



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Proper English Usage : a sociolinguistic investigation of attitudes towards usage problems in British English

Ebner, C.

Citation

Ebner, C. (2017, September 5). *Proper English Usage : a sociolinguistic investigation of attitudes towards usage problems in British English*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Utrecht. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/54849>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/54849>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/54849> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Ebner, C.

Title: Proper English Usage : a sociolinguistic investigation of attitudes towards usage problems in British English

Issue Date: 2017-09-05

Proper English Usage

**A sociolinguistic investigation of attitudes towards usage
problems in British English**

Published by
LOT
Trans 10
3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands

phone: +31 30 253 6111

e-mail: lot@uu.nl
<http://www.lotschool.nl>

Cover illustration: Photo kindly provided by Indigo Coffee House in
Cambridge

ISBN: 978-94-6093-251-9
NUR 616

Copyright © 2017: Carmen Ebner. All rights reserved.

Proper English Usage
A sociolinguistic investigation of attitudes towards usage
problems in British English

P R O E F S C H R I F T

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens het besluit van College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 5 september 2017
klokke 15:00 uur

door

Carmen Ebner

geboren te Vorau

in 1987

Promotor

Prof. dr. I.M. Tieken-Boon van Ostade

Co-promotor

Prof. dr. J. Cheshire (Queen Mary University of London)

Promotiecommissie

Prof. dr. L.M.E.A. Cornips (Meertens Instituut)

Prof. dr. T. van Haaften (Universiteit Leiden)

Prof. dr. M. Hannay (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Dr. D. Smakman (Universiteit Leiden)

The research for this book was carried out as part of the project “Bridging the Unbridgeable: linguists, prescriptivists and the general public”, financed by the Dutch Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

For my parents.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
ABBREVIATIONS	VII
LIST OF FIGURES	IX
LIST OF TABLES	XI
 1. INTRODUCTION	 1
1.1. Proper English Usage?	1
1.2. Prescriptivism, Descriptivism and their Key Players	2
1.3. What are Usage Problems?	5
1.4. Aims of this Study	8
1.5. The Usage Problems Investigated	12
1.6. Chapter Outline	14
 2. THE USAGE DEBATE	 19
2.1. Introduction	19
2.2. The Usage Debate and Standard Language	20
2.3. The Notion of Correct (Standard) Language	32
2.3.1. Education as a gatekeeper	36
2.3.2. The media as gatekeeper	45
2.4. Defining Prescription and Prescriptivism	51
2.5. Concluding Remarks	59
 3. DEFINING (USAGE) ATTITUDES: WHAT ARE THEY AND HOW CAN THEY BE STUDIED?	 61
3.1. Introduction	61
3.2. The Concept ‘Attitude’	62
3.2.1. Three key components of attitudes	65
3.2.2. Related terms	68
3.3. The Concept ‘Attitude’ in Linguistics	70
3.3.1. Defining usage attitudes	73
3.4. Research Approaches to the Study of Language Attitudes	80
3.4.1. The Direct Approach	82
3.4.2. The Indirect Approach	84
3.4.3. The Societal Treatment Approach	88
3.5. Concluding Remarks	90
 4. USAGE ATTITUDE STUDIES: A BRIEF REVIEW	 93
4.1. Introduction	93
4.2. Five usage attitude studies	93
4.2.1. Leonard’s <i>Current English Usage</i> (1932)	96
4.2.2. Bryant’s <i>Current American Usage</i> (1962)	99
4.2.3. Mittins et al.’s <i>Attitudes to English Usage</i> (1970)	101
4.2.4. Sandred’s <i>Good or Bad Scots?</i> (1983)	105

