinction between intuition and data noted by Algeo (2006) in the quote below and give a more comprehensive account of the phenomenon of Americanisation in the AusE context.

A distinction is often drawn between intuition and data as the basis for statements about language. That dichotomy, like most others, is false. Intuition is needed to identify matters to comment on, and data is [...] needed to substantiate intuition.

(Algeo 2006: 2)

The two strands of the study (perceptual and usage) are intertwined throughout this dissertation. The benefits of combining the examination of linguistic variation (through corpus linguistic methods) with the study of language attitudes is described by Leech et al. (2009: 257):

the corpus linguistic paradigm gives no access to the attitudes to usage that may influence the changes of frequency we observe. Ideally, then, corpus research should be complemented by experiments or questionnaires eliciting informants’ judgements and attitudes.

The importance of taking perceptual information into account in the study of language change is also emphasised by Buchstaller (2014: 198):

Perceptual information can provide an important backdrop to distributional studies, especially in cases of language change, since it broadens our understanding of how change in the linguistic system is perceived by its very users.

These accounts well justify the use of multiple approaches to language variation in this study and form a background against which to evaluate the outcomes.

In addition to examining the speakers’ perceptions of AmE influence, a selection of linguistic features needs to be included in the study in order to be able to confirm or contradict these perceptions as well as to evaluate the extent to which AusE is possibly following the AmE usage patterns. As Peters (1998: 33) suggests, “A broader view of the language is needed to examine these recurring claims of American influence, taking in all levels of language, phonology, grammar and the lexicon”. Therefore, the second strand of the study first charts the pronunciations of a selection of individual lexical items that the informants read from flash cards at the end of the interviews. Although these lexical items were decided on beforehand, some of them were also commented on by the speakers and generated discussion on the topic of Americanisation during the interviews.

Following the section on pronunciation, two morphosyntactic features and one discourse feature are studied in detail. As already mentioned, these
features do not necessarily present Americanisms in the sense that they would have been borrowed directly from AmE to AusE, but merely that they are used with differing frequencies in the three varieties of English with AmE often leading the change. The wish to make a contribution to the so far very scarce variationist sociolinguistic research of AusE, the selection of features was guided by previous studies in other varieties of English. Furthermore, as this study also takes speaker views into account, it was felt important to include features that were mentioned by the speakers in the course of the interview, although not necessarily directly in connection with AmE influence. These mentions do, however, show that some of the features are above the consciousness of the speakers. Finally, the features selected for study have been reported to occur more often in spoken than in written language and also occur with high frequencies in the present material. Some of the features mentioned in previous research as hovering between the BrE style usage and the American style usage in AusE, such as the ones reported by Newbrook (2001), could not be considered because of their low number of occurrences in the data. This selection process then yielded the following features to complement the study of speaker perceptions and pronunciation: subject-verb agreement with there-existentials, stative possessive have (got) and discourse quotatives, each of which will be discussed in detail in the relevant research sections of this thesis (Chapters 7–8).

By considering the main research questions listed below, this dissertation aims at widening the knowledge of the uses current in AusE by investigating the language spoken in a rural setting. It will also serve as a starting point for further studies on the features examined in the present study as well as open up various new possibilities for future research. By encompassing multiple features this dissertation aims for breadth rather than depth which necessarily means that it is not feasible to account for all possible aspects of variation in the use of the variables examined in the data. However, with its reach from speaker perceptions to their language use and its cross-generational orientation, this study is set out to achieve a broad understanding of the ongoing linguistic changes in AusE.

The main research questions addressed in this study are:

1) Do the interview participants think that there is AmE influence in AusE? If so, what kinds of influence have they noticed? Do the different age groups differ in their opinions?

2) Do the examined features (of pronunciation, morphosyntax and discourse) present heightened use of the perceived AmE style variants in AusE? Are there generational and/or gender differences in their use?

3) Do the different features present different results?
The search for the answers to these questions needs to start with setting the background for the study. This is done by describing the external and the linguistic history as well as the current state of AusE and social variation within it (Chapter 2) and by setting the background for the American influence by surveying the Australian-American relationship from the early settlement history to the present day (Chapter 3). This is followed by a detailed description of the research site, fieldwork and the material together with the methods used (Chapter 4). The findings of the study are presented in Chapters 5–8 followed by a concluding summary of the findings together with a critical evaluation of the study and suggestions for future research directions in Chapter 9.
2 THE STORY OF AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH

In order to be able to examine AusE as it is used at present, one needs to have a look at the history first. This chapter describes the history of AusE – both external and linguistic – together with a discussion on its current status as well as social variation within it.

2.1 THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH

The European contact with the Australian continent started when the Dutch explored the coasts of Australia in the seventeenth century. In 1770, the Englishman James Cook sailed to the east coast and soon afterwards, in 1788, Britain began settling convicts in Australia. The European settlement in Australia thus began when the first convict settlement was established in Sydney Cove in New South Wales (NSW). There was also sporadic contact with Americans and their language through trading ships visiting Sydney as early as at the end of the 18th century. The transportation of convicts continued until the mid-19th century when the pressure to end the convict transportation increased and the system was subsequently abolished (NSW by 1850, Van Diemen’s Land [Tasmania] in 1853). The last convict ship departed for Western Australia in 1867 and altogether approximately 150,000 convicts were transported to Australia (Davidson et al. 2001: 654). After the sentences of the prisoners expired and they became free, many of them returned to England but many also stayed in Australia (Millward 1989: 315).

The first arrivals were mostly prisoners, prison officers and their families from southern England. Besides the English convicts, there were also Irish prisoners in Australia during the first years of colonisation, and around the turn of the nineteenth century there was heavy immigration from Scotland. In the early years of the colony, free settlers were in the minority (Burridge and Mulder 1998: 36; Millward 1989: 315). Table 2.1 presents the origins of the inhabitants of the colonies in mid-19th century.

The convicts were not by any means a homogeneous group as Fritz (2007: 22) points out by saying that “[i]n education, skills, outlook on life and, of course, language, convicts differed very much from each other.” A further description of the convicts is given by Gunn (1992: 209):

Five sixths of the convicts were men, the average age was about twenty-six, few were married, and the place they knew best was London, where the majority were tried and sentenced. [...] Former occupations were commonly described as labourers or farm worker, and the most frequent sentence was seven years, usually for theft or burglary with previous convictions.
Table 2.1. Origins of inhabitants of colonies (from Price 1987: 10f; cited in Fritz 2007: 34 as Table 2.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colony (year)</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Other British</th>
<th>Non-British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW (1846)</td>
<td>54,357</td>
<td>46,368</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>10,064</td>
<td>37,729</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC (1846)</td>
<td>7,583</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>9,126</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA (1846)</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>11,792</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD (1846)</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA (1832)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to convicts, other social groups were also present from the beginning. Gunn (1992: 208–214) divides the people in early Australia into three social groups: 1) the top social group included educated civic officials and military officers, 2) convicts, who clearly outnumbered the free settlers up to 1830, and 3) middle social groups, a relatively small group of tradesmen and some emancipists. The most important middle group arose a little later with the first generation of native born, “the currency lads and lasses as distinct from the British born or sterling” (Gunn 1992: 213). The demarcation of these different groups was not, however, strong (Mitchell ms: 6, cited in Fritz 2007: 23). The first settlers were, according to Turner (1994: 277), important in setting the direction of linguistic development in the new land. Therefore, linguistically this mixing of different regional, occupational and social varieties meant that some levelling of the language followed (Turner 1966: 10). The linguistic development of AusE will be discussed in more detail in Section 2.2.

As the settlement spread inland, the Blue Mountains on the east coast of Australia were crossed in 1813 (Turner 1966: 13). This is also when the first settlers arrived in Blayney, the research site for this study (see Map 2.1. for the location of the research site). Towards the middle of the 19th century, the new settlements expanded further to other parts of the Australian continent. The new colonies were initially established without transported convicts. However, old hands from NSW and Van Diemen’s Land (convicts, ex-convicts and colonials) were important for the new colonies’ development (Fritz 2007: 30, 39).
There was internal migration in Australia from the beginning because of the frequent intersettlement transfers of convicts and soldiers (Guy 1991: 219). Furthermore, the two gold rush periods in the 19th century increased the need for migration. The first gold rush in the 1850s centred in Victoria and NSW. This brought about a great deal of internal as well as overseas migration (Horvath 1985: 33) as gold-seekers from England, Scotland and Ireland headed for Australia (Clark 1995: 131). The gold rush period also brought a considerable number of Americans to Australia. Linguistically these internal migrations meant that any differences there might have been between the varieties of AusE were overwhelmed by them (Kiesling 2004: 424–425). As Moore (2008: 88) concludes, “It is likely [...] that the gold rushes were important in enforcing the homogeneity of the Australian accent across the continent.”

In the mid-19th century, as a result of the growing political and economic power and increased feeling of national pride, the desire for independence started to rise (Fritz 2007: 41). Various changes occurred around this time including at least the following: 1) the focus of many colonial-born shifted from Britain to their country of birth; 2) the ratio of males and females became more
balanced and the number of unmarried males declined; 3) as a result of urbanisation, social class became more important also in the Australian society and urban and rural Australia became more separated from each other (Fritz 2007: 41, 54–56). Towards the end of the 19th century, a series of conventions and referendums took place in order to form a federation (Crowley 1974: 245–252). As a result, the former six colonies (New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia, Western Australia and Queensland) were federated into the Commonwealth of Australia in 1901.

Despite the establishment of the Commonwealth of Australia, there was still no fully developed Australian national identity or self-image (Crowley 1974: 260–261). The close ties with Britain became evident in both world wars in which Australian volunteers served as Britain’s auxiliaries (Bolton 1990: 6). However, World War II was to change this setting as Australia felt – in the fear of a Japanese attack – that their “mother country” would not necessarily always protect them and thus started to look elsewhere for “allies”. Schneider (2007: 123) regards this as the “Event X” in Australian history that changed the attitudes of Australians. The consequences of this for the Australian-American relations are further discussed in Section 3.2.

After the war, migration from Europe was encouraged by the government (Clark 1995: 277). Prior to that the number of non-British European immigrants was low and there were hardly any Asians in Australia (Guy 1991: 216). Although the non-English speakers started to come in large numbers after World War II, their impact on AusE was minimal (Guy 1991: 217). However, in the 21st century, Australia is very much a multicultural society and the possible linguistic effect of this is certainly a valid question in present-day Australia.

### 2.2 THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH

The settlement history of Australia serves as the background for the discussion of the linguistic development of AusE. As this often goes hand in hand with the development of language attitudes, they will be considered together in this section. I will discuss the evolution of AusE through the five stage model (the Dynamic Model) proposed by Schneider (2007) for the development of colonial Englishes. As for the attitudes, Leitner (2004a) provides a four-phase model and this categorisation will be used as the basis for the discussion on attitudes.

According to Schneider (2007: 118), the first phase of AusE lasted from the beginning of the convict settlement until the end of the 1830s. Several theories of the development of AusE during this first phase have been put forward in the literature. Some researchers refer to the “mixing bowl” effect, i.e. the dialects that were present in the colonies then mixed into what became to be AusE. For example, Guy (1991: 217) and Trudgill (1986: 136–137) state that besides the London (Cockney) variety of English and the dialects of the south
of England, also other dialects, such as Irish English, East Anglian varieties and the dialects of the Midlands must have had an impact on AusE. Schneider (2007: 119) supports this “mixing bowl” theory by calling this first phase “a classic example of dialect mixture and koinéization”. This view that AusE developed on Australian soil has been further divided into two different approaches (Fritz 1998: 26). According to the first approach, AusE developed independently all over Australia into a uniform dialect from the same set of ‘ingredients’ while the second approach suggests that AusE was shaped in Sydney and then spread from there to all other corners of the continent.

Another alternative is that, instead of being formed on Australian soil, the mixing of different dialects took place already in Britain and then this new “variety” was transported to Australia. For example, Turner (1966: 10–11) claims that AusE is a mixed variety consisting of predominantly southern BrE dialects and that the mixing had already started in London before the transportation. However, Collins (1975; cited in Cochrane 1989: 177) claims that such mixing had taken place in the southeast Midlands and that the mixture then “‘pidginized” through a reduction of phonological rules and variants” in Australia.

There is also a third proposal as to how AusE became to be what it is today. This is provided by Hammarström (1980) who claims that it is plausible to believe that the most prestigious dialect, which in this case would have been the dialect of London, takes over more or less completely. His claim is also based on the evidence that London provided the greatest number of immigrants in the early years of the Australian settlement. However, as Moore (2008: 69) writes, this view is not seen as correct today. Moore (2008: 70) states, supporting Turner (1966) up to a point, that “some rudimentary levelling of dialects could have occurred in the prison hulks in Britain […] as well as on the long ship journey to Australia” but that these modifications would have been only minor and not have affected the wider speech community. According to him, the Australian accent was established in Sydney from where it spread out to the other centres of settlement resulting in linguistic homogeneity (Moore 2008: 70). Trudgill (2004: 23) predicts that the process of dialect creation in Australia would have taken about 50 years so that “the first adolescent speakers of this fully-fledged variety” could be found around 1855. This timeframe of 50 years for the development of AusE is shared by Mitchell who states that “we might guess that the main features of Australian speech were established by the 1830s” (Mitchell 1970: 11). Based on the evidence from the Origins of New Zealand English (ONZE) Project, Trudgill (2006: 23) proposes a similar timespan for the development of NZE.7

One of the features of this first period of linguistic development in Australia, naturally, is the borrowing of a large number of words from Aboriginal languages. As the settlers came across unfamiliar things, they
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7 The ONZE Project is based at the Department of Linguistics at the University of Canterbury. http://www.nzilbb.canterbury.ac.nz/once.shtml
needed new words to describe them with. Therefore, a number of words for native flora and fauna and some cultural terms were borrowed (see e.g., Turner [1994] and Leitner [2004a: 151–156] for further discussion). Of course, other means to “create” new words were also used, such as the expansion of the meaning of lexical items and compounding (for example, with the words *bush* and *native*) (Eagleson 1982: 417–418).

During this first period, Australia had very close ties with Britain, the mother country. This was also seen in the language attitudes. English spoken in Australia was often seen as a deviation from BrE and attitudes towards it were primarily negative (Leitner 2004a: 94). This only started to change when the convict system was superseded by free settlement in the 1820s and a sense of Australianness began to develop (Leitner 2004a: 95).

The Phase 2 of Schneider’s model, the exonormative period, took place from around 1830s to 1901 in Australia (Schneider 2007: 120). At that time, Australians still looked at Britain as the mother country. As a result of the regional expansion and population growth (the establishment of new colonies and the gold rushes thereafter) English was rooted in new parts of Australia (Schneider 2007: 120). This led to another period of heavy borrowing from Aboriginal languages and, thus, the AusE vocabulary extended tremendously on the second half of the 19th century (Moore 2008: 106). The older settlers also had an important role in facilitating the linguistic adaptation of the new immigrants to their new surroundings (Fritz 2007: 39). According to Fritz (2007: 61), “[t]he native varieties of English in Australia reached maturity” towards the end of this period.

Interest in AusE grew in this period and the first Australian slang dictionaries were published. Two most important ones were the Australian edition of *Webster’s International Dictionary of the English Language* (1898), and E.E. Morris’s *Austral English: A Dictionary of Australasian Words, Phrases and Usages* (1898). Besides illustrating the growing interest in AusE, the publication of these dictionaries also showed how AusE had diverged from BrE (Moore 2008: 121). This period of increased nationalistic feelings thus marked the beginning of serious study of AusE (Turner 1966: 24).

The attitudes towards the English spoken in Australia seem to have varied in the 19th century. As Eagleson (1982: 434) states, AusE received some conflicting comments from very early on. Both visitors and officials expressed their views on it and the comments ranged from ‘pure’ and ‘harmonious’ to ‘corrupt’. However, there seems to be general agreement that for most of the 19th century AusE was seen as a ‘pure’ form of English because it was free of dialectal elements (Moore 2008: 76). This especially applied to the children born in the colony. As Kiesling (2004: 430) states, many observers in the early colony noted that the native-born speak ‘better’ English than their parents. Despite a few negative comments, the commentary on AusE is overwhelmingly positive until at least the 1880s (Moore 2008: 76).
More critical commentary on AusE begins to appear towards the beginning of the 20th century. In 1911 Valerie Desmond writes about the Australian way of speech:

The Australian accent has frequently been described by travellers, but none have done justice to its abominations. Many unobservant persons, shuddering through three or four months’ experience, have left Australia saying that the people of the island continent use the dialect of the East End of London. This is a gross injustice to poor Whitechapel. Neither the coster of to-day, nor the old-time Cockney of the days of Dickens, would be guilty of uttering the uncouth vowel sounds I have heard habitually used by all classes in Australia. For the dialect of this country differs from those of other lands in being as strongly developed among the educated people as among the peasantry. Were its use restricted to the bullock-driver and the larrikin one could make excuses; but this is not so. Judges, scientists, University graduates, and bottle-gatherers use the same universal Australian esperanto.

(Desmond 1911: 15–16)

This spread of criticism developed into a prescriptivist attitude especially towards Australian vowels and diphthongs, the sounds that most clearly distinguish AusE from other English varieties (Moore 2008: 124, 126). Tied to these critical attitudes towards the Australian accent in the latter part of the 19th century was the emphasis put on elocution in education. Schools (both private and government-funded) exercised heavy emphasis on correct speech, i.e., that of middle- and upper-class English (Damousi 2010: 124). Of special importance were the school speech days which were, as Damousi (2010: 123) describes, “a celebration of British speech and culture and reflected not only a firm connection to the empire but a commitment to the Victorian values inherent in correct and fluent speech”. The strong association with the “mother country” is thus also evident in the language attitudes in this period.

At the same time, however, English as it was spoken in Australia was starting to be of more interest and also seen as something to be proud of. Leitner (2004a: 94) calls this period the ‘AusE awareness’ Phase and it stretched to the first decades of the 20th century. This coincided with the nationalistic feelings that led up to the forming of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Schneider’s Phase 3 in the development of AusE took place during the first decades of the 20th century (1901–1942) and this is the time of nativisation (Schneider 2007: 121). The beginning of this phase is marked with the forming of the Commonwealth of Australia. Linguistically, this was the time when local linguistic forms and patterns in pronunciation, vocabulary and also in grammar developed (Schneider 2007: 121). The linguistic developments towards this period increased the awareness of a distinctly Australian variety and, according to Moore (2008: 101), the term ‘Australian English’ appeared in 1908.
In this period, attitudes towards AusE continued to be, as described by Horvath (1985: 22), largely negative – a ‘trend’ that lasted until the 1940s. However, there were also opposing views. One of the defendants of AusE was the linguist A.G. Mitchell who commented on the Australians way of speech in 1942 through a series of articles in the *ABC Weekly*. On 5 September 1942 (cited in Moore 2008: 135) he writes:

The Australian pronunciation of English takes its place among the national forms of English as any other. It has its own history and is not a corrupt derivative of anything. Development does not of necessity imply degeneration.

Even though Mitchell had support for his views, they were not widely accepted. Although it was the pronunciation of AusE that was most often condemned, also vocabulary was seen as not suitable for serious contexts (Moore 2008: 136). This variability in attitudes corresponds with Leitner’s description of the third stage in the development of attitudes towards AusE (starting in the 1930s) which he calls ‘mainstream AusE’ Phase 1. According to him, an acceptable local accent was recognised but many still had mixed feelings about it (Leitner 2004: 95). At the same time, however, AusE was celebrated in popular culture, e.g. on radio and film. Thus, Australian accents were accepted in comic contexts or when the emphasis was on rural Australia (Moore 2008: 140). In addition to film productions, there were several publications that celebrated Australian vocabulary. Prime examples of these include C.J. Dennis’s *Songs of a Sentimental Bloke* (1915) and John O’Grady’s *They’re a Weird Mob* (1957). The popularity of these and other books like them demonstrate the popular interest in the Australian way of speech (Moore 2008: 142).

Schneider’s Phase 4, the endonormative period, took place in AusE between 1942 and the 1980s (Schneider 2007: 122). According to Peters (2009a: 115), the events of World War II gave Australians a greater sense of national identity and thus precipitated the way to linguistic endonormativity. In other words, the connections to England weakened and the Australian national identity became stronger. This also meant the acceptance of the Australian way of speaking towards the end of the period. One clear sign of this development is the codification of AusE that could be said to have started with Baker’s *The Australian Language* in 1945 and Mitchell’s *The Pronunciation of English in Australia* in 1946. In his book, Mitchell introduces the division of AusE into Broad and Educated Australian, which can be seen as the predecessor of the division into the three varieties (Broad, General and Cultivated Australian) proposed by Mitchell and Delbridge (1965). Towards the 1980s dictionary projects were well on their way and the *Macquarie Dictionary* edited by Delbridge et al. was first published in 1981 and the *Australian National Dictionary* edited by W.S. Ramson in 1988. In addition to dictionaries, AusE usage has been recorded in style manuals and usage guides. The Australian Government *Style Manual* was first published in
1966 with several updated editions appearing between the 1970s and 2002. The publication of a number of usage guides, such as Right Words by Murray-Smith in 1987, Modern Australian Usage by Hudson in 1993 and The Cambridge Australian English Style Guide by Peters in 1995/2007 have also marked the endonormative status of AusE.

AusE can be said to have moved to Phase 5 in the 1980s (Schneider 2007: 125). Therefore, AusE has, according to Schneider, reached the end of the cycle. Recently, more and more Australians have been noted to claim that they can identify the regional origin of a fellow Australian by their accent (Schneider 2007: 125). That is, new dialects seem to be developing in Australia. Among the first to observe this internal differentiation of AusE was Trudgill (1986) who stated that “the relatively new, mixed, uniform Australian variety is now showing definite signs of beginning to develop regional differentiation” (Trudgill 1986: 145). Studies have shown that there are some regional differences in AusE, most of which are found in the vocabulary and phonetics/phonology (see, for example, Bradley 1989, 2004; Bryant 1989, 1993; Horvath & Horvath 2001; Kreuiter 1994). At present, the migrant English varieties and the development of new ethnic dialects are making the linguistic landscape of Australia even more complex.

In attitudes, the most radical changes can be said to have happened by the early 1970s. In the 1950s, many Australians still regarded themselves as British (Moore 2008: 154), but by the 1970s this had changed towards the acceptance of AusE. The new cultural nationalism was evident in films and TV and there was also an increased academic interest in AusE (Moore 2008: 158). In Leitner’s categorisation this is the fourth stage, called ‘mainstream AusE’ Phase 2, and by this time the independence and identity of AusE is fully accepted and this is also the best documented period of all (Leitner 2004a: 95, 104). According to Moore (2008: 161–162) AusE becomes ‘naturalised’ in the period of 1966–1988 and the complaints subside: “The complaints about the Australian accent largely disappear in this period, and Australian colloquialisms are not a cause for complaint.” This view is supported, for example, by Bradley and Bradley’s study (2001) who report that Australians’ positive attitudes towards AusE notably increased during the fifteen years between 1980 and 1995.

During its nearly 200-year history, AusE has developed from what was often seen as a disregarded and corrupt variety into a national variety and a regional standard. Leitner (2004: 1, 341) even suggests, that AusE is on its way to becoming an epicentre for the Asia-Pacific region and as such being “a target variety” in that area. Although this view has been more recently criticised both on terminological as well as methodological grounds (Hundt 2013; see also Peters 2009a), AusE of today is certainly recognised internationally as one of the major varieties of English (Schneider 2007: 124). The current status of AusE and variation within it are described in the last two sections of this chapter below.
2.3 PRESENT-DAY AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH

As was shown in the previous section, AusE has reached Phase 5 in Schneider’s (2007) model and is now in the early stages of differentiation (Peters 2014). The present stage of AusE is thus that of a recognised national variety. This is demonstrated by the codification (dictionaries, style manuals and usage guides) of the language variety as well as by the numerous studies and publications on characteristically AusE features. Certain cultural changes, such as the move from British announcers to Australian ones by the ABC and the resurgence of Australian films, have also enforced this (Collins and Blair 2001; Peters 2014).

Since the 1970s and the advent of increased interest in AusE a lot of research has been done in all areas of language: lexicon (e.g., Moore 2008; Ramson 1966), phonetics and phonology (e.g., Borowsky 2001; Cox and Palethorpe 2001; Horvath 1985; 2004; Mitchell and Delbridge 1965), grammar/morphosyntax (e.g., Collins and Peters 2004; Newbrook 1992, 2001; Peters, Collins and Smith, eds. 2009), and discourse (e.g., Miller 2009; Rodríguez Louro 2013, 2016; Winter 2002). Speaker attitudes towards AusE have also been examined, albeit not extensively (Bradley and Bradley 2001; Reeve 1989). Studies on regional and social variation in AusE are discussed in Section 2.4.

Although AusE now holds a position of a recognised variety among the other major varieties of English, linguistic insecurities are still apparent in people’s commentary on the alleged threats to AusE. Often these are directed towards the “big bad AmE”. The external influence from AmE has also been noted by linguists (Butler 2001; Sussex 1985, 1989; Taylor 1989; see also Peters 2014) and there has been a number of research papers on various aspects of Americanisation: Butler (2001), Ferguson (2008), Leitner (1984), Peters (1998, 2001), Peters and Fee (1989), Price (2006), Sussex (1978, 1985, 1989) and Taylor (1989, 2001). Despite the plethora of commentary on the alleged AmE influence, investigation of the attitudes towards this influence is scarce. Some recent research has, however, also addressed this question (Ferguson 2008; Korhonen 2008) and found that speakers of AusE indeed hold stong opinions of American influence. Often, however, laypeople and linguists present markedly differing views on the topic of Americanisation as for example, Collins (2012a) has noted. While the public firmly believes in the AmE influence, this has not been confirmed by scholarly research (see, Peters 1998).

In addition to AmE providing AusE with new linguistic material, other immigrant languages have also been of interest lately. As contemporary
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8 This is by no means an exhaustive list of research papers on AusE, rather these are here merely given as examples of the wide variety of topics discussed in the research literature on AusE. The most relevant references for the present study are referred to throughout this thesis, especially in the research sections below.
Australia is very much a multicultural society, especially in the cities, the languages of immigrants add to the differentiation. Studies that also consider the effect of immigrant languages include, for example, Clyne et al. (2001), Horvath (1985) and Leitner (2004b) just to name but a few.

2.4 VARIATION IN AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH

The pronunciation of vowels is the major factor differentiating AusE from other varieties and this vowel variation is often looked at through the categorisation of AusE into Broad, General and Cultivated accents introduced by Mitchell and Delbridge (1965). Although this categorisation has received some criticism (see, for example, Bradley 1980; Horvath 1985), the three partite division is still often used as the basis for the description of AusE. In what follows, the variation in present-day AusE is looked at from the viewpoints of regional and social differences. Firstly, I will briefly discuss the regional, socioeconomic and ethnic variation in AusE after which the social factors of age and gender are discussed in more detail.

AusE varies along many parameters in all areas of language. Firstly, there are regional differences. Although AusE has traditionally been considered as probably the most homogenous variety of English (Bernard 1989), regional differences have also started to emerge as it has reached the state of differentiation (see Peters 2014). As noted in the previous section, Trudgill (1986) was among the first to recognise this regional differentiation in AusE. Since then research has brought forward a variety of studies on the subject. According to the findings of these studies, regional differences are presented in the lexicon (Bryant 1985, 1989, 1991, 1997) as well as phonology and phonetics (Bernard 1989; Bradley 1989; Cox and Palethorpe 2001, 2004; Horvath and Horvath 2001a, 2001b, 2002; Oasa 1989). Lexicon also provides the showcase examples, such as *port/*suitcase and *devon/*fritz/*polony*, of regional variation that are often mentioned by the speakers of AusE (see Bryant 1989). Grammar, on the other hand, has so far presented no regional differentiation (Bernard 1989).

Differences between rural and urban areas can also be put under the heading of regional differences and these have been noted in AusE since the early work by Mitchell and Delbridge (1965). Although the rural/urban distinction (as in city versus the bush) has always been important in Australia (Butler 2001: 157), it has not been discussed in much detail in linguistic research literature and therefore calls for closer investigation as suggested by Taylor (2001: 334).

As with regional variation, AusE is also said to be socioeconomically fairly homogeneous. This is not to say that there are no socioeconomic differences in Australia as even in the beginning the settlers were by no means equal (convict vs free), but social class is not such a pronounced factor than, for instance, in the UK (Horvath 1985). However, this view of socioeconomic
In her study, the interview participants found class associations to be the most important conditioning factor in relation to language, albeit not the only one (Penry Williams 2011: 387). Indeed, social class has been one of the factors that have brought up differences in AusE. For example, Horvath’s (1985) study revealed that working class men used more Broad accents than the other participants. Variation according to social class has also been noted in studies on, for example, the high rising tone (HRT) (Guy and Vonwiller 1989) and nonstandard grammatical variants in vernacular AusE (Pawley 2004) (see also Peters 2014).

A more recent social factor in Australia is the ethnic diversity as was also pointed out in the previous section. What once was a very British society is now very multicultural and this is also notable in the linguistic landscape. Horvath (1985) included Greek and Italian immigrants in her study and identified a variety of “Ethnic Broad” to be used by the first generation speakers. Clyne et al. (2001) also look at what they call “ethnolects”. Research on these ethnic varieties has been conducted in various parts of the country (see Peters 2014 for references) and it can be expected to attract further study.

The two most important social factors for the present study are age and gender. As these are the factors used throughout this study, both in the examination of speaker perceptions of Americanisation as well as in the investigation of linguistic features, they are discussed in more detail in their relation to AusE below.

Age
Sociolectal variation in AusE is often related to age (younger and older generations) as are language attitudes, especially regarding Americanisation (Peters 2014: 113, 120). The need for having speakers from different age groups when examining any changes in the use of linguistic features is also pointed out by Horvath (1985). Even though this is the case, there are relatively few studies on AusE that would take generational differences into account. Starting with the study by Mitchell and Delbridge (1965), a number of studies on AusE have been conducted with young informants (most recently, e.g., Ferguson 2008; Penry Williams 2011; Winter 2002). However, a small number of generational studies on spoken AusE have also been conducted, such as Gallois and Callan (1989) on attitudes, Shnukal (1982) on phonology and most recently Rodríguez Louro (2013) on quotatives. Of the characteristically AusE features, the use of HRT has shown generational differences in that this type of pronunciation contour is used more by the young speakers of AusE (Guy and Vonwiller 1989).

Survey studies, such as the ones reported on in the Australian Style, on the other hand, have shed light on the generational differences in certain usage issues. According to Peters (2014: 112), “age related differences have regularly emerged as the dominant factor in language surveys in AusE”. These surveys
have revealed age related variation, for example, in grammar, such as the use of personal pronouns in non-subject coordinates (…) for my wife and I/me). In addition to surveys, corpus-based studies on verb morphology have also indicated that there are generational differences in AusE (Collins and Peters 2004).

Recently, there has been growing interest in the use of the quotatives in direct speech reporting. Studies done in Perth by Rodríguez Louro (2013, 2016; see also Rodríguez Louro and Ritz 2014) revealed generational differences in the use of quotatives by Australians. These are among the few studies that have been carried out using spoken material and examining the language use of different generations in AusE.

Age is also an important factor in relation to AmE influence. Taylor (1989) already notes that the younger generation is more likely to use the American variants in their pronunciation. In addition to generational differences in the use of linguistic features, there are also generational differences in the commentary. In talking about lexical transfers, Peters (2014: 120) states,

while younger Australians borrow them [AmE lexical items] freely, they are the focus of regular complaint by members of the older generation, though this reaction seems to be more about perceived subservience to American popular culture than the linguistic threat to AusE endonormativity.

It is therefore important to examine how the different generations’ perceptions of AmE influence possibly diverge from each other together with their differing uses of language features.

**Gender**

Besides age, gender is another important factor in Labovian sociolinguistics. It has been shown in numerous studies that women tend to take the lead in linguistic change (e.g., Labov 1966; Trudgill 1974). The historical background for the variation in language use between the two genders, males and females, in the Australian context is noted by Horvath (1985: 37–38): “Men and women led quite separate lives in the early days of the colony and [...] the remnants of the sexual division are felt even today.”

The importance of gender is further highlighted in AusE due to the portrayal of a stereotypical AusE speaker as a male from the lower socio-economic class. This is also evident in public commentary in which Australianness is exemplified by such public figures as Crocodile Dundee (Collins 2012a; Pawley 2008; Penry Williams 2011). This being so, the gender effect has also been taken into account in previous investigations on spoken AusE. The early work by Mitchell and Delbridge (1965) was balanced according to gender. Gender is also considered as an important factor by both Eisikovits (1989) and Horvath (1985). Eisikovits investigated the use of nonstandard forms in the speech of adolescents, while Horvath’s study revealed that the use of vowel variants is differentiated by gender for
teenagers. As a result, Horvath (1985: 82) predicted that gender differences may be becoming even more marked. In addition to presenting social class differences, the use of HRT is also variable according to speaker sex. Guy and Vonwiller (1989) found in their study that, in addition to the young, females are also more regular users of HRT than are males. However, more recently this gender difference has been diminishing. As Fletcher and Harrington (2001: 216) note on the changes taking place in the use of HRT: “popular wisdom is that it is becoming more widespread among both sexes throughout the Australian community”. In fact, they found males to produce more HRTs in statements in their map task data (Fletcher and Harrington 2001: 226).

In relation to AmE influence, to my knowledge, gender differences have not been examined. The interesting point here is, whether females would also more readily use the incoming AmE linguistic forms than males or rather shy away from them because they may be seen as stigmatised. In many sociolinguistic studies women have been shown to adopt new variants more quickly, but at the same time, they often also resort to more conservative variants than men (see e.g., Labov 2001: 266, 366ff.). Whether this gender difference also applies to people’s perceptions of and attitudes towards AmE influence makes an interesting topic for study.

In order to set the ground for the present study on the perceived AmE influence in AusE, I will now move from the linguistic description of AusE on to taking a look at how the relationships between Australia and the United States have developed since the early days of the European settlement in Australia.

---

9 The corpus used in Fletcher and Harrington’s (2001) study was the map task corpus of the Australian National Database of Spoken Language (ANDOSL).
3 AUSTRALIA IN CONTACT WITH AMERICA AND ITS LINGUISTIC CONSEQUENCES

As briefly noted in the previous chapter, Australia’s relationship with America started in the very early years of the settlement. This contact, which has constantly been reinforced in many fronts of life, has also had an impact on the English spoken in Australia. This chapter looks at how the two nations have interacted during the years and how their relationship has evolved since the early contacts (Section 3.1), the attitudes that have been manifested (3.2) and what the linguistic consequences of this ever closer relationship between Australia and the US are (3.3).

3.1 AUSTRALIA’S RELATIONSHIP WITH AMERICA

3.1.1 EARLY CONTACTS
Australia’s relationship with America goes as far back as the early years of the European settlement. The first American ship called in Sydney in 1792 and during the following years a number of whaling, sealing and trading vessels visited Australia. Although the Americans were seen as a nuisance by the NSW authorities – for example, it was claimed that they were aiding the convicts to escape – the number of American vessels visiting Sydney increased from 1800 and especially the trading of spirits and dry goods was substantial (Greenwood 1944: 63–96, 123). As Greenwood (1944: 117) writes, “the foreign trade of New South Wales in the first twenty years of the settlement was almost entirely confined to the United States”. However, the Anglo-American war of 1812 brought the trade relations to an end and they were not re-established anywhere near the scale they had been before during the next few decades (Greenwood 1944: 138–139).

American culture, on the other hand, started making its way to Australia in the early 19th century. The first American missionaries arrived in the 1820s and in the following decade American constitutional and political ideas were seen as models for Australia (Mosler and Catley 1998: 11). But the feelings towards the Americans were mixed. As Mosler and Catley (1998: 11) write, Australia was “willing, or even anxious, to accept Americans but always suspicious of the motives, power, and national characteristics of their Yankee cousins”. At the time, the emerging cultural impact of America was still small, but it “was to be inexorable” (Mosler and Catley 1998: 11). The linguistic impact, as well, was limited at this stage. It was not frequent enough and many

10 America is used for brevity in this context to refer to the United States of America.
of ships’ crew members were not actually American but British, Irish, Africans etc. who used pidgin forms of English (Fritz 2007: 205).

