

## INTRODUCTION

MALCAH YAEGER-DROR

I will begin this Introduction with a somewhat unorthodox explanation of how I came to the conclusion that studies like this one are important to the field of sociolinguistics. I will then define relevant *terminology* for the phenomena which will be discussed in the papers in this issue, and describe some *field methods* which are useful for such analysis. This background will provide a framework within which the papers can be shown to be *relevant to the definitions*, and to this frontier area of *sociolinguistic study*. I hope to make the case that more work in this area is needed for meaningful sociolinguistic analysis to be possible.

### **An aside: my personal perspective**

As a student, I discovered that analysis of a style continuum revealed that as speech became more 'careful' the linguistic shift was not always in the expected direction, nor was it always possible to characterize stylistic change in word lists as 'conscious' (Yaeger, 1974). I found that even in the English speaking communities which I studied,<sup>1</sup> the direction of shift could not be determined without recourse to what Bell (1984) labeled 'referee design', as well as other social psychological motivating factors (Giles *et al.*, 1977).

Unfortunately, in recent years, these social psychologically relevant analytical resources have been untapped. During the 1970s and 1980s researchers took advantage of the burst of innovation in acoustic analysis techniques, carrying out unistyle acoustic analysis of a given vernacular or group of vernaculars, to discover 'secular linguistic' typological rules. Along with my colleagues, I spent the 1970s and 1980s doing narrow acoustic analyses of a range of social dialects to determine the underlying phonological patterns. However, my field studies in what I came to consider relatively 'complex' communities kept reminding me that 'style', apparent '*hypercorrection*', and 'conscious' change were not as transparent concepts as they were believed to be.

Montreal French became a focus of my concern because of possible anomalies in the chain shifting pattern (relative to our understanding at the time). It soon became clear that while most American English speakers appear only slightly ambivalent about what they consider to be their dialect, Québec speakers during the 1970s were undergoing a major change in their attitudes toward themselves *vis-à-vis* the local English speaking population (generally referred to as 'Anglophones'), as well as *vis-à-vis* the speakers of what we will refer to, following Flikeid (this issue) as Normative French: that being the Continental French equivalent of what Di Paolo (this issue) refers to as 'Broadcaster-ese' (American English), Baugh (this issue) refers to as 'Standard (American) English', and Bell and Garrett (this issue) refer to as 'RP', or 'BBC (British) English'. The complex attitudes of the Québec

---

Correspondence relating to this paper should be addressed to Dr Malcah Yaeger-Dror, Department of Linguistics, University of Arizona, AZ 85721, U.S.A.

speakers *vis-à-vis* their own dialect emphasized the importance of expanding our understanding of *hypercorrection* to include cases where speakers correct away from rather than toward the standard, or ‘normative’ dialect; new, more articulated terminology, and more elaborated data gathering techniques were both obviously necessary to adequately analyze Québec speech attitudes and their influence on speech.

As the Québec language attitudes changed during the late 1970s and early 1980s (Levine, 1990; Yaeger-Dror and Kemp, 1992; Sankoff *et al.*, 1989), it was inevitable that the speech deemed appropriate for both ingroup and outgroup communication would change, and the ‘corrective’ ‘mistakes’—which occur as speakers approximate evolving vernacular norms—would reveal interesting and informative patterns. There was ample evidence that speakers were still attracted to normative usage; at the same time, there was evidence that along with the anti-Anglophone political rhetoric (Levine, 1990), speakers were evolving a newer separatist set of linguistic conventions. Both complex political and social psychological motivations appear to be involved in the choice of adaptive strategies chosen by the speakers (Kemp, 1981; Sankoff *et al.*, 1989; Bourhis, 1984, 1989).

To provide perspective on this phenomenon, I searched the literature to find other ‘sightings’ of such complex sociolinguistic perspectives; aside from the work of the Milroys in Belfast (1985), I found no helpful linguistic analyses, so I began to study the speech of another group which has a great deal of ambivalence toward their dialect, due to complex political and social psychological motivations (Ben Rafael, 1982; 1989). I found that Israeli Hebrew speakers who speak Arabic natively also reveal ambivalence in their choice of phonology. Quantitative evidence supports the hypothesis that both affiliative and separatist motives are involved, and that members of the community alter their speech radically when talking to different people in different social settings (Yaeger-Dror, 1988, 1991).