4.2.5.	Albanyan and Preston's <i>What is Standard American English?</i> (1998)	109
4.3.	Why Usage Attitude Surveys Are Important	112
4.4.	Concluding Remarks	115
5.	METHODOLOGY	117
5.1.	Introduction	117
5.2.	The Research Area, its Population and its Language Varieties	117
5.2.1.	The geographical research areas	118
5.2.2.	The research population and language varieties spoken in England	120
5.3.	A Mixed-Methods Approach to Study Usage Attitudes	122
5.3.1.	Online questionnaire	123
5.3.2.	Interview sessions	132
5.3.3.	Open-guise test	133
5.3.4.	Usage judgment test and direct elicitation test	135
5.3.5.	Semi-structured interview	137
5.4.	The HUGE Database	138
5.5.	The Corpora Consulted	141
5.6.	Concluding Remarks	143
6.	DESCRIBING THE (USAGE) PROBLEMS	145
6.1.	Introduction	145
6.2.	<i>Different From/Than/To</i>	146
6.3.	Latinate Plurals	149
6.4.	Flat Adverbs	151
6.5.	The Use(s) of <i>Like</i>	153
6.6.	Americanisms	156
6.7.	<i>Less Than</i>	159
6.8.	Double Negatives	161
6.9.	Dangling participles	163
6.10.	<i>I for Me</i>	165
6.11.	Split Infinitives	168
6.12.	<i>Literally</i>	170
6.13.	Concluding Remarks	173
7.	CURRENT USAGE ATTITUDES IN ENGLAND: THE ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE (PART ONE)	175
7.1.	Introduction	175
7.2.	Results of the Questionnaire	177
7.2.1.	The usage problems	185
7.2.1.1.	<i>Different from/than/to</i>	185
7.2.1.2.	<i>Data are</i>	199
7.2.1.3.	Flat adverb: <i>go slow</i>	213
7.2.1.4.	<i>Like</i> as an approximative adverb	223

7.2.1.5.	Americanisms: <i>burglarize</i>	232
7.2.1.6.	<i>Less than</i>	241
7.2.1.7.	The double negative	250
7.2.1.8.	The dangling participle	260
7.2.1.9.	<i>I for me</i>	269
7.2.1.10.	Split infinitive	278
7.2.1.11.	<i>Literally</i> as an intensifier	288
7.3.	Concluding Remarks	298
8.	CURRENT USAGE ATTITUDES IN ENGLAND: THE ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE (PART TWO)	301
8.1.	Introduction	301
8.2.	Meta-Societal Treatment Analysis of Comments on English Usage	301
8.3.	The State of the English Language	309
8.4.	Concluding Remarks	316
9.	CURRENT USAGE ATTITUDES IN ENGLAND: THE INTERVIEW SESSIONS	317
9.1.	Introduction	317
9.2.	Results of the Interview Sessions in the “Golden Triangle”	317
9.2.1.	Open-guise test	320
9.2.2.	Usage judgment test	334
9.3.	Concluding Remarks	344
10.	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	347
10.1.	Introduction	347
10.2.	The Social Stratification of Usage Attitudes in England	348
10.2.1.	Self-presentation, distancing and linguistic identity	359
10.2.2.	Resurgence of prescriptive attitudes	364
10.3.	Usage Tendencies: a Comparison with the Mittins Study	367
10.4.	The Role of Education in the Usage Debate	371
10.5.	Testing Usage Attitudes	374
10.6.	Concluding Remarks	376
11.	CONCLUSION	379
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	391
	APPENDICES	409
A	Introductory Text to Proper English Usage Survey	409
B	Open-Guise Rating Sheet	410
C	Usage Judgment Test Letter	411
D	Usage Rules	412
E	Interview Question Topics	414

F	Description of Sentence-initial <i>And</i> and <i>Very Unique</i>	415
G	Overview of Interview Session Informants' Ages	423
H	Overview of Treatment of Usage Problems in HUGE	424
I	Professions of Questionnaire Respondents	425
J	Themes Identified in Respondents' Comments	426
SAMENVATTING		429
CURRICULUM VITAE		435

Acknowledgements

In the following section, I would like to thank some people who have contributed to varying extents to the realisation of this thesis.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor and co-promotor for their guidance and advice, as well as the members of the Bridging the Unbridgeable project for their input at various stages of my PhD endeavour. In particular, I thank Inge Otto, student assistant in the project and dear friend, who has always been on hand with word and deed for which I am very grateful. I would also like to express my gratitude to fellow PhDs at Leiden University and Queen Mary University of London, most notably Lena Karavovskaya, Matthias Pache and Nurenzia Yannuar.