3.1.2 GOLD RUSHES
The next more intense phase of Australia’s relationship with America and Americans was during the gold rushes in the 1850s. Gold was first found in America in 1849 and only a couple of years later in 1851 in Australia. This resulted in two-way migration across the Pacific – number of Australian gold-seekers went to America and American miners came to Australia. The exact number of Americans in Australia at that time is hard to establish but they could be counted in their thousands (e.g., Mosler and Catley [1998: 12] give the figure of 5,000–6,000 while Gunn’s [1992: 221] estimate is 16,000). According to Fritz (2007: 44), the Americans who came to Australia were either miners or merchants who “soon acquired influential positions due to their superior skills”. This meant that linguistic consequences were also to be expected. In addition to Americans coming to Australia, also a number of Australian miners who had gone to the American gold fields returned to Australia and brought with them American vocabulary (Mosler and Catley 1998: 12). American influence was also visible in the political sphere as well as in the area of communications and commerce (Aitchison 1986).

The miners and merchants were not the only Americans to come to Australia during this period. There were people in the entertainment business – circuses, minstrel shows and live theatre – as well (see Waterhouse 1998). However, these were often resisted by the Australian theatrical scene (Mosler and Catley 1998: 13). All in all, the gold rush period of the 1850s can be seen as the time when AusE had its first real contact with AmE. It also marked the beginning of the still ongoing fear of Americanisation in Australia as the quote below confirms.

The cultural dynamic [...] of American influence producing fears about Americanization, and the concomitant reaction of anti-Americanism associated with Australian nationalistic search for identity, can be observed as early as the 1850s.

(Mosler and Catley 1998: 11–12)

After this fairly intense period of contact with the Americans, the connections faded towards the end of the 1850s only to strengthen again during the world wars in the next century.
3.1.3 FROM WORLD WAR II ONWARDS

After the gold rushes Australia continued to have commercial relationships with the United States, albeit its relationship with America was not clearly defined at the time. In addition to a small number of Americans settling into Australia during the first decades of the 20th century, there were also American visitors from cultural as well as political spheres (Mosler and Catley 1998: 23–25). The American-Australian trade relationships cooled during the 1930s depression and World War I strengthened the Australian loyalties to Britain (Aitchison 1986: 92, 96) but World War II – the Event X in Schneider’s (2007) terms – changed this altogether. World War II was to “end Australia’s historic reliance upon British protection, and create a new alliance with the United States” (Aitchison 1986: 98). Therefore, World War II can be seen as a watershed from British to more American association in Australia.

During World War II Australia had close military association with the US. According to Bell and Bell (1993: 99), close to a million American service personnel were either stationed in or visited Australia during the war. Although this type of migration was only temporary in nature, its social impact was notable (ibid.). Furthermore, a fair number of the Americans who had arrived in Australia during the war also stayed after the war (Mosler and Catley 1998: 26). After World War II Australia continued to have close ties with America including military association, which led to Australia taking part in, for example, wars in Korea and Vietnam. One of the consequences of this association was the signing of the ANZUS Treaty in 1951.¹¹ Later on in the 1990s, Australian alliance with the US led to Australia taking part in the Gulf War.

In addition to strong military association, trade between Australia and America increased tremendously as did American investments after World War II. This development was, naturally, also followed by greater American cultural impact on, for example, advertising, film, television, radio and sport, a trend that had already begun between the two world wars. Of these, television provided the most significant avenue for American influence (Waterhouse 1995, cited in Waterhouse 1998: 47). At that time, the reactions towards the American influence varied. On the one hand, some aspects of American culture, such as education, were greatly admired by the ruling elite while others, mainly in the popular culture, such as music and movies, were not (Matthews 1998: 16). On the whole, however, the American way of life fascinated the people of Australia (Aitchison 1986: 99).

¹¹ The acronym ANZUS stands for The Australia, New Zealand and United States Security Treaty.
3.1.4 RELATIONS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The close relationship between Australia and the United States continues in the new millennium in all fronts. The US is one of Australia’s most important trading partners and the leading source of its foreign investments. The Australia-US Free Trade Agreement (AUSFTA) was signed, although not without critical comments, in 2005 with the view of providing significant new opportunities for Australian exporters and investors.\(^\text{12}\)

Military association with the US has led to Australia sending troops to Afghanistan (in 2001) and to Iraq (in 2003), which has not necessarily been approved by the people of Australia. The newsreports of these types of events could be hypothesised to lead to an increased commentary on American influence as was shown to have happened in Canada by Heffernan et al. (2010).

Culturally, American imports are still significant in Australia with American movies and TV-shows as well as music enjoying continued popularity. Since the advent of the Internet in the 1990s, the general public’s increased access to American media has truly brought America to every Australian’s home. In addition, the number of American-born residents in Australia has steadily increased since the early 20th century (see Table 3.1) and Americans are the second largest visitor group in Australia after the British (in numbers of visitor visas) (ABS 2009–10). It is especially through this cultural relationship, that also the American variety of English has become all the more familiar to Australians.

Table 3.1. Numbers of American-born people in Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census year</th>
<th>Number of American-born</th>
<th>Total population of Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>7,448</td>
<td>3,788,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>6,642</td>
<td>4,489,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>6,604</td>
<td>5,455,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>6,066</td>
<td>6,629,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6,232</td>
<td>7,579,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>8,289</td>
<td>8,986,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>17,412</td>
<td>11,599,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>28,565</td>
<td>14,033,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>37,419</td>
<td>16,018,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>49,528</td>
<td>18,224,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>61,718</td>
<td>20,450,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS 2014.

As the American influence has increased in several fronts in Australia, reactions from the Australian people have also become more common. This was evident already in the 1970s during the nationalist wave in Australia (Mosler and Catley 1998: 40) but has certainly continued to this day. However, the commentary on Americanisation has, since the early 20th century, shifted from the economic sphere more towards the cultural realm concentrating especially on language, dress and sport (Bell and Bell 1998: 7). These Anti-American comments have been and are found in many sources – the media, letters to the editor, on discussion boards on the Internet and in more recent years also in social media – and not with the least emphasis on the Americanisation of AusE. This leads us to have a closer look at this commentary and Australians’ attitudes towards the American influence.

3.2 ATTITUDES TOWARDS AND COMMENTARY ON AMERICANISMS IN AUSTRALIA

The long history of contact between Australia and the US is also visible in the changing nature of attitudes towards America and AmE. On the linguistic side of things, people have been eager to speak their mind about the influence AmE may or may not have on AusE. These folk linguistic perceptions have been aired since the early years of American-Australian contact and will be viewed in this section both through the public commentary as well as scholarly research.

As was seen in Chapter 2, during the early years, comments on AmE influence by the public were rare (Leitner 2004a: 193). In the 20th century, by contrast, (mainly negative) public comments started to become more commonplace as the exposure to the American variety of English became more prominent first through American radio and later also movies, TV and advertising as well as American immigrants arriving in increasing numbers since the gold rush period. When exploring this public commentary on the AmE influence, it is important to keep in mind, however, that the term ‘Americanisation’ is not only used to describe linguistic influence but refers to any kind of cultural examples as noted by Bell and Bell (1998: 5) who write that the term Americanisation “is applied indiscriminately within Australian media discourse to label an array of factors seen as threatening to national(istic) identity, way of life or values.” This is also confirmed by, for example, Taylor (2001: 324), who notes that “sometimes a complaint about AmE is couched in a more general bemoaning of American cultural influences”.

The earliest comments on the AmE influence were often found in newspapers and were, indeed, closely tied to the introduction of American radio, movies and TV to Australia. Especially movies, or “talkies” as they were called, were seen as a threat to the English spoken in Australia. It was feared
that what had been achieved through elocution classes in schools was going to be ruined by these American films. Damousi (2010: 272) describes the Australians’ response to the introduction of American films as follows:

The most profound response to American talkies was a belief that they corrupted the English voice, which meant the desecration of the voice trained by elocution: correct pronunciation, clear enunciation, pausation and clarity, and the purity of speech of the English middle-classes. American speech, it was believed, had none of these qualities.

While some of the commentary, especially on media influence, was certainly represented with a very disapproving voice (see Belfrage 1972: 103), some of the statements were made with more neutral tones. The following quotes from the 1930s give a taste of the opinions that people held towards AmE in Australia in the first half of the 20th century.

It must be already apparent to many thinking people that since the introduction of the American talking films ... we are in grave danger of the Americanisation of our speech.

_Sydney Morning Herald_, June 23, 1930 (cited in Damousi 2007: 394)

Much of the slang called Australian is really imported from the United States.


The American element in our slang is growing fast and outstripping the original Cockney element.

_Sydney Morning Herald_, 1936 (cited in Baker 1978: 399)

Although many of the comments may have been made by laypeople, they were by no means the only ones to be concerned about the AmE influence. It was also considered as something to be avoided by the media operators, such as the News Limited, who, according to Leitner (2004a: 198), advised that “Americanisms should be avoided”. Furthermore, teachers and legislators also saw the increasing exposure to AmE as a thread to the high standard of English that Australian schools should try and maintain (Damousi 2007: 412). Therefore, while the American school system was admired, the language variety was not.

Not all commentary was, nevertheless, negative. While the majority certainly thought of AmE as destroying the English spoken in Australia, the extent to which Americanisms were actually adopted was questioned even in the early years.

---

13 Whether the comments used as examples here were made by laypeople is hard to verify as no indication as to who the person behind the comment is is given in the source books.
The all-in [Australia] imitators of Americanisms are still in a minority, despite the enormous influence of the “movies”.

*Age*, 1942 (cited in Baker 1978: 399)

After the war years, the concern with AmE seems to have faded in the 1950s and 1960s but then re-emerged in the 1970s when it started receiving both professional and popular attention (Leitner 2004a: 200–201). This goes hand in hand with the increased nationalistic feeling among Australians. One may also predict that at times of heightened American visibility in the world affairs, such as the wars in Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan, there would also be an increase in the commentary on the AmE influence as Heffernan et al. (2010) have shown to be the case in Canada. This has not, however, been systematically surveyed in the Australian context.

Although newspapers are still an important venue for anti-American comments (both in lettersto-the-editor as well as in columns, see Taylor 2001), other avenues for this kind of commentary have also appeared in more recent years. Besides talkback radio (see Peters 1998), the Internet discussion boards and the social media have facilitated the airing of opinions on the use of AmE features in AusE (see also Burridge 2010). These often provide heated discussions on the topic as is exemplified by the below quote from 2014 in *Reddit Australia*¹⁴ and the comments therein.

We speak like Americans (dude, bro, whatever), we eat like Americans (Hungry Jacks, Mcdonalds, KFC), we behave like Americans (like what we see on TV), and we even think like Americans.

Although radio, TV and the movies seem to be the most commonly given reasons for the AmE influence, advertising and music as well as computers and the Internet are also seen as causing AmE to influence AusE. Furthermore, it often is the young that are blamed for accepting and using American words and phrases more readily (e.g., Damousi 2007). This is evidenced by some recent writings in the media exemplified by a quote from *The Telegraph*:¹⁵

Many younger Australians are now more likely to say “hi” than “g’day”, and “vacation” rather than “holiday”. “Bloke” and “mate”, long regarded as quintessentially Aussie, are giving way to “dude” and even “bro”.

*The Telegraph*, 2005

---

¹⁴ Online: http://www.reddit.com/r/australia/comments/214950/are_you_bothered_of_the_continuing/, accessed online February 26, 2015.

As can be seen, comments on the Americanisation of AusE have been around for nearly as long as the Australian-American contacts and there is no sign of this being vanishing. Although this is somewhat in contradiction to the current endonormative status of AusE and its position as a regional standard variety, the negative attitudes towards foreign influence(s) underline the linguistic insecurity that is still present in Australia. However, as will be discussed later on, often these attitudes do not arise from strictly linguistic concerns, but rather from various cultural aspects.

The topic of Americanisation of Australia is not, however, as straightforward as people often seem to think. Linguistic research on the topic has not found any large scale Americanisation of AusE (e.g., Peters 1998; Burridge and Mulder 1998) and, thus, linguists often find themselves at odds with the views of the public (Burridge 2010). However, this is not to say that AmE features would be absent from AusE. On the contrary, there are American words, spellings, pronunciations and also features of morphosyntax and discourse that have made their way into Australian usage. These will be the explored in the next section.

### 3.3 American English Input into Australian English

As noted in Chapter 2, in Australia, the first linguistic input other than the transported English(es) naturally came from the various Aboriginal languages that the settlers encountered after arrival to Australia, providing numerous lexical items for AusE in the early years. AmE input is also most prominent in the vocabulary but traces of AmE can also be found in other areas of language as will be shown in this section.

#### 3.3.1 Vocabulary

Vocabulary provides the earliest AmE transfers in AusE and it is, in fact, often seen by the public as being flooded by Americanisms. The first American words were borrowed already before the 1850s gold rush period and they included, for example, *block*, *township*, *bush*, *bushranger* and *squatter* (Ramson 1966: 135). The AmE origins of these lexemes have, however, been called into question by Peters (1998: 37) when she writes that they “do not seem to have been mediated directly from the New World, but rather by the British colonial administration”. The second group of words were borrowed from Americans during the gold rush periods and they included American mining vocabulary such as *dipper*, *pan* and *prospect* (Ramson 1966: 148–149). In addition to words being borrowed in the Australian gold fields, there had also been Australians who had gone to California in search of gold and then returned to Australia (Fritz 2007: 44) bringing with them some American vocabulary. However, it needs to be kept in mind that not all lexical items
borrowed from the Americans were American coinages or new formations but originally from BrE (e.g., cradle, digger, gold-washer) (Ramson 1966: 147).

The next period of heavy American lexical influence can be said to have started after World War II. Taylor (1989: 239) writes that “lexical items transferred from AmE into AusE since World War II can be numbered in their thousands”, most of which have also entered General English. He lists number of American lexemes in different areas of vocabulary that have entered AusE after World War II (1989: 239–244):

- exclamations, e.g. hi, so long, wow, huh (as a question tag), sure, yuk
- common nouns referring to people, e.g. guy, dame, chick
- pejorative language, e.g. chicken, to chicken out, jerk
- taboo language items, e.g. to screw, to lay, boobs, dong, crap
- food items, e.g. French fries, candy, cotton candy, cookie (but mainly in the commercial names of new varieties)
- commercial used for radio and TV (instead of advertisement)
- transport, e.g. truck has almost completely replaced lorry, service station, has largely supplanted garage
- most of the vocabulary of surfboarding consists of AmE transfers

Others to provide lists of AmE loan words roughly from this period are Baker (1945, 1966), Gunn (1969) and Sussex (1985, 1995) (see Peters [2001: 300–301] for full lists).

Towards the end of the 20th century the increased access to computers, computer programs and games as well as the introduction of the Internet have provided AmE with another powerful medium besides television to influence especially the younger AusE speakers (Taylor 2001: 332). Butler (2001: 154) claims that AmE is the strongest external influence on present-day AusE and gives the following as examples of recent borrowings: schmooze, schlep, smick, d’oh, dreck, high five, himbo, push polling, wannabe, zine. Taylor (2001: 332) mentions AmE technical vocabulary (from the 1980s onwards) as an example, but also notes that this type of influence has not had much of an effect on non-technical language. Sussex (1985: 400) gives the following as further examples of areas of lexical influence: computer terminology, drug scene, pop music, skateboards and American sports (baseball, American football). Interestingly, almost all of these also come up in the interview material collected for this study (see Ch. 5). However, the originally American words that have been adopted to AusE use may not be considered as such for very long. As Peters (1998: 37) notes, once the lexemes are borrowed and assimilated in AusE they fairly rapidly lose their American flavour.

In addition to lexical transfers as exemplified above, AmE has also provided AusE new words through derivational morphology. Examples of this include changes in the word class (to access, to trial) as well as suffixing (-wise as in healthwise and -fully as in thankfully) (Taylor 1989: 232–233; see also Peters 1998: 36).
3.3.2 SPELLING

Spelling is another area of language that fairly frequently attracts public commentary. Research literature also gives examples of AmE style spellings that are used in Australia. Traditionally, AusE spelling derives from that of BrE and is, therefore, systematically different from the AmE one. Taylor (1989: 229–230) gives the following lexical items, among others, as examples of systematical spelling differences between BrE and AmE: final -re vs -er (as in centre), final -our vs -or (colour) and final -ise vs -ize (recognise) (see Taylor [1989: 230] for a full list). With these, AusE tends to prefer the BrE spellings. However, according to Taylor (ibid.), of these variable spellings -ise/-ize, -our/-or, and -amme/-am and possibly some of the digraph versus e spellings (mediaeval/medieval) vary quite freely in AusE. This is confirmed by Peters (1995: 546) who reports that in regards to the -or/-our spellings AusE users “vary considerably”. Her corpus-based investigations revealed this variability to be lexeme dependent, in that, for example, labor clearly outnumbers labour (129:95), whereas behaviour is used much more often than behavior (99:10).16 This is also the case with some of the other spelling variables. For example, there is a clear change towards the simpler spelling for mediaeval, but not for aesthetic (Korhonen 2015; Peters 1995; see also Fritz 2010 for a detailed study on the history of AusE spelling).

While BrE spellings are often used in the printed medium in Australia, sometimes even to the point of respelling American newspaper articles (Taylor 1989: 230), some AmE spelling conventions have almost completely replaced the BrE ones in the use of Australians. This view is backed up by Fritz (2010: 278) whose analysis of both web data and newspapers and parliament records revealed that AmE spelling are more common in writings on the Internet than in other forms of written material. According to Taylor (1989: 231), the reason for AusE writers choosing the AmE spellings can be pragmatism as well as fashion. One should notice, however, that AmE style spellings are not necessarily a sign of AmE influence. For example, the -or spellings were used for decades by Melbourne-based newspapers (Peters 1992: 21) until changed into -our spellings in 2001 under pressure from the readers (Burridge 2010: 7). This shows that public opinion can, in fact, have an impact on the spelling conventions (cf. Heffernan et al. 2010 for a similar effect in CanE).

16 References to the Labor Party were excluded from the counts (Peters 1995: 546).
3.3.3 PRONUNCIATION

In addition to vocabulary and spelling, AusE pronunciation is fairly often seen as being Americanised by the public and often it is the young that are blamed for this (Leitner 2004a: 205). In fact, as Damousi (2007: 395) reports, the early debate on the American films in Australia centred around the nature of the accent, pronunciation and voice. However, despite the at times fierce commentary in the public sphere, AmE pronunciations, while certainly an option for the speakers (see Leitner 2004a: 205), are largely limited to individual lexical items. Therefore, no large scale Americanisation of the way AusE sounds could be claimed (see, for example, Sussex 1989: 159; Peters 1998: 34–35).

Previous research has, nevertheless, shown some AmE pronunciations to be accepted and used by Australian speakers as well. Taylor (1989) looks at two types of AmE phonological transfers: the ones affecting the quality of the vowel/consonant and the ones affecting the word stress of individual lexemes. He claims, for example, that the use of AmE /ai/ is often heard in AusE and that the pronunciation of schedule as /skedʒul/ as in AmE is now widespread in AusE. His latter claim is backed up by the fact that the 3rd edition of the Macquarie Dictionary mentions the /sk/ pronunciation to be “chiefly American” while the 5th edition does not. Furthermore, Taylor (1989: 228) claims that many Australians pronounce the prefix pro- as /prəʊ/ instead of /proʊ/ in words like progress and process. This may, however, be a question of using a different pronunciation for a verb and a noun as noted in the 5th edition of the Macquarie Dictionary. The fact that the change in the preferred pronunciation for schedule and pro- align them with other similar lexical items, such as scheme and product, may, of course, play a part in this process (Taylor 1989: 228; see also Peters 1998: 34).

In terms of word stress, Taylor (1989) gives the following nouns as examples: frontier, finance, research and address17 which are, according to him, more often heard with their AmE pronunciation than the BrE one in AusE (Taylor 1989: 228). Other words in which the AmE pronunciation is in strong competition with the BrE one in AusE include secretary, harass and controversy (Taylor 1989: 228–229).18 It is the shifts in the stress pattern that are also mentioned by Sussex (1985) and Butler (2001) as presenting areas of phonological influence from AmE into present-day AusE (see also Moore 2008: 162).

---

17 Frontier BrE /ˈfræntɪə/, AmE /ˈfræntə/; finance BrE /ˈfɪnəns/, AmE /ˈfænəns/; research BrE /ˈrɛsərچ/; AmE /ˈriːsərچ/; address BrE /əˈdres/, Am /ˈadres/

18 Secretary BrE /ˈsɛkrətri/, AmE /ˈsektrəri/; harass BrE /ˈhærəs/, AmE /həˈræs/; controversy BrE /ˌkɒnˈtrəvərsi/, AmE /kəˈtrɒvəsi/
3.3.4 GRAMMAR

As has been discussed above, AmE transfers are most numerous in the vocabulary with some examples from spelling and pronunciation as well. These are also the linguistic areas which have attracted the most comments on the Americanisation of AusE. However, there are also AmE style usages in the grammar (esp. morphosyntax) of AusE. These usages are rarely categorical, rather they present cases in which AusE is leaning more towards the AmE usage than the BrE one. Due to its less salient nature, this type of input is less often commented on by the speakers. However, some of the morphosyntactic features are also above the consciousness of the speakers (see Collins 2003) and therefore may attract commentary. It is these kinds of features with special emphasis on their more prominent occurrence in spoken language that are discussed in this section.

Starting with inflectional morphology, the AmE use of *gotten* to mean that something has been acquired or that there has been a change of state (the so called ‘actional’ *get*) is also used in Australia making it distinct from the possessive *has/have got* (*statal* *get*) (Taylor 1989: 231; also discussed by Leitner 2004a: 208). In BrE, on the other hand, the perfect meaning of the ‘actional’ *get* is expressed by *have got* (Biber et al 1999: 467). According to Collins and Peters (2004: 596), the use of *gotten* in AusE shows clear age stratification with the younger speakers favouring it.

On the syntactic level, recent research has shown that AusE is, to varying degrees, moving away from the “traditional” BrE usage and more towards the AmE preferences. One such area is the subject-verb agreement. With collective nouns, such as *government* and *team*, AusE tends to use singular concord as does AmE, whereas BrE prefers plural concord (Hundt 1998: 88–89; Trudgill and Hannah 2002: 19). According to Newbrook (2001: 120) this is also true of sports team names, however, this usage is clearly variable. In line with this, AusE has also moved to using mostly singular concord with existentials, in fact even more so than AmE (Collins 2012b). However, this being the case in most of the English varieties, the possibility of this being an independent but parallel development needs to be considered.

Another well documented area of syntax in which AusE is moving away from the BrE style use is the use of modal auxiliaries. Collins’ research (1988, 1991a, 1991b, 2001, 2009) has shown that AusE has, indeed, moved closer to AmE in its use of modals. Newbrook (2001: 126–127) also mentions the use of the epistemic *have (got) to* (as in *Martina has (got) to be the best player in the world!*) as gaining ground in the use of younger Australians. However, Collins (2009: 83) states, that the epistemic use is rare. In its deontic meaning (as in *you’ve got to be home by nine*), on the other hand, it has a stronger preference in BrE and AusE than AmE (Collins 2009: 83).

Another syntactic feature that has sparked public comments regarding AmE influence in AusE is the increased use of *like*. Indeed, *like* used as a conjunction (as in *Kaye, it looks like it's Officers’ Night tonight* [ACE W02], cited in Collins 2003: 46) is widely used in AmE and, according to Collins...
(ibid.), more acceptable in AusE than in BrE (see also Peters 2001a: 166–167). In connection to this, the recent rise in the use of *be like* as a quotative, has added to the potential of *like* to be a source of commentary from the public (see Section 3.3.5). *Like* does, of course, have a variety of functions other than the ones mentioned here. As an example of another syntactic feature, mandative subjunctive has also been shown to be used more in AmE than elsewhere. In AusE, this feature is used more often than either in BrE or NZE (Peters 2009b: 135). However, in spoken language, it is rather found in more formal genres than in private conversations (Peters 2009b: 125). Nevertheless, it too has attracted public commentary (Peters 2009b: 135), although this commentary does not link it to Americanisation.

The syntactic features discussed in this section are, of course, just some of the usages that appear to be moving towards more AmE style usages in AusE as well as attracting commentary from the public, although this commentary is not in every case associated with AmE influence. Further examples of variable uses in grammar of AusE are provided, for example, in Newbrook (1992, 2001) and Taylor (1989). As noted, the differences are by no means categorical in any of the features presented above and there is variation in the use of all of them. However, although the grammatical differences between AusE and the other two major varieties of English are not very significant, they allow for some interesting insights into the state of the present-day AusE and thus also grammar needs to be taken into account when building a picture of the alleged Americanisation of AusE (cf. Peters 1998).

### 3.3.5 DISCOURSE

Taylor’s (1989: 244) list of American loanwords includes exclamations, such as *wow* and *sure*, which are also used as discourse markers. Therefore, discourse practices provide another language area in which to consider the possible American influence. One fairly recent development in the area of discourse, the use of *be like* as a quotative in the representation of direct speech, has been extensively studied in many varieties of English since the 1990s, but has only recently been investigated in Australia. Often people see the increased use of *be like* to be a result of AmE influence and consider it to be a feature of adolescent speech. According to recent studies by Winter (2002) and Rodríguez Louro (2013, 2016), the use of the American-originated quotative *be like* is, indeed, on the rise in Australia. As Rodriguez Louro and Ritz (2014) have shown, this is connected to other changes, such as the increased use of the Historical Present tense (HP) in narratives.

As has been shown in the previous sections, AmE transfers as well as usages that may be perceived as originating in AmE can be found in various linguistic areas in AusE. The two major varieties of English, BrE and AmE, rarely differ from each other categorically and neither does AusE from either one of them. It is rather a question of tendencies. But the fact that even these different tendencies are noticed by the speakers and have meaning for the them
provides an interesting starting point for a study that combines the examination of speakers’ perspectives on Americanisms and their use of linguistic features that may be perceived as representing American influence in AusE.
PART II: MATERIAL AND METHODS
4 RESEARCH MATERIAL AND METHODS

As the background chapters of this dissertation have shown, Americanisation of AusE is a very broad and complicated topic. This study examines this phenomenon with traditional sociolinguistic methods starting with the collection of spoken material in which to investigate the speaker perceptions and attitudes as well as the linguistic features of interest in apparent time. This process from material collection to the analysis of the data is described in this chapter. As the present study comprises of a variety of features, these will be only briefly introduced in this chapter with a more detailed discussion of each to appear in the relevant sections in the research chapters 5–8.

4.1 KEY METHODS OF THE STUDY

4.1.1 SOCIOLINGUISTIC INTERVIEW AND THE APPARENT TIME APPROACH

The research questions posed in the introductory chapter are examined using the material obtained from the sociolinguistic interviews conducted in the small country town of Blayney in New South Wales (NSW). As there was no cross-generational spoken data of (especially rural) AusE readily available at the time of the start of this project, the decision to collect the material using the Labovian sociolinguistic interview method was made. Furthermore, the main preoccupation of the study being the combination of Australians’ attitudes towards and perceptions of the AmE influence and their use of certain linguistic features with possible signs of Americanisation led to choosing this data collection method.

The interview method has been widely used in sociolinguistic research since Labov introduced it in his Martha’s Vineyard and New York City studies in the 1960s (Labov 1963, 1966). Milroy and Gordon (2003: 57) see the interview method as “the most common approach to data collection among sociolinguists”. While there are studies of AusE that are based on sociolinguistic interview data (e.g., Eisikovits 1991; Horvath 1985; Rodriguez Louro 2013, 2016; Shnukal 1978, 1982), these are in the minority. The few studies employing the traditional sociolinguistic methods in AusE have varied from only including young participants (e.g., Eisikovits 1991) to including

---

19 The three corpora of spoken AusE available today (some with limited access) through the Australian National Corpus website (https://www.ausnc.org.au/) are the Australian Talkback Radio corpus (ART), The Monash Corpus of Australian English (MCE) and The Griffith Corpus of Spoken Australian English (GCSAusE). None of these, however, allow for cross-generational examination of language use.
multiple age groups and social classes (e.g., Horvath 1985; Shnukal 1978, 1982).

The sociolinguistic interview method, although widely used, has also been criticised as being somewhat too formal and not generating natural spoken data (Feagin 2002: 26). What Labov (1972) describes as the Observer’s Paradox is in the centre of this critique. The contradiction involved in this paradox is, as Labov (1972: 61) states, that “our goal is to observe the way people use language when they are not being observed”. There are, however, ways which have been used to overcome the problems arising from the Observer’s Paradox. First of all, the interviewer may try and steer the conversation to “more lively and personal topics” (Meyerhoff 2006: 38), which has often included a question about the interviewee being in a ‘danger of death’ situation. However, the success rate of this question in eliciting spontaneous speech has been variable. For example, rather than using the ‘danger of death’ question, Trudgill (1974) used the question “Have you ever been in a situation, recently or some time ago, where you had a good laugh, or something funny or humorous happened to you, or you saw it happen to someone else?” to elicit narratives from the speakers (Trudgill 1974: 51). Other means to overcome the Observer’s Paradox may also include, for example, not having the recording equipment in plain sight (if possible) and trying to make the interviewee(s) forget the interview situation. Having more than one speaker interviewed at the same time certainly helps in generating more natural speech (Labov 1984: 48), but often this results in more time spent at the transcription phase due to challenges in either distinguishing the different speakers and/or overlapping speech (see Meyerhoff et al. 2011: 140). Furthermore, in some cases having multiple speakers present may result in one speaker dominating the interview while another speaks far less, thus resulting in imbalances in the data sample. Despite these obvious shortcomings of the sociolinguistic interview method, its wide use also provides evidence of its usefulness, especially, in the examination of spoken language and ongoing language change.

In conjunction with the sociolinguistic interview method, it is necessary to consider the use of apparent time as a means to depict ongoing language change. This construct was, again, developed and first used by Labov in the 1960s (Labov 1963, 1966) and has since then been applied in many later studies. While the apparent time model can reveal the changing trends in language use, there are certain aspects that need to be kept in mind when viewing the results obtained by investigating language use with this construct. Firstly, the suitability of the apparent time construct for investigating different linguistic variables needs to be considered. As Boberg (2004: 265) notes, it is the more abstract levels of grammar such as phonology and syntax that are less likely to vary across a speaker’s lifespan and, thus, are good candidates for apparent time investigations. The less abstract levels, such as vocabulary, on the other hand, may not yield accurate results as speakers are capable of adding new words into their lexicon at any time in their lives. Furthermore,
those linguistic features that attract social awareness may not yield accurate results with the apparent time construct (see Milroy and Gordon 2003). The stability of the informants’ vernaculars is often discussed together with age-grading as possibly causing problems to the apparent time hypothesis (e.g., Chambers 2003; Guy 2002), but previous research has shown that, in fact, speakers’ vernaculars seem to stay fairly stable during their lifetime, especially in middle and old age (see Chambers 2003: 202–203; Milroy and Gordon 2003: 36–37). Thus, this method need not be rejected in the examination of language change as evidence from real time studies has shown the apparent time construct to be relatively sound (Chambers 2003: 219; see also Boberg 2004) and is, thus, seen as useful in the present attempt to catch ongoing linguistic changes. In the Australian context, this view is emphatically endorsed by Horvath’s (1985: 47) emphasis on examining language use of different age groups in order to see the generational differences.

In terms of the present study comprising material from speakers in three age groups from adolescents to retirees, the apparent time construct is used to investigate how the features of interest are used along this age continuum. The interest in the possible increase in the use of features that may be perceived as American supports the use of the apparent time approach, especially since the change towards more use of the AmE variants is often seen as being promoted by the young. Although the suitability of this approach to examine different types of variables may be called into question as discussed above, the fact that all of the features investigated here have also been previously successfully examined in apparent time in different varieties of English supports its use. For example, Boberg (2004) found that his follow-up real time study largely supported his initial apparent time findings of different pronunciations (including, for instance, the word *schedule*) in CanE. Furthermore, the syntactic and discourse features investigated here also have a strong tradition of apparent time research (see Bibliography, for example, for Tagliamonte’s and her colleagues’ work) and thus provide ready comparisons for the present study.

### 4.1.2 MIXED METHODS APPROACH

In the present study, a variety of methods are used to analyse the material obtained from the sociolinguistic interviews conducted in Blayney at the start of this project. First of all, all the features – both perceptual and linguistic – are examined by applying the variationist sociolinguistic paradigm, i.e., quantitatively examining the variation that is found in the speakers’ use of language and interpreting it against the conditioning social (external) and/or linguistic (internal) constraints. This type of quantitative approach considers the choices speakers make as they use a certain variant when there are two or more ways of saying (more or less) the same thing (Tagliamonte 2009: 76). According to the Principle of Accountability (Labov 1972), variationist analysis needs to consider the variable system as a whole, thus taking into account all
environments where the variant of interest could be used. This principle is followed in the examination of the morphosyntactic and discourse features in the present study.

Another factor worth considering, but which has often been neglected in sociolinguistic studies, is the effect of the individual on the overall findings. Although some work, as exemplified by Walker and Meyerhoff (2013) and Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2017: 202–214), has included the examination of language use of individual speakers, previous studies have largely been concerned with the preferences of each group of speakers investigated. While the present study also uses predefined groups (based on age and sex of the speaker) to examine the use of the variables of interest, the diverging preferences of individual speakers are also noted and regarded as possibly contributing to the overall distributions.

Although traditionally the quantitative variationist approach involves the use of statistical methodology in the form of logistic regression analysis, in the present study the relationships of the social and linguistic constraints and the variants used are examined through cross-tabulations. To test the statistical significance of the findings, chi-square tests are performed where relevant (see Section 4.5.3). The relevant linguistic constraints associated with the features examined are introduced and described in detail in each of the research sections of this study (Chapters 7–8). As noted earlier, studies in the variationist tradition considering the language use across generations of speakers are scarce in AusE and, therefore, the purpose of this study is to quantitatively show the ongoing changes in present-day AusE.

In addition to applying a strictly quantitative approach throughout this study, a more qualitative approach is taken in examining the attitudinal comments and the perceptions that the speakers present regarding the AmE influence (Chapter 5). As the views and opinions that the speakers provide when directly questioned about the possible AmE influence in AusE are not scaled, this study falls under the realms of folk linguistics rather than the study of language attitudes. Folk linguistics in itself can be defined as “the study of linguistic beliefs of non-linguists” (Penry Williams 2011: 37) and it has been especially promoted by the works of Preston (e.g., 1996) and Niedzielski and Preston (2003) and mainly concentrated on AmE. In terms of AusE, the folk linguistic accounts have earlier been investigated by Penry Williams (2011). Although a somewhat neglected area of research in the sociolinguistic tradition, taking into account the views and opinions that people hold for (their) language and/or language use can enrich and complement the results achieved by other, mainly quantitative, sociolinguistic and/or corpus linguistic research methods (see e.g., Leech et al. [2009: 257]). While the examination of the speakers’ perceptions of and attitudes towards the AmE influence constitute the first research chapter of this thesis, the aim is not to dig very
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20 Often a variable rule program, such as Goldvarb (e.g., Sankoff, Tagliamonte and Smith 2005) or RBrul (http://www.danielezrajohnson.com/rbrul.html), is used in carrying out these analyses.
deep into the subject of folk linguistics, rather the interviewees' views on the Americanisation of AusE are used as a basis for the study of their actual language use. It is hypothesised that their feelings about the influence may have an effect on their language use (cf. Labov’s [1963] and Eckert’s [2000] studies and how the participants’ personal orientation towards their home town affected their linguistic preferences). Furthermore, giving the speakers a chance to speak freely (without predefined choices) of the topic of Americanisation may result in a discovery of features that can be further considered in the later parts of the study that concentrate on the same speakers’ actual language use.

After this general introduction to the research methodology used in this study, I will next describe the research site and the fieldwork conducted as part of this thesis project together with information on the informants. This is followed by a short introduction to the features studied in this thesis, how they were analysed, and the statistical methods that were used.

4.2 THE RESEARCH MATERIAL

4.2.1 BACKGROUND FOR THE FIELDWORK

As mentioned earlier, no spoken AusE material that would have allowed the examination of language use across generations was freely available at the start of this project. Furthermore, the aim with the material collection was to build a resource of generational spoken AusE that could be used for a variety of future studies as well. In this and the following sections, I will introduce the research site and describe the fieldwork and the subsequent steps taken in building the Corpus of Blayney Speech (CoBS). To complete the chapter, the features studied in this thesis will be shortly introduced together with description of the principles used in the analyses of the data.

