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that a CAT/ELIT analysis would provide a theoretical extension on the models proposed and that linguistic data would not only supplement the data presented but would be very useful in resolving the dilemmas of the present analysis.
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The book under review is of great interest to sociolinguists, social psychologists (of language), and sociologists (of language use). The editorial perspective of Allan Bell assures that it is of special interest to any of us concerned with the impact of attitudes toward one’s own group on the shaping of dialect, especially among speakers who see their ingroup as less good (along some social parameter) than those who speak differently. The works included here make abundantly clear that you need not belong to an “ethnic minority” group to wish to emulate the speech of some other group. The book is composed of three sections: “Attitudes Toward New Zealand English” (chapters 2-4), “Change and Variation in New Zealand English” (chapters 5-9), and “Pragmatic Analysis of New Zealand Discourse” (chapters 10-13). Each chapter has its own bibliography, and there is a helpful index for the entire work. The contributions in each section are considered in turn.

The three chapters in the first section—“Attitudes Toward New Zealand English” (NZE)—provide us with both a synchronic and a historical estimate of the attitudes of NZE speakers toward their own and other dialects. I was impressed with the breadth of the analysis and ashamed that I know of no New World English dialect for which such studies are available. As one would expect, the historical evidence (“This Objectionable Colonial Dialect: Historical and Contemporary Attitudes Toward New Zealand Speech,” by Gordon and Abell) gives the reader a sense of perspective on the attitudes expressed by contemporary dialect speakers (discussed in their chapter and in “Sociolinguis-
tic Stereotyping in New Zealand," by Vaughan and Huygens, and "'God Help Us if We All Sound Like This': Attitudes to New Zealand and Other English Accents," by Bayard). Inevitably, the historical evidence comes from orthoepists, not from "naive" dialect speakers, but how many British, Australian, or U.S. dialects have even one article presenting this important historical evidence, which is the only available information on sociolinguistic attitudes of older generations!? Even in French, where (I admit) the situation is better, evidence of language attitudes is very sparse and can only be found by turning to very abstruse philological studies (such as Thuot, 1881-1883). The fact that there are contemporary attitude studies from different New Zealand cities with different populations serves to make the additional point that social attitudes need not be identical within an entire linguistic area (even one as small as New Zealand) or across all age groups.

The synchronic evidence for attitudes toward NZE is based on attitude studies of student reactions to speech heard in an educational setting, and two of the three researchers attempt to distinguish their accent categories in ways that are useful to the linguist. The chapters are informed by the latest sophisticated methods available for the analysis of unconscious attitudes. As Holmes and Bell point out in their introduction, this type of evidence is still severely flawed by the obvious fact that high school and college students have (or, at least, express) attitudes much closer to the language policeman's than to the man on the street's. There are clear discrepancies between the data from different cities, and from speakers of different age groups, but there is no way of knowing which of the possibly relevant factors influences the results. Gordon and Abell propose that high school students will be most prescriptivist. Bayard's study investigates the attitudes of both high school and college students in his town, attempting to fill the gaps, and finds data that contradict Gordon and Abell's hypothesis. Nonetheless, these are much better data than are available for other English dialects, and all the studies combined give us a sense of perspective on how attitudes are related to speech data as well as to social parameters.

One of the most impressive aspects of this volume is the degree to which attitude studies are used to supplement the linguistic studies. It is highly commendable that Bell and Holmes have managed to include the attitude studies in the same volume with the studies of actual speech variation and change. Students of sociolinguistic variation in American English or French dialects should take a lesson from these studies. Negative attitudes toward a specific dialect feature should trigger a change from above to get rid of (or at least arrest the advance of) that feature, but very few studies can be found that actually analyze the influence of attitudes on language variation: It may well be that when, like here, the evidence is available to evaluate the hypothesis that corrective change from above advances in a dialect, we find that the evidence contradicts the theory: Just as [R] (velar or uvular r) was not corrected to [r] (postdental r) in French, despite the fact that prescriptivists regarded this sound as "ugly," "vulgar," and "like snoring," in NZE stigmatized features are not being eliminated. However, it takes a volume with both attitudinal and sound change articles to permit such conclusions to be drawn.

The second section, "Change and Variation in NZE," contains five chapters that give the uninitiated reader a cross section of the linguistic idiosyncrasies of the dialect; however, they are quite mixed in their level of sophistication.
Without the section on attitudes, the American reader (and I presume many British readers as well) would be hard put to classify whether or not a specific dialect feature is stigmatized within the community, much less whether it is stable, advancing, or in retreat, whether a specific sound change (or non-change) under discussion is a “change from below” or “from above,” much less whether social attitudes influence language change in NZE.