Secondly, I am very grateful for the statistical support and advice I have received from Mathijs Deen and Dr. Wouter Weeda. I am, however, the only person responsible for any flaws in this thesis. I also owe my gratitude to Prof. Charlotte Brewer, Adrian du Plessis and Jonathan Robinson for helping with the distribution of my survey. I would also like to thank Dr. Colleen Cotter, and Dr. Barbara Soukup for their input and comments on parts of my methodology. I am forever grateful to all of my informants and respondents without whom this thesis would have not been possible.

Last but certainly not least, I would like to thank my family and friends near and far for their support, encouraging words and kind gestures.

Abbreviations

AmE	American English
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
BNC	British National Corpus
BrE	British English
<i>CGEL</i>	<i>The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language</i>
CMC	Computer-mediated communication
COCA	Corpus of Contemporary American English
COHA	Corpus of Historical American English
GCE	General Certificate of Education
GCSE	General Certificate of Secondary Education
HND	Higher National Diploma
HUGE	Hyper Usage Guide of English
KMO	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measures
Mdn	Median
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
ONS	Office for National Statistics
OR	Odds Ratio
PEU	Proper English Usage
POS	Parts-of-speech
RP	Received Pronunciation
SPaG	Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar test
U3A	University of the Third Age

List of Figures

Figure 3.1 ABC model of attitudes	67
Figure 3.2 Latent Process Viewpoint (Oskamp & Schultz, 2005)	68
Figure 3.3 Preston's (2010, p. 101) Language Regard concept	77
Figure 4.1 Language usage vs. language use	94
Figure 5.1 The nine administrative regions of England	119
Figure 5.2 Ethnic groups in the Golden Triangle based on ONS 2015a	121
Figure 5.3 Screenshot of the survey question on <i>data are</i>	128
Figure 5.4 Usage guides included in HUGE	140
Figure 7.1 Contextual acceptability in percentages: <i>differently than</i>	189
Figure 7.2 Diachronic treatment of <i>different(ly) than</i> in British publications	198
Figure 7.3 Contextual acceptability in percentages: <i>data are</i>	206
Figure 7.4 Diachronic treatment of <i>data is</i> in British publications	212
Figure 7.5 Contextual acceptability in percentages: <i>go slow</i>	216
Figure 7.6 Diachronic treatment of flat adverbs in British English	222
Figure 7.7 Contextual acceptability in percentages: <i>like</i>	227
Figure 7.8 Contextual acceptability in percentages: <i>burglarize</i>	234
Figure 7.9 Contextual Acceptability in percentages: <i>less than</i>	243
Figure 7.10 Diachronic treatment of <i>less than</i> in British publications	248
Figure 7.11 Contextual acceptability in percentages: double negative	253
Figure 7.12 Diachronic treatment of double negatives in British publications	258
Figure 7.13 Contextual acceptability in percentages: dangling participle	262
Figure 7.14 Diachronic treatment of dangling participles in British publications	266
Figure 7.15 Contextual acceptability in percentages: <i>I for me</i>	271
Figure 7.16 Diachronic treatment of <i>between you and I</i> in British publications	277
Figure 7.17 Contextual acceptability in percentages: split infinitive	281
Figure 7.18 Diachronic treatment of the split infinitive in British publications	286
Figure 7.19 Contextual acceptability in percentages: <i>literally</i>	291
Figure 7.20 Diachronic treatment of the <i>literally</i> as an intensifier in British publications	297
Figure 9.1 Degrees of salience of usage problems (raw figures in bars)	335
Figure 9.2 Informants' rule agreement categorisation (raw figures in bars)	341
Figure 9.3 Comparison between salience and rule agreement	342