4.2.1.1 The speech community

The research site for this study, Blayney, is a small rural town in NSW about 250 kilometres from Sydney to the west (as was shown in Map 2.1 on p. 26). In addition to the township of Blayney, the Blayney Shire includes the following smaller villages: Barry, Carcoar, Lyndhurst, Mandurama, Millthorpe, Neville and Newbridge as shown in Map 4.1 (see also Table 4.1 for the population of each of these).
The European settlement in the area began around 1814, immediately after the crossing of the Blue Mountains (Reynolds 1982: 4). In the early years (around the 1850s), Blayney had a fairly strong Irish settlement (30% of the population) with equally many English inhabitants together with some Scottish settlers (10%). At that time, there were hardly any other nationalities in the area, apart from maybe a few Germans and some American-born miners (Reynolds 1982: 12). After the establishment of Blayney, the surrounding villages were also populated (see Table 4.1).

The development of Blayney was very much dependent on two things: mining and the railway. The finding of gold in 1851 had a great impact on the area, as did the opening of the Great Western Railway in 1876–77. The fact that Blayney was one of the Colony’s most important rail junctions made railways the biggest employer at that time (Reynolds 1982: 48). Mining has also always been important in the area with Cadia being one of the oldest copper finds in Australia (Reynolds 1982: 26).
Table 4.1. Establishment years of Blayney and the surrounding villages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town/village</th>
<th>Year of establishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blayney</td>
<td>1843 (unofficial occupation since 1821)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carcoar</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndhurst</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandurama</td>
<td>1830s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millthorpe</td>
<td>1830s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbridge</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville</td>
<td>1850s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: www.blayney-nsw.com; www.millthorpevillage.com.au

According to the Census of 2006, 21 94% of Blayney’s approximately 6600 residents were Australian citizens and 54% reported they had Australian ancestors. The second most common ancestry reported was English (39%). Overall, Blayney’s population can be said to be fairly homogeneous as noted by Reynolds (1982: 64):

By 1981 the population of the Blayney Shire was estimated at only 6550 and compared to the multicultural character of most of Australia’s population was notable for its homogeneity. The great majority of the residents were derived from a Western European background.

Furthermore, in 2006, a clear majority, 90%, of the residents of Blayney were born in Australia which is about 21% more than the overall for NSW (Blayney Community Portrait 2006). The population of Blayney and the surrounding villages as of 2006 is presented in Table 4.2.

---

21 There is also a more recent Census from 2011, but the one done in 2006 was used as that is consistent with the data collection time. The Census data is retrieved by using the QuickStats search on the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) website at http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/censushome.nsf/home/quickstats?opendocument&navpos=220, last accessed on October 28, 2016.
Table 4.2. Population of Blayney and the surrounding villages in 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town/village</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blayney</td>
<td>3091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carcoar</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndhurst</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandurama</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millthorpe</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbridge</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The main industries in the Blayney area, according to the census of 2006, are farming and health care as shown in Table 4.3. Although mining is not on the top on the list of the main industries, it is considered very important by the residents and often gets mentioned in the interview material and does, in fact, employ more people in the area than on average in NSW.

Table 4.3. The main industries employing Blayney residents in 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>% of workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural industries</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social care</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining*</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and accommodation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mining employed 5.0% more local residents than on average for NSW

Source: Blayney Community Portrait 2006.

The most populous occupation groups in the Blayney area are managers, technicians and tradesmen, and labourers (Table 4.4).
Table 4.4. Occupations of employed residents in Blayney in 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>% in Blayney</th>
<th>% in NSW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians and tradesmen</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/personal workers</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative workers</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers and operators</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Blayney Community Portrait 2006.

In comparison with the whole of NSW, there are slightly less workers in the top two occupational bands (32% in Blayney, 35% in NSW) while in the two lowest bands there are clearly more workers in Blayney (26% as opposed to 16% in NSW).

Language wise, Blayney is very much a monolingual town. The main language spoken in Blayney is English with 96% of Blayney’s residents speaking it at home. This is 22% higher than in the overall NSW area (Blayney Community Portrait 2006).

The details given above portray Blayney as a small rural Australian town. For the purposes of the present study, it is noteworthy that the residents are mainly Australian born and there are no large ethnic groups. Furthermore, from the linguistic point of view, the dominance of English is worth noticing. Linguistic research in a location like Blayney gives the opportunity to update the knowledge on AusE with data from the rural end of the language spectrum – just as Taylor (2001) suggests needs to be done.

4.2.1.2 Selection criteria for interview participants

In order to study linguistic variation and change “it is essential that the speaker samples be stratified by age and sex” (Poplack 1989: 414–415). Hence, these two sociolinguistic variables were used as the main criteria in selecting the informants for this research. This kind of judgement sampling is frequently used in sociolinguistic research and Milroy (1987: 28) suggests that “it may be more realistic for researchers conducting, for example, an urban dialect survey, to judgement sample on the basis of specifiable and defensible principles than to aim for true representativeness” (emphasis original). As the aim was to gather material for an apparent time study, informants in three different age groups (roughly three generations) were interviewed with the aim of having at least 20 informants in each age group, which was
accomplished.\textsuperscript{22} The total number per age group and age ranges of the interviewees are presented in Table 4.5 with the labelling of the groups as G1 (oldest), G2 (middle) and G3 (youngest) (see Section 4.2.3 for more information on the interview participants).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Number of informants</th>
<th>Age range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57–89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14–18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although social class is also one of the sociolinguistic variables with high importance, it was not considered as one of the main criteria for selecting the informants for this research. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly, concentrating on too many social variables at the data collection stage would have made the finding of informants much harder, especially considering the population of the research site. Keeping the amount of data handleable is also emphasised by Feagin (2002: 21) when he states that “a close analysis of a small amount of data is better than an unfinished grandiose project”. Secondly, Australian society is traditionally held to be rather homogeneous as, for example, Horvath (1985: 4) points out:

> It is widely held by Australians [...] that their society; unlike the British society from which their cultural heritage is drawn, is not internally marked in any strong sense by social class boundaries.

This view of Australian society as homogeneous has, however, been brought into question, as noted in Ch. 2. The interview participants in Penry Williams’s recent study found class associations to be an important conditioning factor in relation to language, albeit not the only one (Penry Williams 2011: 387).

When looking for interviewees for the present study, the aim was to have participants who were either born or had spent a long time in the area. The minimum time of residence in the area was set at 15 years (cf. Shnukal 1982) or alternatively, with the high school age participants, that they had done most of their schooling in the area. However, the majority of the informants (83%) had resided in the area most of their lives.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{22} Often the adequate number of informants in sociolinguistic research is set at five per cell (e.g., Guy 1980, cited in Feagin 2002: 29), but as I only wished to concentrate on two social factors (age and gender), I aimed at having a somewhat larger number of informants in each age group.

\textsuperscript{23} Some had, naturally, done their secondary schooling elsewhere, but had in total spent most of their lives in the area.
4.2.2 DATA GATHERING FOR THE CORPUS OF BLAYNEY SPEECH

4.2.2.1 Interview questionnaire

As noted in Section 4.1, interviews have a long history in sociolinguistic research. In designing the interview questionnaire for the present research, several sociolinguistic studies, such as those of Horvath (1985), Labov (1966) and Trudgill (1974) were used as models. Although the questions used in the interviews to collect the data for CoBS were specifically designed with the research questions of the present study in mind, the possibility to use the material also for future research was taken into account.

The interview questionnaire had three separate sections and it was structured roughly according to the order suggested by Tagliamonte (2006). The first section concentrated on the interviewee’s personal information including age, place of birth, education, occupation, mother’s and father’s place of birth and occupation, family relations etc. The second part consisted of questions relating to Blayney. The purpose of this part was to gather information about Blayney as well as to investigate the informant’s relationship with their home town, which may also have an effect on their language use (cf. Eckert 2000). After the second part, the interviewee was being asked to read a passage from a classic Australian children’s book, The Magic Pudding by Norman Lindsey (1918). This often led the discussion easily to talking about language which was the main theme of the next set of questions. In this part, the informants were being asked how they feel about AusE, whether there are generational and/or regional differences in language use and whether they have noticed any AmE influence in AusE. In addition, themes such as language/grammar teaching at school and changes in that during the past decades were discussed. The last task of the interview comprised a wordlist. The informants were given one card at a time and they were to read the word written in the card. The words included in this task were either, research, territory, harass, defence, schedule, semi-final, process, secretary, kilometre, hostile, data, controversy, schism (presented to the participants in this order in most cases). The entire interview questionnaire is presented in Appendix A.

4.2.2.2 Fieldwork

The fieldwork for this research was conducted by the present writer during two separate research trips to Australia, the first in the Northern Hemisphere autumn of 2005 and the second a year later. In order to record the interviews I used Audacity which is a free software that enables the recording as well as the editing of spoken data. As recording equipment, I used my laptop with a

---

24 Available for download at http://audacity.sourceforge.net/?lang=fi
table microphone. If possible, the recording equipment was placed so that it was not right in front of the informant(s) and as little attention as possible was paid to it during the interview.25

Although local interviewers are often used in sociolinguistic fieldwork (see e.g., Poplack 1989; Tagliamonte 2008), my being an outsider did not seem to be a problem. In fact, in some cases it seemed to make the interview situations even easier for the informants (cf. Labov’s suggestion about positioning the interviewer as a learner [Labov 1981: 15]). The fact that I knew the speech community from my time there as an exchange student during high school and, therefore, had friends and acquaintances there, proved to be of great importance. The initial contact to find interviewees was made through my friends after which I often asked at the end of an interview if the informant had some people in mind that might be good candidates to be interviewed (similar technique was also used by Horvath 1985). This sampling strategy is also known as the “snowball” technique (Milroy and Gordon 2003: 32) and it proved to be a very efficient – the refusal rate was fairly high when the possible interviewee was contacted directly while this “friend of a friend” method returned hardly any refusals.

Although the interviews were (semi-)structured and in most cases conducted in the same order they were by no means strict. As Meyerhoff et al. (2011: 135) point out, it is important to have some structure to the interview but, at the same time, it is maybe even more important to be flexible and ready to make changes on the go if needed. In order to make the interview situation less intimidating for the participants, they were told beforehand that the purpose is “just to have a chat”. In some cases, this resulted in a very lively discussion and to reordering of the sections. However, the aim was to cover all the topics of the questionnaire in all the interviews. The lengths of the interviews varied from the shortest one of 24 minutes to the longest one of 88 minutes.26 Traditionally, somewhat longer interviews have been suggested. For example, Labov (1984: 32) suggests one to two hours from each speaker. Therefore, it would have been desirable for the interviews to be longer especially for purposes of syntactic research, but there was quite a lot of fluctuation between the interviews, mainly due to people reacting differently to the interview situation. While majority of the interviewees were quite talkative, some clearly found the situation somewhat intimidating. The interviews were most often conducted in the informant’s home (or a close relative’s home) except for the interviews with the high school pupils that took place at the high school library.27 The style of the interviews could in most cases be described as semi-formal to formal, largely depending on the

---

25 The effect of the recording equipment is commented on by Labov (1972: 113): “The tape recorder itself has a variable but persistent effect in shifting speech towards the formal end of the spectrum.”

26 Due to including a number of interviews with more than one interviewee, the amount of material (in minutes) provided by each individual speaker is not available.

27 Some of the interviews were also conducted at the informant’s work place or at a friend’s house.
interviewee. However, some informants did come across as very relaxed in the interview situation.

Most of the interviews were conducted one-on-one, but there are also some group interviews (2–4 informants). The distribution of the interviews according to the number of participants is presented in Table 4.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews with 1 participant</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Number of interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with 2 participants</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with 3 participants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with 4 participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although previous research has suggested that having participants interviewed with their peers often results in more natural use of language that also necessarily complicates the transcription phase as was noted in Section 4.1.1. This was also the case with the present material: the more speakers present in an interview, the more time it took to transcribe the recording and more unclear passages remained in the transcribed text due to overlapping speech. However, conducting some of the interviews with informants from three generations within one family (either together or separately) has the benefit of enabling the examination of language use of closely related people (see Labov 1972).

In addition to recording the interviews, data on the interview situation and the participants were collected. For each interview, an “Interview information sheet” was filled in. This document provides information on the interview situation and the interviewees’ background as well as a short description of their participation in the interview. This type of situational information may be of help in explaining some of the linguistic phenomena found in the material. The social background information regarding each participant was drawn from the interviews and has been compiled into a database. In the future, these documents will be integrated into the interview material and built into a complete database/archive. Before each interview, all the interviewees were also asked to sign a “Confidentiality and consent form” (see Appendix B). In this form, the purpose of the interview and the proposed use of the material were explained to the participants and they were asked for their permission to record the interview. A copy of the form including the researcher’s contact details was then also given to the informants.
4.2.3 INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

The Corpus of Blayney Speech comprises the interviews of 69 speakers, altogether approximately 30 hours of recorded speech. The word count of the material is approximately 236,000 words. The informants come from three age groups (three generations) and their age range was from 14 to 89 at the time of the interviews. Table 4.7 shows the distribution of informants according to age and gender groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there are a few more informants in the youngest age group, these interviews were in general shorter than the ones with older informants (as also shown by the word counts provided in Appendix C). The gender balance is overall slightly skewed towards females (56% females and 44% males) with the two older age groups comprising of more females than males while in the youngest age group males outnumber females. Age and gender are the only sociolinguistic parameters considered in this study, but other kinds of background information, such as place of birth, education and occupation, can be extracted from the interviews. Thus, the material also allows for the inclusion of social class as a variable in future studies.

---

28 Altogether 74 people were interviewed during the fieldwork, but five of the informants are not included in the material used in this study due to their background (not Australian born), not fitting the age groups or only partially completing the interview questionnaire.

29 Only approximate word count can be given as, due to the nature of the material, some unclear passages remain in the transcriptions. The word counts of the individual speakers are included in Tables 4a-4c in Appendix C together with information on the speakers and the recordings.
4.2.4 TRANSCRIPTIONS

The interview material was transcribed orthographically to facilitate the linguistic searches. The aim was to present the spoken data as accurately as possible. As the primary aim was not to do close phonetic or phonological research, it was felt sufficient to use orthographic transcription. This view is supported by Tagliamonte (2006: 60) when she notes that “any analysis of phonological variation is going to require listening to the audio record anyway”. Furthermore, the basic orthographic transcription can later be amended on with more detailed information.

While standard orthography was used for the transcriptions, fully standard punctuation was not. Punctuation (commas, full stops, questions marks and exclamation marks) is only used to facilitate the reading of the transcript. Overall, as Tagliamonte (2006: 210) presents, “the goals of a transcription can be encapsulated as the desire for it to be: (a) detailed enough to retain enough information to conduct linguistic analyses in an efficient way, and (b) simple enough to be relatively easily transcribed and easily readable.” In order to reach these goals, a simplistic transcription protocol was adopted. The most often used transcription symbols are presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8. Most often used transcription symbols in the Corpus of Blayney Speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>interrupted word</td>
<td>I was co- coming home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>anonymised syllable (in proper names)</td>
<td>I met ** * yesterday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Pause at an unconventional place$^1$</td>
<td>and then he got = closer to where he works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>} or { }</td>
<td>overlapping speech (with one or more speakers)</td>
<td>[Interviewer:]} did you? [G3_F09:]} Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[LAUGH], [COUGH]</td>
<td>vocal noises, any extra information on the situation</td>
<td>That’s the dog [LAUGH]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% %</td>
<td>uncertain or unclear word(s) or passage</td>
<td>a) %they’ll% let something out$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%---%</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) just it’s %---%,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Pauses at conventional places have been indicated by punctuation (comma, full stop).
$^2$ The text inside the percentage symbols indicates the best interpretation of what was said.

---

30 The program Transcriber was used for the initial transcriptions of the material. Transcriber is available for download at: https://sourceforge.net/projects/trans/files/transcriber/.
31 The lexical items included in the wordlist task were, however, also transcribed phonetically throughout the text in order to facilitate the examination of them.
4.3 FEATURES STUDIED

As stated in the Introduction, the present study combines the examination of speakers’ folklinguistic accounts of and attitudes towards the alleged AmE influence on AusE together with an investigation of their actual language use. All the features included in this study are briefly introduced here. The more detailed circumscribing of the variables is done in each of the sections presenting the analysis and findings of the study in the later chapters (5–8). In the interest of language variation and change, the results of each of the features, both attitudinal as well as linguistic, are examined in their relation to the social factors of age and gender.

Attitudes towards American English influence
The speakers’ views on the topic of Americanisation are examined through the direct questioning method. Material for this section comes from the direct interview questions concerning the participants’ perceptions of and attitudes towards the possible AmE influence in AusE. The following questions were used in the interviews to get the informants’ views on this topic:
Do you think there’s any American English influence in Australian English?
Have you noticed any American English influence in Australian English?
How/where do you notice it?
What kinds of American features have you noticed?

Pronunciation
This section of the study charts the pronunciations of the words included in the wordlist task. The words included in the task were selected from previous reports on differences in pronunciation between BrE and AmE, such as Bayard 1989, Leek and Bayard 1995, Shitara 1993, Taylor 1989, Trudgill and Hannah 2002, Wells 1999 and, in relation to AusE usage, the Australian Style (1994) surveys. This selection process yielded the following lexemes to be included in the wordlist task: either, research, territory, harass, defence, schedule, semi-final, process, secretary, kilometre, hostile, data, controversy, schism. The results of this wordlist task will be reported along two separate phonological phenomena: the variation in the quality of the vowel/consonant and the variation in the stress patterns.

Morphosyntax
The two morphosyntactic features examined in this study are subject-verb agreement in existential there-sentences (there+BE+NP plural) and stative possessive have (got). Both of these have attracted previous research in other varieties of English and have shown to differ in their preferred usages in BrE and AmE. Furthermore, both of these features occur frequently in spoken language and, thus, are suitable for the present study. Although it has been recommended that the linguistic variables to be studied should preferably be
decided on before the fieldwork is commenced (Feagin 2002: 23), in the present study this was not done. As I hoped to include features that also have some bearing to the speakers, I did not decide on them in advance. As a result, I could include two features commented on by the speakers, the use of stative possessive have (got) and quotatives (esp. be like, see below) in the analysis. Both of the morphosyntactic features will be investigated in relation to a set of linguistic constraints. The linguistic constraints in the case of there-existentials are tense of the verb, polarity (positive/negative), contractedness of the verb and determiner type and, in the case of stative possessive have (got), negation and contraction.

**Discourse**
The discourse feature to be examined is the use of quotatives which has attracted plenty of interest since the 1990s and the emergence of the new quotative be like in the major varieties of English. As the use of be like has been shown to have originated in AmE, it thus makes a good candidate for studying the spread of AmE features into AusE. The linguistic factors to be examined include grammatical person, tense and content of the quote.

### 4.4 DATA EXTRACTION AND ANALYSIS

#### 4.4.1 FOLK LINGUISTIC ACCOUNTS

Although the results of this section are also quantified, more qualitative type of procedures were employed in charting the speakers' views and opinions on the AmE influence. In addition to simply searching for the informants' responses to the direct questions that were used to elicit attitudes, some key words that could be expected to be used in discussing the topic, such as 'American influence', 'Americanisation' and 'Americanisms', were searched for. However, as the topic of Americanisation was talked about from a variety of viewpoints and thus with very variable vocabulary, any context touching upon the AmE influence had to be read through in order to make sure that none of the attitudinal information was lost. As the attitudes were not marked in the transcribed texts in any way, these proved to be the most challenging to find and analyse.

#### 4.4.2 LINGUISTIC FEATURES

The wordlist task used to elicit data for the study of pronunciation was analysed by listening to the speakers’ productions and marking the results into a table. These were double checked by a native speaker of AusE. In cases where the first two judges diverged in their marking of the pronunciation, another native speaker was consulted to confirm the analysis.
For the retrieval of the other linguistic and discourse features, there-existentials, stative possessive have (got) and quotatives, the freely available corpus program AntConc was used. In each case, I searched for all the occurrences of the features in question and then discarded the irrelevant examples. A detailed description of the search protocol and the subsequent exclusions for each of the linguistic features under investigation are discussed in the respective chapters reporting the research findings below.

4.4.3 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The results of each of the features examined in this study are quantified and, except for some of the commentary in the perceptual part, presented with relative frequencies, i.e., percentages. While I am fully aware of the imbalances of the data, firstly, between the age groups and genders and secondly between individual speakers, the results are reported as overall distributions. However, attention is also drawn to individual differences in preferred usages in each of the features studied, although any further examination of those is outside the scope of the present study.

In order to test for the statistical significance of differences especially of the two sociolinguistic factors of interest, age and gender, chi-square tests using the program R were performed. In cases in which the expected frequency in any cell was less than five, this test could not be performed. It needs to be noted that when performing a chi-square test on more than two groups, as is the case with age in this study, a possible significant result only shows that there is a difference somewhere, but not necessarily between all age groups (see e.g., Meyerhoff et al. 2015). Three levels of significance are applied in reporting the results of the chi-square tests: p<0.05, p<0.01 and p<0.001. In each case, the level of significance is reported in the text. The exact results of the chi-square tests are presented in the relevant tables. The raw numbers and the chi-square calculations for the results presented in figure format are provided in Appendix D.

---

32 Available for download at http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software.html

33 R is available for download at https://www.r-project.org/. The software for using R, RStudio, is available for download at https://www.rstudio.com/.
PART III: RESEARCH FINDINGS
5 SPEAKER PERSPECTIVES ON AMERICAN ENGLISH FEATURES IN AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH

This first research chapter of this thesis presents the results of the direct questions on the speakers’ perceptions of and attitudes towards AmE influence in AusE. Although the commentary on AmE influence in AusE abounds in newspapers and the media in more general, research on this topic in the Australian context is rather scarce. Previous research on Australian speakers’ attitudes has mainly concentrated on how Australians feel about AusE (e.g., Bradley and Bradley 2001) together with some studies on ethnic varieties of AusE (e.g., Callan and Gallois 1982). Bradley and Bradley’s (2001) study revealed that Australian’s attitudes towards AusE have become more positive, but judging by the heated discussions on the Americanisation of AusE in the media, it could be expected that the interview participants may find that there is such an influence and see it as a threat to AusE.

Although, according to my knowledge, there are no generational studies on speaker attitudes towards AmE influence in AusE, some studies have also taken attitudes into account. Firstly, some previous research on the use of certain AmE features in AusE, the Australian Style surveys and Tardiff’s (1990) surveys on spelling, also presents some attitudinal aspects. These have revealed the negative views that people hold for any American influence. As Tardiff (1990: 62) concludes, “If a spelling is commented on as an Americanisation, it is always seen as a bad thing.” A more recent view is presented by Ferguson’s (2008) survey study, which probably is the most thorough examination of the topic investigating the attitudes of young people (18–30 year-olds). In her study, nearly two thirds of the 92 respondents had a negative attitude towards Americanisation (Ferguson 2008: 43).

Linguistic influence of another language variety on one’s own variety is not a straightforward topic to discuss and neither are the attitudes put forward in these accounts. When people present negative attitudes towards AmE, it may actually be the result of the person disliking America in general (see Ferguson 2008: 39). This also became evident in the Blayney interviews when people actually commented on a variety of things besides language although the initial question was strictly about language and AmE influence in that. These strong feelings that people present about American usage is, according to Burridge (2010: 7), “born of linguistic insecurity in the face of a cultural, political and economic superpower”.

Another factor to consider is what actually is an Americanism and what is just perceived as such by the speakers. AmE may be thought of as the source of any disliked forms (Penry Williams 2011: 366), and often people think of anything new and unfamiliar in the language as being American. This is
confirmed by Ferguson (2008: 54), when she writes that “they [the respondents] are ranking unknown or unusual features as American”. An excerpt from an interview with informants from two generations (grandmother [G1_F05] and grandson [G3_M06]) from CoBS also exemplifies this (see [5.1] below).

(5.1) 
[G1_F05:] American expressions like awesome = tell me some more = * that you
[G3_M06:] use
[G3_M06:] %that’s not% American
[G3_M06:] is it?
[G1_F05:] well that’s a new word as far as we’re concerned
[G3_M06:] awesome
[G1_F05:] [G3_M06 LAUGHS] in our age group it is.
[G1_F05:] awesome
[G3_M06:] really?

In this example, the young informant (G3_M06) is surprised to hear that awesome could be an Americanism. This also points to the fact that younger speakers are likely to be less sensitised to Americanisms and to see some of the earlier borrowings as less American than the older generations. Similar generational differences were found in the Australian Style surveys on American lexical items (Peters 2001c).

As this part of the study relies on the informants’ self-reporting, these comments and thus the results need to be interpreted with some caution. The attitudinal material gained by the direct questioning method used here presents some problems for the analysis (see section 5.1 below) as the responses from the interviewees vary a great deal. In addition, the respondents may also say what they think they are expected to say or what they think is “the correct answer” (see e.g., Milroy 1987 and Milroy and Gordon 2003 for discussions on data collection by a sociolinguistic interview method and its limitations). Furthermore, as Penny Williams (2011: 366) points out, by asking the participants directly about AmE influence, the researcher implies that such a phenomenon exists and may, therefore, influence their subsequent responses. At the same time, however, this method gives insights into the views and opinions that the speakers have about the AmE and the influence it may have on AusE and, therefore, compliments the linguistic evidence obtained by the examination of their actual language use in the later chapters of this thesis.

This chapter is divided into five sections as follows: after this introduction the procedure for the extraction and analysis of the data is described in detail (5.1), after which the results are presented (5.2). This is then followed by a

---

34 The speaker code includes the following information: age group (G1, G2 or G3), gender of the speaker (M or F) and the individual speaker number (within the age group).
summarising discussion (5.3). As the development of Australians’ attitudes towards America and AmE has already been discussed in Chapter 3, these will not be repeated here.

5.1 EXTRACTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTUAL DATA

Analysing the perceptual data, i.e., the responses to the direct questions about the AmE influence, turned out to be fairly complicated. As could be expected, the responses varied from individual to individual. For some this was a very enticing topic and they were willing to talk at length about it and presented very strong views while others were not so keen to talk about the subject. Therefore, the analysis had to be done individual by individual. As noted in Section 4.5.1, certain search words, such as American, Americanism and influence were used in retrieving the interviewees’ comments, but in order to include all the relevant responses discussing AmE influence much of the interview transcription simply had to be read through.

Once the initial answers to the direct question about AmE influence were extracted from the material, they were then categorised according to four categories: ‘yes’, ‘no’, ‘mixed’ and ‘no answer’. While most of the informants responded with a clear ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to the initial question about AmE influence, some answers could not be directly put under either of the first two headings. Thus, a category called ‘mixed’ was included. Responses that included both affirmative and negative views were included in this category. For example, if an informant changed his/her mind during the discussion following the initial question about the AmE influence, this was treated as a ‘mixed’ answer. Some informants in this category also reported that there is no AmE influence in language but then, however, gave examples of AmE features that are used in Australia. The last category, ‘no answer’ included those who did not give an answer to the question at all. These were all in interviews where there were more than one informant present, i.e., some of the informants discussed the topic while one of the participants did not give their opinion.

When analysing the reasons that the interviewees gave for AmE influence, it was sometimes hard to determine whether something was thought of as a reason for American influence or whether the informant was just reporting on differences between AusE and AmE. Some responses also included more general comments on the American cultural influence. For example, one of the informants in the middle age group reported that the authors her children read are American but did not go into any more detail as to whether she thought this had any effect on their actual language use. In cases like this the decision on how to treat the answer was made according to the context in which the statement occurred.

Some of the informants also reported on as to how much influence they thought AmE has on AusE. For example, one of the informants reported that
“there’s heaps of American English influence in Australian English” (G3_M02) while others reported that they had only noticed a little bit of influence. However, this type of commentary was very sporadic and not in any way systematic and is therefore not considered further at this stage.

5.2 **“DO YOU THINK THERE IS AMERICAN ENGLISH INFLUENCE IN AUSTRALIA?”**

The title of this subsection presents the question used in the interviews to elicit discursive data from the interview participants on their views on the possible Americanisation of AusE. Naturally, the wording of the question depended on the interview situation and further questions were posed according to the interviewees’ initial views on the situation. The results in this section are presented in the following order: the overall results, the areas which the interviewees mentioned as having American influence and the reasons given for this influence. The chapter finishes with a summarising discussion.

5.2.1 **OVERALL FINDINGS**

The question about the alleged AmE influence provided some interesting and varied results. Some of the informants had quite strong views on the topic while others were vaguer in their opinions (see examples [5.2] and [5.3] respectively). Furthermore, while most of the informants gave simple yes/no responses to the initial question, some gave much more detailed accounts on the topic (example [5.4]).

(5.2) the American influence = peeves me off (G2_M03)

(5.3) Not really. Not here. I don’t believe. (G1_F15)

(5.4) We can recognise an awful lot of American slang because of the TV influence and what not but it’s not used uh while it’s recognised it’s not used as an Americanism in in my experience. Uhm we don’t pronounce it the same way. (G1_M07)

As the overall distribution of speaker responses to the question on AmE influence as presented in Table 5.1 show, a great majority of the people seem to think that there is AmE influence in AusE (81.2%). Only a minority (11.6%) think that this is not the case.
Table 5.1. Overall results on the question “Do you think there’s any American English influence in Australian English?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1</th>
<th></th>
<th>G2</th>
<th></th>
<th>G3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The varying views reported by the speakers are exemplified by the statements in (5.5) and (5.6):

(5.5) Oh don’t get %you’re gonna% get me started on the American influence on Australia. It’s terrible. Deplorable. Shocking. (G1_F13)

(5.6) we seem to follow the Americans down the rail all the way in a lot of things but I don’t think we have so much so with our with our language. Uhm I think a lot of Australians tend to = uh be aggravated by the American accent. (G2_M02)

If we take a look at the different age groups, it becomes clear that all behave similarly. Surprisingly however, it is the oldest generation with the highest percentage of no-answers and the youngest with the highest percentage of yes-answers. This is somewhat contradictory to the hypothesis of younger people being less aware of Americanisms and, therefore, not seeing them as foreign.

Gender differences, as presented in Table 5.2, are not great either. Both males and females behave similarly although a slightly higher percentage of males do think that AmE is influencing AusE. This, too, could be considered as somewhat contradictory to the idea of women being more sensitive to stigmatised features than men as often the use of Americanisms is seen as such.

---

35 Statistical analysis of these data is limited to a chi-square test of the yes-answers due to the low number of tokens in all the other cells. The differences between age groups in their presentation of yes-answers are not statistically significant; x-squared = 0.67857, df = 2, p-value = 0.7123.

36 Again, a chi-square test could only be performed for the yes-answers, the result of which is not statistically significant; x-squared = 0.64286, df = 1, p-value = 0.4227
Table 5.2. Results on the question “Do you think there’s any American English influence in Australian English?” according to gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With age and gender cross-tabulated as presented in Table 5.3, the similarity of the speakers’ responses is further highlighted. Only a slightly smaller percentage of female speakers in the oldest age group claim that there is AmE influence than the other age and gender groups.

Table 5.3. Results on the question “Do you think there’s any American English influence in Australian English?” According to age and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>G2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>G3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in Table 5.3. also show that the oldest and the youngest age groups are most alike in their views in that in both groups it is the male speakers who present the highest percentage of yes-answers while in G2 the reverse is true, i.e., the female speakers more often report that there is AmE influence.

When analysing the overall results, two recurring themes surfaced from the responses. Firstly, there is the language change aspect. Some of the respondents had noticed an ongoing change in AusE. This theme was brought up by informants in all age groups and is exemplified by (5.7) and (5.8).
Because there’s more American influence now. [...] In our parents’ generation grandparents’ generation, they, it was more British oriented but now it’s more American oriented and stuff. (G3_M13)

I think we may have started British and we are moving to American. (G2_F10)

Furthermore, this aspect of change in progress was also brought up mainly by some of the older speakers who noted that it is the young people who are quite readily adopting Americanisms. This is exemplified by the comment in (5.9) from a G2 female speaker when she comments on the differences between her and her children’s language use.

A lot of their language is a combination of like Australian and American. (G2_F07)

Another recurring theme was regional differences as in people seeing Americanisation as something happening more in the cities and not so much in the rural areas. A young male informant in G3 stated that he has not noticed Americanisms in Blayney but some in Sydney and also gave a reason for this (example 5.10).

It’s more a city thing because yeah. Why is that? Why do you think it is more a city thing than Because Americans don’t really come to the country. They more go to the city so there’s more Americans in the city than there is =

The above example nicely illustrates the speaker’s awareness of a need for face-to-face contact for linguistic influence to occur. A female informant in G2 also mentioned that there is more American influence in the city (example 5.11) and gave surfie talk as an area of language with a lot of Americanisms.

The way they uhm = I suppose it’s a lot of Americanisms they’ve picked up. It = you know, %wipe out% a- an- it’s just terms we don’t use up here. (G2_F07)

Both of the above mentioned recurring themes in the interviews interestingly underline the distancing of AmE influence from oneself. This is done by noting that there is AmE influence, but that it is not present in one’s own speech community or one’s own age group (the latter mainly noted by the older speakers). It is, indeed, as noted by Burridge (2010: 5), often the case that
complaints about language use are directed at that of others’ rather one’s one linguistic choices.

### 5.2.2 AMERICAN ENGLISH FEATURES MENTIONED IN THE INTERVIEWS

In addition to asking whether there is AmE influence in AusE, the interviewees were also asked to provide examples of linguistic features which they thought had been influenced by AmE. As responses to this follow-up question, several areas of language were mentioned as presenting American features. These are listed and categorised according to the age groups in Table 5.4.

| Table 5.4. Most often mentioned linguistic areas with AmE features. |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                 | G1   | G2   | G3   | TOTAL |
| Vocabulary (incl. sayings, phrases, idioms) | 8    | 8    | 13   | 28    |
| Spelling        | 7    | 8    | 6    | 21    |
| Pronunciation (incl. accent) | 4    | 9    | 7    | 20    |

The most often mentioned area of language in which informants had noticed AmE influence was vocabulary followed by spelling and pronunciation nearly at a par. Accent was mentioned as an area of American influence only a couple of times by the youngest and the middle-aged informants and these have therefore been put together with pronunciation in this categorisation. Grammatical features were rarely mentioned, although one informant did give an example of prepositional usage and another one mentioned that text messaging has an impact on the grammar without giving concrete examples. The lack of commentary in grammar is, of course, not surprising as the possible American features in that would less likely to be noticed by the speakers (cf. Niedzielski and Preston 2003; Labov 2001: 28). Due to the low number of mentions, grammatical features are not discussed further in this section.

*Generational differences in features mentioned*

There were only two examples in the whole material that were mentioned by all three age groups, *guy* as an example of vocabulary and *jail* as an example of American spelling used in Australia. Therefore, these can be thought of as stereotypical examples of AmE influence. In addition, there were some features that were mentioned by two age groups, such as the spelling of *programme*, -*our*/*-or* and *s/z* (see Table 5.5 below). Overall, the older age
groups (G1 and G2) had more examples in common (especially spelling features), while the youngest speakers mainly seemed to note lexical items. Nevertheless, it seems that there is no common stock of Americanisms that would be recognised or thought of as such by informants in all age groups.

As Table 5.5 shows, many specific examples of what people think of as Americanisms were mentioned in the interviews. In additions to these, vaguer notions of language areas as containing AmE elements were also brought forward. These included the mentioning of idioms, colloquial terms, slang, catch phrases from movies and use of profanities as presenting AmE influence. However, as the informants did not go into any more detail as to what kinds of examples they have noticed, a closer examination of these is not possible.

Table 5.5. Examples of AmE influence mentioned in the interviews.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOCABULARY</strong></td>
<td>guy</td>
<td>guys</td>
<td>guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cans for tins</td>
<td>can (for tin)</td>
<td>calling (someone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>awesome</td>
<td>doh!</td>
<td>gangsta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in this point of time</td>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sports terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td>bucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>thru (for track mix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>man/dude (for mate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that's so fetch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPELLING</strong></td>
<td>z/s (also s/z)</td>
<td>programme</td>
<td>z instead of s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme</td>
<td>thru (for through)</td>
<td>jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jail</td>
<td>jail</td>
<td>abbreviating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-our / -or (colour)</td>
<td>-our / -or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l / ll</td>
<td>(labour, colour, favour)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRONUNCIATION</strong></td>
<td>zee/zed</td>
<td>secretary</td>
<td>semi-final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research</td>
<td>ceremony</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>schedule</td>
<td>cool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>zee for zed</td>
<td>aluminium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clerks</td>
<td>oregano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vitamins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rodeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items common to all three age groups are in **boldface** and items common to two age groups are *italicised.*
As for the differences between the age groups, the youngest speakers mainly gave lexical items as examples of Americanisms as in (5.12) and (5.13).