Continued literature searches reveal few linguistic studies confirming that the evidence of social psychological complexity found in Québec French and Israeli Hebrew speaking communities reflects a more generally complex political and social reality. Only in the late 1980s, researchers came to the conclusion that speakers could simultaneously diverge from and converge toward ‘Standard’ American dialects (Butters, 1987, 1989). Several recent volumes have documented the motivating factors behind language variation: see Giles and Coupland (1988, 1991), Bell and Holmes (1990), and Giles *et al.* (1991), Eckert (1991) and Biber and Finegan (1992). However, none of them has focused directly on hypercorrective language use, as diagnostic of such motivation.

The present issue was initially proposed by Joshua Fishman to permit a forum for discussion of an expanded understanding of *hypercorrection/hyperaccommodation*, from the linguists’ perspective. Part of the results are now before you. They show that the social psychological complexity I heard in Québécois and Israeli speech can be found in other groups as well. Each of these authors has studied a speech community in which the field situation has what I will come to describe as *hyperaccommodative* usage. Each author here distinguishes the motivation for the change s/he studied from the motivation for change discussed in earlier work, expanding our perspective on the social motivation for variation. These studies make it possible to chart the conditions under which linguistic variation leads to language change.

### **Terminology**

Labov (1966a, 1972) argued that *hypercorrection* is of interest to the sociolinguist because it can help reveal

- (1) the relative insecurity of different socioeconomic groups,
- (2) speakers' attitudes toward different subgroups within the society,
- (3) speakers' attitudes toward different dialect features (which are associated with these groups), and
- (4) the direction of linguistic change.

Any individual who uses a linguistic variable more than those s/he is emulating (for whatever reason) is *hypercorrecting*. As a rule, the examples of this type of variation are chosen from Labov's work on Martha's Vineyard (1963, 1972), or New York City (1966a, 1972) speech. Examples cited usually include reintroduction of 'r' into formerly 'r-less' dialect areas—when a self-conscious speaker uses a more 'r-ful' pronunciation in careful styles than speakers from that community who are comfortable with an 'r-ful' pronunciation. We have come to recognize this as the 'cross-over' principle which Labov used to characterize a self-conscious group of speakers.

Janda and Auger (this issue), who provide the most elaborated taxonomy of *hypercorrection* types, classify this as *quantitative hypercorrection*. Their study also appears to rely on a neat parallel between economic class of provenance for a change and conscious choice. Labov assumed a direct connection between these parameters when he chose the terminological dichotomy 'change from above' and 'change from below'; this point will be discussed further below, since it is an important point to be considered when reading the papers which follow.

Another form of *hypercorrection* discussed in this issue reveals even less contact with a prestigious variety: this Janda and Auger term *qualitative hypercorrection*. A new (innovative) form arises when speakers attempt to emulate a language or dialect with which they are unfamiliar. A common example cited for this form of *hypercorrection* is the introduction of 'r' into inappropriate contexts—e.g. 'the *idea-r-is*', where any speaker with a native competence knows that '*idea*' does not end in 'r'. Both their study (of intrusive (h)—as in '*ead(h)ache*'—in French accented English), and Flikeid's (of the creation of new morphological forms for certain verbs in Acadian French) come to grips with the need for an appropriate terminology for the analysis of such data, even though often (as in the Janda and Auger study) the total number of occurrences of the innovative variant is extremely small, or (as in Flikeid's study) the total number of communities which adapt their speech according to this rule is small.

#### *Relevance of these studies to the definition*

In the papers which follow, Labov's definition of *hypercorrection* has been adapted, qualified, or changed, to fit the needs of each individual study. In the course of these studies, the 'classic' terminology (e.g. '(hyper)correction') was found to be inadequate.

In some cases the 'correction' is toward what is presumed to be a more prestigious variety.

(1) French speakers of English 'correct' toward [their perception of] (h) use by native speakers (Janda/Auger).

(2) Acadian speakers of French 'correct' toward what appears to be their internalized morphology for 'Normative French' (Flikeid).