Figure 10.1 Usage advice per decade for the nine usage problems
investigated

365

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Usage problems investigated	13
Table 4.1 Comparison of five usage studies	113
Table 5.1 Stimuli included in the online questionnaire with counterparts of previous studies	125
Table 5.2 Part 2 of the Proper English Usage survey: language statements	130
Table 5.3 Unmarked and marked open-guise test utterances (usage controversy in bold)	134
Table 7.1 Full sample breakdown	178
Table 7.2 Proportionally stratified sample breakdown	178
Table 7.3 Comparative overview of samples and the 2011 Census data (%)	180
Table 7.4 PEU stratified sample respondents' ethnicities in percentages (raw figures in brackets)	181
Table 7.5 PEU respondents' linguistic background in percentages (raw figures in brackets)	181
Table 7.6 PEU respondents' education level in percentages (raw figures in brackets)	182
Table 7.7 PEU categorisation: university-educated vs non-university-educated (raw figures in brackets)	182
Table 7.8 Overview of <i>different than</i> and <i>differently than</i> in BNC and COCA	186
Table 7.9 Results of binary logistic regression: <i>differently than</i>	188
Table 7.10 Treatment of <i>different than</i> ("criticised", "neutral", "advocated" and "not mentioned") in British publications	197
Table 7.11 Overview of <i>data is</i> and <i>data are</i> in BNC and COCA	200
Table 7.12 Overview of <i>data is</i> and <i>data are</i> in COHA by decade since 1810	201
Table 7.13 Overview of <i>data is</i> and <i>data are</i> in Hansard Corpus	202
Table 7.14 Results of binary logistic regression: <i>data are</i>	204
Table 7.15 Treatment of <i>data are</i> ("criticised", "neutral", "advocated" and "not mentioned") in British publications	211
Table 7.16 Results of binary logistic regression: <i>go slow</i>	215
Table 7.17 Treatment of flat adverbs ("criticised", "neutral" and "advocated") in British publications	221
Table 7.18 Results of binary logistic regression: <i>like</i>	226
Table 7.19 Results of binary logistic regression: <i>burglarize</i>	233
Table 7.20 Overview of Americanisms discussed in British publications	238
Table 7.21 Results of binary logistic regression: <i>less than</i>	242

Table 7.22 Treatment of <i>less than</i> (“criticised”, “neutral”, and “advocated”) in British publications	248
Table 7.23 Results of binary logistic regression: double negative	252
Table 7.24 Treatment of double negative (“criticised” and “neutral” only) in British publications	258
Table 7.25 Results of binary logistic regression: dangling participle	261
Table 7.26 Treatment of the dangling participle (“criticised” and “neutral” only) in British publications	266
Table 7.27 Results of binary logistic regression: <i>between you and I</i>	270
Table 7.28 Treatment of <i>between you and I</i> (“criticised” and “neutral” only) in British publications	276
Table 7.29 Top 4 split infinitives and their prescribed variants (raw figures in parenthesis, BNC subsection with highest normalised frequencies in bold)	279
Table 7.30 Treatment of the split infinitive (“criticised”, “neutral” and “advocated”) in British publications	285
Table 7.31 Results of binary logistic regression: <i>literally</i>	290
Table 7.32 Treatment of <i>literally</i> (“criticised”, “neutral” and “advocated”) in British publications	296
Table 8.1 Agreement with statements in percentages	303
Table 8.2 Correlations between the usage judgment index and agreement ratings, ordered by statistical significance (<i>p</i> -value)	307
Table 9.1 Quota sampling for interview session	318
Table 9.2 KMO measures and Bartlett’s test of sphericity	321
Table 9.3 Factor composition and factor loadings	322
Table 9.4 Wilcoxon signed-rank test results by gender	328
Table 9.5 Wilcoxon signed-rank test results by age group	330
Table 9.6 Significant correlations between salience of usage problems and age	336
Table 9.7 Results of Mann Whitney <i>U</i> -tests for gender and usage problem’s noticing	339
Table 9.8 Results of the correlation test between salience judgment and rule agreement	343
Table 10.1 Overview of the eleven usage problems investigated in the questionnaire (Chapter 7)	351
Table 10.2 Comparison of my own survey with Mittins et al.’s (1970) <i>Attitudes to English Usage</i>	369