(5.12) it change now like with some of my friends instead of saying ‘mate’ they say ‘man’ or ‘dude’ which is very American (G3_M12)

(5.13) Oh if you say ‘guy’ that sounds a bit American (G3_M01)

Spelling and pronunciation features were also mentioned by the young speakers. However, not many examples were given of the American spelling variants used in Australia. Pronunciation, on the other hand, was exemplified by the following: semi-final, pronunciation of r, cool, aluminium37 and oregano. But there was also at least one informant who specifically mentioned that there is no American influence in pronunciation (example [5.14]):

(5.14) because it’s just an English background here sort of thing, %we% just speak more English so (G3_M11)

The speakers in the middle-aged group (G2), on the other hand, most often mentioned pronunciation as an area in which they have noticed AmE influence. Examples included progress, rodeo, zee rather than zed and schedule pronounced with /sk/ rather than /ʃ/. The second most common sources of AmE influence according to the middle-aged informants were vocabulary and spelling. The most often mentioned spelling features were -or/-our and jail/gaol. Lexical transfers were, however, only exemplified by three words: guys, can for tin and doh! from the TV-series The Simpsons.

The speakers in the oldest age group (G1) mainly gave examples from vocabulary and spelling and remarkably less from pronunciation. Lexical items that were mentioned included, for example, guys and cans for tins. Spelling provided a number of examples as well, such as jail/gaol, colour and the difference s/z and l/ll. The differences in pronunciation were exemplified by the lexical items research and Granada.

Recurring themes in more than one generation

In addition to the two above mentioned specific examples from vocabulary and spelling (guy and jail), some recurring themes surfaced when the interviewees were reporting on the areas of AmE influence. First of all, speakers in the older age groups (G1 and G2) more often believed that it is the younger people who use more AmE features (as in example [5.15]) whereas the younger informants did not report this to be the case. However, there was one aspect in which both the young and the old seemed to agree on: young people use AmE features

37 Although aluminium and aluminum are in fact different words, they were treated as pronunciation variants by the two speakers who mentioned them.
when they imitate characters from TV shows as exemplified in (5.16) and (5.17). Moore (2008: 201) also discusses this.

(5.15) And I I think some of some of our younger Australians are probably tended to pronounce a little more like the American pronunciation. (G2_F13)

(5.16) Because = uhm when we'd imitate like as children imitate a character or an actor or some other person it would be in an American accent. (G3_M15)

(5.17) And and if there's a play or something on and kids just want to change their voice a little bit it's nearly always in American accent (G2_F08)

Even though AmE influence was generally seen as negative and many presented quite purist views on, for example, the pronunciation of AusE (see example [5.18]), some also noted that in some aspects the AmE variant is easier or, in the case of spelling, phonetically more correct as examples (5.19) and (5.20), respectively, show. The ease of spelling was actually mentioned by one informant in each age group, so that too can be viewed as something common to all ages. Similar type of commentary was also found by Ferguson (2008: 12) in letters by newspaper readers, albeit it was scarce.

(5.18) I think we should pronounce things the way we always have. (G1_F09)

(5.19) I think the British is taught = but the American is known and accepted ha ha and generally the the thing with American is it's more uhm phonetically correct. (G2_F05)

(5.20) and I think the way they [Americans] spell a word is is probably easier to learn, isn’t it? (G2_F01)

*American influence in other areas than language*
In addition to examples of linguistic influence, a number of other areas of life presenting American influence were also mentioned in the interviews. This shows the difficulty of separating the linguistic influence from other types of influence. Other than linguistic examples of American influence were mainly mentioned by the young informants (G3). The most often mentioned areas were fast food, dress/clothing/fashion and rap music and things related to that. However, a few older informants also noted how America was influencing Australia in many ways. One of the informants in the oldest age group, for example, mentioned that the Australian “government is relying too much on America” (G1_F14). Dress and fast food were also mentioned by the older informants.
While there was variation in the linguistic areas that the informants mentioned as having been influenced by AmE, the reasons given for this influence were by and large the same across generations. These reasons are presented in the following section.

5.2.3 REASONS GIVEN FOR THE AMERICAN ENGLISH INFLUENCE
The most often mentioned sources of AmE influence were American TV and movies, technology/computers, music and the media/advertising as shown in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6. Most often mentioned reasons for AmE influence in AusE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology, computers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies, films</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media (newspapers, magazines, radio), advertising</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the age groups do not differ much in their observations as to what they think of as reasons for the AmE influence. TV and movies/films are most commonly considered to be the cause of this influence as well over half of the interview participants mention these. Second place in this ranking goes to technology and computers. This includes mentions of computer games, video games, spell check and the use of mobile phones. Interestingly, the Internet as such was not mentioned (cf. Taylor 2001). Use of mobile phones and how texting is affecting the language was mentioned especially by informants in the oldest age group (see example [5.21]).

(5.21) I think text messaging is having a major impact on grammar and spelling. (G1_M01)

Music was also seen as presenting AmE influence. Rap music influence was mentioned by some of the younger informants while the older generations had noticed the AmE used in songs, both in American but also in Anglo-Australian and (British) English songs (cf. Sussex 1989). American influence in newspapers and magazines and in advertising was also mentioned.

In addition to these commonly mentioned reasons, there were also some interesting individual observations. One of these gives time depth for the AmE influence: a male informant in the middle-age group mentions American soldiers in Australia around the end of World War II. This leads him to
estimate that the AmE influence has been around in Australia since “nineteen forty, forty-five, end of the war sort of thing” (G2_M04). Some people also remarked the political connection that the two countries have, while a few also mentioned fast food and fashion as adding to the AmE linguistic influence.

5.3 DISCUSSION

As the findings presented in this chapter have shown, the CoBS speakers provided some interesting and varied commentary on the topic of Americanisation of AusE. It became evident when analysing this data that the interviewees had trouble separating linguistic influence from other, mainly cultural, types of influence. Instead of commenting strictly on the AmE influence on AusE, many also talked about their views on other types of influence.

Overall, on the linguistic side of things, a majority of the interviewees (over 80%) feel that AmE, indeed, has an impact on the English used in Australia. Thus, the age groups examined in this study do not greatly differ in their opinions about the existence of AmE influence. This is in line with Ferguson’s (2008) study in which she did not find proof for the claims that young people would be more tolerant of Americanisms as nearly two thirds of her participants presented a negative attitude towards AmE with the youngest informants (aged 18–20) being even less tolerant of Americanisms than their older peers (aged 21–30) (Ferguson 2008: 43–44). However, as the age range of the participants in her study is 18–30 and only includes first year university students, no generational evidence is available. As for the gender differences in the present study, both males and females presented by and large similar views with females only slightly more often stating that there is no AmE influence in Australia. As Ferguson (2008) did not report the gender differences in her study, no comparison can be made regarding AusE. In terms of NZE, however, Vine’s (1999) study found that at least women are largely accepting of the AmE influence in their language. However, as her study only included female participants, no gender differences were reported in that study either (Ferguson 2008: 44).

Of different language areas, vocabulary is the one that speakers most often mention as absorbing a lot of Americanisms. A similar trend was noticed by Ferguson in her review of the Daily Telegraph articles and letters (Ferguson 2008: 10 and the references therein). In the present study, one of the lexical items, guy, was mentioned by all the age groups as being American.38

38 The position of guy as a stereotypical example of American influence is strengthened by its occurrence in newspaper commentary such as the following:

The waiter posed the usual question to our small group at dinner. "Are you guys ready to order?"

Guys? There were two women among us, but this waiter seemed to be suffering the creeping
Therefore, it represents a kind of a stereotype that people generally see as an Americanism. Although guy was seen as more neutral (not clearly American nor Australian) by the younger respondents than the older in the *Australian Style* survey (Peters 2001c: 10), the fact that it is mentioned by informants of all ages in the present material shows that it is still noticed by speakers. A much later borrowing, dude, on the other hand, was only mentioned by one informant in the youngest (G3) age group. Notably, dude attracted more comments in Ferguson’s study than guy (2008: 55), which may indicate that the use of dude is more familiar to the younger age groups but not necessarily to older speakers. Taylor (1989: 240) also notices the increased use of guy in AusE but considers the use of dude very restricted. Dude was also clearly ranked as being American by all age groups (although less so by the youngest respondents) in the *Australian Style* survey (Peters 2001c: 10). Overall, in the present study, the young informants gave more examples of lexical transfers than the speakers in either of the other two age groups (as shown in Table 5.5 above).

In addition to specific lexical items being mentioned as American, informants in all age groups also gave more general type of examples, such as colloquial terms, idioms and slang. As these were not further exemplified, it stays more or less a mystery as to what kinds of things the informants were thinking of. However, there was one informant in the oldest age group who mentioned sports terminology as having been influenced by AmE. This is not, in a way, surprising as the Americanisation of Australian sport (including clothing, customs and language) has been – at least in the popular mind – around since the mid-19th century (Cashman and Hughes 1998: 179–180). This overall influence on sports (not directly related to language) was also mentioned in one interview in the present data.

After vocabulary, spelling and pronunciation were the second most commonly mentioned areas of linguistic influence. In comparison, in Ferguson’s (2008) study it was spelling that was most often mentioned as having been influenced by AmE. In the present study, spelling and pronunciation were almost equally often mentioned by both the youngest and the middle-age groups, while for the oldest age group pronunciation seemed to be the least Americanised area of language. Changes in the teaching of spelling as well as the use of computer spell checks were mentioned as reasons for this increased use of AmE spellings in AusE (see also Ferguson 2008: 16; Taylor 2001).

Spelling also provided the other one of those two examples that were mentioned by all three age groups. Jail was definitely a pet hate for many of

American disease that makes a good proportion of young Australians wear their caps backwards and insert the word "like" into every second sentence. So everyone is now a gender-neutral "guy"

*(Sydney Morning Herald, Feb 1, 2010).*

the informants and could thus be seen as another stereotypical example of the AmE influence in addition to guy. A number of other spelling features, such as program(me), -ize/-ise and -or/-our, were also mentioned by informants across two generations. All of these are also discussed by Taylor (1989: 230-231) as examples of AmE influence. According to him, these are used in free variation in AusE (Taylor 1989: 230). The variability in the use of -our/-or is also noted by Fritz (2010) in his historical study of AusE spelling. As the reports from the interviewees in this study show, speakers of AusE seem to be very aware of this variation as well and also have strong views about it.

While pronunciation is not so much discussed in letters and articles (Ferguson 2008: 16), it did provide nearly as many comments as did spelling in the present study. In fact, the middle-aged informants mentioned pronunciation even more often than vocabulary which was the overall most often mentioned language area allegedly being influenced by AmE. The examples that the informants gave from pronunciation varied across generations as there was only one example, zed used for zee, which was mentioned by informants in both G1 and G2. According to Ferguson (2008: 17), this is also one of the pet hates mentioned in letters to newspapers. Not surprisingly, the reason given for this is also the same: kids watching Sesame Street. Other than that, there were no common features of pronunciation across generations.

In terms of the reasons that the informants mentioned as adding to the Americanisation of AusE, the most often mentioned were TV and movies followed by technology/computers, music and the media and advertising. These are all also mentioned in previous research. Sussex (1989) discusses the influence found in the media (incl. TV and cinema), music and advertising while Taylor (2001) comments on the impact that computers and the Internet have had. The influence mediated through TV and movies seems to be the main reason for the rapid Americanisation of AusE in the minds of the speakers across generations. As was seen in Section 3.2, this view has been prevalent since the introduction of American movies and TV shows to Australia. This has, however, been brought into question in linguistic research, for example, by Trudgill (1986, 2014) who discusses the extent to which passive TV watching can affect the language system. However, for the speakers, this is seen as the most obvious reason for the influence.

Music, on the other hand, provided very similar views by the informants as were discussed in Sussex (1989): the songs may be sung in an American voice but it does not affect the language as a whole. Computers and technology in a broader sense (including the use of mobile phones) was also viewed as having an impact on the language, both by the informants in the present study as well as in previous research (Taylor 2001). Interestingly, none of the interview participants mentioned the use of the Internet as such as adding to the AmE influence in AusE while, according to Taylor (2001: 332), the Internet with other rapid advances in computer technology “have provided AmE with another powerful medium besides television to influence younger AusE
speakers.” The discussion on the role of technology in Americanisation revealed one generational difference: the use of mobile phones and especially text messaging was only mentioned by the middle-aged and the oldest informants. Either the young people do not see this as having an influence on the language or at least they are not conscious of the possible influence. One explanation for this may also be that the youngest generation have grown up with mobile phones and do not see them as a recent development which, on the other hand, may affect the older generations’ perceptions of their impact on language.

To summarise, the majority of the informants in this study reported that AmE is influencingAusE in many ways. While some held a very negative view on this influence, others just noted its presence and some even saw it as being useful (as in the case of the more phonetic pronunciation). The overall differences in perceptions between the generations and genders were minor, although the linguistic examples did show some differences. The reasons given for the AmE influence were, however, largely the same.

On a methodological note, the analysis of these attitudinal data showed the difficulty of categorising speakers’ attitudes, perceptions and views. Firstly, it was sometimes hard to know if the people were actually answering that there is AmE influence in the language or more generally that there is American influence in Australia, be it in language, clothing, sports or fast food. Furthermore, being self-reporting it is not possible to know whether the people were giving their honest opinion or rather adjusting their answer to what they thought they were expected to say. Furthermore, the fact that the topic of Americanisation was brought up by the interviewer may also have had an effect on the speakers’ answers as is argued by Penry Williams (2011: 366) when she notes that in a setup like this it is “already implied the phenomenon exists and is something significant”. This inevitably results into a need to consider these results as presenting certain perceptual views that the speakers present but not as the absolute truth about the language. This said, it is, however, important and also fascinating to try and look at the language through the eyes and ideas of the speakers themselves. In order to complement these speaker perspectives on the perceived AmE influence, the following chapters investigate the reported and actual language use of these same speakers.
6 VARIABLE PRONUNCIATIONS IN AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH

[G2_Fo4:] Secretary. You hate that one.
[G2_Mo3:] Yeah. Oh, there’s a few but the lot of the, you know lot of American = pronunciation of words is coming over here

As was shown in the previous section on speaker accounts of AmE influence in AusE as well as by the comment above, AusE speakers quite readily provide examples of pronunciation to back up their claims of American influence. Thus, AmE pronunciations – or more likely, what is perceived as such by the speakers – are noticed by Australians, and even more so by the younger generations. However, often these claims are based on the pronunciation of individual words as Peters (1998: 34) points out. Furthermore, as the accounts of the interview participants showed, AmE pronunciations are often used for specific purposes, such as imitation of movie characters or when children want to change their voice when playing/acting. Therefore, no large scale Americanisation of AusE pronunciation seems to be happening. But in order to get a broad picture of the current state of AusE in regards to the use of AmE features, a phonological aspect needs to be included in this study. This is done through the examination of the pronunciations of a set of lexical items that the informants read as a wordlist usually at the end of the interview. All the lexical items included in the wordlist have been reported to differ in their pronunciations in AmE and BrE by previous research as well as dictionary evidence (see Section 6.2 for pronunciations given in dictionaries).

As most of such lexical items as the ones selected for this study do not tend to occur frequently in spontaneous speech, the use of the wordlist method was necessary. However, a word of caution regarding the method is in order as reading words from flash cards is, in essence, self-reporting.

The essential difference between speech styles is the amount of self-monitoring people do when they are speaking. When people are asked to read lists of words they obviously concentrate on their pronunciation almost completely, especially when the reading is being recorded by someone who is admittedly studying the way they speak.

(Chambers 2003: 5)

The fact that people are concentrating on reading the words, as Chambers (2003) notes, may affect the results as people may try to give the pronunciation that they consider to be the correct one and not the one they themselves would use as exemplified in (6.1). In addition, this method does not give any context for the word, which may also affect the pronunciation. This was also commented on in the interviews as example (6.2) below shows.
(6.1) Uh ha ha. It was interesting I found myself you know probably trying to say kilometre (ki lometre) more correctly. It it probably is a kilometre (ˈkilo,metre). I don’t know. (G2_Mo8)

(6.2) depending on what I’m reading. There’s controversy (ˈcontro,versy) or if I’m reading something it could be controversy (cont’roversy) depending on how it’s put into a sentence. (G1_Fo8)

Nevertheless, this method has been used before in phonological studies in AusE (e.g., Cox and Palethorpe 2001) and is one of the few methods to use in the examination of words that would otherwise rarely occur in interview material.

The structure of this chapter is as follows: after this introduction, I will first introduce the lexical items examined together with previous research (6.1) followed by dictionary evidence on the pronunciations of these lexemes in BrE, AmE and AusE (6.2). In Section 6.3, I describe the steps taken in the analysis of the data. This is followed by the results of the present study (6.4). The background chapters (6.1–6.2) and the results section (6.4) are divided into two subsections presenting the two types of phonological variation that is being studied: 1) variation in the quality of the vowel/consonant and 2) variation in the stress pattern. The chapter finishes with a summarising discussion which, again, is divided into two subsections: 6.5.1 Lexemes showing variation in pronunciation and 6.5.2 Lexemes with non-variable pronunciation.

6.1 THE VARIABLES AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The wordlist used in the interviews included the following lexical items: either, research, territory, harass, defence, schedule, semi-final, process, secretary, kilometre, hostile, antinuclear, progress, data, controversy and schism (presented to the informants in this order on flash cards). These lexemes were chosen to be included in this study mainly because they have been reported to differ in their pronunciation from one variety to another, especially between BrE and AmE (see Bayard 1989; Leek and Bayard 1995; Shitara 1993; Taylor 1989; Trudgill and Hannah 2002; Wells 1999), but also because some of them have been commented on by the speakers of AusE. Many of the words investigated here were also included in the Australian Style survey in 1994, the results of which provide ready comparisons for the present study. However, the difference in the data collection methods (written questionnaire vs reading from flash cards) is worth keeping in mind when drawing
conclusions based on the results from the two investigations. Some of the words in the wordlist task were also mentioned by the informants in the course if the interview, as shown, for example, by the extract from CoBS at the beginning of this chapter, which shows that some of these have also caught the attention of the present speakers.

The lexical items in the wordlist task can be divided into two: 1) the ones presenting variation in the quality of the vowel/consonant and 2) the ones having variable stress patterns. The first group entails the following words: *either, data, semi-final, antinuclear, schedule, schism, process, progress and hostile*, while the following make up the second group of words: *territory, secretary, kilometre, controversy, research, defence and harass*. Furthermore, throughout this study, these lexemes are dealt with in pairs (as in *either* and *data, territory* and *secretary* etc.), except for the last one in the first subsection (*hostile*) and the last three in the second subsection (*research, defence, harass*). The reason behind this is that by examining the pronunciation of similar lexemes, conclusions of the extent to which each pronunciation is used can be drawn.

### 6.1.1 VARIATION IN THE QUALITY OF THE VOWEL/CONSONANT

The first pair of words, *either* and *data*, were set out to examine the quality of the first vowel. Trudgill and Hannah (2002: 51) note that both /i/ and /ai/ can be used in the pronunciation of *either* (as well as *neither*) in both BrE and AmE, but that in educated speech the /i/ pronunciation is more common in AmE and /ai/ in BrE. This preference for the /i/ pronunciation is confirmed by Pyles and Algeo (1993: 222), who state that “an overwhelming majority of Americans have [i] in the stressed syllable”. In terms of *data*, there are three possible pronunciations for the vowel: /a/, /ei/ and /æ/. Trudgill and Hannah (2002: 51) say that AmE allows two of these pronunciations (/æ/ and /ei/), but that only /ei/ is used in BrE. In AusE, in addition to the /ei/ pronunciation, /ˈdɑːtə/ is also possible (*Macquarie Dictionary*, 5th ed.). In the light of these accounts, for *either* the difference in pronunciation may primarily lie in the style of the text/speech whereas for *data* it is more of a question of different preferences in different varieties.

*Semi-final* and *antinuclear* were set out to investigate the variation in the pronunciation of the final vowel of the prefix. According to Trudgill and Hannah (2002: 51), these prefixes have final /i/ – /iː/ in BrE but in AmE also

---

39 The different data collection methods also necessarily result in differences in the population. In this case, the people likely to respond to written questionnaires as the ones presented in the *Australian Style* are often more interested in language phenomena in general and also possibly more knowledgeable of differences in pronunciation.

40 The word *data* would also provide for another interesting investigation in relation to American influence: whether or not the intervocalic [t] is flapped. The flapped [t] is often associated with AmE and is also used in AusE.
the /ai/ pronunciation is used. For AusE, Taylor (1989: 228) reports that “while the AusE pronunciation [i.e., /æntɪ/] still predominates, the other is often heard”. The /ai/ pronunciation of the prefixes anti- and semi- was also commented on by some of the speakers as in the comment (6.3) below by a G3 male speaker.

(6.3) Interviewer:] that’s alright. any comments on the words? you noticed some 
[AD:] well after talking to * and on, just on TV the semi-trailer /ai/ [...] we call it semi /i/ they call it semi /ai/ (G3_M04)

The following word pair, schedule and schism, were set out to study the pronunciation of the beginning consonant cluster sch-. Of these, schedule is often mentioned in connection with Americanisation and used as evidence of AmE influence (Wells 1999: 48). Trudgill and Hannah (2002: 51) also list schedule as one of the lexical items that show differences in their pronunciation across the Atlantic. In AmE the common pronunciation is with /sk/ in the beginning whereas in BrE /ʃ/ is still the preferred variant. Schedule was also one of the lexemes mentioned in some of the interviews when talking about AmE influence before the wordlist task as the comment (6.4) below shows.

(6.4) probably just some of the pronunciations and things uhm like = I think * and I were talking about schedule /ʃ/ and schedule /sk/ this morning and just things like that. (G2_M04)

Schedule and schism were also included in the Australian Style survey in 1994. In that survey, the /ʃ/ pronunciation still prevailed for schedule, but /sk/ was the preferred pronunciation for schism. The change towards the /sk/ pronunciation for schedule was also visible, however, in that the youngest generation clearly preferred that (65% as against the overall preference of 77% for /ʃ/) (Australian Style 1994). For schism, Wells (1990) reports that /sk/ is also the preferred pronunciation in BrE with 71%, although the traditional pronunciation with /ʃ/ is still more popular in BrE than in AusE.

Taylor (1989: 228) also discusses this change from /ʃ/ to /sk/ in these lexemes and suggests that systematisation may be the reason for this change in bringing them in line with other lexical items beginning with <sch> such as school and scheme. This also applies for the pronunciation of the next pair of words, process and progress, in which it is the prefix pro- that is of interest. Taylor (1989: 228) claims that “the pronunciation by many Australians of the prefix pro- as /pro/, instead of as AusE /prou/ in the lexical items progress, project, and process is pretty certainly due to their pronunciation in AmE as [ˈprɒgrɛs], but it does serve to align them with other initially stressed items like product and problem, where the prefix has always been pronounced /pro/.” Peters (1998: 34) also points out this “internal systemic support” for
the /prə/ pronunciation. However, the fact that both process and progress can be used both as a noun and a verb makes matters somewhat more complicated. It was not specified in the wordlist task which one of these the lexeme was meant to present, so the results need to be interpreted keeping that in mind. The last in this first group of lexemes is hostile with which the interest lies in the quality of the last vowel. Trudgill and Hannah (2002: 51) propose that BrE has /ail/ in the final syllable, but in AmE either /ail/ or /sl/ can be heard.41

The second type of variation in the pronunciation of AusE, namely, variation in the stress pattern (stress shifts) is discussed in the following subsection.

6.1.2 VARIATION IN THE STRESS PATTERNS

Regarding changes in the stress patterns, Sussex (1995: 2) claims that the pronunciation of AusE is moving towards the American model in words that were earlier stressed elsewhere than the first syllable but are now increasingly stressed on the first syllable. These stress differences between BrE and AusE were already noted by Mitchell and Delbridge (1965: 53), although they claim that there were only a few of them. They further note that these stress shifts are used in all varieties of English to avoid long series of unaccented syllables: “Tradition is strongly in favour of keeping the stress on the first syllable, but the tendency to place the stress on the root syllable is also strong” (Mitchell and Delbridge 1965: 54). Taylor (1989: 229) also comments on these stress shifts by saying that in some isolated words, such as harass and controversy, the AmE pronunciation “is in strong competition with [British English] pronunciations in AusE”.

Some of the most common examples of the stress differences between BrE and AmE in polysyllabic words involve the endings -ary, -ery and -ory. The secondary stress on the penultimate syllable of these types of words was lost in BrE a long ago (Pyles and Algeo 1993: 224) and has resulted in a situation in which BrE has the stress only on the first (or second) syllable with a reduced penultimate syllable whereas AmE has retained the secondary stress on the penultimate syllable (Trudgill & Hannah 2002:52; Bauer et al. 1980: 201–202; Peters and Swan 1983: 16). In the present study, this phenomenon is examined by charting the pronunciations of the lexemes territory and secretary.42 According to Trudgill and Hannah (2002: 52), BrE allows the use of partially reduced pronunciations, such as /ˈsekrətri/, but does not have secondary stress on the penultimate syllable. As for the pronunciation of these polysyllabic words in AusE, Taylor (1989: 229) states, that “there is a strong tendency in AusE to reduce unstressed vowels [...] but in polysyllabic words

41 Other words in this category as listed by Trudgill and Hannah (2002: 51) include fertile, juvenile, missile, mobile and sterile.

42 Other lexemes in this category include, for example, commentary, dictionary, lavatory, observatory and ordinary.
this can lead to consonant clusters” as in /ˈsɛkrətri/. This difficult pronunciation is sometimes avoided by resorting to the r-less pronunciation /ˈsɛkrətri/. As this is, however, “heavily stigmatised” (Taylor 1989: 229), speakers may choose to give the penultimate syllable secondary stress, which is the pronunciation also used in AmE, to avoid using it. Of this type of lexemes especially secretary was also commented on in the interviews as the excerpt in the beginning of this chapter showed.

Kilometre and controversy is another pair of words that present a case of stress shift in their pronunciation. Both of these lexical items can have stress either on the first (and the penultimate) syllable (ˈkiloˌmetre) or they can be stressed on the second syllable (kɪˈlometre). Of these, kilometre presents an example of lexemes whose pronunciation has also been commented on by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC). According to Leitner (2004a: 205), kilometre “seems to have come up for discussion for the first time in 1956 (38th meeting) when the committee ruled in favour of the traditional EngE pronunciation kilomètre.” Furthermore, as is mentioned in the Australian Style (1994), this pronunciation was also recommended by the Metrication Board in the 1970s. The Macquarie Dictionary (2009: 919) also states about the usage: “It makes sense to pronounce metric units in a standard way, with the stress on the first syllable, as (uncontroversially) in kilogram and kilolitre. But many people retain the earlier pronunciation of kilometre with the stress on the second syllable.” This latter pronunciation, of course, brings kilometre in line with words such as speedometer and thermometer. The Australian Style survey revealed that Australians prefer to stress the first (and third) syllables rather than to have stress on the second syllable, a preference which was consistent across generations (Australian Style 1994: 14).

The second word in this pair, controversy, is one of the most controversial of pronunciations, and not just in Australia. As becomes evident from newspaper articles both in British as well as Australian newspapers, controversy among others causes concern for speakers. Traditionally it was pronounced with stress on the first syllable in BrE but in recent years there has been a change towards controversy. In his study, Wells (1990) reports a 56% preference for the latter pronunciation in BrE. In comparison, AmE is more inclined to use `controversy with initial stress as evidenced by the Merriam-Webster dictionary.

As for AusE, Taylor (1989: 229) states that with controversy the AmE pronunciation is in competition with the BrE pronunciation. However, he claims that the pronunciation controversy is the AmE option while, for example, in Merriam-Webster it states that that is the pronunciation that is used in BrE beside `controˌversy (see section 6.3 for further discussion). Mitchell and Delbridge (1965: 54) also comment on the pronunciation of controversy claiming that controversy is well established in Australian speech.

The Australian Style survey showed a slight overall preference for controversy (55%). In that study, only the youngest generation (aged 10–24)
showed a stronger preference (79%) for this pronunciation as against all the other age groups (varying from 25–65+ years of age) used it with similar rates (52–55%) (Australian Style 1994: 15). Therefore, according to that study, the younger Australians seem to prefer the initial stress with controversy.43

The last three lexemes in this section, research, defence and harass, present stress variation in isolated lexemes. Trudgill and Hannah (2002: 51) report that BrE prefers second-syllable stress for research while AmE has the stress on the first syllable. However, they also mention that, as a noun, research is now increasingly pronounced with first-syllable stress also in BrE. Thus, this is another lexeme besides progress and process that presents the problem of being used both as a noun and a verb. Therefore, the results on this lexeme also need to be interpreted with caution.

As for AusE, Taylor (1989: 228) notes the possibility of change towards the pronunciation with the stress on the first syllable for research. Penry Williams’s (2011: 227) study of young speakers confirms this as all the occurrences of research (N=23) were pronounced with initial stress in her interview data. Harass is another word that Taylor (1989: 229) notes as being one of the words in which the AmE pronunciation is competing with the BrE pronunciation in AusE. Moore (2008: 162) agrees with that by stating that the stress patterns of research and harass have been affected by AmE. The Australian Style survey (1994) results indicate that this could, indeed, be the case. In that survey, the preferred pronunciation for harass was haˈrass (68%) with clear increase in its use across generations: 59% of the respondents in the oldest age group using that pronunciation as opposed to 82% of the respondents in the youngest age group (Australian Style 1994: 15).

Defence is yet another word that also has a different spelling in the two varieties, BrE and AmE, as defence and defense respectively. As the BrE spelling was used in the flash card, it may have had an effect as to which pronunciation the speakers would use, i.e. guide them to report the BrE pronunciation with the stress on the second syllable.

### 6.2 DICTIONARY EVIDENCE

Besides previous research on the pronunciation of the lexemes under investigation, dictionaries can be used as guides into the pronunciation patterns in different varieties. In order to chart the pronunciation of these lexemes, the major dictionaries of the three varieties (AusE, BrE and AmE) were consulted. For BrE, the online Oxford English Dictionary was used, for AmE the online Merriam-Webster and for AusE the 5th edition of the

---

43 Note that in the Australian Style the pronunciations for controversy were listed as either -x- or x-x- and thus indicating stress also on the penultimate syllable.
Macquarie Dictionary. It is important to remember that, in case of the online dictionaries, the pronunciations reported here may not be the ones that are currently listed in them due to the dictionaries having been updated since the initial examination of the pronunciations given in them. In some cases, these differences are commented on, in others, it is to be expected that the listings are from the time mentioned in References or in the footnotes as the date of last access. Nevertheless, the following two subsections go through all the lexemes examined in this study presenting the pronunciations given in the dictionaries mentioned.

6.2.1 VARIATION IN THE QUALITY OF THE VOWEL/CONSONANT

Either and data

Oxford English Dictionary: /ˈiːðə(r)/ /ˈaɪðə(r)/
Brit. /ˈdeɪtə/, /ˈdæːtə/,
U.S. /ˈdædə/, /ˈdeɪdə/

Merriam-Webster:
/ˈiːðə/ also /ˈeɪ/ /ˈdeɪtə, ˈdæ-/, also /ˈdæ-/

Macquarie Dictionary: /ˈaɪðə/, /ˈiðə/
/ˈdeɪtə, ˈdɑː/

The Oxford English Dictionary says about either that “in London the pronunciation /ˈaɪðə(r)/ is somewhat more prevalent in educated speech than /ˈiːðə(r)/”], but gives the latter as first in its listing. In Merriam-Webster the /i/ pronunciation is also given first and then mentioned that also /aɪ/ is used. In the Macquarie Dictionary both variants are also given, but in the reverse order – /aɪ/ first and /i/ second – in comparison to the other two dictionaries. For data, the Oxford English Dictionary gives the /ei/ pronunciation first for BrE and /æ/ second. For AmE, /æ/ is first and /ei/ second. Merriam-Webster gives three possible pronunciations for the vowel – /ei/, /æ/ and also /a/ – surprisingly, the one that is first mentioned as American in the OED is mentioned here second. The Macquarie Dictionary gives data two pronunciations /ˈdeɪtə/ and /ˈdɑːtə/, which are the same as the ones given for BrE in the Oxford English Dictionary.

44 The phonetic transcriptions used in Merriam-Webster diverges from that used in the other two dictionaries and is therefore standardised here for clarity using the IPA symbols. The notation for the beginning and end of the phonetic transcription is also systematised and marked with / for all rather than keeping the original \ for Merriam-Webster.

45 When accessed online on October 30, 2016, the following pronunciations were given for either in the Oxford English Dictionary: Brit. /aɪðə/, /ˈiːðə/, U.S. /ˈiːðə/, /ˈaɪðə/. Thus, the order for the first mentioned has changed since the listing was first done for this study.
**Semi-final and antinuclear**

Oxford English Dictionary: /ˈsemi/ U.S. /ˈsemaɪ/ (as a prefix)
    /ˈænti/ (noun, adj.), /ˈænti ŋu.kiə(r)/
Merriam-Webster: /ˈsemi/ also /-maɪ/
    /ˈæn.tai, ˈænti/
Macquarie Dictionary.: /ˈsemi/ (noun)
    /ˈænti/ (noun)

As in most cases no special mention of the pronunciations of the prefixes was included in the dictionaries that were consulted, it is the pronunciations for the noun that are discussed in the following. The only exception to this is semi- in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. The OED gives the /i/ pronunciation as first to both *anti-* and *semi-* but mentions that in the U.S. also /ˈsemaɪ/ is used for the prefix. For *anti-* this other option is not mentioned at all. Interestingly, *Merriam-Webster* differs in its preference as both pronunciations are mentioned but in different order, i.e. the /i/ pronunciation for *semi-* first but the /ai/ pronunciation for *anti-. The *Macquarie Dictionary* only gives the /i/ pronunciation for both.

**Schedule and schism**

    /ˈsiz(ə)m/ /ˈskiz(ə)m/
    The pronunciation /skiz(ə)m/, though widely regarded as incorrect, is now frequently used for this word and its derivatives both in the U.K. and in North America.
Merriam-Webster: /ˈskɛdʒal, -dʒəl/,
    Canada also /ˈje-/; British usually /ˈje(ˌ)dʒal/ /ˈsizəm, ˈski-/ also /ˈfi-/; among clergy usually /ˈsi-/ 
Macquarie Dictionary: /ˈʃɛdʒul, ˈskɛdʒul/ 
    /ˈskizəm, ˈʃɪzəm, ˈsizəm/

The *Oxford English Dictionary* says about *schedule* that “in England the pronunciation at present seems to be with (ʃ); and in the U.S. (sk)”. In *Merriam-Webster* the /sk/ pronunciation is first given for *schedule* after which it is mentioned that BrE usually uses /ʃ/. In the *Macquarie Dictionary* the /ʃ/ pronunciation is given first for *schedule*. In the third edition of *The Macquarie Dictionary* the /sk/ pronunciation is mentioned to be chiefly US, whereas in the later edition both pronunciations are given as equal without the mention of more American usage.
For *schism*, the *Oxford English Dictionary* gives two possible pronunciations: /sɪz(ə)m/ and /skɪz(ə)m/. However, it adds that “The pronunciation /skɪz(ə)m/, though widely regarded as incorrect, is now frequently used for this word and its derivatives both in the U.K. and in North America.”[46] *Merriam-Webster*, on the other hand, also gives /ʃ/ as a possibility in addition to the other two already mentioned. The *Macquarie Dictionary* gives all three as possible pronunciations for *schism* with the /sk/ pronunciation first and the /s/ pronunciation, which is first mentioned in the other two dictionaries, last.