(3) Utah Vernacular speakers of English 'correct' toward what they perceive to be a more normative dialect of English, which includes the merger of (a) and (o) (Di Paolo).

Although Di Paolo's work comes closest to matching the definition for *quantitative hypercorrection*, she finds that the speakers are adapting to a norm which may exist (Herold, 1990; Labov, 1991), but which is not generally considered prestigious, certainly not based on economic class considerations; consequently, she felt that a terminological choice involving 'correction' is inadequate for her needs.

In other cases, the speakers are clearly accommodating to a dialect which is less prestigious.

(1) Learners of English as a second language do not 'correct' toward the normative dialect of the language (Garrett).

(2) African American speakers of standard American English, appear to 'correct' away from the standard, and are ultimately perceived as accommodating to Afro-American English or 'correcting' toward the dialect because of its apparent social psychological 'gestalt' in North American culture (Baugh, this issue; see also Rickford and McNair-Knox, 1992).<sup>2</sup>

(3) Speakers of Australian English go even further in advertisements. Bell (this issue) discusses several refinements on his former taxonomy of referee design. In the process, he presents a number of reasons why speakers might choose to accommodate their speech to models which are only poorly understood, in order to influence the opinions of their listeners.

We see that while half of these studies can be made to fit into the procrustean bed of 'correction', the other half cannot. Appropriate terminology critical to the analysis either must be newly coined, or borrowed from other fields, even for some of the studies which initially appear to follow the older terminology.

(4) Consequently, we have been very lucky that Howard Giles, the man who has shown the importance of linguistic data to the study of social psychology, is willing to contribute to this issue, in which linguists are newly coming to grips with the need to make social psychological data relevant to the study of sociolinguistics. Hopefully his contribution will direct our research more toward fleshing out the accommodative perspective on the linguistic problems which will be discussed.

*Terminological change.* Given that the underlying theme of the studies collected here is that speech varies with the speaker's motivation, and given that the shift is not always in the direction of a normative variety, I propose to adapt the terminology of the social psychologists to sociolinguistic needs, since I feel that if terminology could be adapted to focus more specifically on the interactional parameters involved, as both Giles (from the perspective of social psychology) and Bell (from the perspective of sociolinguistics) have advocated, the redefinitions would hopefully motivate us to incorporate this analytical perspective in our research design.

Giles *et al.* (1977) propose the term '*accommodation*' to include both '*convergence*', or movement toward an interlocutor's speech patterns, and '*divergence*', or movement away from that speech variety. Following this pattern, '*hyperaccommodation*' is the shift toward or away from a given speech variety (for social reasons which need to be determined), creating linguistic patterns which overshoot the speech in that target variety. The speech which results differs from all possibly emulable dialects, by overshooting the linguistic target in one or more ways.

Most of the papers here document ways in which accommodative behavior leads to ungrammatical behavior: while the underlying understanding for *quantitative hypercorrection* which underlies studies of the '*cross-over principle*' is that the *hypercorrective* form exists in the language which the speaker is emulating, in many cases of what Janda and Auger will term '*qualitative hypercorrection*' it is the changes which clearly do not occur in the target/emulated language which give a clue that this form of accommodation is taking place. This is true of intrusive (*h*) in French learners' English (Janda and Auger), as well as plural markings of third person verbs in Acadian (Flikeid), many of the would-be speech patterns of language-learners' '*hypercorrective*' register (Garrett), and the forms used by Black and White speakers emulating Afro-American English [AAEV] (Baugh).

### Field method(s)/technique(s)

Labov's analysis of *hypercorrection* required a *multi-style analysis* of vernacular speech (1966a, b), and/or attitude studies of perception tests (1972). The methods he proposed, combined with the methods used by Trudgill (1974), can still be considered the most sophisticated techniques for the analysis of any *hypercorrective* usage. Both Labov and Trudgill took advantage of *multiple guise listening tests* along with other social psychological methods proposed by Giles and his coworkers (Giles *et al.*, 1977; Lambert, 1979) in order to clarify the underlying motivation for language variation and change. They also made use of judicious self-report information (Labov, 1972; Trudgill, 1972, 1983, 1986). The key ingredient for each of these techniques is *variation*. A cookbook would direct:

Find any interactive parameter which correlates with systematic linguistic variation. Vary that parameter systematically while quantitatively measuring speech variation along that parameter. Appropriate parameters might include

- (1) age (for language change),
- (2) gender,
- (3) socioeconomic level,
- (4) ethnic affiliation,
- (5) style (for self-consciousness),
- (6) register, and
- (7) co-participant variation (for accommodative perspective).