The first chapter in this section (“Pidgin English and Pidgin Maori in New Zealand,” by Clark), while a bit to the side of the main theme of the book, is a fascinating addition to the field of pidgin studies, even though from our perspective it is a study of a language stillbirth. The chapter is a library study, demonstrating both that we should not take secondary literature at face value and that a thorough search for relevant data in earlier “primary” literature can often “pay” the researcher by adding to our understanding of theoretical issues within the field. In this case, Clark discovered that, although the secondary literature available assumes that Maori speakers never had a pidgin dialect before they spoke English, close perusal of the writings of early French and English explorers demonstrates that rudimentary pidgin English and pidgin Maori were actually spoken in the late 18th and perhaps early 19th century.

The other studies in the section describe specific sound changes in progress in NZE: the evolution of (ihr) versus (ehr) (“A Longitudinal Study of the ‘Ear/Air’ Contrast in NZ Speech,” by Gordon and Maclagan), the use of post-vocalic (r) and (t) (in “Glottalization and Post-Vocalic (r) in Younger NZE Speakers,” by Bayard, and “Audience and Referee Design,” by Bell), (h) “dropping,” (l) vocalizing, negative contraction (in Bell’s chapter), and rising intonation as declarative terminals (“The Rise of NZ Intonation,” by Allan).

Allan’s chapter is concerned with the problem discussed in Guy, Horvath, Vonwiller, Daisely, and Rogers (1986) for Australian English: Who uses high-rising terminal intonation (HRT) in declarative sentences, and why do they do so? Unfortunately, the treatment of this problem here appears to be highly flawed, both in its use of mathematical methods and in its understanding of “standard” and “dialect” placement of HRTs in the course of conversation. This is especially unfortunate as Allan’s is the only chapter in the volume that bases most of its conclusions on a relaxed conversational speaking style.

Both the study of the possible merger of “ear” and “air”—or, as we would say in American circles, (ihr) and (ehr)—and the discussion of (t) glottalization and (r) use, are based on word list data rather than on the interview style (Labov, 1966) or the conversational style (Milroy, 1987) favored by sociolinguists. Despite this weakness, the writers are aware of the important theoretical contributions their studies can make, and they exploit their evidence efficiently to permit very interesting conclusions to be drawn from the data. Gordon and Maclagan’s chapter on the (ihr)(ehr) distinction shows that even in word-list style, there is (at least) a (pseudo) merger in progress and that the neutralized target is higher for younger speakers. However, they do not consider the possibility that closer phonetic analysis would reveal that the two vowels remain distinct (see DiPaolo & Faber, 1990; Milroy & Harris, 1980; Labov, Karen, & Miller, 1991, for quantitative studies of pseudomergers in Irish and US dialects).

Bayard’s chapter ostensibly discusses primarily (t) glottalization and post-vocalic r-ful speech in reading style (RS) or word-list style (WLS), for speakers
of NZE. In fact, the chapter is much richer than its title would lead one to believe. Because r-fullness is differently evaluated by speakers of the (apparently stigmatized) Southland dialect, which is natively r-ful, and by speakers of the larger NZE-speaking population, who apparently regard r-fullness as a (prestigious) Americanism, the tables allow the reader to contrast the (presumably) r-ful speakers' accommodation to r-less NZE with the (presumably) r-less NZE speakers' accommodation to the prestigious American import. Glottalization is advancing, despite the apparent negative attitude toward it. All vowel shifts studied are advancing in this corpus, except the (ihr)(ehr) merger. Bayard's study allows the reader to contrast phonological accommodation with lexical accommodation and the speakers' expressed attitudes toward given American lexical importations like "elevator," "eraser," "gas," and "flashlight." Bayard also takes advantage of the speech used by punk singers to evaluate attitudes toward some of these dialect variables. Although this information is very interesting, it is unfair to assume a linear relationship between what is highly regarded in a punk-singing register and what might be highly regarded in a casual interaction (Trudgill, 1983).

Bell's chapter uses media data (newscasts and advertisements) rather than word lists. This chapter makes even clearer the two theses first expressed in his 1984 Language in Society article and since elaborated:

1. A speaker's phonology varies with different registers (which Bell refers to as "genres"), and these registers are partly determined by his or her attitudes and willingness to accommodate to others.
2. A speaker may be influenced as much by how he or she thinks one's audience (or referee) evaluates speech as by how he or she evaluates it.

Bell's chapter clearly distinguishes the audiences for different stations and determines the correlation between a specific audience and specific NZE (or innovative American) linguistic traits. Americanisms (like neg-contraction and t flapping instead of glottalization) are common to newscasters on more youth-oriented working-class stations and are less common on newscasts for stations with older and more middle-class listeners.