**Process and progress**

*Process* and *progress* provide an interesting word pair as they can function as examples of variation in both the quality of the vowel as well as variation in the stress pattern. However, only the quality of the vowel is examined here due to the fact that that seems to vary between the varieties more so than the stress pattern which is more concerned with the noun/verb distinction. According to the dictionaries used here as reference, *process* does not seem to differ in its pronunciation according to its use, but *progress*, on the other hand, may have different pronunciations for noun and verb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionary</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford English Dictionary</td>
<td>/ˈprəʊses/, /prəˌses/</td>
<td>/ˈprəɡres/, /ˈprəˌɡres/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriam-Webster</td>
<td>/ˈprə-ˌses, ˈprəʊ-ˌsəs/</td>
<td>/ˈprə-ˌgrəs, -ˌgres/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Dictionary</td>
<td>/ˈproʊəs/, (noun), /ˈprəˌsəs/ (verb)</td>
<td>/ˈprəʊˌgres/, /ˈprəˌɡrəs/ (noun), /ˈprəˌɡrəs/ (verb)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditionally, /ˈprəʊses/ has been seen as the BrE variant and it is, indeed, first given in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, whereas /ˈprəˌses/ is given as the AmE variant. For *progress*, the *Oxford English Dictionary* differentiates between noun and verb for both BrE and AmE by giving /ˈprəʊgres/ and /ˈprəˌgres/ as the pronunciation variants for a noun in BrE and /ˈprəˌgrəs/ for AmE. When used as a verb, the variants are /prə(ʊ)ˈgres/ and /ˈprəʊgres/ for BrE and /prəˈgres/ and /ˈprəʊˌgres/ for AmE. Therefore, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the stress shift would only affect the use of *progress* as a verb. Otherwise, it is a question of the quality of the first vowel. *Merriam-Webster* does not differentiate between noun and verb, but shows a difference in the first vowel if compared with the *Oxford English Dictionary*. In *Merriam-Webster* the same pronunciation is given for the first vowel for

both of the lexemes: /ˈprəˌses/ and /ˈprə-grəs/. The Macquarie Dictionary, on the other hand, clearly differentiates between noun and verb for both of the lexical items examined here. For noun, the pronunciations are /ˈproʊses/ and /ˈproʊɡres/ whereas for verb the pronunciations with the stress on the second syllable are given: /prəˈses/ and /prəˈɡres/. This may indicate that the pronunciation is more dependent on the function of the word in AusE than in the other two varieties. However, the fact that it was not indicated in the interviews which of the two was meant need to be kept in mind when interpreting the results.

*Hostile*

**Oxford English Dictionary**: /ˈhɒstəl/ /-tɪl/
Merriam-Webster: /ˈhɑːs-,təl,-ˌtəl/  
Macquarie Dictionary: /ˈhɒstəl/

*Hostile* is the last word to be examined and with it the interest lies in the vowel in the second syllable. The Oxford English Dictionary gives /ˈhɒstəl/ and /-tɪl/ as the variants for hostile whereas Merriam-Webster gives /ˈhɑːs-,təl/ as the first variant. The Macquarie Dictionary only gives one option: /ˈhɒstəl/ which is the more British variant.

### 6.2.2 VARIATION IN THE STRESS PATTERNS

**Territory** and **secretary**

**Oxford English Dictionary**: Brit. /ˈtɜːrɪti(ə)ri/, U.S. /ˈtɛrəˌtɔri/  
/ˈsekrətri/

**Merriam-Webster**:  
/ˈter-əˌtɔr-ə/  
/ˈse-kəˌter-i, ˈse-kəˌter-/  
in rapid speech also /ˈsekˌter-/  
especially British /ˈse-k(ə)ˌtɔrɪ/

**Macquarie Dictionary**:  
/ˈtɛrət ri, -təri/  
/ˈsekrət ri/

The Oxford English Dictionary gives two options for territory, ‘territory for BrE and ‘terri, tory, i.e. the one with secondary stress on the penultimate syllable, for AmE. For secretary only one option, ‘secretary, is given. Merriam-Webster, on the other hand, gives the initially stressed one as the only option for territory, but lists four pronunciations for secretary. The first options are ‘secre,tary, ‘sece,tary, i.e. with stress also on the penultimate syllable. They also mention that the pronunciation without the secondary stress (‘sec(r)etary) is especially British usage. It is noteworthy that Merriam-
Webster also gives the r-less pronunciation (ˈsecre,try), which is not mentioned in the Oxford English Dictionary. The Macquarie Dictionary only presents the pronunciation with the stress on the first syllable for both lexemes under investigation and actually only one pronunciation is given for secretary (/ˈsɛkrətri/). However, as the findings of this study will evince, there is much more variation in AusE in the pronunciation of this word.

Kilometre and controversy

Oxford English Dictionary:  /ˈkɒntrəvɜːsi/  
/ˈkɪləmɪtə(r)/; also with pronunc.  
/kɪˈlɒmɪtə(r)/, prob. under the influence of such words as speedometer, thermometer  
Merriam-Webster:  /ˈkən-trə-ˌvər-si/  
British also /kənˈtrə-vər-si/  
/kəˈla-mə-tər, ki-, ˈki-la-, mi-tər/  
Macquarie Dictionary:  /ˈkɒntrəvəsɪ, kənˈtrəvəsɪ, ˈkɒntrəvəsɪ /  
/ˈkɪləmɪtə, kɪˈlɒmɪtə/  

The Oxford English Dictionary only gives /ˈkɒntrəvɜːsi/ as the pronunciation of controversy, which is also first mentioned in Merriam-Webster. As an option for the BrE speakers, Merriam-Webster gives the pronunciation conˈtrovery. ‘Controversy is also the first pronunciation given in the Macquarie Dictionary followed by conˈtrovery.

For kilometre, the Oxford English Dictionary gives /ˈkɪləmɪtə(r)/ as the first option but then adds that “also with pronunc. /kɪˈlɒmɪtə(r)/, prob. under the influence of such words as speedometer, thermometer“. The AmE preference for the stress on the second syllable is confirmed by Merriam-Webster which gives kiˈlomēter first and only then ‘kiloˌmeter. It should be noted that the orthography also varies on different sides of the Atlantic (kilometre vs. kilometer). In the Macquarie Dictionary the pronunciation with initial stress, i.e. ‘kilometre, is given first.

Research, defence, harass

Brit. /riˈsə:tʃ/, U.S. /ˈrəsərtʃ/, /riˌsərtʃ/, /ˈriˌsərtʃ/ (verb)  
/dəˈfɛns/  
/ˈhærəs/
Merriam-Webster: /ri-ˈsərch, ˈri-./
/di-ˈfən(t)ʃ/; as antonym of “offense,” often ˈdi-./
(NB. also orthography is different to BrE - defense)
/haˈræs; ˈher-əs, ˈhær-əs/
Macquarie Dictionary: /rəˈsətʃ/, /ˈrisətʃ/ (no separate pronunciation for verb and noun)
/dəˈfəns/
/haˈræs, ˈhærəs/

For research, all three dictionaries give the variant with the stress on the second syllable first, but they all also give the initially stressed option for pronunciation. The Oxford English Dictionary is the only one to separate between noun and verb and to give BrE and AmE pronunciations separately. In the case of defence, the dictionaries are unified in their preference to give the option with stress on the second syllable first. In fact, the alternative pronunciation with the stress on the first syllable (ˈdefence) is only mentioned in Merriam-Webster with the indication of it being used often in AmE as an antonym of offense.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, harass has stress on the first syllable whereas both Merriam-Webster and the Macquarie Dictionary give the option with second-syllable stress first. Furthermore, the OED does not give any other option for pronunciation but the other two dictionaries also give the variant with the initial stress in their listings. This then could be taken to indicate that the American pronunciation of this lexeme also appears in AusE. This survey of the pronunciations given in the dictionaries and the findings from previous research have shown the variability in the pronunciation of these lexemes in the three varieties of English. It is against this backdrop that the results of the present study will be considered next.

6.3 ANALYSIS OF THE WORDLIST DATA

As stated in the introduction to this chapter, the material for this part of the study was collected towards the end of each interview. The interviewees read the words from flash cards and they were only read once, i.e. each card was only given out once, but due to hesitation sometimes the speaker repeated the word or gave two pronunciations. The analysis of the wordlist data was done by listening to the pronunciation of each word by each informant. If the interviewee hesitated as to which pronunciation they would use, the pronunciation that the speaker used first when reading the word was taken as their pronunciation for that particular word. Some of the informants also discussed the words (or some of the words) after they had completed the task.
These discussions will be referred to where relevant when reporting the findings.

In order to analyse the pronunciations of the lexical items in the wordlist task, I listened to the pronunciations of each individual speaker and marked down the pronunciations into a table. To double check the results, a native AusE speaker also listened to the words and marked his judgement on a similar table. In cases where the first two rounds of acoustic judgements diverged from each other, another native AusE speaker listened to the words again. The pronunciation that two out of the three listeners thought was the one produced by the speaker was then recorded. The results of the acoustic judgements were then added up and compiled into figures which are presented in the next section.

6.4 RESULTS OF THE WORDLIST TASK

The results of the wordlist task are here presented according to the division already stated: variation in the quality of the vowel/consonant and variation in the stress pattern. In addition to the numerical data reporting the preferred pronunciations for all the words, some commentary by the speakers is included. These bring in more insights into the kinds of attitudes and opinions that the speakers have of the different pronunciations. Furthermore, to exemplify the possible difference of the reported use and the actual use of the word in spontaneous speech, the use of *either* elsewhere in the material than the wordlist task is reported on. Unfortunately, the other lexemes did not occur often enough to allow for this type of comparison to be performed on all of the items under investigation.

6.4.1 VARIATION IN THE QUALITY OF THE VOWEL/CONSONANT

*Either, data*

The first pair of words is *either* and *data*. In the case of *either*, the */i/* pronunciation is the preferred one with 73.9% of all the informants reporting to use it as shown in Figure 6.1.

Generational differences are not great but there is a slight tendency for the young people to revert to the */i/* pronunciation (80% reported to use */i/*) more often. The difference between the other two age groups is marginal (69.6% for G2 and 71.4% for G1 for */i/*), thus making the generational differences not statistically significant.47

---

47 The raw numbers on which the calculations for statistical significance (chi-square tests) are based are provided in Tables 6a-6r in Appendix D.
Figure 6.1. Pronunciation of either.

Figure 6.2 presents the results according to age and gender for either. Although all age groups clearly prefer the /i/ pronunciation, differences between genders are more pronounced, however, not statistically significant.48

![Figure 6.1. Pronunciation of either.](image)

![Figure 6.2. Pronunciation of either according to age and gender.](image)

48 As none of the gender differences (only calculated for the overall male/female distributions) reached the level of statistical significance, they are not further commented on in the remainder of this chapter. The chi-square calculations are, nevertheless, presented in Appendix D.
While males present a very strong preference for the /i/ pronunciation in G2 and G3, in G1 females are the ones to use this pronunciation the most. On the other hand, the /ai/ pronunciation is more regularly used by the female speakers than the males in G2 and G3, while in the oldest age group that is not the case. Overall, females present a stronger preference for the /ai/ pronunciation than males.

**Actual usage of either**

For comparison’s sake and to test the validity of the wordlist method, the instances of actual usage of *either* were also examined. It would, of course, have been desirable to examine the actual usage of the other lexemes as well, but as they are so infrequent in conversational data it was not possible.

Tables 6.1 and 6.2 show the reported usage and the actual usage of *either* in CoBS. The difference is quite clear in that while the informants reported to use the /i/ pronunciation much more often in the wordlist task, their spontaneous speech data showed nearly equal usage of the two variables. Furthermore, the youngest age group who most strongly reported the /i/ usage were actually the most prominent users of the /ai/ pronunciation in their spontaneous speech.

**Table 6.1.** Reported usage of *either*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th></th>
<th>/ai/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.2.** Actual usage of *either* in CoBS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th></th>
<th>/ai/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between reported usage and actual usage is well exemplified by a female informant in G1 who particularly mentions that she uses the /i/ pronunciation for *either* while some others may use /ai/ (example [6.5]). However, all four occurrences of *either* in her spontaneous speech are pronounced with /ai/.
(6.5) Well, I would say either /i/ but some of us would say either /aɪ/. (G1_F14)

This, then, shows that people are not necessarily aware of what variants they use in their speech. This brings us back to the reliability of this kind of research method, which will be discussed in more detail at the end of this chapter.

The reported usage for the other lexeme in this pair, *data*, showed that the /a/ pronunciation is used more often across the board (85.5%) (Figure 6.3). The examination of different age groups, however, reveals that the /eɪ/ pronunciation is also making inroads in the speech of the young informants of whom 28.0% reported using this pronunciation.

[Figure 6.3. Pronunciation of *data*.]

*Data* was also one of the lexemes that sparked some commentary from the interviewees (see examples [6.6]–[6.8]). These present how variable the commentary on this lexeme is, ranging from noting a change in the pronunciation as in (6.6) to individual preferences as in (6.7) as well as to mentioning the /eɪ/ variant as being AmE as in (6.8).

(6.6) Data /eɪ/. Not data /a/. Well, we used to use data /a/ at uni but data /eɪ/ is the what I way I say it. (G1_M07)

(6.7) [G1_F14:] Data /a/. Now I’ve got a friend that says, she’s picking me up on that all the time, she’ll say it’s data /eɪ/.
[Interviewer:] Ha ha.
[G1_F14:] And I say data /a/.
(G1_F14)
(6.8) And I can see a lot of them were like different languages like I can see data /ei/ being used in sort of dat- like for an American sort of accent or something. (G3_Mo8)

In addition to generational differences, there also seems to be a gender difference in the case of data with males more eagerly using the /ei/ pronunciation than females (Figure 6.4). This tendency is most pronounced among the youngest informants.

Figure 6.4. Pronunciation of data according to age and gender.

Semi-final, antinuclear
The next pair of words, semi-final and antinuclear, were chosen to investigate the pronunciation of the vowel in the prefix. For semi-final the results were unanimous as all the informants reported to use the /i/ pronunciation. This was to be expected based on the previous research and the dictionary evidence.

For some people semi- pronounced with /ai/ was clearly an AmE variant as is evident in the following comment (example [6.9]).

(6.9) we call it semi /i/ they [Americans] call it semi /ai/ (G3_Mo4)

Furthermore, some informants were convinced that the /ai/ pronunciation is not used in Australia as example (6.10) shows. Here the informant is reading the word from the flash card and clarifies his point by mentioning which pronunciation is not used.
The results for the pronunciation of *antinuclear* are presented in Figure 6.5. By and large, the /i/ pronunciation is used also for this lexeme. The main differences are actually not in the production of the vowel sound but more in the pronunciation of the end of the word as -nuclear or -nucular. However, as the main interest in the present study lies in the pronunciation of the vowel in the prefix, the different variants of the nuclear pronunciation were collapsed together.

As for the vowel sound, there is a clear preference for the /i/ pronunciation. Notably, there are only three informants in the youngest age group who reported to use the /ai/ pronunciation (two with *antinuclear* and one with *antinucular*). It is, however, doubtful whether they would actually use this pronunciation in spontaneous speech as two of the informants first mispronounce the word and then correct themselves using the /ai/ pronunciation. The third one to use this pronunciation does so after his friend has used it, but then claims to use the /i/ pronunciation when discussing the pronunciations after the wordlist task (example [6.11]).

(6.11) [Interviewer:] Which one do you say?
[G3_M11:] Uh probably anti /i/
(G3_M11)
Schedule, schism

This word pair, schedule and schism, were used to test variation in the quality of the consonant. Schedule, which is often mentioned in association with Americanisation, turned out to be the clearest case of change in progress in the material. Although the overall preference (58.0%) is for the /sk/ pronunciation, there is a strong preference for the /ʃ/ pronunciation among the oldest informants (81.0%) (Figure 6.6). On the other hand, there was only one G3 informant who reported to use the /ʃ/ pronunciation. The direction in which the pronunciation of schedule is going is clear from the generational data with the differences between the age groups being statistically significant (p<0.001).

![Figure 6.6. Pronunciation of schedule.](image)

In terms of gender differences, the results show that in the older age groups (G2 and G1) there is variability as to who are the more advanced users of the incoming /sk/ pronunciation (Figure 6.7). In G2 it is the male speakers who are slightly more advanced in their preference for the /sk/ pronunciation whereas in G1 it is the females. Overall, males present a slightly stronger preference for the /sk/ pronunciation.

---

49 A possible reason for this may be that he was interviewd together with his mother and grandmother who both used the /ʃ/ pronunciation before him in the wordlist task.
Schism was included in the wordlist to see if the trend predicted for schedule would also hold for other lexemes beginning with <sch>. This word turned out to be the hardest one in the whole wordlist for all the informants to pronounce as most of them did not even know the word. Therefore, in most cases, the informant just stared at the word at first and quite often asked what the word means (as in example [6.12]). This may also affect the production of the word and in some cases the informant simply mispronounced the word.\textsuperscript{50}

(6.12) What does schism /sk/ mean? Or is that schism /ʃ/? (G2_F08)

The results as presented in Figure 6.8 show that the change towards the /sk/ pronunciation is also happening with schism but is not nearly as clear as for schedule. The difference between generations in the use of the two most popular pronunciations, /sk/ and /ʃ/, is not statistically significant. Nearly half of the informants reported to use the /sk/ pronunciation. Notably, the older pronunciation with /s/ occurred more often among the oldest informants.

\textsuperscript{50} The category ‘other’ in Figures 6.8 and 6.9 includes the following mispronunciations: 1 /ʃk/ in G3, 1 /ʃk/ and 1 scepticism in G2, 1 /k/ and 1 schicism /sk/ in G1.
Schism also provided some interesting gender differences as Figure 6.9 shows. In all age groups, it is the females who most strongly prefer the /sk/ pronunciation. This, then, presents a clearer picture of females as the leaders towards the use of the /sk/ pronunciation for this lexeme. The difference between female and male preference is evident in the overall rates for both genders with females having the highest reported usage of /sk/ while males report to use the two pronunciations with almost equal rates. Furthermore, the /ʃ/ pronunciation, on the other hand, is more strongly preferred by the male speakers in G2 and G1 than by females.
As was shown by the dictionary evidence, this pair of words may be problematic as both *progress* and *process* can function as a noun as well as a verb. As no distinction was made in the interviews to indicate which function was meant, the results need to be considered with that in mind. This possibility of different pronunciations according to the context was also brought up in the interviews as example (6.13) shows. Note, however, that the informant is paying attention to the word stress rather than the quality of the vowel.

(6.13) Process (proˈˈcess) would be another one. Depending like process (ˈˈprocess) and process (proˈˈcess) I think is depending on what you’re talking about, I think. (G3_M02)

Overall, for both lexemes it is the /ˈprəʊ-/ pronunciation that is preferred by the informants. The only cases of the /ˈprəː-/ pronunciation (N=4, 16.0%) with *progress* occur in the reports of the youngest speakers. There was also one male informant in G3 who used the pronunciation /prəːgres/. Thus, despite the few speakers who reported to use the AmE pronunciation, by and large speakers of AusE prefer the /ˈprəʊ-/ pronunciation.

With *process* this trend is even stronger. There were only two speakers who reported to use the /ˈpraːses/ pronunciation, both again in the youngest age
group. All the older informants unanimously reported to use /ˈprəʊses/.
Therefore, AusE speakers clearly prefer the /ˈprəʊ/- pronunciation for process as well.

Hostile
The last word in this subsection is hostile which provided very uniform results across all speakers with all of them except for one female in age group G2 pronouncing the word as /ˈhɒstəl/. Therefore, this lexeme does not show any variation in AusE according to this material.

6.4.2 VARIATION IN THE STRESS PATTERNS

Territory and secretary
As shown in Figure 6.10, the two pronunciations are almost equally often used by the speakers with the initial stress (ˈterritory) being only marginally preferred (53.6%). However, the generational differences borne out by this study reveal that there is an increase in the use of the secondary stress on the penultimate syllable the younger the speakers are. While more informants in the two oldest age groups are still inclined to pronounce territory with initial stress, among the young informants the pronunciation with a secondary stress (ˈterriˌtory) is the preferred variant (albeit with a very small margin).

![Figure 6.10. Pronunciation of territory.](image)

---

5¹ One male informant in G3 used the /prəʊses/ pronunciation and one female informant in G2 mispronounced the word as progress /prəʊgres/.
Gender differences are varied in the use of *territory* as shown in Figure 6.11. Overall, the female preference is for `territory` while there does not seem to be a clearly preferred pronunciation for the male speakers as equally many males report to using both pronunciations. The females present a stronger preference for `terriˌtory` only in the oldest age group, while both G2 and G3 males report to using this AmE pronunciation more often than the initially stressed BrE variant.

![Figure 6.11. Pronunciation of *territory* according to age and gender.](image)

The other word in this word pair, *secretary*, showed a strong preference for the pronunciation with secondary stress (`ˈsecreˌtary`) by all age groups (79.7%) (Figure 6.12).\(^{52}\) This is in contradiction to the results of *territory* above. However, both of these lexemes show a trend towards more use of the pronunciation with the secondary stress.

As the interest here is on the stress patterns, the r-less pronunciations `ˈseceˌtary` and `ˈsecetary` (discussed in Section 6.1.2 above) were collapsed together with the full pronunciations. It is worth noticing, however, that these pronunciations also presented generational differences in their use in that the r-less variants were more commonly produced by the oldest age group (19% reported to use `ˈseceˌtary`).

\(^{52}\) Due to low numbers in some cells, chi-square tests could not be performed.
The examination of genders reveals that females have a stronger preference for the ˈsecreˌtary pronunciation than males (Figure 6.13). The highest representation of ˈsecretary is found among the G1 male speakers, which may be partly due to their higher use of the ˈsecetary.

Figure 6.12. Pronunciation of secretary.

Figure 6.13. Pronunciation of secretary according to age and gender.
Kilometre, controversy
This pair of words inspired the interview participants to discuss the pronunciations at length as will be exemplified later in this section. The overall preferred pronunciation for kilometre was with the stress on the second syllable (59.4%) whereas for controversy stress on the first syllable was clearly preferred (75.4%) (Figures 6.14 and 6.15 respectively). Both of these findings are statistically significant (p<0.05 for kilometre and p<0.001 for controversy).

![Figure 6.14. Pronunciation of kilometre.](image)

The greatest difference in the pronunciation of kilometre occurs between the youngest and the other two age groups, G2 and G1. While the youngest informants present a clear preference for the pronunciation with secondary stress (ˈkiloˌmetre) with 64.0%, both of the older age groups prefer the other alternative with over 70% usage rate.

As for the gender differences, females and males present quite opposing preferences. Overall, males slightly prefer ˈkiloˌmetre while females report to use kiˈlometre much more often (Figure 6.15). The strongest preference for the ˈkiloˌmetre pronunciation is found among the young male speakers (78.6%) whereas there is no difference between the genders in the oldest age group. Thus, it seems that the men are most welcoming to this pronunciation.
As noted, *kilometre* also inspired the informants to comment on the pronunciation. Firstly, one informant made the point of being told how to pronounce *kilometre* at college (example [6.14]). Thus, prescriptivism may play a role in the reported use of this lexeme.

(6.14) Yes. Because I would say kilometre /ˈki lom eɪt/. Because when we were at college our maths teacher told us that if we said kilometre /ˈki lə metr/ we were wrong. (G2_F04)

Another informant pointed out that it may also be a question of difference in spelling (example [6.15]). This may further affect the results as the spelling *kilometre* was used on the flash card and that may have affected the pronunciation of some informants.

(6.15) See, that’s kilometre /ˈki lə metr/. That’s spelled kilometre /ˈki lə metr/. (G2_F04)

The other word in this pair, *controversy*, is another one besides *schedule* that shows the clearest generational differences in this study. Overall, the pronunciation with the stress on the first syllable (ˈcontroversy) is preferred (75.4%), although it is not the preferred pronunciation for the oldest generation (Figure 6.16). The very strong preference for the pronunciation with the initial stress for the youngest informants is noteworthy.
While generational differences are clear, gender differences are more complicated (Figure 6.17). While it is males in both G1 and G3 that prefer the pronunciation with the initial stress more strongly than their female peers, in the middle age group the roles are reversed. However, the differences between genders are smallest in G2. The pronunciation with the stress on the second syllable is the preferred variant only for the female speakers in the oldest age group.

Figure 6.16. Pronunciation of controversy.

Figure 6.17. Pronunciation of controversy according to age and gender.
Once again, commentary on the pronunciation of *controversy* brings further insights into the feelings people have about this lexeme. Example (6.16) shows that, according to this female informant in the oldest age group, there has been a change — at least in her language use — in the pronunciation of this lexeme.

(6.16) I was just thinking I used to say conˈtroˌversy but these days I’d say ‘controˌversy. (G1_F03)

*Research, defence, harass*

The last three lexemes in this section presented variable results. The first, *research*, is pronounced with the initial stress by majority of the informants (78.2%). There is, however, a clear generational difference as is shown by Figure 6.18. While nearly 62% of the informants in the oldest age group prefer the 'research pronunciation, the preference for this pronunciation is over 80% for the other two age groups. The youngest participants are most advanced in their preference for the 'research pronunciation with 88%. As with *process* and *progress*, the fact that no indication was given whether this lexeme was considered as a noun or a verb by the speakers is worth keeping in mind when considering the results.

![Figure 6.18. Pronunciation of research.](image-url)

---

53 Due to low numbers in some cells, chi-square tests could not be performed.
Research was also one of the lexemes that inspired speakers to comment on its pronunciation. An example of this commentary is presented in (6.17).

(6.17) And we notice especially on television and even radio and so forth, people are pronouncing words in the American way like research (‘research) and that’s research (re’search). Research (re’search) is the word. They call it research (‘research) and that really bugs me. I think that’s not the way to say it. You have a look in the dictionary and you can see how it should be pronounced. And that sort of thing really annoys me because everyone calls it research (‘research) and. (G1_F09)

The examination of differences between genders in regards to the pronunciation of research reveals that females more readily use ‘research in all age groups (Figure 6.19). The differences are consistent across ages in that there is a clear increase in the use of this pronunciation both in female and male usage towards the younger age groups.

![Figure 6.19. Pronunciation of research according to age and gender.](image)

For the last two words in this section, defence and harass, the informants almost unanimously reported to use only one of the variants. For both words, the pronunciation with the stress on the second syllable is preferred.

In the case of harass, there is only one informant who reports to use ˈharass while all the others report to use haˈrass. This deviates clearly from the results presented in the Australian Style survey in which 68% reported to using haˈrass and 32% ˈharass. The trend, however, is similar, i.e. the pronunciation with the stress on the second syllable is the preferred variant.
For *defence*, the pronunciation with the stress on the second syllable was preferred by all informants. Despite that there is a difference in the spelling of the word in AmE (*defence*) and BrE (*defense*), of which the AmE one was used on the flash card, it did not lead the speakers to using the AmE pronunciation.

### 6.5 DISCUSSION

As has become evident through the results presented above, some of the lexemes showed great variation in their reported pronunciations while others were (almost) unanimously reported to have the same preferred pronunciation across generations and genders. In this summarising discussion the results are dealt with from this perspective and therefore this section is divided into two sections: lexemes showing variation (6.5.1) and lexemes that did not vary in their pronunciation (6.5.2). All in all, there were more variable lexemes (11) than non-variable ones (5).

#### 6.5.1 LEXEMES SHOWING VARIATION IN PRONUNCIATION

Most of the lexemes examined in this study showed either generational or gender differences with *schedule* and *controversy* presenting the clearest cases of change in progress in AusE pronunciation. For others, the patterns were not as evident. The results are here summarised and compared to the results provided by the *Australian Style* survey from 1994 where applicable. Although the possible effect of the different research methods (written survey vs reading words from flash cards) cannot be ignored, the comparisons are seen as useful in drawing a picture of recent changes in the reported pronunciation of AusE.

Beginning with *either*, which was on the outset a word that has highly variable pronunciation across varieties of English, proved to be so also in the present study. Although the preference was clearly for the /i/ pronunciation in the wordlist task (73.9%), the interviewees’ actual usage proved that this is not necessarily the one they use in spontaneous speech. In fact, the occurrences of *either* in the interviewees’ speech elsewhere in the interviews were almost equally often realised with both possible pronunciations. This discrepancy between what the speakers report they use and what they then use in their speech is also valid for other language areas (cf. Niedzielski and Preston 2003: 163 for a discussion on grammatical judgements).

With *data*, both the present study and the *Australian Style* survey (1994) showed a preference for the /a/ pronunciation (73.9% and 60% respectively). However, when examining the generational differences between these studies an interesting difference appeared. In the *Australian Style* survey the youngest speakers showed the strongest preference for the /a/ pronunciation (82%) while in the present study it was only the youngest informants who showed increased use of the /ei/ pronunciation. This contradiction between
the two studies is interesting as it seems to indicate that there has been a change as to which of the available pronunciations is gaining ground in AusE. Whether the different research method or the over ten year gap between the studies may be at least partly responsible for this discrepancy in the results is, of course, a valid question.

Examination of the reported pronunciations for the word schedule showed that, in recent years, there has been a change from the use of one clearly preferred pronunciation for the oldest participants (/ʃ/) to another being preferred by the younger informants (/sk/). Overall, the /sk/ pronunciation was only marginally more often reported as the favoured variant by the informants (58%), while an overwhelming majority (96%) of the G3 speakers reported to use this pronunciation. In comparison with the Australian Style survey (1994), the overall results are quite different as in that study only 23% of the total respondents chose the /sk/ pronunciation. However, the generational pattern was similar in that in the Australian Style survey 65% of the youngest respondents reported to use the /sk/ pronunciation as opposed to 9% of the oldest age group. Thus, the change in progress that was visible in 1994 seems to have accelerated in the later years. In the light of these results, schedule would be especially interesting one to investigate in real spoken data. Unfortunately, it only occurred twice in spontaneous speech in the interviews outside the discussions on the wordlist words and does not, therefore, allow for any comparative judgement. However, very similar results were also obtained in two online studies (Korhonen, in preparation).

The results for the other lexical item beginning with <sch>, schism, were not as straightforward. Nevertheless, the results hint at similar direction of change if only the pronunciations /sk/ and /ʃ/ are taken into account. Of these, the preferred pronunciation is with /sk/ with an overall usage rate of 49.3% as opposed to 31.9% reporting to use the /ʃ/ pronunciation for schism. However, there was much more variation with this lexeme due to more pronunciation variants and the high number of mispronunciations resulting from the fact that many of the speakers were not familiar with the word further complicating the analysis. Nevertheless, an increase in the reported use of the /sk/ pronunciation is evident in the present material with females especially preferring this pronunciation. In the Australian Style survey this preference was even stronger, but no clear generational preferences were found. The older pronunciation with /s/ was most popular among the oldest speakers in the present study as was the case also in the Australian Style survey.

Territory and secretary also provided interesting results by both showing an increase in the use of the AmE style pronunciation (ˈterriˌtory and ˈsecreˌtary respectively), but with the difference that the overall preference was for the pronunciation with secondary stress only for secretary with 79.9%. For territory, both pronunciations were nearly equally often reported as the one the speaker would use: 53.6% for ‘territory and 46.4% for ‘terriˌtory. This is in line with Penry Williams’s (2011) findings from actual spoken discourse. In her interview data, the speakers used the word territory nine times of which
five were pronounced with secondary stress on the penultimate syllable and four without (Penry Williams 2011: 227). Generational comparisons of the present data showed that the direction of change is the same for both lexemes with the AmE style pronunciation with growing preference among the younger speakers. In terms of gender, females showed a stronger preference for the ‘secre $\tilde{t}$ary pronunciation while G1 males provided the largest number of the r-less (secretary) pronunciations (discussed in 6.1.2).

In comparison with the Australian Style study, kilometre was the lexeme that provided the most interesting results. On the whole, the Australian Style survey reported that 63% of the respondents reported to use ‘kilo metre with the stress on the first syllable while 37% reported to use ki lometre. None of the age groups preferred the latter pronunciation. In the present study, ki lometre was the overall preferred variant with 59.4% with only the young male speakers in G3 preferring ‘kilometre. Thus, as was the case with data, the pronunciation that is reported to be increasingly preferred is not the same in the two AusE studies.\(^\text{54}\)

The other lexeme providing a clear case of change in progress, controversy, showed an overall preference for the ‘controversy pronunciation in both the present study and the Australian Style survey. But while the present material showed a clear generational change, in the Australian Style survey only the youngest generation reported to use clearly more ‘controversy (79%) as opposed to all the other age groups reporting to use this pronunciation with 52–55%. Thus, as was the case with schedule, the rate of change seems to have become stronger with controversy since the Australian Style survey in 1994.

The last lexeme that presented variation in the reported pronunciations is research. As process and progress, research too can be used as a noun and as a verb which may affect the results. Overall, the present study showed a clear preference for the pronunciation with the initial stress with 78.2% with the youngest informants providing the highest percentage (88%). Thus, this confirms the findings reported by Penry Williams (2011: 227) whose young interview participants unanimously used the ‘research pronunciation in their speech. Furthermore, the pattern across generations was consistent towards more use of the initially stressed variant in the present study.

6.5.2 LEXEMES WITH NON-VARIABLE PRONUNCIATION

It is somewhat misleading to say that all of the lexemes discussed in this section would not show any variation in their pronunciation as there was marginal variation reported for some of them. However, by and large, one of the available pronunciations was clearly the preferred variant for the interview participants. In addition to these not showing a lot of variation in their

\(^{54}\) In the Australian Style (1994: 15) the increase in the preference for the /a/ pronunciation for data is consistent across generations (44%-62%-75%-82% for /a/ from oldest to youngest age group) while with kilometre the pattern is not as clear (72%-62%-55%-71% for ‘kilometre).
reported pronunciation, they also inspired much less conversation and commentary by the informants (except for a couple of comments on how George W. Bush cannot pronounce *antinuclear*).

Both *semi-final* and *antinuclear* were predominantly pronounced with /i/ at the end of the prefix (with only three young informants using the /aɪ/ pronunciation for *antinuclear*). The commentary by the informants further emphasises this trend as was presented in examples (6.9) and (6.10). Therefore, these findings contradict Taylor’s (1989: 228) claims that, in the case of *anti-*, “while the AusE pronunciation still predominates, the other is often heard”.

*Process* and *progress* provided similar results in that a clear majority of the informants reported to use the /ˈprəʊ-/ pronunciation for both of these lexemes. In fact, there were only two G3 informants who used the /ˈpraː-/ pronunciation for *process* and four, again G3 informants, for *progress*. Of these, only one used this pronunciation for both of the items investigated. While these findings show that the AmE pronunciation is used to a minor degree for these lexemes by the young speakers, they do not support Taylor’s (1989: 228) claim that “many Australians” would use this pronunciation. The fact that these lexemes can be used both as a noun and a verb is, of course, problematic for the analysis, but there seems to be no indication of overall change towards a widespread use of the AmE style pronunciation.

The last three (largely) invariable lexemes were *harass, hostile* and *defence*. With *harass*, the results are quite different in comparison with the *Australian Style* survey in which 68% reported to use haˈrass and 32% haˈrass. In the present study there was only one informant who reported to use haˈrass while all the others reported to use haˈrass. Keeping the population differences in mind, the two studies, nevertheless, indicate a possible change in AusE during the last two decades despite the lack of generational differences in the present data. The other two lexemes, *hostile* and *defence*, both seem to have an established pronunciation in AusE. Apart from one female speaker, *hostail* was always pronounced as /ˈhɒstail/ and all the speakers reported to have stress on the second syllable in *defence*.

To sum up this chapter on AusE pronunciation, the findings reported on here well show the variability that is present in the use of Australian speakers. The findings also emphasise the fact that the changes are dependent on the lexemes in question and thus confirming Peters’s (1998: 34) observation that speakers’ claims of Americanisation are often targeted at particular lexical items. As was shown by the word pair *kilometre* and *controversy*, not even lexemes with similar syllable structure always behave the same. A further note was made in regards to *either*: people’s reports on their language use may differ considerably from their actual productions.

In terms of the perceived Americanisation of AusE, the present results revealed that, first of all, some of the lexemes chosen to be examined by the wordlist task were such that the speakers had noticed and were ready to comment on in reference to AmE influence. In many cases it was, indeed, these
perceived AmE pronunciations that were on the rise in the use of Australians, such as *schedule*, *secretary* and *research*. Others, on the other hand, were not discussed much by the speakers nor presented much variation in their use across generations or genders, as *antinuclear* and *hostile* showed. Overall, while no across the board change in pronunciation could be claimed, some of the lexemes certainly showed changing patterns of use which may readily add to the speakers’ perceptions of American influence in AusE.

After the examination of the speakers’ folk linguistic accounts of AmE influence in the previous chapter and their self-reporting on pronunciation in this chapter, the attention is now turned to investigating their actual language use in spontaneous speech. The following chapters complement the results obtained so far by showing the ongoing changes in the morphosyntactic and discourse practices of AusE.
7 VARIABLE USES IN AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH MORPHOSYNTAX

This chapter examines the use of two grammatical features, namely, the variable subject-verb agreement in existential *there*-sentences and the use of *have* (*got*) in its stative possessive meaning. As mentioned in the introductory chapters, grammar of AusE does not differ from the other major varieties of English to any significant degree. However, some grammatical features are used with different frequencies in AusE in comparison with other varieties. The features under investigation in this chapter have been reported to be used with differing frequencies in BrE and AmE and thus present an interesting field for studying AusE in comparison with those varieties. Furthermore, the features under investigation are especially suitable for a study of spoken language as they are both frequently occurring and present differences in their use in spoken as opposed to written language.