Although, in the 1990s we systematically vary age, gender, socioeconomic level, and even (where relevant) ethnic affiliation, unfortunately, systematic analysis of style-, register-, or co-participant-related variation has not been commonly used in recent years (cf. comments in Rickford and McNair-Knox, 1992). Several researchers have independently come to the conclusion that the motivations of speakers must be analyzed in greater detail than we have recently considered necessary (cf., for example, Romaine, 1982; Biber and Finegan, 1992, especially Rickford and McNair-Knox; Giles and Coupland, 1988, 1991; Giles *et al.*, 1991). These studies reflect that new trend.

Each of these studies makes use of analytical tools discussed above to access information relevant to accommodative usage. All use some form of variation built into the research design, although only two studies use the multiple guise techniques which were designed for the analysis of accommodative motivation.

Bell varies his interactional situation as systematically as possible, by judging how

advertisements for different products, or in different registers (e.g. song vs speech) can influence the choice of dialect variables.

Two of the papers here analyze the speech of second language speakers. One of these (Garrett) makes extensive use of Giles' techniques to understand the degree to which language attitudes may be influencing the speech of language learners, while the other (Janda and Auger) is more interested in the linguistic aspects of the accommodative behavior, than in the social attitudes which trigger such behavior.

Janda and Auger use multi-style analysis, to determine how style variation influences accommodative behavior: whether the intrusive (*h*) is more common in more self-conscious styles.

Flikeid follows Douglas-Cowie (1978), in collecting data from different social situations, to determine how the presence of different interlocutors influences speech. She also adapts the quintessential sociolinguistic tool—variable rule analysis (Sankoff, 1988; Sankoff and Rand, 1991)—both to measure the linguistic variation, and to clarify social psychological motivation.

Both Garrett and Di Paolo make innovative use of the twin guise—actually triple guise—methodology, recording tapes to be judged for their social psychological characteristics. In the process they vary the speech (guises), as well as the linguistic and social background of the listeners.

The studies use variationist techniques to explore speakers' motivation as an influence on speech variation.

Giles and Williams' contribution presents a reasoned perspective on the work in this issue, from the perspective of Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT). The paper points out ways in which sociolinguistic methodology can answer questions which Speech Accommodation theorists consider important, and ways in which SAT research tools are useful to answer sociolinguistic problems. Hopefully, this work will both provide new and renewed models for how we may incorporate motivation into our research design, and new examples of ways in which speakers are motivated to adapt speech to their listeners' or to some abstract 'prestige' model. The researchers whose work is presented here attempt to make the most of the data found in what I will be referring to as *hyperaccommodative* speech to attempt to solve two common riddles: what motivates speakers to choose to speak the way they do? and how does that motivation impact on language change?

### **The relevance of these studies to our understanding of sociolinguistics**

The studies which appear here have been used to interpret either the course of language change (in Flikeid's and Di Paolo's studies), or the social psychological attitudes which influence speakers' use of their language (in all of the studies). One motivation for collecting these papers is to find ways to interpret sociolinguistic data to clarify their social psychological underpinnings.

All of the studies presented here differ in one main respect from most previously published work. In each case, the direction of variation (whether or not it leads to long-term change) is not toward what is often referred to as the 'prestigious' or 'normative' form.

In some papers (Flikeid, Baugh, Bell, and Janda and Auger) the speakers do not have sufficient acquaintance with the form which they are emulating, and a new form develops.

Flikeid found that in an isolated Acadian community, the speakers who have an intermediate amount of contact with so-called Normative French speakers attempt to emulate what they consider to be the Normative dialect, creating their own form, and using it quite often, especially when talking to speakers of the emulated dialect; Acadian French speakers' ambivalence about their own linguistic heritage *vis-à-vis* a more 'Normative' French heritage is revealed by their development of a new form which conforms neither to the stigmatized Acadian form, nor to the Normative form. Similar findings have been published for Newfoundland French (King, 1980).