Bell also taps a new source of "media" speech, looking at advertisements to see which dialect characteristics are implemented by advertisers to influence the public. In a follow-up study, Bell (1992) clarifies that even a very rough caricature appears to be useful for attracting the listeners' attention and shows what stereotyped social traits appear to account for the choice of dialect to be caricatured. Both Bell's and Bayard's chapters make clear the fact that social attitudes do have an influence on sound variation, and both try to delineate ways in which this influence is realized linguistically.

The four chapters in the "Pragmatic Analyses of NZ Discourse" section are very interesting. They demonstrate that the NZE researchers are not parochial but are aware of questions pursued by their colleagues ("The Sociolinguistics of Questioning in District Court Trials," by Lane; "Politeness Strategies in NZ Women's Speech," by Holmes; "Politeness Revisited," by Austin), and they successfully add new insights to the analysis of their data and propose innovative research problems as well ("They're Off and Racing Now: The Speech of the NZ Race Caller," by Kuiper and Austin).
My greatest complaint against this volume is a minor one, which hopefully can be rectified in later editions: The writers have a tendency to assume the understanding of the reader in a manner that is entirely consistent with the degree to which they generally rely on each other as readers but is not consistent with the broader audience they deserve to attract with the present book. This parochialism is occasionally evident in the use of naming devices: “Thanks also go to Harriet who . . .” (p. 127). However, it is more frustrating when it concerns strictly substantive matters. In the backwoods of North America we do not know how old “fourth form” students are, although it is clear that fourth form is meant to tell us the age of the speakers (p. 130). Bayard’s marvelously informative chapter in section 2 confuses those of us who know a “torch” is not a “flashlight,” but do not understand how “schedule” can be merged with some other reading or how z can merge with “zed” (p. 156). We search in vain for the SECIND (security index) (p. 154) and are made nervous by tables that seem to conflate the r-ful (“rhoticised”) data from older, lower-working-class urban speakers with data from younger, upper-class urban speakers (p. 154). Nor is it clear to the researcher who has not read Bayard’s earlier work what relationship the mathematical indexes bear to each other: The r-ful index (showing American or Southern NZE rural influence), and the t-glottalization index (showing an urban NZE change in progress, possibly influenced by urban British speech) are both listed in percentages, but it is not clear what LEXUSE and LEXPRF are reflections of. Most frustrating of all to the American reader who is seriously interested in understanding the phonological system is the cavalier request that we find a reference in Te Reo (e.g., p. 151), even when sufficient evidence to clarify matters is available in this volume (pp. 37 and 70ff.)! Such minor irritants do not, however, detract from the overall significance of the work.

Although each chapter has a different psychological and geographic point of departure, the book makes clear to the foreign reader the degree to which all of these disparate influences should be considered in a mature evaluation of language change. The book is quite interesting both as an analysis of speech and attitude data in tandem and as a starting point for the analysis of how speakers’ attitudes might influence their speech through hypercorrection (upward accommodation) or hyperaccommodation (downward accommodation). As this book was coming out, John Rickford gave a keynote speech at NNAV, bewailing the lack of serious attention to “style” variation and the lack of analysis of the influence of accommodative parameters on speech. Multilingual Matters should be highly commended for having published these studies, and I sincerely hope that more of these authors’ work will soon become accessible in other English-speaking countries!

NOTE

1. Bell (personal communication) points out that Americans are just as parochial. A point well taken, I’m sure.
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The book under review is divided into six chapters plus appendixes, bibliography, and author index. Chapter 1 contains a short outline of the investigation and discusses its scope, whereas chapter 2 describes the theoretical framework of the study in more detail. Chapter 3 describes the two language groups under investigation, namely, the migrant speakers of the Limburg dialect (a Dutch province in the southeast corner of the Netherlands) and of the Swabian dialect (spoken in the southwestern part of Germany, within the state Baden-Württemberg), and their situation as immigrants and language minority groups in Australia. Chapter 4 outlines how the study was organized (the sample, the informants, methods of investigation, etc.). In chapter 5, the actual investigation and its results are presented in a structured way. Finally, some conclusions and future implications of the study are discussed in chapter 6. Four appendixes are added: The first offers additional information on the informants, the second presents the questionnaires used, the third contains the raw data, and the fourth lists the ethnic publications surveyed by the author in order to get background information on relevant language use patterns.

Generally speaking, the study impresses through its innovative questions, its clear design, and the structured way in which it is presented and in which the results and implications are discussed. The author demonstrates her