Both subsections of this chapter follow the same structure: I will first introduce the feature under investigation together with a review of earlier research after which the variable context for the present study is circumscribed. After this, the overall results are presented which is followed by the examination of social and linguistic constraints involved in the use of these features. Both subsections are completed with a summarising discussion.

7.1 SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT IN *THERE*-EXISTENTIALS

But there are there’s definitely Am- Americanisms (G2_M04)

The topic of this section is the variable agreement patterns with existential *there*-sentences. The variability in the use of agreement between the verb be and the notional subject in existentials has been shown to be a feature of spoken language (e.g., Cheshire 1999; Starks and Thompson 2009). This variability is present in existential constructions in all varieties of English (Britain and Sudbury 2002: 213) and there is indirect evidence in the literature that singular agreement is on the rise in contemporary English (Collins 2012b: 53). The aim of this chapter is to examine the preferred agreement patterns in existential *there*-sentences with plural notional subjects in the present

---

55 The term “existentials” is used in this study only to refer to *there*-existentials and does not include *it*-existentials.
material and to reveal how the different linguistic and social constraints affect this variability.

7.1.1 THE VARIABLE AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Most typically, a clause with existential *there* has the following structure: *there* + BE + indefinite NP (+place or time position adverbial) (Biber et al. 1999: 943). In standard language, the verb phrase takes its number from the notional subject, i.e. a plural form is used with plural NPs and a singular form with singular NPs. This pattern is regularly used in written English, but in spoken language existential constructions with plural subjects often vary between singular and plural agreement (see examples [7.1] and [7.2] respectively from CoBS).

(7.1)  *there’s* more people on the field in rugby union. (G3_M02)

(7.2)  *There are* fewer shops in the main street open now than *there were* thirty years ago (G1_F03)

*There*-existentials have high frequency especially in speech (and speech-based texts) (e.g., Martínez Insua and Pérez Guerra 2006: 207) and they often occur with singular verb forms even with plural notional subjects in spoken language (Cheshire 1999: 136). This is also the case in AusE as Peters (1995: 750) notes: “in speech […] *there is* (or *there’s*) is increasingly used as a fixed phrase even before plural nouns”. It has, in fact, been suggested that the contracted form (*there’s*) has become lexicalised as it most clearly promotes the use of singular concord (see, for example, Walker 2007). The use of singular concord is, however, considered informal in grammars (e.g., Quirk et al. 1985: 1405).

The agreement patterns with *there*-existentials have been variable for centuries (Jespersen 1954; Denison 1998; Meechan and Foley 1994). Martínez-Insua and Pérez-Guerra (2006: 195–196) found that there has been non-agreement between the verb and the postverbal NP throughout the history of English (the periods they investigated ranged from Late Modern English to Present-Day English) and that most of the cases present *there*-sentences with singular verb forms and plural NPs. This variability in the subject-verb agreement occurs in all present-day varieties. This together with the fact that the use of singular agreement is on the rise has led Chambers (2004) to consider this as one of the vernacular universals (see also Walker 2007).

Previous research on the topic has not revealed any clear cut differences between the varieties in the Northern and Southern Hemispheres. However, it has been shown that AmE is well advanced in the use of the singular agreement in existentials, but, at the same time, it is certainly not absent from the use of BrE speakers either. For AmE, Feagin (1979) already reported in his study of Alabama English that “the use of a singular verb after dummy *there* and before
a plural subject NP is nearly categorical in the nonstandard of Anniston”. He further states that this environment (\textit{there} + BE + NP (pl)) seems to promote non-agreement even among the most standard speakers (24% for the upper class). Although not categorical, Meechan and Foley’s study (1994) of CanE reveals that that variety too overwhelmingly prefers singular agreement in existentials: 72% of existentials containing a plural noun showed singular agreement. Tagliamonte’s (1998) study on the past tense forms of \textit{be} in York, UK, found that the singular verb form is more frequently used with existentials as opposed to all other grammatical persons. However, she found a difference between positive and negative contexts: in negative contexts the singular verb form \textit{was} was only used in 17% of the cases (Tagliamonte 1998: 161), thus indicating a clear preference for plural agreement with negatives. Her findings also revealed that while all age groups more frequently used \textit{was} with existentials, young females provided the highest usage rates for the nonstandard form (Tagliamonte 1998: 182).

Similar developments have also been noted in the Southern Hemisphere. Eisikovits’s (1991) study of Inner-Sydney English revealed that the use of singular verb forms in existential \textit{there}-sentences is nearly categorical. In fact, the majority of the speakers in her data (30 out of the total of 40 speakers) were categorical users of singular verb forms with \textit{there}-existentials (Eisikovits 1991: 244). It should be noted, however, that all her participants were young (under 20) which may further promote the use of singular agreement. AusE users’ tolerance for the singular agreement is, however, also confirmed by Collins’s (2012b) findings. His corpus-based study on spoken language revealed that AusE is the most tolerant of the Inner Circle Englishes in the use of singular agreement in the existential construction, with AmE and BrE following it (AusE 52.7% > AmE 44.4% > BrE 25.4%) (Collins 2012b: 62). Thus, as Collins (2012b: 67) points out, AmE has conceded the leading position in the use of singular agreement with \textit{there}-existentials to AusE.\textsuperscript{56}

NZE has also been reported to have strong preference for singular agreement in existentials. Although there was a decline in the use of singular verb in the existential construction in the nineteenth century and the use virtually disappeared with non-existentials, the use of \textit{there’s/there was} began to increase again in existentials and is very robust in contemporary NZE (Hay and Schreier 2004). Similar findings for both NZE as well as Falkland Islands English were reported by Britain and Sudbury (2002).

These previous studies have included the examination of a variety of linguistic and social factors that affect the use of singular verb forms with plural NPs in existential sentences. The linguistic factors included in these studies vary from study to study, but the most often studied ones are tense (present/past), polarity (positive/negative), contractedness of the verb, determiner type, plural marking on the noun (present/absent) and distance

\textsuperscript{56} Collins (2012b: 67) considers this to be due to “the comparatively strong influence of informality and colloquialization attested in a number of other grammatical developments in AusE”.
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between the verb and the NP (none/small/large). Social factors taken into account in previous research include at least the following: sex, age, social class and/or education and ethnicity. In addition to the social factors of age and sex, the linguistic factors of tense, polarity, contractedness of the verb and the determiner type are examined in the present study. A short summary of earlier findings regarding these constraints is provided below.

The examination of the constraints just mentioned have yielded variable results in different varieties of English. Starting off with the social factors, some of the studies have found younger speakers to use more singular concord (Britain and Sudbury 2002; Tagliamonte 1998) while the age effect has not been so clear in others. In terms of gender, Eisikovits (1991), for example, found in her study of AusE as used in Sydney that young girls are more regular users of the singular verb form in the past tense than are their older peers. In Britain and Sudbury’s (2002) study of NZE, on the other hand, it was the males that provided the highest rates of singular verb forms in all other age groups except for the 30–39 age bracket. However, often the different social factors (age, sex, social class/education and ethnicity) overlap (Walker 2007: 152).

While the effect of social factors seems to vary from study to study, the examination of the linguistic constraints has provided somewhat more consistent results (Walker 2007: 152). Of these, present tense is found to prefer singular agreement more strongly while plural concord has higher frequencies in the past tense. The effect of polarity is not, however, as straightforward. Some studies have found negatives to favour singular concord (e.g., Martínez Insua and Palacios Martínez 2003; Meechan and Foley 1994) while in others this has not been the case (e.g., Britain and Sudbury 2002; Tagliamonte 1998). Contractedness of the verb form, on the other hand, is clearly more often found to appear with singular concord and in the present tense. In fact, some of the studies do not consider it possible to have a contracted form of the verb in the past tense (e.g., Collins 2012b; Walker 2007). Some studies do, however, also include past tense in the examination of contraction using the context to determine the occurrence of the contracted form as either present or past tense (see e.g., Hay and Schreier 2004: 219). As for the examination of determiners used preceding the postverbal NP, interpretation of the findings is somewhat more challenging as the categorisation of the determiners varies between different studies. However, Walker (2007: 153) notes some common findings. According to him, most studies show a preference for singular verb form preceding no and numbers, while quantifiers, adjectives and bare NPs occur more often together with plural forms of the verb.

After this synopsis of findings from previous studies on the agreement patterns found in there-existentials around the world, this feature in AusE is examined with the hypothesis that singular agreement will also be found in

---

57 For example, Collins (2012b: 64) writes: "The contraction of is to ['s] is inextricably linked to the tense factor discussed above, insofar as contraction is restricted to the present forms of be."
high numbers in the present material. In what follows, the variable context is discussed in detail and the results are presented separately for each of the constraints investigated.

7.1.2 CIRCUMSCRIBING THE VARIABLE CONTEXT

In order to examine the subject-verb agreement in existentials in the present material, it was necessary to find all the existential *there*-sentences with the verb BE and a following plural NP as a subject. In order to do that, I searched for all occurrences of *there* and included all existential instances that were followed by a clearly plural subject. As previous studies have shown, virtually all agreement variability in existentials occurs when *there* is followed by a plural NP and therefore only such cases were included in the present study. I also included those elliptical sentences where the subject was implied in the context. Often the elliptical clauses, whether they were answers, question tags, comparative clauses or the like, consisted of only *there* + BE but they could also have a determiner or the like following the verb (examples [7.3] and [7.4]) (see also Peitsara 1988: 72).

(7.3) [INTERVIEWER:] What do you think about the language in this area of the country? Do you think that there are some sayings or phrases or words that are used particularly in this area?
[G1_F08:] Uhm I suppose *there are*.
(G1_F08)

(7.4) [INTERVIEWER:] Yeah. Do a lot of kids go to school in Bathurst and Orange rather than Blayney High?
[G2_F04:] Aah,
[G2_M03:] *There’s* a few.
(G2_M03)

After the retrieval of all occurrences of *there*-existentials in the material, certain exclusions had to be made. First of all, any repetitions, hesitations and discontinued sentences (see examples [7.5]–[7.7] respectively) were excluded from the final analysis. With repetitions only one occurrence was counted for and with hesitations the last occurrence (the one the speaker eventually chose to use) was included. Existentials with no clear plural reference were also excluded (example [7.8]).

(7.5) *there are there are* definite word differences (G2_M01)

(7.6) But *there are there are* uhm *there’s* definitely Am-Amercianisms (G2_M04)
it used to be a lot of young male workers who worked at the abattoir that we find that *there’s*, the people who have come to work at Friskies have actually bought ten-acre blocks and...

(7.8) *There’s* nothing really much else to do. (G3_F04)

Secondly, questions were left out of the analysis due to their low number of occurrences (N=8). Furthermore, a clear majority of these occurrences were tag questions as in example (7.9).

(7.9) It’s it’s funny how there’s so many languages, *isn’t there?* (G2_F09)

Coordinate structures and lists presented a special case (see also Meechan and Foley 1994; Tagliamonte 1998). While lists may readily occur with plural agreement as in example (7.10), singular agreement is often seen as more idiomatic if the verb *be* is followed by a coordinated NP with a singular first element as in (7.11) (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 242).

(7.10) *There are* still Brown, Jones, Mason and Smith to interview. (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 242; emphasis mine).

(7.11) *There was/?were* a bottle of wine and several glasses on the table. (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 242; emphasis mine).

Previous research has indeed shown that in cases where the plurality comes from the co-ordination of two singular NPs, there is a high tendency for the verb to occur in the singular form (Hannay 1985: 16; also Jespersen 1924: 155; cited in Martínez Insua and Palacios Martínez 2003: 264). Peters (1995: 750) has reported that this is also the case in AusE: “Before a series of singular nouns, *there is/was* is widely acceptable in writing as well as speech: *In that village there is a post office, a garage and a tiny church.*” After examining all coordinated structures (including lists) in the present material, it was decided that only those with a plural first element (as in example [7.12]) were included as there was no variation in the verb form if the first element was singular (as in example [7.13]). There were altogether 17 such structures with singular first element in the material.

(7.12) And *there are* drawings an’ illustrations from the books (G2_F10)

(7.13) a) *there was* another farmer and myself (G1_M02)
    b) *there’s* tennis and all the different sporting things (G1_F10)
Examples of existential *there* followed by a collective noun were also excluded as those can, by nature, occur with both singular or plural verb form depending on whether they are considered as a single unit or as a collection of individuals.

After these exclusions, 547 existential *there*-sentences remained for analysis. All instances were coded for the social factors of age and gender and for the linguistic factors of tense, polarity (positive/negative), contractedness of the verb and determiner type (listed in the next section). The results of the analysis are presented below.

### 7.1.3 RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The overall results as presented in Table 7.1 show that singular agreement is preferred in existential *there* constructions with plural NPs (63.6%). However, as will be shown below, different social and linguistic constraints have an effect on the use of singular/plural agreement with this construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb form</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before examining the different constraints, a note on individual differences in the use of subject-verb agreement is in order. There was variation in the use of singular/plural verb forms with *there*-existentials between individual speakers in all age groups. Some speakers did not use any existentials (N=5) while the highest number of *there*-existentials (29) was provided by a male speaker in G2. As for the differences in singular/plural agreement, there were 18 categorical singular verb users (3 in G1, 3 in G2 and 12 in G3) as opposed to 3 categorical plural verb users (2 in G1 and 1 in G2).\(^5^8\) Although it is not in the scope of this study to examine these individual differences any further, these differences are worth keeping in mind when interpreting the results below as they may have a skewing effect on the overall findings (see e.g. Baker [2010] and Brezina and Meyerhoff [2014] for the effect of individual speakers in sociolinguistic studies).

\(^{5^8}\) Note, however, that the number of examples provided by these categorical users was fairly low in most cases. For example, the two categorical plural verb users in the oldest age group only provided one example each.
Age
The first constraint to be considered is age which reveals a statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) increase in the use of singular agreement with *there*-existentials. The number of examples provided by different age groups varies to some degree with the youngest informants providing the least examples (115 as opposed to over 200 by both of the other age groups). The distribution of singular and plural verb forms in *there*-existentials across generations is presented in Table 7.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb form</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: $X^2$-squared = 29.722, df = 2, p-value = 3.515e-07

The speakers in the youngest age group, G3, show a much stronger preference for singular agreement with existential *there*-sentences (80.0%) than do the speakers in the oldest age group (G1). For the G1 speakers, the use of singular and plural verb forms in this construction is close to equal (50.5% singular, 49.5% plural). The middle-aged position between the two other groups in their use with the usage rate of 67.1% of singular verb forms.

Gender
The examination of gender revealed that males and females use singular/plural agreement with *there*-existentials with very similar rates with males using singular agreement only marginally more often (65.7%) than females (61.5%) (Figure 7.1). The difference between the two genders is not statistically significant.
A clear majority of the there-existentials under investigation occurred in the present tense (459 present tense vs 88 past tense). As Table 7.3 shows, tense has an effect on the use of singular/plural agreement with existentials with singular verb forms occurring significantly more often with present tense than with past tense.

In the present tense, singular agreement is preferred whereas plural agreement is more often employed in the past tense. It should be noted, however, that a clear majority of the past tense examples (51 out of the total of 88) were presented by the oldest age group which may affect the results. Furthermore, the youngest age group did not provide any examples of plural agreement in the past tense.

Table 7.3. Distribution of singular and plural verb forms in present and past tense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb form</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th></th>
<th>Past</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: X-squared = 22.215, df = 1, p-value = 2.437e-06

Figure 7.1. Use of singular and plural concord in there-existentials according to gender.

Tense

A clear majority of the there-existentials under investigation occurred in the present tense (459 present tense vs 88 past tense). As Table 7.3 shows, tense has an effect on the use of singular/plural agreement with existentials with singular verb forms occurring significantly more often with present tense than with past tense.

In the present tense, singular agreement is preferred whereas plural agreement is more often employed in the past tense. It should be noted, however, that a clear majority of the past tense examples (51 out of the total of 88) were presented by the oldest age group which may affect the results. Furthermore, the youngest age group did not provide any examples of plural agreement in the past tense.
Polarity
The overall distribution of singular and plural verb forms in positive and negative sentences is presented in Table 7.4. Of the total of 547 existentials, 490 occurred in positive sentences, while only 57 were found in negative contexts.

Table 7.4. Distribution of singular and plural verb forms in positive and negative sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb form</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: X-squared = 1.5189, df = 1, p-value = 0.2178

In the present material, singular agreement is preferred both in positive and negative sentences with negatives attracting singular verb forms even more strongly. The difference between positive and negative sentences is not, however, statistically significant. But when cross-tabulated with the tense of the verb, an interesting difference is found.

As Tables 7.5 and 7.6 below show, while singular verb forms are preferred in all other environments, positive past tense sentences are more likely to occur with plural verb forms than with singular verb forms. Chi-square test shows that the difference is statistically significant (p < 0.001). However, the number of examples of negative past tense sentences was very low (N=12) and therefore the results for the negative past can only be treated as indicative.

Table 7.5. Distribution of singular and plural verb forms in positive present and past tense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive present</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Positive past</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: X-squared = 21.993, df = 1, p-value = 2.736e-06
Table 7.6. Distribution of singular and plural verb forms in negative present and past tense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative present</th>
<th></th>
<th>Negative past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square test not performed due to low numbers in some cells.

The fact that previous research (e.g., Biber et al. 1999: 172) has shown that NO tends to be the preferred negator in existentials calls for another distinction to be made between the use of NOT/N’T and NO (including other special negations) in the negated sentences. In the present material, both types of negation were used but, maybe somewhat surprisingly, the overall preferred negator was NOT/N’T (N=35) as compared to a clearly lower number of NO negation (N=21).

*Contractedness of the verb*

As noted in section 7.1.1, the contracted form *there’s* is the most often used variant in the present tense. While it is also possible to use the contracted form of the verb in the past tense, as presented, for example, by Hay and Schreier (2004), the surface form in those cases is the same than in the present tense (i.e., *there’s*) and thus context needs to be used to distinguish the two tenses. However, there were no examples of contracted past tense forms in the present data. Furthermore, as there were no examples of contracted verb forms with plural agreement in the data, only the occurrences of singular agreement in the present tense are reported on here. As has been the case in previous research, the current material also showed an overwhelming preference for the contracted form in this context by all age groups as presented in Table 7.7.

Table 7.7. Distribution of contracted and full verb forms in positive and negative present tense sentences (only singular agreement included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive present</th>
<th></th>
<th>Negative present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contracted</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were only a handful of examples of the full verb form and most of these were elliptical uses as in example (7.14). In singular negative present tense sentences, the verb form was always contracted as in examples (7.15) and (7.16). As with the overall distribution of negation, also in the singular negative present tense, the negator NOT was more often used than NO and other special negations (22/11).

(7.14) [Interviewer:] I’ve heard that there’s a lot of sports and [Interviewer:] } the kids like to do sports and [G1_F10:] the there is yes

(7.15) well, there’s no shoe shops (G2_F08)

(7.16) yeah, well, there’s not many jobs (G3_M09)

**Determiner type**

The present material provided a variety of determiners used in existential *there*-sentences. There are some differences in the coding of these determiners in previous studies and therefore a decision as to which one to use needed to be made. While previous studies (e.g., Meechan and Foley 1994) have often first made the binary classification into “strong” and “weak” determiners and only then applying a more detailed breakdown of the types, I will directly examine the use of the individual determiners. To achieve maximum comparability with the earlier studies of English varieties in the Southern Hemisphere, I followed the categorisation of Britain and Sudbury (2002) and Hay and Schreier (2004) (Tagliamonte 1998 used a slightly different coding in her study of the past tense *was/were* variation in the British Isles). The determiner types included in the study are listed below with examples from the material.

1. Adjective
   *Uh there’s massive snow fights and everything.* (G3_F11)

2. Bare NP
   *so there’s opportunities if you wanna take them* (G1_M06)

3. Definite article
   *Because there’s the beaches* (G3_M10)

4. “a” quantifier
   *there’s a couple of different writing techniques we use.* (G2_F13)

5. Other quantifier
   *there’s several mines there.* (G2_M06)

6. Negative (no/not)
   *there’s no shortcuts in the language at all* (G1_M04)
As there were also other modifiers directly following the verb, a category “Other” was added to this list. Modifiers in this category included, for example, adverbs (such as often in there’s often kids trying to get transport to TAFE [G2_F04]) and intensifiers (such as so in there are so many little things [G3_F08]). As it was often the case that there was more than one modifier before the NP, only the initial modifier was coded as was the practice taken by Hay and Schreier (2004). The category N/A mostly entails elliptical occurrences of existentials, i.e. there was no determiner or a head noun but the plural head noun was discernible from the context and thus the instance was included in the analysis.

The distribution of the determiners preceding the NP in there-existentials in the material is presented in Table 7.8 revealing quantifiers as the dominant group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determiner</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare NP</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite article</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A” quantifier</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other quantifier</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (no/not)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to these findings, the strongest promoters of singular concord are “a” quantifiers, negatives, definite article (albeit with very few occurrences) and adjectives. On the other hand, bare NPs occur more often with plural verb forms than with singular verb forms. Although the category “other” presents the second largest number of determiners in the material, these are not considered further in this study. Instead the generational differences are considered only for those determiners that have also been in the focus of previous studies. The distribution of the most commonly examined determiners according to age is presented in Table 7.9.
Table 7.9. Distribution of the most commonly examined determiner types with singular verb forms according to age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determiner</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare NP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite article</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A” quantifier</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other quantifier</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (no/not)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is shown, generational differences are evident in the use of singular verb forms with the most commonly used determiners in the material. For each determiner, there is a clear increase in the use of singular verb forms the younger the speakers are. While bare NPs and other quantifiers still occur more often with plural verb forms in the speech of the oldest age group, the young speakers prefer to use singular agreement across the board. This, of course, further highlights the change towards more use of the singular in the speech of the younger informants overall in the material.

7.1.4 DISCUSSION

The examination of the present material shows a clear overall preference (63.6%) for singular agreement with plural notional subjects in existential *there*-sentences. This puts AusE in line with other varieties, such as NZE (Britain and Sudbury 2002; Hay and Schreier 2004), BrE (Tagliamonte 1998) and CanE (Meechan and Foley 1994). Thus, subject-verb agreement in existential *there*-sentences does not in essence provide proof for AmE influence as all varieties seem to be heading in the same direction, i.e., towards more use of singular verb forms in this context. However, the present study is in accordance with Collins’s (2012b) findings: in his study, AusE was most tolerant of the use of singular agreement with existentials with AmE following it and thus putting AusE and AmE usage closer to one another than AusE and BrE usage. If compared with Eisikovits’s earlier study (1991) of AusE, which showed nearly categorical use of singular forms of the verb BE by young speakers, the present study presents a more variable picture of the use of agreement with *there*-existentials which becomes evident when considering the distribution of singular/plural verb forms according to speaker age.

The present study offers a clear picture of the generational differences in the use of singular verb forms with *there*-existentials. The young informants use singular concord considerably more (80.0%) than the oldest age group.
(50.5%) with the middle-aged hovering in between (67.1%). This kind of generational trajectory could, according to Tagliamonte (1998: 181), imply linguistic change. Furthermore, when only considering the singular verb form usage rate by the youngest speakers in the data, the results exhibit much more similarity to those of Eisikovits (1991), albeit still not categorical.

The examination of gender differences reveals that males are more likely to use singular concord than are females, a finding similar to that of Britain and Sudbury (2002: 219) in NZE. In the youngest age group, however, it is the females who use marginally more singular concord than do the male speakers. This is in line with Tagliamonte’s (1998) study of BrE, in which females favoured the use of nonstandard *was*, but in contrast to Britain and Sudbury’s (2002: 220) findings that showed a stronger preference for singular agreement by young males (85% as opposed to 76% for females) in NZE in both present and past tense. In AusE, Eisikovits (1991: 245) showed that young males increase their use of the nonstandard *was* as they grow older while females’ use of the nonstandard forms decreases with age. Although comparisons within age groups is outside the scope of the present study, the clear increase in the use of singular concord across generations of speakers indicates that this feature is in a state of an ongoing change in AusE.

Despite some differences in the results, the linguistic factors examined in this study largely also put AusE in line with other English varieties. Firstly, while singular concord is the much more likely choice with *there*-existentials in the present tense, past tense promotes the use of plural concord. Similar findings have also been reported in previous research on AusE and elsewhere (Britain and Sudbury 2002; Collins 2012b; Eisikovits 1991; Hay and Schreier 2004; Meechan and Foley 1994). The low number of past tense forms did not allow for a detailed study of *was* and *were*, but the fact that the youngest speakers did not provide any examples of the plural use of *be* in the past tense as opposed to both of the older age groups preferring plural verb forms in the past tense further indicates an ongoing linguistic change.

As for polarity, which was found to be a significant constraint in Tagliamonte’s (1998) study of BrE but not in NZE by Hay and Schreier (2004), the present study shows a strong preference for the singular both in positive and negative sentences. Thus, polarity does not seem to be a significant factor in the use of singular agreement in AusE. Only when cross-tabulated with tense, a preference for the plural verb form in the negative past is revealed. This, again, is in line with Tagliamonte’s (1998) study in which only 17% of the use of the singular *was* was in the negative (Tagliamonte 1998: 181). In her study, polarity thus appears as the strongest conditioning factor for the use of plural agreement in existential sentences (Tagliamonte 1998: 181).

As for the contractedness of the verb, the present study did not provide any surprising results. Due to the lack of contracted past tense examples in the material, only the present tense instances were examined showing an overwhelming preference of over 93% for the contracted form *there’s* by all age groups. Similar findings were discovered in Collins’s (2012b) corpus study.
which provided similar figures (over 96%) for all the Inner Circle varieties of English. The full verb forms were very rare in the present material and most of them occurred in elliptical sentences. This further confirms the trend towards the use of *there’s* as a fixed phrase as reported by, for example, Peters (1995) and Walker (2007).

Lastly, as regards to the type of determiner used in conjunction with the NP in existential *there*-sentences, this study diverges somewhat from that of Hay and Schreier (2004) in NZE in that adjectival determiners are one of the strongest promoters of singular concord after “a” quantifiers, negatives and definite articles. In contrast, Hay and Schreier (2004: 224) found that adjectives were least likely to have singular verb forms. Furthermore, both Hay and Schreier (2004) and Tagliamonte (1998) found *no* as a determiner to most likely promote the use of singular verb forms. As noted above, in the present data, “a” quantifiers show a stronger preference for singular agreement than negatives. Moreover, although both the “a” quantifiers and the other quantifiers are more often accompanied by singular verb forms in CoBS, the difference that the “a” quantifiers occur more often with the singular forms of BE found in previous studies also holds for AusE. The occurrence of bare NPs, on the other hand, is the strongest promoter of plural verb forms in existentials in the present data, which is in line with Tagliamonte’s (1998) findings but not with Hay and Schreier’s (2004), who found premodifying adjectives to be most often preceded by plural verb forms. The large number of determiners grouped into the ‘other’ category – closer examination of which may reveal further distinctions in the use of determiners in existential sentences – remains to be studied further later.

Despite the minor divergences concerning the constraints of gender (especially in G3) and the type of determiner, the findings of this study are largely in line with previous studies on subject-verb agreement in existential *there*-sentences. The examination of both social and linguistic constraints indicate that this grammatical feature is in the middle of an ongoing change in present-day AusE. This is especially underlined by the higher frequencies of singular agreement use by the young speakers although not to the extent that Eisikovits’s (1991) study of Sydney youth showed. Overall, the findings presented here have clearly shown the rise in the use of the singular forms of BE in existential constructions in rural AusE.
7.2 STATIVE POSSESSIVE HAVE (GOT)

This excerpt from an interview with an elderly speaker in the Blayney material introduces the grammatical feature under investigation in this section, the stative possessive have (got), and brings forward the variability in its use as well as the prescriptive attitude associated with the use of got. I will first describe the history and use of have (got) in this function together with previous research on the variable which is then followed by the results of the present study.

7.2.1 THE VARIABLE AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Being one of the primary verbs in English, have can function both as an auxiliary and as a main verb in various uses. In addition to being used as an auxiliary followed by the past participle to express perfect tense and as a modal followed by to to express obligation or necessity, have is used as a main verb to express possession or ownership. It is this latter mentioned stative possessive function that is examined in this section. When used to express possession have is followed by a noun phrase and has the alternative (have) got in all varieties of English. In this introduction to the use of the possessive have (got) I will concentrate on the aspects of its use in the present tense as the past tense will not be considered in this study. The main reason for leaving out the past tense is that there is much less variation in the use of have (got) in that in general (Tagliamonte et al. 2010: 155) and my research material provided hardly any examples of the different usages. Furthermore, the majority of previous studies have also concentrated on the present tense.

Historically, the possessive construction with have is the oldest of the variants. Got was added in the 16th century and the construction have got started to be used for the same function as have (Crowell 1959: 280; Jespersen 1961: 47; Visser 1963–1973: 2202). Different explanations for the rise of have got in place of have have been proposed. Jespersen (1961: 47-48) claims that the reason for the rise of the later form have got was the need for another word
to express or emphasise the idea of ‘possess’ because have was frequently being used as an auxiliary. Crowell (1959: 280), on the other hand, proposes that have got started gaining ground as a result of a change in stress patterns in early Modern English while Kroch (1989: 207) suggests that it may be “a late continuation of the linguistic changes surrounding the rise of do”.

The last variant for the possessive construction under investigation is got which appeared later than the other two (simple have and have got) and is especially associated with informal BrE and AmE usage. According to Quirk et al. (1985: 132), ‘ve got may be reduced to got (as in I got something nice for you) but only in very informal English. In written text, this form is considered nonstandard. However, research on spoken language has provided reports on its use in different varieties of English (see, for example, Tagliamonte 2003 and Tagliamonte et al. 2010).

In positive declarative sentences the choice is then between have, have got and got for the stative possessive meaning. In the present tense, have got is usually contracted (Algeo 2006: 27) while have rarely is, although there are also examples of that in various studies. Contrary to Quinn’s (2009: 214) claim that uncontracted have in the phrase have got denotes emphasis, Algeo (2006: 20) states that in BrE usage this uncontracted form may also be used in unstressed sentences whereas AmE usually only uses stressed have.

In negative clauses, the situation is somewhat more complicated as there are five main types of possible negative forms for the possessive have (got) as listed in the Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (Biber et al. 1999: 160):

1) not-negation, lexical verb construction (She doesn’t have a dime)
2) not-negation, auxiliary-like construction (I haven’t a clue)
3) not-negation, have got (We haven’t got any cheesecake)
4) no-negation, have (He had no clve I liked him)
5) no-negation, (have) got (I’ve got no friends)

The last one of these (type 5) also allows the use of got alone with no-negation (She got no light on her bike) (Biber et al. 1999: 161). However, this use is considered nonstandard.

Previous research has revealed an interesting divide in the use of the possessive have (got) between the North American varieties of English (AmE and CanE) and the British and Antipodean varieties of English. However, as Tagliamonte (2003) has shown, the differences are not limited to ones between varieties of English but there is also variability within varieties.59 The differences in preferred usage are best documented for BrE (e.g., Biber et al. 1999; Tagliamonte 2003) and AmE (e.g., Algeo 2006; Biber et al. 1999; Tagliamonte et al. 2010).

59 The study by Tagliamonte (2003) was based on data extracted from three corpora of BrE from three separate locales and the findings showed that the variants of have (got) were used with different frequencies in these locales.
Jankowski 2005), but there is also empirical evidence from other varieties such as CanE (Tagliamonte et al. 2010) and NZE (Bauer 1989; Quinn 2004 and 2009). The overall findings show that, by and large, BrE and NZE are moving towards have got while in AmE and CanE the use of have is increasing. Although have is overall far more frequent than have got in both BrE and AmE (this being especially the case with AmE), has/have got is more common in BrE conversation than either got or have occurring alone while have is much more commonly used to express current possession in AmE (Algeo 2006: 32; Biber et al. 1999: 466–467). In its contracted form ‘ve got is more frequent than simple ‘ve in both varieties (Algeo 2006: 19).

Previous studies have further shown that different varieties of English are separated by their preferences in the use of this feature in negative and interrogative sentences. As Algeo (2006: 20) states, “the do-less forms are still characteristically British” while AmE is known to favour do-support in both negative and interrogative sentences. It should be noted, however, that in negative sentences the choice of the form may depend on the type of object. According to Algeo (2006: 32), have no is used before indefinite objects and do not have is used before definite objects in AmE while BrE prefers have not got in such cases. As for the other varieties, Tagliamonte et al.’s study (2010) showed that CanE also prefers do-support as does NZE according to Bauer (1989: 78). Quinn (2009: 214) does not give exact results but reports that New Zealanders use both do+have and have got. The same is also reported by Collins (1989) for AusE. However, although still more prominently used in AmE, do-support with negatives and interrogatives seems to be on the rise in BrE as well (e.g., Quirk et al. 1985: 132; Trudgill et al. 2002: 6).

Social factors also play a role in the use of the possessive have (got). Tagliamonte et al.’s study (2010) draws a clear picture of the increased use of have by the younger Canadian speakers. According to them, this indicates a change in progress in CanE (Tagliamonte et al. 2010: 158). Similarly, Quinn (2009) found age to be significant but in NZE it is have got that is increasingly used. As for gender, Tagliamonte et al. (2010: 162) found that have is favoured by females while got is clearly a feature of male speech. Quinn (2004), on the other hand, reported that females were the likely leaders towards (have) got in NZE. However, according to her study of the Canterbury Corpus data, there is interaction between both class and sex and age and sex.

In reference to AusE, to my knowledge research on this feature is scarce and concentrates solely on the use of do-support in negatives and interrogatives with possessive have (got). In a recent study on historical AusE (1840–1900), Hundt (2015) examined the use of do-support in negatives and affirmative interrogatives and found that “instances of do-support with possessive negative have are extremely rare” and found no examples of it in interrogatives (Hundt 2015: 80–81).60 Collins (1989), on the other hand,

---

60 In fact, Hundt (2015: 80) found only one example of do-support with negative possessive have in the data.
reports on earlier studies using selection tests which revealed that Australian usage is closer to AmE than BrE in that in negative sentences the do-support was clearly preferred (*doesn’t have / hasn’t*). These studies also showed that the context is relevant – in a judgment test *got* was more readily accepted in informal than in formal contexts (Collins 1989: 143). Peters (1995: 331) also confirms that, at least in negative sentences, the American style usage of the do-support is increasing with possessive *have (got)*. Korhonen’s (2016) examination of two types of spoken AusE data revealed that the use of this feature may also depend on the topics people talk about, i.e., the object type may have an effect. Many of the previous studies have also included this as one of the constraints in the examination of possessive *have (got)*.

### 7.2.2 CIRCUMSCRIBING THE VARIABLE CONTEXT

The stative possessive is here defined broadly and, as spoken language is more permissive of many kinds of variation in general, all the notionally stative possessive uses are included in the analysis. This means that in addition to concrete possession also notional domains such as alienable possession, locational uses, uses that refer to illnesses, family relationships and physical description are included (cf. Chalcraft 2009: 61). Thus, in order to find all the relevant examples of the stative possessive *have (got)* in which the meaning indicates possession, I searched for all occurrences of present tense *have, have got* and *got* and their contracted forms in the material after which the exclusions listed below were made.

Firstly, in cases where *have got* does not alternate with *have*, previous studies were used as guidelines in excluding the irrelevant occurrences. The non-alternating cases include the clear dynamic uses of *have (have lunch/coffee/conversation)*, when *have* is used in an imperative (*Don’t have anything to do with him*) or when *have* forms a sense unit with the following noun (*have a look, have a nap*). In some cases, however, the decision was made according to the context as even what traditionally may be thought of as dynamic usage (e.g., *have an exam/test/party/influence*) may present variation as in example (7.17) from Tagliamonte et al.’s study (2010: 150) (emphasis original). These types of examples are, thus, also included in the present study.

(7.17) I *have* a couple of projects to do and I *got* a test in math and law coming up. (3/m/m/15)

The second set of exclusions involves the use of *have (got)* together with modals, *to*-infinitives and emphatic *do*. Although it is possible to use *have got* with some modals “in the most permissive varieties of British English” (Chalcraft 2009: 66), Quinn (2004) found in her NZE study that simple *have* is always used with *to* and with auxiliaries as well as with *do* emphasis. As it was also noticed during the initial analysis that this is the case with the present
material as well (see examples 7.18–7.19 below), these types of occurrences were excluded from the final analysis.