Baugh hypothesizes that Afro-American speakers of the standard dialect emulate a stigmatized Afro-American English dialect for complex social psychological reasons. This hypothesis is substantiated by recent quantitative evidence for elaborated referee design of Afro-American English features in the speech of Black Americans (Rickford and McNair-Knox, 1992).

Bell demonstrates that in New Zealand advertisements speakers will emulate a 'foreign' dialect whose speakers are stereotypically considered knowledgeable about what they are advertising, even if the dialect is poorly mimicked. However, he also points out that foreign dialects are also emulated in the media purely for the salience which the foreign 'accent' or language lends to the 'sound bite'.

Janda and Auger discuss the evidence that second language speakers of English whose first language is French 'forget' *h*, as we would expect, but also insert *h* where it is inappropriate in English. One of the points which came out of their study is that in their corpus, inappropriate changes occur much less frequently than the quantitative hypercorrective changes studied by Labov; they hypothesize that to be the reason why it has been much less studied by sociolinguists.

The Québec speakers are much more consistent (*h*) forgetters than the speakers from France, but there does not seem to be any difference between the two groups' use of intrusive (*h*). In addition, if intrusive (*h*) is considered hypercorrective, the percentage should rise in Word List Style. However, only half of the speakers actually increase intrusive (*h*) in a more 'careful' style.

Garrett, whose paper is reminiscent of earlier work by Ryan (1979, 1986), hypothesizes that non-native speakers avoid the use of the prestigious RP dialect, and retain (apparently) stigmatized foreign features because native speakers appear to be more supportive of them if they do not appear to control RP phonology. Although Garrett would have expected English language learners to emulate a normative dialect, he found that the test-guise which did use a pseudo-RP, normative phonology was clearly downgraded by both native speakers of British English, and by the language learners themselves. Note that while Garrett's study does not rule out the possibility that speakers' non-RP phonology is partly related to language interference from their first language, his use of the multiple guise technique helps him to learn that speaker motivation (and listener attitudes) definitely are at issue. Traditional studies of interference would not have provided sufficient evidence to permit these conclusions.

Di Paolo demonstrates that the Utah-area English phonological preferences are directly correlated with the social prestige attributed to those who used those variables. There have been many recent studies of the (ɑ)/(ɔ) merger in different U.S. dialects; Di Paolo hypothesizes that the Utah speakers neutralize the (ɑ) and (ɔ) contrast in situations in which

the word classes are salient, because they believe that the merged pronunciation is more prestigious than their usual pronunciation. Her multiple guise study finds that native speakers of this near merger dialect react most positively to speech which does not appear to differentiate these two variables, and least favorably to speech which clearly does differentiate the two vowels, although their own dialect does not merge the vowels. Note that Di Paolo's use of the multiple guise technique permits us to understand the motivation of speakers and listeners from different backgrounds, which we would not otherwise have been able to study.

The present researchers have made innovative use of research design, adapting their tools to the needs of their studies, and 'massaging' both the data they collected and the available definitions, to position their own data within a broader perspective of linguistic study; their papers recognize that the quantitative methods initially applied by Labov to one type of linguistic variation can be adapted for meaningful analysis of different types of variation. The evidence which they present permits us to entertain some interesting hypotheses relative to the theoretical issues which are of concern here. In fact, the more our studies expand our perspective, the more they enrich the accepted theories.

*Hyperaccommodation as a form of self-conscious/insecure behavior.* Consider for a moment the attitude which hypercorrection was used to reveal—linguistic insecurity. Labov (1972) showed that in New York society both the lower middle class and women can be considered self-conscious, since both of these groups display clear *hypercorrective* tendencies, by 'crossing over' to a more prestigious phonological usage in self-conscious speech. Those who were making a conscious choice to return to Martha's Vineyard (or not to leave it), were those who were self-conscious enough to 'cross over' to a strong 'Islander' phonology. Labov (1966a, 1972) also showed that self-report data are not only unreliable, but are less reliable (rather than more so) for more self-conscious speakers. Consequently, especially in societies with extensive *hypercorrection*, we must make the best of the hypercorrective data, to assist us in the understanding of a community's cognitive interpretation of their dialect and variation within the dialect.