(7.17) In fact we are very lucky to have all that here. (G1_F01)
(7.18) They I think just because they will have different terms. (G2_F07)
(7.19) they actually really do have very strine sort of accent (G3_F03)

In addition to the cases where there is no variation, the cases of reported speech (unless it is the informant reporting his/her own speech) were excluded as were repetitions, hesitations and disrupted sentences (see examples 7.20–7.22 respectively). With repetitions only one occurrence was counted for and with hesitations the last occurrence (the one the speaker eventually chose to use) was included.

(7.20) a lot of kids they have they have everything (G2_F01)
(7.21) a) We’ve got we certainly have some slang words (G1_F08)
    b) Ooh, there’s quite a few out the other side I really don’t haven’t got much idea what industry there is. (G1_F11)
(7.22) One of my other grandsons have got = ooh, he said it to me on the phone the other night, isn’t it, I’ll think of it in a minute and tell you. (G1_F14)

All the other occurrences of the stative possessive in which the verb form was discernible from the context were included in the analysis. Once all the instances were retrieved, they were coded for the linguistic factors of negation and contraction and the social factors of age and gender.

The results of the analysis of all the remaining 1072 occurrences of the stative possessive have (got) in present-tense positive and negative sentences in CoBS are presented below according to the constraints just mentioned. As there were so few interrogatives in the material – which is, of course, typical for interview data – they were not included in the analysis as no reliable conclusions could be drawn.


7.2.3 RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Overall distribution of variants
The overall results presented in Table 7.10 show that *have* is the most often used variant in stative possessive contexts in CoBS (55.7%). *Have got* has the usage rate of 35.6% while *got* is used rarely (8.7%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have got</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with existential sentences, individuals also differed in their use of the possessive *have (got)*. Intra-speaker variation could be seen in many cases such as the simple alternation of the forms (as in example 7.23) and also between, for example, positive and negative sentences (as in example 7.24). However, the same speaker may also use a variety of forms for both positive and negative sentences as the example (7.25) shows.

(7.23) a) He *has* red hair. (G3_M15)
 b) So *he’s got* a black afro. (G3_M15)

(7.24) a) I’ve *got* my L’s but I *don’t have* my P’s yet. (G3_M14)
 b) And even if you haven’t anyone to meet you, I’m fortunate I’ve *got* another daughter in Orange (G1_F14)

(7.25) a) So you most definitely, yeah, er different areas right around Australia they *have* different sort of colloquialisms (G2_M02)
 b) Uhm I suppose with the way we tune to probably s- well, with our accent as as, we say we *don’t have* one and you know Poms say they *don’t have* one and the Americans don’t think they’ve *got* one [INTERVIEWER LAUGHS] but we’ve all *got* one. (G2_M02)
 c) I *haven’t got* a fifteen. (G2_M02)

There were also differences in the number of possessives that individual speakers used in their speech. All the informants provided at least one example of stative possessive *have (got)* with the highest number of possessive uses being 56 by a female speaker in G1. Variation in the use of *have (got)* was present in the speech of nearly all interviewees with only 7 informants using...
either have or have got categorically. However, three of these categorical users only provided one example of the possessive use. These individual differences are reported here merely as background for interpreting the findings that follow, a more detailed study of these being outside the scope of the present study.

Age

The examination of the use of have (got) in apparent time reveals a highly significant (p < .0001) increase in the use of have as shown in Figure 7.2.

Although all age groups prefer have, there is a clear decline in the use of have got in the youngest generation whereas the use of have steadily increases. Got, on the other hand, is most commonly used by the young informants, but it should be noted that nearly half of the examples in that age group (21 out of 52) were provided by one individual. This being the case, there is the possibility of the one speaker skewing the results of that age group by his personal preference for got. However, the youngest age group still has the highest usage rate of got (9.7%) in comparison with the other age cohorts if this individual is excluded from the analysis, albeit with a considerably smaller marginal.

![Figure 7.2. Distribution of have (got) according to age.](image-url)
Gender

Gender can be another revealing factor in the use of *have (got)*. In CoBS, females provided 60% of the examples of *have (got)* usage and preferred the use of *have* more clearly than male speakers (females 60.7% and males 48.5%). *Have got* is used with almost equal frequencies by both genders with females presenting only marginally higher usage rate (females 35.8% and males 35.4%). Although *got* was used rarely overall, it was clearly more commonly used by male informants (Figure 7.3).  

![Figure 7.3. Distribution of *have (got)* according to gender.](image)

While the overall gender differences in the use of *have (got)* in the possessive construction are not remarkable except for the variant *got* (the overall result for all three variables is highly significant with \( p < .0001 \), but not significant for *have* and *have got*), the examination of female and male usage by informants from different age groups reveals some noteworthy results as Figure 7.4 shows.

In all age groups, it is the females who use most *have* with the youngest generation females presenting the highest percentage of usage. *Have got* and *got*, on the other hand, are more often used by male speakers with clearly the strongest preference for *have got* in the oldest age group. In both G2 and G1 *have got* together with *got* constitute over half of the male usage for the possessive construction.

---

61 As already noted, one young male speaker provided nearly half of the *got* examples.
Figure 7.4. Distribution of have (got) according to age and gender.

Negation
The main interest with the negation of have (got) lies in the use of do-support. Table 7.11 shows the results of the use of have (got) in negative sentences.

In CoBS, do-support is clearly the preferred usage in negative sentences by all ages with the difference between the use of do-support and all the other variants being significant at p < .05 level. But there is also a clear increase in the use of the do-support in the younger age groups with the youngest generation using do with negation nearly 70% of the time, while speakers in the oldest age group only employ the do-periphrasis in just over 42% of the

Table 7.11. Distribution of have (got) in negative sentences according to age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1</th>
<th></th>
<th>G2</th>
<th></th>
<th>G3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have no/ haven't</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haven't got / have/ve got no</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't have</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution of do vs other forms of negation: X-squared = 7.7344, df = 2, p-value = 0.02092.
negatives. The second most common alternative is have got which is still fairly common among the oldest generation but only marginally used by the young speakers. The simple have (have no or haven’t) is also used, but all the examples of the form haven’t were provided by speakers of the oldest age group (see example [7.26]). Furthermore, most of the examples of have no were of the type have no idea/clue/doubt. However, there was also variability in the use of these so called NO collocations as the example (7.27) from a single speaker shows. In sum, the findings provided here evidence the current trend towards more use of do-support in negative sentences with possessive have (got) in AusE.

(7.26) They haven’t enough dams, they haven’t enough power. (G1_F14)

(7.27) a) I have no clue. (G3_M02)
   b) they just don’t have a clue. (G3_M02)

Contraction
The clear contrast between the use of the full form with have and the contracted forms ’s and ‘ve with have got as reported on in previous studies was also found in the present data as presented in Table 7.12.

Have is almost exclusively used in its full form, while in the form have got the verb have is most often contracted (see examples 7.28 and 7.29 respectively).\(^6\) Furthermore, it is noteworthy that in this material the full verb use with have got does not necessarily mean emphasis on the verb (see example [7.30]), even though some of the examples do imply emphasis (cf. Quinn [2009: 214] who states that “[...] and positive present-tense declaratives with emphasis on the verb may be formed either with DO+have or with HAVE got”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full</th>
<th></th>
<th>Contracted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have got</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Only the contraction of the verb have is included in the analysis. Thus, other possible contractions, such as that of the negator not are not examined.
I have cousins up in Brisbane and I have family over in Scotland (G3_F11)

See you’ve got a beautiful accent. (G2_F07)

Uh like mum always tells me we have got Irish background and (G3_M03)

The comparison of the different age groups did not provide any contrasting results regarding contraction in the use of *have (got)* in the possessive. All age groups behave the same so that with *have* the contracted form is hardly ever used and with *have got* speakers of all ages mostly use the contracted form of the verb with only a marginally stronger preference for this by the youngest informants.

### 7.2.4 DISCUSSION

The focus of this section was the use of the stative possessive *have (got)* with the results indicating that the use of the simple *have* is on the rise in present-day AusE with the overall usage rate of nearly 56% in the data. Speakers of all ages prefer *have* and a clear decline in the use of *have got* with the younger informants can be seen. Although not reaching the overall preference figure of 77% in CanE, the apparent time trajectory of *have* as presented in Figure 7.2 (p. 149) has a clear resemblance to the one in Tagliamonte et al. (2010: 159) on CanE. In terms of AmE, Jankowski’s (2005) study of American and British plays indicated that *have* is taking over in the expression of possession in AmE. Therefore, it seems that AusE usage is more in line with the Canadian variety of English as well as AmE than either BrE or NZE, both of which have been reported to prefer *have got* in this function (Tagliamonte 2003; Quinn 2009).

The similar preferences for the use of *have* in Canada as well as in Australia may well be explained by the prescriptive attitudes towards *have got* as presented in the interview excerpt at the beginning of this section and commented on by Tagliamonte et al. (2010: 170–171). Further explanation for the current findings may be revealed when the object type is examined at a later stage.

Overall gender differences in the use of the possessive *have (got)* were not considerable in CoBS, but when age and gender were examined together, some noteworthy differences were discovered. In all age groups it is the females who most strongly prefer *have*, while *have got* and *got* are more often used by male speakers. These results also align with the results of Tagliamonte et al.’s (2010) study on CanE in which *have* was also most strongly preferred by the youngest age group and among females (Tagliamonte et al. 2010: 162).

The linguistic constraints on the use of the possessive *have (got)* considered in this section were negation and contraction. As for negation, there is a clear increase in the use of *do*-support in the younger age groups with the usage rate of nearly 70% for G3 as opposed to the much lower figure...
of 42%. The current trend in AusE, therefore, seems to be towards more use of do-support in negative sentences with have (got). This has been shown to be the case also in other varieties including both AmE and BrE as well as CanE and NZE (Quirk et al. 1985: 132; Bauer 1989: 78; Hundt 1998: 56; Trudgill et al. 2002: 6; Algeo 2006: 20; Tagliamonte et al. 2010). Furthermore, this study also confirms the preference for do-support with negatives in the judgement tests reported on by Collins (1989) in AusE. The demonstrated increase in the use of do-support with negated instances of the stative possessive have (got) in the present material thus evidences the overall growing fortunes of the do-periphrasis, which, according to Hundt (2015: 82), has been visible since the latter half of the 19th century.

In regards to contraction, the present material provided support for earlier studies in that have got nearly categorically appears in its contracted forms (’s and ’ve) while have rarely does. In CoBS, speakers of all ages behaved the same, i.e., no generational differences were detected regarding the contraction of have (got), thus presenting an established use of the contracted form in AusE.

Overall, the examination of the stative possessive have (got) construction revealed that AusE speakers’ usage resembles more that of CanE (and AmE) speakers than BrE users’ or New Zealanders’ usage. This perhaps unexpected result does, however, confirm the strong view expressed by the interview participant quoted at the beginning of this section. If not dead and buried, have got is certainly not the preferred variant in the use of Australians in the present material.

To complement the findings obtained so far in this study, from attitudes to morphosyntax, the next chapter will examine the use of a feature that has only recently attracted attention in AusE. Being one of the latest of AmE features to have been adopted to AusE usage (as well as to other varieties), the use of be like together with other quotatives provides another perspective on the perceived Americanisation of AusE.
8 VARIABLE USES IN THE QUOTATIVE SYSTEM OF AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH

[INTERVIEWER:] Yeah, yeah. That’s a definite- big difference between two areas. Uhm what about have you noticed any differences in language between different age groups? Like if you think of your grandparents, your parents, and you, your age group. Do you speak differently?

[G3_F03:] Yeah.

[G3_F06:] Probably. Yeah.

[G3_F03:] We say like a lot. [G3_F06 LAUGHS] I’ve noticed. Whenever you start talking about someone we’ll say uhm like a lot instead of saying said.

[INTERVIEWER:] Mm.

[G3_F03:] And with the o- older age group they’ll say “oh this person said that and they said this”. Instead we’ll say “uhm this person was like”.

The final research chapter of this dissertation examines another well-documented feature, namely the use of discourse quotatives\(^{63}\) to introduce constructed dialogue.\(^{64}\) While having been widely researched in numerous varieties of English, only recently has this feature attracted attention in AusE. However, Winter (2002: 7) has suggested that due to the AmE origins of the newest quotative, *be like*, its spread to AusE and the adjacent changes in the quotative system could be viewed as further evidence of AmE influence in AusE.

8.1 THE VARIABLE AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The quotative system in English has been an increasingly researched topic in a number of varieties of English since the early 1990s (see, for example, Barbieri 2007; Blyth et al. 1990; Dailey-O’Cain 2000; Ferrera and Bell 1995; Romaine and Lange 1991 for AmE; Buchstaller 2006a,b, 2011; Buchstaller and D’Arcy 2009; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999; Tagliamonte et al. 2016 for BrE;

\(^{63}\) The term ‘(discourse) quotative’ is used in this study to refer to the linguistic form that is used to introduce constructed dialogue. Other terms used in previous studies include, for example, *an introducer of constructed dialogue* (Ferrera and Bell 1995: 268), *a quotative complementizer* (Romaine and Lang 1991) and *dialogue introducer* (Johnstone 1987, cited in Ferrera and Bell 1995: 269).

\(^{64}\) The term ‘constructed dialogue’ is here used to refer to the recreation of speech and thought (internal dialogue) in conversation and storytelling and includes both utterances that were actually spoken as well as ones that were given as illustrations of speech/thought (see Tannen 1986 for further discussion on the term).
Recent diachronic studies on quotatives (Buchstaller 2011, 2014; D’Arcy 2012; Höhn 2012; Rodríguez Louro 2016) have shown that earlier *say* and *think* were the main quotatives used to introduce constructed speech and thought respectively (see examples [8.1] and [8.2]), but the rise of the new quotatives *go* and *be like* (examples 8.3–8.4), which are, according to Leech et al. (2009: 258), “among the fastest-spreading grammatical constructions in varieties of English today”, has significantly changed the quotative system of English. Of these new quotatives, *go* was first associated with lexicalised sounds and gestures but spread later to introducing various content types (D’Arcy 2012: 353). *Be like* was also first used for dramatic effect with non-lexicalised sounds as well as for inner thoughts and emotion states (Butters 1980; Tannen 1986), after which it spread to direct speech (Ferrera and Bell 1995: 279). Through its ability to frame both inner dialogue and direct speech, *be like* has acquired a so called ‘wild card’ status (Buchstaller 2014: 9), which has attributed to its rapid spread in the quotative system. By using *be like* speakers can avoid committing themselves, according to Buchstaller (2014: 8), “to whether or not a quote was actually uttered aloud”. The increased use of the new forms by young speakers has further contributed to the recent changes in the use of quotatives. In addition, the changes in the discourse context, i.e. the rise in the reporting of internal thought/dialogue, have attributed to this change. These two changes have been shown to be interrelated (see Buchstaller and D’Arcy 2009; D’Arcy 2012; Rodríguez Louro 2016; Tagliamonte and D’Arcy 2007).

(8.1) There was a, this real old piano in the dining room and somebody *says* “give us a tune *” (G1_F14)

(8.2) When I was on the bus the other day in Sydney I just sort of hearing the school kids talking uhm = *I thought* “yeah, our kids don’t normally talk like that”. (G2_F07)

(8.3) and they go “mad mad” *I’m like* “who’s mad?” (G2_F05)

---

65 In addition to the varieties listed here (AmE, BrE, CanE, NZE and AusE), quotatives have recently been studied, for example, in African American English (Cukor-Avila 2002; Kohn and Franz 2009), Irish English (Höhn 2012) and Jamaican English (Bogetić 2014).
then she just said to me one day “*’s family are coming out” and I said “oh that’s nice” and said “yeah” uhm “his brother and two sisters are coming out, his brother’s blaa blaa” and I **went** “oh that’s my age” (G2_F02)

In addition to the commonly used overt quotative markers mentioned above, quotation can also be marked by the so called zero variant as in example (8.5).

(8.5) And the- they even do it now to their own children. Θ “Grandma says “yes””. (G1_F13)

Several other verbs, such as *tell* and *ring* as in (8.6), can also be found in the quotative position. However, due to their low frequencies, they are grouped together in category ‘other’ in the overall distribution counts, but are not analysed further in the present study.

(8.6) a) I kept telling mum that people are coming over and she kept **telling** me “no, they won’t”. [G3_M15]
    b) Or that somebody would **ring**, “just come and speak to them.” (G2_F12)

The increased use of *be like* to introduce constructed dialogue has also sparked some attitudinal commentary on its use. Although (*be) like* has been reported to attract some negative reactions among older speakers and prescriptivists (see Buchstaller 2015: 464) and in the attitudinal study by Blyth et al. (1990) the majority of the respondents considered both *go* and *be like* “stigmatized, ungrammatical, and indicative of casual speech” (Blyth et al. 1990: 223–224), opposing views have also appeared. For instance, surveys conducted by Buchstaller (2014) revealed that “respondents below thirty-five tend to perceive *be like* as indicative of attractive, extroverted, fashionable, and confident speakers” (Buchstaller 2015: 464). This, of course, raises the question of whether this feature is above the consciousness of the speakers (see Buchstaller 2006a: 15). As was exemplified by the excerpt from the interview with two young informants in the beginning of this chapter, commentary on the use of *be like* also surfaced in the present material.

While extensively studied in many varieties of English, the use of quotatives has only relatively recently attracted attention in AusE. Winter (2002), being the first to chart the quotatives used in AusE, showed that *go, say* and the zero variant were the most frequently used quotatives by the adolescent informants, while *be like* was only used marginally. More recent studies, on the other hand, have revealed the increased use of *be like* by the younger informants but at the same time confirming the use of *say* as the main variant across time (Rodríguez Louro 2013, 2016), a tendency also found in other varieties (Blyth et al. 1990; Buchstaller 2011; Buchstaller and D’Arcy 2009; D’Arcy 2004, 2012; Ferrera and Bell 1995; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999).
Rodríguez-Louro’s (2016) diachronic study on the AusE quotative system shows a clear move towards a more complex system as the use of *say* as the main introducer of direct speech is accompanied by the use of *zero*, *think* and *go* as well as *be like*.

Both internal (or linguistic) and external (or social) factors that condition the use of the quotative variants have been examined in previous studies. The most often studied social factors in relation to quotative use are speaker age and gender. Overall, the quotative systems of older speakers tend to be mainly occupied by *say* and *think* (with some use of the zero variant) while the younger informants present a more varied system (see e.g., Buchstaller 2011; Rodríguez Louro 2013). As noted above, age is a significant factor especially in the use of *be like* but also *go* (see Blyth et al. 1990; Buchstaller 2011; Tagliamonte and D’Arcy 2007). As reported by Tagliamonte and D’Arcy (2007: 204), the use of *be like* “overshadows all other forms among speakers under age 30”. The importance of age is further illustrated by the results of Buchstaller’s (2006a) study on the attitudes of BrE speakers on the use of *be like* and *go* which revealed that they are both considered to be features of youth speech.

In terms of gender, while it has been reported that earlier there was a fairly balanced gender pattern in the use of the quotatives with females preferring the conventional forms of *say* and *think* while males used relatively more zero forms and the ‘other’ variants (Buchstaller 2011:70), there does not seem to be an overall consensus as to the significance of gender as a conditioning factor in the use of quotatives. Although attitudinal studies have shown that *be like* is more often considered to be a female feature and *go* is more often associated with male speakers (Blyth et al. 1990, Buchstaller 2006a), studies on actual use have presented varied results. For example, Barbieri’s (2007) findings challenge the view of females leading in the use of *be like* across the board. In her study, females used more *be like* in the youngest age group (16–26) but in the next age group (27–40) it was more often used by male speakers. Similar findings are also reported by Rodríguez Louro (2013) and Tagliamonte and D’Arcy (2007), both of which found young adult males to favour *be like* more than females. This is further backed up by Buchstaller’s (2011) Tyneside (BrE) study which showed the equal use of *be like* by both young male and female speakers. Of the other variants, D’Arcy (2012) and Rodriguez Louro (2016) have shown the importance of male speakers in the increase in the use of the zero variant.

Of the linguistic factors the most often studied are grammatical person, tense/temporal reference and content of the quote, which are also examined

---

66 Socio-economic status has also been shown to be an important factor in certain aspects of quotative use. For example, in D’Arcy’s (2012) diachronic study on NZE it was found to be the strongest language-external correlate in the use of the Historical Present (HP) tense *say* (D’Arcy 2012: 363). The use of *be like* is also often associated with lack of professionalism (see, e.g., Singler 2004, cited in Buchstaller 2015: 465).
in the present study. Overall, as quotatives were first mainly used to quote the speech of others, the third person subjects predominated (D’Arcy 2012: 351). However, different quotative variants have been shown to pattern with different subjects. The early study by Blyth et al. (1990: 221) found that say and go occur more often with third person subjects while be like is more often associated with first person subjects (Romaine and Lange 1991: 243; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999). However, although Buchstaller and D’Arcy’s (2009: 306) findings also establish first person as a universal constraint on the use of be like, some studies have shown be like to be also used with the third person (e.g., Buchstaller 2011: 79; Ferrera and Bell 1995: 278). The zero variant rarely occurs with a NP subject.

Tense/temporal reference has also been found to be a significant conditioning factor in quotative use. Many of the studies include three categories of tense/temporal reference: past tense, present tense, and the Historical Present (HP) tense (i.e. past-referring present tense morphology). According to Blyth et al. (1990), both go and be like occur where there is a switch to the present tense in the narrative. The findings of other studies confirm the heightened use of be like with HP (see e.g., D’Arcy 2012; Rodríguez Louro 2013; Tagliamonte and D’Arcy 2007). Buchstaller (2011: 80) reports that HP (or CHP, conversational historical present) is also favoured by say in the 1990s and 2000s Tyneside (BrE) data. However, in the latter material say is also increasingly used in the past tense. As for the other quotatives, Buchstaller’s (2011) study revealed that over the years go is also increasingly used in the past tense.

As for the content of the quote, say is the main variant used for quoting direct speech, while think nearly always denotes inner dialogue. Go, on the other hand, has been found to occur most often in association with non-lexicalised sound (Blyth et al. 1990; Buchstaller and D’Arcy 2009; Romaine and Lange 1991; Tagliamonte and D’Arcy 2007). The newcomer, be like, entered the quotative system through thought reporting but has since spread to direct speech reporting which, undoubtedly, has contributed to its success (Buschstaller 2011: 78). As an overall trend, the reporting of inner thought has increased tremendously in spoken language narratives over time (D’Arcy 2012; Rodríguez Louro 2016).

8.2 CIRCUMSCRIBING THE VARIABLE CONTEXT

The aim of this chapter is to chart the use of the most frequently used discourse quotatives (i.e., say, be like, think, go and zero) (see examples [8.7]–[8.11]) and examine the linguistic and social factors that condition the use of each of these in present-day AusE. The use of the newest variant be like, which “has

---

67 Other linguistic factors that have previously been studied include, for example, aspect and sequence of quotatives in narrative (Blyth et al. 1990) and mimesis (e.g., D’Arcy 2012).
altered the use of quotative landscape in less than three decades” (Buchstaller 2015: 463) is of special interest. In order to examine the quotative use in AusE, all instances of constructed dialogue, whether the content was primarily lexical (i.e. speech, thought, writing) or non-lexical (i.e. sound, gesture), were extracted from the material for analysis (cf. Buchstaller and D’Arcy 2009: 300). In many instances, it was necessary to check the transcriptions against the audio material to confirm the quotative context (see also Rodríguez Louro 2016: 144). Cues, such as the use of utterance-openers (e.g., oh, well, look, okay) (see Biber et al. 1999: 1118–1119) as well as intonational cues (Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999: 156–157) were used in determining the context.

(8.7) he said to me the other night, he said, “do you know what a gradient is *?” and I said, “God I remember doing something like that when I was in year ten or something”. He said, “yeah, it’s to do with tri- trigon- trigonometry and everything like that” and I said “yeah, and where are you gonna use that?” and he said, “well, I said the same thing to the teacher.” (G2_M05)

(8.8) mum’s just like “you’ve been on there for hours” (G3_F09)

(8.9) if you get six or eight weeks without rain you think “well, crikey it’s never gonna rain again” (G2_M06)

(8.10) a) And we used to love singing songs about being bright and gay and happy and [G1_M07 AND INTERVIEWER LAUGH] and now everyone goes “ooh”. (G1_F13)

b) I don’t know what we were talking about but ** goes “Oh, ** and ** are talking to each other and they are not yelling.” (G3_M14)

(8.11) a) I remember going home [NAME] kissed me today mum”. (G1_F04)

b) there was this completely new = interchange I suppose you’d call it with roads going that way and tunnels that way and I said to ** “which way do I go?” [LAUGH] [YELLING] Θ “Straight ahead, mum, straight ahead!” (G1_F13)

As the aim of this study is to chart the overall use of quotatives in the material, all environments where there is the possibility for variation in the choice of the quotative used are included in the analysis that follows. Thus, although number of previous studies have concentrated on the use of quotatives mainly in narratives, also non-narrative contexts, such as opinion, description and reminiscing about the past (Buchstaller 2011; Rodríguez Louro et al. 2015), are included in the present study. Nevertheless, once all the quotatives were extracted from the material, certain exclusions had to be made. Firstly, any incomplete, ambiguous or unclear occurrences of quotative use were excluded
from the analysis (see examples [8.12] and [8.13]). Furthermore, the present study only includes quotatives occurring in pre-quote position. Although studies with speakers born in the earlier periods have shown that the quotative *say* can also be positioned after the quoted material (see D'Arcy 2012; Rodríguez Louro 2016), the scarcity of tokens in the present material ruled out the examination of such instances (see example (8.14)).

(8.12) I went home and said and mum %went like “---”% Ha. (G3_M10)
(8.13) but it’s she says it’s just blended in (G3_F11)
(8.14) “Oh,” he said, “no”, he said, “it just slipped out.” (G2_F12)

In addition, instances of metalinguistic commentary that were merely given as examples of linguistic phenomena as in (8.14) and (8.15) were also excluded.

(8.14) Uh not every day but like %say it% sounds really built and strong you *say* “they’re built like a double-brick shithouse”. (G3_M03)
(8.15) More formal like instead of *saying* “g’day” “hello” or something (G3_M01)

When there was a sequence of constructed dialogues being referred to but there was no change in the person of the verb, the entire complex was interpreted as one quotative context as in example (8.16) below (from Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999: 156). On the other hand, when there were consecutive quotations from different speakers, as in example (8.17), they were coded separately.

(8.16) And so we were like, *going* “Oh wow!” You know. “You’ve got to come to this party.” (Uk/b)
(8.17) but mum and dad didn’t know. And the next morning they *are like* “How are you?” Ø %--- good%. Ø “Did you have a good night?” Ø “Yeah.” [BOTH LAUGH] And uh they asked if I had a drink and I’m *like* “no”. (G3_F10)

After these exclusions, 594 relevant instances of quotative use were left for analysis. Each of them was coded for the social factors of age and gender and for the linguistic factors of grammatical subject (of the matrix verb), tense/temporal reference (non-past, past, HP) and content of the quote (speech, thought and sound/gesture), exemplified in (8.18)–(8.20).
(8.18) a) we went into this take away and we ordered our meal and the Chinese girl said “oh, where are you guys from?” And we said, “oh, from Australia.” And she looked at us and said, “oh God, you don’t look like Israelis to me.” [CS LAUGHS] And I said, “No, we’re Aussies.” O “Oh, Aussies, alright.” (G2_M05)
b) And mum and dad they uh they don’t swear very often. And they hear me swear and they’re like “what was that?” (G3_F10)
c) it’s only the fussy teachers that = get uptight when you use the American spell check and it’s like “oh well” (G3_M04)

(8.19) a) I’ve got friends over there and they say “we’d like to live here forever but it’s too far away from the family.” (G1_F01)
b) When I was growing up I thought I’d like to be a school teacher, but then uhm as school went on I thought “no, I’m not cut out to be a school teacher”. (G2_F06)
c) She said “uh there’s gonna be some construction around the place” and I’m like “what kind of construction?” and she’s just told the entire assembly that the roof literally on uhm in the maths rooms is gonna be taken off so that’s gonna be disrupting everyone, I’m like “oh really”? (G3_F09)

(8.20) a) and I said “I don’t have an accent, you have an accent not me” (G1_F05)
b) And you think “Ooh, do we really talk like that?” Yeah. (G2_F06)
c) but **goes “[IMITATES THE SOUND OF THROWING DIRT WITH A SHOVEL]” (G1_F15)

In the examination of tense/temporal reference, the category ‘non-past’ also includes other tenses/aspects, such as habitual and modal expressions in addition to simple present. Of course, it would be desirable to examine each of these individually, but the present categorisation is seen as sufficient for this exploratory study of the material. Furthermore, in the content of the quote both hypothetical and direct speech were collapsed into the category ‘speech’. Following this coding procedure, the overall distribution of the entire pool of quotative verbs is first established and checked against the effect of the social factors of age and gender. This is followed by the examination of the conditioning linguistic factors together with the social factor of age. Due to the low number of instances in some categories, a detailed analysis of the gender effect was not performed at this second stage. The results of these analyses are presented in the following section.
8.3 RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Overall distribution of variants
From the 594 relevant instances of quotative use in the CoBS corpus as presented in Table 8.1, *say* is by far the most commonly used quotative (47.5%), followed by the zero variant (21.2%), *think* (11.6%) and *be like* (10.1%). *Go* is only used rarely (6.6%). The category ‘Other’ includes any other verbs used in a quotative position, such as *tell* and *decide.*

Table 8.1. Overall distribution of quotatives in CoBS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be like</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the nature of the interview material, there were some noteworthy differences between individual speakers in that some speakers used a variety of quotatives in their speech while some did not use any quoted material at all. The differences between individuals were most pronounced for the youngest age group in which three of the informants provided 63.6% of the quotatives while the rest of the informants used quotatives much less frequently (<10 per informant). The highest number of quotatives provided by an individual in the youngest age group was 60 by a female speaker while there were four speakers who did not use any quotatives. Although the number of quotatives used was fairly low for most of the informants in G3, 13 of them used a variety of quotatives and those who did not generally only used one or two quotatives in their speech. There were four young informants who never used *say* but did use *be like* as well as other quotatives. Similar discrepancy between individuals was also present in age group G2 with three informants providing 62.5% of the quotatives used (the highest number was 74 by a male speaker). All the rest used less than 15 quotatives in their speech. In the oldest age group, the number of quotatives provided by individuals was more evenly distributed varying from 0 to 28. These individual differences in all age groups are mainly explained by the characters of the individuals in that some were very talkative.

68 The category ‘Other’ includes the following verbs used as quotatives: *ask* (N=1), *be* (N=3), *be just* (N=1), *call* (N=1), *decide* (N=2), *go like* (N=3), *ring* (N=2), *sing* (N=1) and *tell* (N=4).
and eager to tell stories while others were not. Although these differences certainly affect the overall results, it is not in the scope of this study to examine the differences between individuals any further. Nevertheless, they need to be kept in mind when interpreting the results and recall for further study.

Age
When examining the quotative use age group by age group, the change towards a more complex system of quotation becomes evident (see Figure 8.1). The main quotatives used by the oldest informants are say (55.2%), zero (21.8%) and think (18.2%) while go is rare and be like, not surprisingly, nonexistent. The younger speakers, on the other hand, present a more varied system of quotation by making more use of be like and go at the expense of say and think. Overall, think as a quotative is rare in the youngest age bracket. Although there are only a handful of verbs in the ‘Other’ category, it is noteworthy that they are also employed more often by the speakers in the two younger age groups (G2 and G3) than by the oldest speakers.

Figure 8.1. Distribution of quotatives across age groups.
Indeed, *be like* is the most often occurring quotative in the speech of the young speakers, while *say* is clearly the preferred quotative for the two older age groups (G2 and G1). The difference is highly significant. It is noteworthy, however, that there are four instances of *be like* also in the G2 age group. However, three of these are provided by a single speaker.

**Gender**

In terms of gender, the first observation is that females use many more quotatives (N=406) than males (N=188) in their speech, a tendency that is most pronounced among the oldest speakers. The overall distribution of quotatives according to gender is presented in Figure 8.2. Although *say* is the most often used quotative for both genders, males use it even more (52.7%) than females (45.1%). *Be like*, on the other hand, is clearly a female feature while *go* is more often found in the speech of males. The zero variant is equally often employed by both genders.

The dominance of young females in the use of *be like* is evident in the overall distribution as males only use *be like* 3.7% of the time, while females use it 13.1% of the time. This figure is much more pronounced in the youngest age group in which females resort to using *be like* 47.1% of the time, while the young males use it 12.1% of the time as a quotative frame (see Table 8.2). For *go*, this is reversed as the young males use it 25.9% of the time, while it is rare in female usage (5.8%).

![Figure 8.2. Distribution of quotatives according to gender.](image-url)
Table 8.2. Overall distribution of quotatives according to age and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1</th>
<th></th>
<th>G2</th>
<th></th>
<th>G3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be like</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: X-squared = 35.211, df = 3, p-value = 1.099e-07.

Next I will examine the linguistic constraints (grammatical subject, tense/temporal reference and content of the quote) that interact with the use of these quotatives. In doing this, I follow Rodríguez Louro (2013, 2016) among others in excluding all second person subjects (N=57) and all existential it (N=10) and there subjects (N=1) (as the latter two only appear with be like). However, due to the large number of instances in the material, zero quotes are examined for the type of quote they introduce (speech/thought) but not for grammatical subject (although the subject can be in some rare cases implied in the context) or tense. Each of the linguistic factors investigated is also examined in relation to speaker age, but due to the low number of instances in many categories, the effect of speaker sex is not examined.

Grammatical subject

The examination of the grammatical subject of the matrix clause shows a statistically significant (p<0.001) divide in the use of quotative frames: say and go are more often used with third person subjects while be like and think occur more often with first person subjects (Table 8.3).

Table 8.3. Distribution of quotatives across 1st and 3rd person subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Say</th>
<th></th>
<th>Be like</th>
<th></th>
<th>Go</th>
<th></th>
<th>Think</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: X-squared = 35.211, df = 3, p-value = 1.099e-07.

The possibility of the quotatives functioning as 'wild cards', i.e. that they can introduce any reported discourse (either uttered or hypothetical), could only be properly considered if the second person subjects and existentials were included, but in the interest of maximum comparability with previous studies in AusE, the examination of the possible 'wild card' effect is left for future studies.
When the age of the speaker is taken into account, certain trends in the use of quotatives become more evident as Table 8.4 shows. Firstly, while *say* is used more often with third person subjects by all ages, the middle group (G2) use it almost equally often for both first and third person. Secondly, although *be like* is used more often with first person subjects, its use in the third person is also high among the young speakers. Furthermore, the increase in the use of *think* with third person subjects by the youngest speakers is noticeable. *Go*, on the other hand, is clearly preferred with third person subjects by all ages.

### Table 8.4. Distribution of quotatives across 1st and 3rd person subjects according to age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st</th>
<th></th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tense/temporal reference**

The distribution of quotatives across tense/temporal reference is presented in Table 8.5. Overall, *say* and *think* occur more often with past tense while *say* and *be like* are more often found in non-past tense contexts. As noted in Section 8.2, these include quotative verbs used with other tense/aspect than simple present (including, for example, habituas and modal expressions).

### Table 8.5. Distribution of quotatives across tense/temporal reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Say</th>
<th>Be like</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Think</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-past</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square test not performed due to low numbers in some cells.
The increase in the use of HP is evident in the youngest age group as Table 8.6 shows.

Table 8.6. Distribution of quotatives across tense/temporal reference according to age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-past</th>
<th></th>
<th>Past</th>
<th></th>
<th>HP</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td>G1 35 41.7</td>
<td>48 57.1</td>
<td>1 1.2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2 39 28.5</td>
<td>95 69.3</td>
<td>3 2.2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G3 27 75.0</td>
<td>7 2.8</td>
<td>2 5.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be like</td>
<td>G1 0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2 2 100.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G3 28 63.6</td>
<td>3 6.8</td>
<td>13 29.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
<td>G1 3 75.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2 9 81.8</td>
<td>2 22.2</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G3 11 73.3</td>
<td>1 13.3</td>
<td>2 13.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think</td>
<td>G1 6 0.0</td>
<td>18 72.0</td>
<td>1 4.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2 7 0.0</td>
<td>7 50.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G3 4 44.4</td>
<td>4 44.4</td>
<td>1 11.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, the examination of different age groups reveals clear trends in the use of quotatives. While *say* is overall used more often with the past tense, the youngest age group uses *say* more often with non-past tense. As for *be like*, it is found to occur most often in the present tense and is rare in past tense, but has a noticeable usage rate in HP in the youngest age group. This clearly constitutes to the overall increase in the use of HP with quotatives. *Go* provides the clearest preference for non-past tense use in all age groups and *think* shows a change from being mainly used with past tense by the oldest speakers to being more equally distributed across non-past and past tenses together with HP use for the youngest speakers.

**Content of the quote**

Findings for content of the quote are presented in Table 8.7. Overall, four of the quotatives, *say*, *be like*, *go* and *zero*, are more often used to represent speech than either internal dialogue or sound/gesture. *Think*, on the other hand, is solely used for thought representation. As there were only seven instances of sound/gesture quotation, the results on that can only be considered tentative. Furthermore, as representations of written content were rare in the material (N=4), they will not be analysed further in this study.
Table 8.7. Distribution of quotatives across content of the quote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Say</th>
<th>Be like</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Think</th>
<th>Zero</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound/</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gesture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of quotatives according to the content of the quoted material across age groups is presented in Table 8.8. Say is used almost categorically to report speech while think is solely used for thought representation. Go, on the other hand, presents a noteworthy increase in speech reporting to up to 73.3% by the youngest speakers. However, the overall scarcity of instances of go needs to be noted. Again, the use of the new quotative, be like, shows some evidence of an ongoing change. Although there are only two instances provided by the middle age group, they both represent internal dialogue. The younger age group, on the other hand, uses be like to report speech, thought and also sound/gesture.

Table 8.8. Distribution of quotatives across content of the quote according to age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Thought</th>
<th>Sound/ gesture</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4 DISCUSSION

Previous studies on the quotative system of AusE have shown that *be like* is on the rise among young speakers (Rodríguez Louro 2013, 2016), which is in accordance with studies in other varieties of English (see references to previous studies on p.155). Furthermore, Rodríguez Louro (2016) reports in her real time study that the quotative system in AusE has become more complex, i.e. more variants are used in expressing quoted content. These findings are confirmed by the results of the present study. While the older speakers largely rely on using *say* and *think* to report speech and thought respectively, younger speakers have a larger pool of quotatives from which to choose.

While it is not surprising that *say* still occupies the number one spot in the quotative system of AusE speakers, the high number of the zero variant in the present material is interesting. In comparison with earlier studies on AusE, the present figures are closer to the ones in Winter (2002). In her study of adolescent speakers zero was the third most commonly employed quotative (after *go* and *say*) with 18% usage rate (Winter 2002: 10). On the contrary, in Rodríguez Louro’s (2013) Perth English data the zero variant was used very rarely (2.3%). These differences may be due to sample design as well as the fact that Rodríguez Louro’s investigations are based on personal experience narratives as opposed to interview material in Winter (2002) and the present study. Of the other varieties, CanE also employs the zero variant to a noticeable degree while in both BrE and AmE it is rarer (Ferrera and Bell 1995; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999). In the present material, the zero variant was most often used by the greatest storytellers (especially in G2 and G3) who provided long narratives in which they reported the speech of two or more speakers. Therefore, a more detailed analysis of the narrative styles of the individuals as well as discourse type would be likely to explain the comparatively high rate of the zero variant.

By and large the results of this study are in line with many of the previous studies in that *say* is the most often used quotative with increased use of *be like* and *go* by the younger speakers. The use of *think* as a quotative is decreasing as was also shown by Rodríguez Louro’s (2013) apparent time study. Both the present study as well as the findings presented in Rodriguez Louro (2013) are in sharp contrast with Winter (2002) in that *go* is not the most commonly used quotative even in the youngest age group as it was for her informants. As for differences between genders, females use significantly more quotatives than do males. This is similar to the results of Baird’s (2001) study on NZE. The use of *be like* as a female feature and *go* as a feature of speech by young males was confirmed by the present study.

Different linguistic constraints revealed the variable use of quotatives in AusE. In line with previous studies, *say* and *go* tend to pattern with third person subjects while *be like* and *think* are more often found to occur with first person subjects. However, there is also a noticeable degree of *be like* use with
third person subjects, a finding that is in accordance with the studies by Ferrera and Bell (1995: 278) and Buchstaller (2011: 79). The examination of tense confirmed that be like is often employed by the young speakers to add vividness to their narratives by using present tense morphology with past tense reference (HP). Furthermore, as D'Arcy (2012: 354) notes, tense and aspect distinctions are broadening in the use of quotatives as various modal, aspectual, participial, infinitival and habitual constructions are being increasingly used. This was also the case with the present material and hence the inclusion of these in the non-past tense category. Especially the young employed these various tenses and aspects in their speech more so than the older informants.

Overall, the hypothesis that the quotative system(s) of younger AusE speakers are more complex than the ones of the older generations was borne out by this study. However, as was discussed earlier, individual differences in the production of quotatives is noticeable and calls for more detailed study of individual usage (also noted by Ferrera and Bell [1995]). Furthermore, as noted by Rodríguez Louro et al. (2015), discourse type plays a key role in the use of quotatives. Taking these factors into account would help in forming a more complete picture of the ongoing changes in AusE quotative use as presented in the current material.


9 CONCLUSION

The aim of this dissertation as set out at the beginning of the project was to chart AusE speakers’ perceptions of the alleged AmE influence in AusE and examine them together with their actual language use. The research setting was inspired by Taylor’s (2001) proposal for investigations on AusE in rural areas and with speakers from different age groups, and the often occurring sentiments of the public towards the alleged Americanisation of AusE. In order to investigate this combination of the speakers’ perspectives on the AmE influence and their actual language use, it was also necessary to use a combination of research methods. Therefore, the speaker perceptions were examined using the direct questioning method to access their folk linguistic beliefs, while their language use was investigated using the wordlist method for pronunciation as well as the variationist approach in investigating morphosyntax and discourse. All the linguistic features examined in the study have been reported to be variable in AusE and to be used with different frequencies in BrE and AmE by previous studies.

In this final chapter of this thesis I will draw together the main findings, discuss the strengths as well weaknesses of the study, and consider some ideas for further research. As the research results have already been discussed in each of the relevant chapters above, it is sufficient to only briefly summarise them in this chapter. This overview of the most essential findings is complemented by addressing the third research question posed in the Introduction: Do the different features present different results? which is done in Section 9.1. This is followed by a critical evaluation of the study (9.2) and suggestions for further research (9.3).

9.1 PERCEPTIONS AND ACTUAL USAGE

This mixed methods study on the perceptions and actual language use of AusE speakers from three generations proved to be a fruitful undertaking. What in the outset may have seemed as a very diverse study comprising of many aspects of language use can at the completion of it be seen as being intertwined at various levels that complement each other. This intertwining can be observed in the summarising discussion of the findings below.

The first feature examined in this study was the perceptions and views that the speakers expressed when presented with the following question: Do you think there is American English influence in Australian English? As hypothesised at the beginning of Chapter 5, the results of the perceptual part of the study showed that the majority of the the interview participants believed that AmE has an influence in AusE with some of them holding very strong views on the topic. This was true for all the generations (as well as both
genders) in that speakers of all ages readily reported on AmE having an influence on AusE. The fact that the young speakers presented even more confirmation for the presence of AmE influence in Australia than the older generations shows that there is no sign of the young being more used to or more accepting of the AmE influence than the older generations. While the age groups did not differ in their overall accounts of the presence of AmE influence in Australia, some differences were found in the areas of language that the speakers considered as representing AmE usages. The young participants mostly listed lexical items as American, whereas both of the older age groups exemplified the influence more readily with pronunciation features as well as some examples of spelling. The reasons given for the increased American influence were largely the same across generations: American TV-shows and movies were most commonly seen as the source for the influence. The general uniformity of findings across generations of this perceptual part of the study provided the background against which the study proceeded to examine the speakers’ actual language use.

The second part of the study concerned pronunciation which was one of the language areas mentioned by many of the participants, especially in the younger age groups, as presenting AmE influence. With the wordlist task, this was put to the test with the hope that the speakers’ reading of the wordlist items would reveal the pronunciation they would use for the lexemes in question in their own speech. But as was discussed in Chapter 6, this research method may also prompt the participants to report their preferred pronunciation of the words as was evidenced by the actual use of either in the course of the interviews. Nevertheless, the results reported in Chapter 6 showed that some of the lexemes did not vary in their pronunciations (e.g., semi-final, harass) but rather seemed to have an established pronunciation in AusE, while others, such as schedule and controversy, presented clear cases of change in progress towards more use of the perceived American pronunciation. Based on this variability of pronunciations between individual lexemes, no across the board Americanisation of AusE can be claimed. This is further confirmed by some of the speakers’ comments in the perceptual part of the study noting that often AmE pronunciation is used for special purposes, such as acting or character playing. The fact that only some of the lexemes included in the wordlist task were commented on by the speakers, either before or after the task, highlights the probability of only some of the items representing Americanisms to the speakers. However, some of them were indeed seen as being clearly American as the quote from a young male speaker in example (6.9) (p. 108) “we call it semi /i/ they call it semi /ai/” showed.

Two grammatical features were chosen to investigate the possible move from the more BrE usage towards AmE preferences in the speakers’ actual language use (Chapter 7). These were the use of subject-verb agreement in there-existentials and the variation in the use of the stative possessive have (got), both of which occur in variable frequencies in all varieties of English. According to the present findings, the use of subject-verb agreement in
existentials is consistent with other studies in that the contracted form *there’s* is widely used by all age groups with more prominent use of singular agreement by the youngest speakers and males. Although this cannot be claimed to be an indication of direct Americanisation of AusE, the present results do confirm Collins’s (2012b) corpus findings that, in its strong preference for singular agreement with *there*-existentials, AusE is indeed closer to AmE than to BrE in its preferred usage.

The lack of studies in present-day AusE on the stative possessive *have (got)* did not allow for comparisons within AusE but in comparison with other varieties AusE seems to pattern more closely with CanE and AmE than with either BrE or NZE in its increasing preference for the use of the simple *have* in this construction. In fact, the apparent time trajectory of the use of the possessive *have (got)* displayed considerable similarity to the one provided in Tagliamonte et al. (2010) for CanE. In the light of the AusE linguistic history this could be considered as a somewhat surprising finding, the reasons for which deserve to be studied further. As for the gender differences in the use of *have (got)*, despite not being remarkable, the present study presents females as the leaders in the use of the simple *have* variant. This was also the case in Tagliamonte et al’s (2010) study on CanE. Furthermore, the prescriptive view on the use of *got* in this construction, as noted by Collins (1989: 143) and implied by the comment presented at the beginning of Section 7.2, seems to be shared with CanE (Tagliamonte et al. 2010: 170). In summary, the examination of these two morphosyntactic features across three generations showed increasing use of the forms that have been reported to have a stronger preference in AmE. Although this development cannot be on linguistic grounds directly attributed to AmE influence, but rather parallel developments, these changes have the potential to strengthen the speakers’ views on AmE influence. As was noted in Chapter 5, speakers often consider any new or disliked forms as being the result of Americanisation.

As for the discourse feature examined in Chapter 8, the success story of the quotative *be like* in varieties of English including AusE was also evidenced by this study. While the older speakers never used this incoming quotative, speakers in the youngest age group quite readily employed *be like* in their reports of constructed dialogue. This ties in with the comment made by one of the young speakers that her age group often uses *be like* in their speech as was exemplified by the interview extract at the beginning of Chapter 8 (“Whenever you start talking about someone we’ll say uhm like a lot instead of saying said”). In line with earlier studies, *be like* was also attested as a feature more often employed by female speakers in the present study. The fact that *be like* is a recent addition to the quotative pool and its common association with the American way of speech demonstrates how linguistic developments may spark and also inflate the commentary on the dominant position of AmE in the Australian context. While linguistic research has shown that the changes in the quotatives system inspired by the increased use of *be like* are happening simultaneously in many English varieties (Tagliamonte et al. 2016), for many
speakers the recent additions and the concurrent developments in the linguistic system may indeed appear as signs of AmE influence. Thus, linguistic changes that are by linguists discussed as globalisation and/or internationalisation of English (see Meyerhoff and Niedzielski 2003), may easily lead the speakers to regard it as an alarming change towards more American usage.

Drawing all this together shows that studying the speakers’ perceptions of language phenomena together with their use of multiple linguistic variables provides a more comprehensive picture of the language than either one of them alone. First of all, by posing questions not only on people’s views on AmE influence, but also on the features that they see as examples of the possible influence enabled the study of features that are above the consciousness of the speakers. This was the case with pronunciation in that some of the lexemes included in the wordlist task were commented on by the speakers in connection with American influence earlier in the interview. The use of *be like and *have (got) were also commented on by an individual speaker each, albeit not in reference to AmE influence. On the other hand, the fact that some of the features that were investigated (some of the lexemes in the wordlist task as well as *there*-existentials) were not commented on by the speakers indicates that not all the variability in present-day AusE is noticed by the language users. Therefore, by including multiple features in this study it was possible to examine both the alleged Americanisation as well as ongoing language change in AusE on a variety of levels. In summary, the findings presented in this study well demonstrate the different stages of language change in progress from the more recent entrants (such as the quotative *be like) to a more widespread use of features across the speech community (such as the use of singular agreement with *there*-existentials).

In order to consider the third research question – *Do the different features present different results?* – three viewpoints deserve to be discussed. Firstly, the question can be considered through the dichotomy of the two strands of the study, perceptual and actual language use. While the first part of the study dealing with speaker perceptions of the alleged AmE influence provided almost surprisingly unified results across generations, the examination of their actual language use showed more variability. In their accounts of the alleged American influence on AusE the young informants were as eager, if not more so, as the older generations to report that such an influence is present in Australia. However, the young speakers’ use of the different features did not show any signs of shying away from the use of the variants more frequently employed in AmE – except for some of the pronunciations – thus contradicting the distancing of oneself from the more American style usages in their initial discussions of AmE influence. In this sense, the results from the two strands of the study diverged from one another.

The third research question can also be approached through the observed interrelations between the commentary on the variables and their actual (reported) usage. This especially applies to the section on pronunciation. The
lack of commentary on some of the lexical items indicates that they do not necessarily appear as examples of AmE pronunciations to the speakers. On the other hand, some of the commentary revealed a clear preference for the more traditional pronunciation as evidenced by the strong views on the pronunciation of *semi*-. In terms of the morphosyntactic and discourse features that were studied, the speaker comments did indicate changes in the language but did not directly allude them to American influence.

Finally, the third research question can be considered through the differences in the findings provided by the apparent time approach. The findings of the wordlist task provided some variable results in that while some of the lexemes did indeed show a change towards more use of the AmE style pronunciation in apparent time (for example, *schedule* and *research*), others were nearly categorically pronounced in the same way (often the BrE way) by speakers of all ages. In comparison with the variability that was evidenced in the examination of the pronunciation of particular lexemes, the morphosyntactic and discourse features provided a much more uniform picture of the AmE preferences gaining ground in the use of the younger informants. Nevertheless, as was shown by the apparent time and real time studies on a set of lexemes in CanE by Boberg (2004), the apparent time approach may also yield accurate results of current changes in pronunciation of individual lexical items. The effect of the apparent time approach on the present results could, however, only be wholly examined by conducting further research in the same speech community as is suggested in the following section. Overall, nonetheless, the changes in the preferred usages represented by the findings of the present study may be hypothesied to be contributing to the speakers’ perceptions of American influence, although it is questionable whether any of them could be attributed to direct Americanisation of AusE. But it is precisely the perception of influence that counts to the speakers.

### 9.2 CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE STUDY

An obvious achievement of this dissertation project is the compilation of the *Corpus of Blayney Speech*. As there was no generational spoken data of present-day AusE readily available, data collection was necessary. The arduous but yet very rewarding task of the material collection and the subsequent transcription of the recordings resulted in the researcher’s detailed knowledge of the data. Considering the size and population of the research site, the amount of data collected is considerable. Furthermore, the establishment and the maintenance of contacts with the people in the area also provide a possibility for further research work. Despite the fact that some of the interviews in the present data were rather short, the material was more than sufficient in addressing the central research questions of this thesis. In addition, the inclusion of various interview styles (questionnaire, wordlist, reading task) together with the available demographic information, lends itself
for a range of future studies on rural AusE. As noted in the Introduction, research data originating in more rural areas of Australia and thus depicting language use outside the main cities is scarce and, therefore, the present material in itself is a valuable resource for the study of AusE.

The different elements of the study (speaker perceptions, wordlist, morphosyntactic and discourse features) presented different challenges. First of all, the examination of speaker perceptions and attitudes is problematic at least in two ways as was shown in Chapter 5. When asked for an opinion on a phenomenon (such as the Americanisation of AusE), one can always question whether the answer represents the speaker’s true opinion or whether the informants are giving the answer they think is correct or the one that the researcher is after. This also ties in with Penry Williams’s (2011: 366) remark on the possibility of participants seeing the topic at hand as an issue as a result of the research setup as was discussed in Chapter 5. The second challenge present in the interpretation of the attitudes is the categorisation of the responses to the initial question. As was seen in this study, the interviewees may interpret the question differently to what was originally meant and thus make the analysis more complicated. On the other hand, the strength of the direct questioning method is indeed that the interviewees are not limited by predefined choices when commenting on the topic of interest. This, then, has the advantage of providing speaker views on features that have some bearing to them and thus serve as good starting points for the examination of their actual language use.

Certain procedures that may be used to overcome the challenges presented above are discussed next. The trustworthiness of the findings obtained by the direct questioning method could be amended by using judgement tests and/or matched guise tests to investigate the same phenomenon (such as Americanisation). The findings from these could then either confirm or contradict the initial conclusions. In terms of the problems in categorising the responses, different ways of exploring the data, such as considering the positivity/negativity of the commentary, would be likely to result in more detailed interpretation of the responses and thus reveal further interesting aspects of the phenomenon under investigation. This type of attitudinal categorisation of the speaker responses would also facilitate the examination of the extent to which a certain attitude (positive/negative/neutral) could be linked to individuals’ language use. Despite these challenges related to the use of the direct questioning method for the study of speaker views on a language phenomenon, in this case the Americanisation of AusE, the findings provide interesting insights into language users’ views on the topic. Therefore, this study adds to the so far very limited knowledge of the folk linguistic accounts on American influence in AusE.

The examination of pronunciation with a wordlist task, also deserves to be evaluated in the light of its limitations. First of all, the fact that the words were read from flash cards without any context inevitably complicated the analysis of those lexemes that can represent multiple word-classes (verb/noun). In
future studies this could be avoided by putting the words of interest into sentences which would then help in making the intended meaning of the word and the word-class clear to the participants. Secondly, the question of authenticity also arises with the wordlist task. Are the interviewees in actual fact using the pronunciation they normally would or are they aiming for the pronunciation that they prefer or think is the correct one? As was shown by the comparison of the reported pronunciation of *either* and the actual use of the lexeme in the interviews, this indeed is a valid question. One way to overcome this would be for the results of the wordlist task to be tested against pronunciation used in a larger body of spoken AusE at least for the lexemes with more frequent use. Unfortunately, this was not possible with the present material as most of the lexemes did not occur frequently enough in spontaneous speech. It is doubtful whether many of the lexemes presenting these pronunciation differences would, in fact, be frequent even in larger corpora. Thus, this study has succeeded in systematically examining the pronunciations of lexemes that have previously mainly been investigated through written questionnaires.

With the grammatical and discourse features examined in this study the main concern is the effect an individual speaker may have on the results. As was the case with all of the features examined, individuals use linguistic features with different frequencies, which may skew the overall distributions. Although the examination of the language use of the individuals was outside the scope of the present study, individual differences were noted. Despite the considerable differences in the number of tokens provided by individuals in each case, the overall results presented in this study provide a solid basis from which to expand in the direction of more thorough examination of the effect of individual language users’ preferences.

In conclusion, despite the limitations discussed above, the present study provides a multifaceted account of AusE speakers’ perceptions of the alleged Americanisation of AusE accompanied by offering a wealth of new knowledge on a variety of features as they are used across generations of speakers in rural AusE. By using the (variationist) sociolinguistic methods and the apparent time approach the study adds to the so far very limited stock of generational sociolinguistic studies of spoken AusE. The present findings certainly also serve as a starting point for many more investigations, some of which are introduced in the final section of this thesis below.

### 9.3 Future Research Directions

In the course of the explorations into the perceptions and usage patterns of Australian speakers in this dissertation, many interesting findings were obtained. But in the true nature of empirical research, these findings have also introduced a number of related issues that open up avenues for future research endeavours some of which are discussed below.
The perceptual part of the study could be expanded to various directions. Firstly, in order to enhance the study with a more attitudinal aspect and to grasp how the speakers actually feel about the reported AmE influence, their evaluations (as in good/bad/neutral) would need to be investigated. Furthermore, this initial exploration of speaker attitudes towards AmE influence could be further enriched by attitudinal surveys on specific linguistic features along the lines of Buchstaller’s (2006b) study of speaker perceptions on the new quotatives in the UK. This type of attitudinal evaluation would be suitable for all the features in the study, for the pronunciation of a set of lexemes as well as the morphosyntactic and discourse features. These investigations could then shed more light on the views the speakers of AusE hold for individual linguistic variables that differ in their usage between AmE and BrE. Furthermore, they would update the elicitation and survey results carried out previously in AusE, such as the ones mentioned by Collins (1989) and the various Australian Style surveys. Secondly, as the speakers’ favourite varieties of English (usually out of BrE, AmE and AusE) were also discussed in the interviews, examining these accounts may further explain their feelings towards certain linguistic uses. Furthermore, the study of the speakers’ views on AusE (and regional and generational variation within it) would update the results of the earlier attitudinal studies on Australian speakers’ feelings towards their own variety of English.

The linguistic features studied also provide various possibilities for future research. First of all, as all of the morphosyntactic and discourse features were only examined through a distributional analysis and cross-tabulations, more detailed studies using multivariate analyses programmes, such as RBrul, would bring more depth to the study and increase the validity of the results. These would also allow for more detailed comparisons to be made with earlier research as most of the variationist sociolinguistic studies include the use of variable rule statistical methods. Further studies in other features that are related to the ones already examined, such as other uses of have got (as in I have got to finish this) and like (as in I was like really surprised) would add to the so far rather limited research on sociolinguistic variation in AusE. Lastly, as the selection of features examined in the present study had to be limited in the interests of space and research economy, further investigations on other features with reported differences in usage between varieties of English would naturally complement the picture drawn here of present-day AusE.

As noted in the previous section, one of the most intriguing research directions that arise from this study is the effect that an individual speaker can have on the overall results and thus it deserves to be examined in more detail. Therefore, it would be desirable to conduct further studies on individual speakers’ repertoires and investigate how much these affect the overall findings from the current data. The examination of these individual differences could also be further expanded in the direction of attitudinal studies by investigating how much an individual’s opinions may carry over to
their language use. For example, do the speakers with the strongest sentiments against (or for) AmE (influence) present the most conservative (or most advanced) use of the AusE/BrE/AmE features in their speech? These types of combined investigations of attitudes and actual language use would further contribute to the sociolinguistic study of AusE as well as underline the importance of a comprehensive investigation of any language change phenomena as emphasised by Buchstaller 2014 (see quote on p. 21).

Lastly, having collected the interview material used in this study over ten years ago, it would be rewarding to conduct another round of interviews both with a selection of the same interviewees that took part in the first fieldwork (a panel study) and also another group of adolescents (a trend study) to see the possible changes that have taken place during the last ten years. A panel study could be used to confirm (or reject) the language changes in progress attested in this apparent time study. This would be especially interesting in the case of pronunciation: the lexemes that showed clear generational differences and thus suggested change in progress in the pronunciation of current AusE could be checked against a new set of data that would either confirm or contradict the results obtained in the present study by revealing if the speakers’ pronunciations of the lexemes have stayed stable. The recent changes in the quotative system, driven largely by the increase in the use of the innovative form *be like*, provide another case for such studies as suggested by Buchstaller (2015). It would be interesting to test whether the rather wide use of *be like* by the youngest informants in the CoBS data would carry over to their language use in adulthood/post-adolescence. A trend study based on material from another group of young speakers would reveal if the trends that were discovered in this study would be confirmed by the language use of the next generation of adolescents. In the light of these intriguing ideas for further research, the numerous accomplishments of this dissertation charting sociolinguistic variation in present-day AusE can be seen as a solid basis from which to embark on new research adventures.
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APPENDIX A

Appendix A provides the interview questionnaire that was used in collecting the data for the *Corpus of Blayney Speech*.

---

I Personal information
- Your name?
- When were you born?
- Have you lived in Blayney all your life? If not, where have you lived during your life? (extended periods of stay)
- Where did your parents come from?
- Where did your wife/husband come from?
- Do you have children? / Do you often meet with your grandparents?
- What kind of work do you do? Have you always done the same job? If not, what else have you done? Please tell me what’s a normal workday for you?
- What does your father / mother do?
- Which schools did you go to? Education?
  - What was your primary school like?
  - What kind of school did you go to?
  - Do you think school’s very different now from how it was when you/your parents went to school?
- Did you have any dreams of what you wanted to become when you were growing up? / What do you want to do when you grow up? / Where do you see yourself in ten years from now?

II Questions about Blayney
- What do you think about Blayney? What is best / worst in Blayney?
- How has Blayney changed in your time?
- What do you think of Blayney’s future?
- Do you think there’s lots of interesting things to do in Blayney?
- Off not, what would you hope there would be?
- Sports in Blayney? / What sports / teams?
III Reading passage

The plain truth was that Bunyip and his Uncle lived in a small house in a tree, and there was no room for the whiskers. What was worse, the whiskers were red, and they blew about in the wind, and Uncle Wattleberry would insist on bringing them to the dinner table with him, where they got in the soup. Bunyip Bluegum was a tidy bear, and he objected to whisker soup, so he was forced to eat his meals outside, which was awkward, and besides, lizards came and borrowed his soup. His Uncle refused to listen to reason on the subject of his whiskers. It was quite useless giving him hints, such as presents of razors, and scissors, and boxes of matches to burn them off. On such occasions he would remark ‘Shaving may add an air that’s somewhat brisker, for dignity, commend me to the whisker.’ Or, when more deeply moved, he would exclaim ‘As noble thoughts the inward being grace, so noble whiskers dignify the face.’ Prayers and entreaties to remove the whiskers being of no avail, Bunyip decided to leave home without more ado. The trouble was that he couldn’t make up his mind whether to be a traveller or a Swagman. You can’t go about the world being nothing, but if you are a traveller you have to carry a bag, while if you are a swagman you have to carry a swag, and the question is: Which is the heavier?

---

Comments on the reading passage?

IV Subjective attitudes
- Do you think that people speak differently in different parts of the country? Different states? Rural/urban?
- Do you like the way people speak in Blayney?
- Do you think there’s any difference between Blayney and, for example, Sydney?
- Do you find that your children/parents speak differently than you? Do your parents ever correct / notice in some way the way you speak?
- Do you think American English has influenced Australian English? How do you notice it? What kinds of American features are there?
- Did you ever know anyone who went all out to change their speech? Do you ever try to change the way you speak? What particular things about it?
- Do you think people in general (Australians/non-Australians) like the way Australians speak?
- Which of the three accents, British, American or Australian do you like the most and why?

VI Wordlist
either, research, territory, harass, defence, schedule, semi-final, process, secretary, kilometre, hostile, data, controversy, schism
APPENDIX B

Appendix B presents the Confidentiality and Consent form that was given to the interview participants to sign before the interview.

---

ID number __________

Confidentiality and Consent

The purpose of this survey is to gather information about the way English is used in Australia today. In order to do this, I would like your permission to record the interview.

Use of Information
The information provided by you will be used for linguistic research purposes. The data you have provided will be held securely and indefinitely by the researcher, Minna Korhonen (University of Helsinki, Finland). The interview material may later on be included in a larger research database.

All the information you provide will remain completely anonymous outside the project (including, for instance, in any published work).

Contact address:
Minna Korhonen
Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English
Department of English
P.O. Box 24 (Unioninkatu 40b)
FI-00014 University of Helsinki
Finland

I give permission for the information I provide to be used for research purposes.

Signed..............................................................................................................................
PRINT NAME..............................................................................................................
Date............................................................................................................................... 
(Under 18s only)
Parent/Guardian’s signature.........................................................................................
PRINT NAME..............................................................................................................
Date...............................................................................................................................
APPENDIX C

Tables 4a-4c in Appendix C provide some personal information (sex, year of birth) on the participants included in the Corpus of Blayney Speech together with information on the interviews (date of the recording, word count).

Table 4a. Information on the speakers in G1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker code</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Date of recording</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1_F01</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>18.11.2005</td>
<td>4978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F02</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>15.11.2005</td>
<td>5925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F03</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>10.11.2006</td>
<td>3506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_M01</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>10.11.2006</td>
<td>4805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F04</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1.12.2005</td>
<td>3908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F05</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>28.11.2005</td>
<td>3620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_M02</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>28.11.2005</td>
<td>2560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_M03</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>5.11.2006</td>
<td>3077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F07</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>5.11.2006</td>
<td>5160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_M04</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>7.11.2006</td>
<td>5105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F08</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>24.11.2005</td>
<td>6972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F09</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>17.11.2005</td>
<td>6104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_M05</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>17.11.2005</td>
<td>6353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>25.11.2005</td>
<td>5768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>16.11.2005</td>
<td>2502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_M06</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>7.11.2006</td>
<td>3127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>7.11.2006</td>
<td>1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_M07</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>22.11.2005</td>
<td>5767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>22.11.2005</td>
<td>2548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>8.11.2005</td>
<td>6786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1_F15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>6.11.2006</td>
<td>4698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total word count 94644
## Table 4b. Information on the speakers in G2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker code</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Date of recording</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G2_F01</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>6.11.2006</td>
<td>4115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F02</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>6.11.2006</td>
<td>3183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_M01</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>9.10.2006</td>
<td>2146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F03</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>9.10.2006</td>
<td>3176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_M02</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>23.11.2005</td>
<td>7198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F04</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>5.11.2006</td>
<td>3435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_M03</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>5.11.2006</td>
<td>2262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F05</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>28.11.2005</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F06</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>25.11.2005</td>
<td>4405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F07</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>10.10.2006</td>
<td>4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_M04</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>21.11.2005</td>
<td>5453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F08</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>21.11.2005</td>
<td>4242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F09</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2.11.2006</td>
<td>6651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_M05</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>5.11.2006</td>
<td>6366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>8.11.2006</td>
<td>3326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_M06</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>8.11.2006</td>
<td>3082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>4.11.2006</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_M07</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>4.11.2006</td>
<td>1325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>5.11.2006</td>
<td>8965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_M08</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>7.11.2006</td>
<td>3990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2.11.2006</td>
<td>3801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_M09</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>4.11.2006</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2_F14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>4.11.2006</td>
<td>2425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total word count** 89583
Table 4c. Information on the speakers in G3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker code</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Date of recording</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G3_M01</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7.11.2006</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F01</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>28.11.2005</td>
<td>2252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F02</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10.11.2006</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M02</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>29.11.2005</td>
<td>4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M03</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>7.11.2006</td>
<td>1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F03</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10.11.2006</td>
<td>2209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F04</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>30.11.2005</td>
<td>3281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F05</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10.11.2006</td>
<td>1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M04</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>28.11.2005</td>
<td>3006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F06</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>10.11.2006</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F07</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>10.11.2006</td>
<td>1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M06</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>28.11.2005</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M07</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>6.11.2006</td>
<td>2934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M08</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>21.11.2005</td>
<td>2080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M09</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>30.11.2005</td>
<td>6066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F08</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>7.11.2006</td>
<td>3172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F09</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>10.11.2006</td>
<td>3077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7.11.2006</td>
<td>4296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>28.11.2005</td>
<td>2540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>6.11.2006</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>7.11.2006</td>
<td>1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>30.11.2005</td>
<td>2612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_F11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>30.11.2005</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>29.11.2005</td>
<td>5442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3_M15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>29.11.2005</td>
<td>4529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total word count 64534
Appendix D presents the raw data used in calculating the chi-square tests together with the overall distribution calculations for the three age groups and the two genders for the pronunciation features in Chapter 6 (Tables 6a-6r), and the raw numbers for the chi-square calculations for the morphosyntactic features in Chapter 7 (7a-7d) and for quotatives in Chapter 8 (8a-8b).

**Table 6a. Distribution of /i/ and /ai/ in either across age groups.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/ai/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: x-squared = 0.77311, df = 2, p-value = 0.6794

**Table 6b. Distribution of /a/ and /ei/ in data across age groups.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/ei/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square test not performed due to low numbers in some cells.

**Table 6c. Distribution of /sk/ and /ʃ/ in schedule across age groups.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>/sk/</th>
<th>/ʃ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: x-squared = 28.215, df = 2, p-value = 7.469e-07

**Table 6d. Distribution of /sk/ and /ʃ/ in schism across age groups.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>/sk/</th>
<th>/ʃ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: x-squared = 3.0658, df = 2, p-value = 0.2159
Table 6e. Distribution of pronunciations for *secretary* across age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th><em>secre</em>†<em>tary</em></th>
<th><em>secretary</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square test not performed due to low numbers in some cells.

Table 6f. Distribution of pronunciations for *territory* across age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th><em>terri</em>†<em>tory</em></th>
<th><em>territory</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: $x^2 = 0.91645$, df = 2, p-value = 0.6324

Table 6g. Distribution of pronunciations for *kilometre* across age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th><em>kilo</em>†<em>metre</em></th>
<th><em>ki`lometre</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: $x^2 = 8.9463$, df = 2, p-value = 0.01141

Table 6h. Distribution of pronunciations for *controversy* across age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th><em>`controversy</em></th>
<th><em>con`troversy</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: $x^2 = 18.335$, df = 2, p-value = 0.0001044

Table 6i. Distribution of pronunciations for *research* across age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th><em>research</em></th>
<th><em>re`search</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square test not performed due to low numbers in some cells.
### Table 6j. Distribution of /i/ and /aɪ/ in either across genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/aɪ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: x-squared = 1.6549, df = 1, p-value = 0.1983

### Table 6k. Distribution of /a/ and /eɪ/ in data across genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/eɪ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square test not performed due to low numbers in some cells.

### Table 6l. Distribution of /sk/ and /ʃ/ in schedule across genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>/sk/</th>
<th>/ʃ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: x-squared = 0.29753, df = 1, p-value = 0.5854

### Table 6m. Distribution of /sk/ and /ʃ/ in schism across genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>/sk/</th>
<th>/ʃ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: x-squared = 1.8785, df = 1, p-value = 0.1705

### Table 6n. Distribution of pronunciations for secretary across genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ˈsecreˌtary</th>
<th>ˈsecretary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: x-squared = 0.72808, df = 1, p-value = 0.3935

### Table 6o. Distribution of pronunciations for territory across genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ˈterriˌtory</th>
<th>ˈterritory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: x-squared = 0.0187, df = a, p-value = 0.775
Table 6p. Distribution of pronunciations for *kilometre* across genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>kilome</th>
<th>ki lometre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: $x^2 = 2.7057$, df = 1, p-value = 0.0999

Table 6q. Distribution of pronunciations for *controversy* across genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>controve</th>
<th>con trovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: $x^2 = 1.1361$, df = 1, p-value = 0.2865

Table 6r. Distribution of pronunciations for *research* across genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>re search</th>
<th>re search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: $x^2 = 3.5874e-31$, df = 1, p-value = 1

Table 7a. Distribution of singular and plural verb forms in *there*-existentials according to gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: $X^2 = 0.84839$, df = 1, p-value = 0.357

Table 7b. Distribution of *have (got)* according to age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have got</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: $X^2 = 61.692$, df = 4, p-value = 1.279e-12
Table 7c. Distribution of *have (got)* according to gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>have</em></td>
<td>383</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>have got</em></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>got</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>631</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: X-squared = 54.523, df = 2, p-value = 1.44e-12.
*Have/have got*: X-squared = 2.2612, df = 1, p-value = 0.1327

Table 7d. Distribution of *have (got)* according to age and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>have</em></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>have got</em></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>got</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8a. Overall distribution of quotatives according to age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Say</em></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Be like</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Go</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Think</em></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zero</em></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Other</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution (excluding ‘other’): X-squared = 183.45, df = 8, p-value < 2.2e-16
*Say/be like* across age groups: X-squared = 144.75, df = 2, p-value < 2.2e-16.
Table 8b. Overall distribution of quotatives according to gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be like</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall distribution: X-squared = 19.384, df = 5, p-value = 0.00163