Flikeid shows that it is the most ambivalent group (older workers, from a community with an intermediate amount of contact with the 'Normative' French speaking community) who develop, and even appear to regularize, innovative morphological forms. Di Paolo shows that a group of speakers from a near merger dialect area respect apparent merger more than speakers who have merged (ɑ) and (ɔ). Baugh shows that it is speakers who are ambivalent about their own position in the evolving politic of AAE society who appear most prone to accommodate their speech so radically to AAE dialect that they create new forms. Bell shows that in a country with very little dialect variation, and (apparently) a low self-image relative to other English speaking communities, foreign accents are often used in advertisements. In short, all of these studies confirm earlier conclusions, that hyperaccommodative behavior takes place in the speech of self-conscious speakers.

Another underlying question will be raised in the following studies: how much can *hyperaccommodation* influence the direction of actual language change?

*Unconscious language change, or 'merely' variation?* Ferguson (1983) described 'sociolinguistic folklore', which presupposes that while changes from below lead to language change, changes from above [among which *hypercorrection* is theoretically included] are

sporadic and do not become part of the language. The papers presented here in large part confirm this folkloric tenet: the tendencies which ‘cross over’ and do lead to change (like the pending merger which Di Paolo analyzes), appear to be unconscious, while those which remain peripheral to the language, effecting at most a few words or morphemes (like the morphological adaptations documented in Flikeid, and metatheses documented in philology which appear to follow Janda and Auger’s ‘*eadhache*’ example) initially appear to be conscious. However, both conscious and unconscious accommodation takes place: this provides an additional motivation for changing the terminology—since ‘correction’ implies conscious choice, while ‘accommodation’ or ‘adaptation’ does not.

The conclusion that what initially appears to be ‘correction’ is often not conscious can be found in earlier studies as well (Bell, 1984, 1985; Milroy and Milroy, 1985; Trudgill, 1986; Prince, 1987; Yaeger-Dror, 1991). Both the Flikeid and Janda and Auger papers support claims made earlier by Prince (1987) and Yaeger-Dror (1988, 1991) that the relationship of the hypercorrective tendency to actually occurring forms in the language may be diagnostically useful in judging the motivation.

*Accommodation: a matter of conscious choice?* This issue is dedicated to studies of variation which reveal *hyperaccommodative* tendencies of either sort. As more data are analyzed, it becomes increasingly clear that more social psychological and interactional variables must be taken into consideration if we want to understand this type of variation. In fact, this issue became possible because increasing acquaintance with complex field situations entailed that the questions raised by Labov required increasingly complex answers.

Even the most straightforward cases of style shift often include variation which is not necessarily self-conscious (Yaeger, 1974). Elaborated analysis of the lexical (Prince, 1987), focal (Yaeger-Dror, 1991) and interactional (Flikeid, this issue; Milroy and Milroy, 1985; Trudgill, 1983, 1986) locus of change in what at first appears to be self-conscious hypercorrective speech, often reveals that the change could not be self-conscious. More studies are needed to clarify how change takes place.

### **Future agenda/visionary statement**

Sociolinguistic analysis has a dual role: on the one hand, linguistic analysis of data from a variety of different social settings can clarify the typological rules for linguistic variation and change. While recently variable data have been used primarily to develop an adequate phonological theory, they can also be used for the analysis of syntax, semantics and lexicon. The more research situations which are analyzed, the more clearly we can formulate a typologically useful linguistic theory to adequately accommodate linguistic structure, variation and change. As we look at the analyses in the coming papers, we discover new questions, which hopefully will form the basis of more advanced theories in the near future.

On the other hand, as some of these studies have shown, a meaningful understanding of language change requires analysis of the *motivation* behind the variation found in *speech*. As we know, *speech* can be heard, measured, and analyzed, while *motivation* is much more elusive. In all cases studied here, the social psychological motivation for the change is quite complex; the hyperaccommodative behavior helps clarify the motivation, and trace the change.

The challenge which we face in the coming years is to make good use of

- (1) the definitions which can help us look for meaningful data,
- (2) the techniques for the analysis of variable speech which already have been shown to reveal motivational factors, and
- (3) the psychological tests which can be implemented to clarify why certain changes are taking place.

The papers by Bell, and by Giles and Williams propose some directions for future inquiry. If we take advantage of their advice and expertise, we will not only be able to understand the motivation behind language change, we will learn to understand language change itself, better than we have before.

*Acknowledgements*—I would like to thank all of those who made this issue possible. I am especially grateful to William Labov, Howard Giles, and Allan Bell, who evolved the terminology and research foci which make these papers possible, to Joshua Fishman, without whose impetus these papers would not have been solicited, and to the editors of this journal, who helped facilitate an early publication date for the work; I would also like to thank Sherry Ash, Chet Creider, Larry Davis, Dick Demers, Kerry Green, Bob Hoberman, Marcy Morgan, Candy Goodwin, Dick Oehrle, Bea Oshika, Suzanne Romaine, Linda Shockey, Pierrette Thibault, and Tom Veatch whose input has been so helpful over the last months. And of course, I would like to thank the contributors, whose work you will find on the coming pages. We are all 'in this together' trying to expand the frontiers of sociolinguistic analysis.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> I say 'even' because it was clear that the communities whose speech I was analyzing did not have what I will come to call 'complex'-conflicted motivations, like those described for Afro-American English (Butters, 1987, 1989; Rickford and McNair-Knox, 1992; Baugh, this issue), or British dialects (Milroy and Milroy 1985; Trudgill 1972, 1983, 1986).

<sup>2</sup>This convergence toward Afro-American English is not limited to Afro-American speakers, or even to American speakers (Trudgill, 1983; Bell, this issue).

## REFERENCES

- BELL, A. 1984 Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13, 145–204.
- BELL, A. 1985 One rule of news English: geographical, social and historical spread. *Te Reo* 28, 95–117.
- BELL, A. 1991 *The Language of News Media*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- BELL, A. and HOLMES, J. (Eds) 1990 *New Zealand Ways of Speaking English*. Multilingual Matters, Philadelphia.
- BEN RAFAEL, E. 1982 *The Emergence of Ethnicity: Cultural Groups and Social Conflict in Israel*. Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut.
- BEN RAFAEL, E. 1989 Acculturation and assimilation in comparative perspective. In Kaplan, Y. and Stern, M. (Eds), *Acculturation and Assimilation*. Shazar Institute, Jerusalem.
- BIBER, D. and FINEGAN, E. 1992 To appear. Parallel patterns in social dialect and register variation: towards an integrated theory. In Biber, D. and Finegan, E. (Eds), *Perspectives on Register: Situating Register Variation Within Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- BIBER, D. and FINEGAN, E. (Eds) To appear. *Perspectives on Register: Situating Register Variation Within Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- BOURHIS, R. 1984 *Conflict and Language Planning in Quebec*. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, U.K.
- BOURHIS, R. 1989 Bilingual communication in organizational settings. In Toomey, S. and Korzenny, F. (Eds), *Language, Communication and Culture*, pp. 244–264. Sage, Newbury Park, California.
- BUTTERS, R. (Ed.) 1987 Special Issue on Divergence and Convergence in AfroAmerican English. *American Speech*.
- BUTTERS, R. 1989 *The Death of Black English: Divergence and Convergence in Black and White Vernaculars*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt.

- DOUGLAS-COWIE E. 1978 Linguistic code-switching in a Northern Irish village. In Trudgill, P. (Ed.), *Sociolinguistic Patterns in British English*, pp. 37–51. Blackwell, Oxford.
- ECKERT, P. (Ed.) 1991 *New Ways of Analyzing Sound Change*. Academic Press, London.
- FERGUSON, C. 1983 LACUS meeting.
- GILES, H., BOURHIS, R. and TAYLOR, D. 1977 Toward a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In Giles, H. (Ed.), *Language Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*, pp. 307–349. Academic Press, London.
- GILES, H. and COUPLAND, N. (Eds) 1988 Special issue on Accommodation. *Language and Communication* 8 (3).
- GILES, H. and COUPLAND, N. 1991 *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Open University Press, Buckingham, U.K.
- GILES, H., COUPLAND, J. and COUPLAND, N. (Eds) 1991 *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- GILES, H. and JOHNSON, P. 1987 Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 68, 69–99.
- HEROLD, R. 1990 Mechanisms of merger. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- KEMP, W. 1981 Major sociolinguistic patterns in Montreal French. In Sankoff, D. and Cedergren, H. (Eds), *Variation Omnibus*, pp. 3–16. Linguistic Research, Edmonton.
- KING, R. 1980 Hypercorrection in Newfoundland French. In Kinloch, A. and House, A. (Eds), *Papers From the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association*, pp. 117–125. University of New Brunswick, Fredrickton.
- LABOV, W. 1963 Social motivation for a sound change. *Word* 19, 273–309.
- LABOV, W. 1966a Hypercorrection by the lower middle class as a factor in linguistic change. In Bright, W. (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics*, pp. 84–113. Mouton, The Hague.
- LABOV, W. 1966b *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.
- LABOV, W. 1972 *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- LABOV, W. 1981 Resolving the Neogrammarian controversy. *Language* 57, 267–308.
- LABOV, W. 1991 The three dialects of English. In Eckert, P. (Ed.), *New Ways of Analyzing Sound Change*, pp. 1–45. Academic Press, London.
- LAMBERT, W. 1979 Language as a factor in intergroup relations. In Giles, H. and St. Clair, R. (Eds), *Language and Social Psychology*, pp. 186–192. University Park Press, Baltimore.
- LEVINE, M. 1990 *The Reconquest of Montreal*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- MILROY, J. and MILROY, L. 1985 Linguistic change: social network and innovation. *Journal of Linguistics* 21, 339–384.
- PRINCE, E. 1987 Sara Gorby, Yiddish folksinger: a case study of dialect shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 67, 83–116.
- PRINCE, E. 1988 Accommodation theory and dialect shift. *Language and Communication* 8, 307–320.
- RICKFORD, J. and McNAIR-KNOX, F. 1992 Addressee- and topic-influenced style shift. To appear in Biber, D. and Finegan, E. (Eds), *Perspectives on Register*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- ROMAINE, S. 1982 (Ed.) *Sociolinguistic Communities*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- RYAN, E. 1979 Why do low prestige varieties persist? In Giles, H. and St. Clair, R. (Eds), *Language and Social Psychology*, pp. 145–157. University Park Press, Baltimore.
- RYAN, E. 1986 The social utility of maintaining an ethnic accent. (Ms.)
- SANKOFF, D., CEDEREGREN, H., KEMP, W., THIBAUT, P. and VINCENT, D. 1989 Montreal French: language, class and ideology. In Fasold, R. and Schiffrin, D. (Eds), *Language Change and Variation*, pp. 107–118. Benjamins, Philadelphia.
- SANKOFF, D. 1988 Variable rules. In Ammon, U., Dittmar, N. and Mattheier, K. (Eds), *Sociolinguistics: an International Handbook*, pp. 984–987. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- SANKOFF, D. and RAND, D. 1991 Documentation for Goldvarb. University of Montreal, Montreal.
- TRUDGILL, P. 1972. Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society* 1, 179–195.
- TRUDGILL, P. 1974 *Sociolinguistics*. Penguin, Harmondsworth, U.K.

- TRUDGILL, P. 1983 Acts of conflicting identity. In Trudgill, P. (Ed.), *On Dialect*, pp. 141–160. Blackwell, Oxford.
- TRUDGILL, P. 1986 *Dialects in Contact*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- YAEGER, M. 1974 Speaking style: some etic realizations and their significance. *Pennsylvania Working Papers on Linguistic Change and Variation I*, 1.
- YAEGER-DROR, M. 1988 The influence of changing group vitality on convergence toward a dominant linguistic norm. *Language and Communication* **8**, 285–306.
- YAEGER-DROR, M. 1989 Real time vs apparent time change in Montreal French. *York Papers in Linguistics* **13**, 141–154.
- YAEGER-DROR, M. 1991 Linguistic evidence for social psychological attitudes: hyperaccommodation of (r) by singers from a Mizrahi background. *Language and Communication* **11**, 309–331.
- YAEGER-DROR, M. and KEMP, W. 1992 Lexical classes in Montreal French: the case (e:). *Language and Speech* **35**, 251–294.