Learning by experience: notes for New Zealand social dialectologists[1]

Janet Holmes & Allan Bell
Victoria University of Wellington

Inspired by the consensus at the Seventh New Zealand Linguistics Society Conference that it was time to begin collecting a corpus of data on spoken New Zealand English, we decided to attempt a small pilot project over the summer of 1987-8. Our main aim was, after learning from experience elsewhere (e.g. Labov 1972, 1984), to develop an interview schedule which could be used as the basis for collecting comparable spoken data anywhere in New Zealand. We also expected to identify some of the methodological problems that we would all have to resolve in collecting speech data. We were not disappointed.

Choosing what to study

On the basis of our review of sociolinguistic research on New Zealand English (Bell and Holmes 1987), two of the most interesting questions appeared to be regional differences and Maori vs Pakeha differences. We decided to focus initially on the question of differences between Maori and Pakeha, since it is a question which has proved frustratingly intransigent. While even linguists continue to feel there is a recognisable "Maori accent", attempts to specify its features have so far identified very few (McCallum 1978, Benton 1987). McCallum (1978) identified some features of verb usage which appeared promising as differentiators of Maori and Pakeha children's speech. Hall (1976) studying the speech of Northland men concluded that Maori men's close vowels tended to be consistently opener, open vowels closer, back vowels more forward and front vowels a little further back than those of Pakeha men. These are the only two of a number of studies that provide any support for the view that a Maori variety of English exists. They also imply that such

---

a variety is influenced by the sounds and structures of the Maori language. However, Benton (1987) believes this has not been confirmed by research so far. It seems possible that the distinguishing features may be prosodic, perhaps involving articulatory set in some cases. We decided therefore to collect data which would allow us to examine the phonological features of Maori vs Pakeha speech[2].

Controlling the social variables

Since we intended to use a very small sample, we decided to control as many non-ethnic social variables as possible. To avoid regional variation we wanted people who had lived in one place most of their lives. The criterion we decided to use for this was a person who had lived in Levin since before the age of ten[3]. Informants had to speak English as their first language. We also needed to restrict the sample with respect to gender, age, and socio-economic class. Research is an interactive undertaking and these decisions could not be made with total disregard for our resources - the most relevant one being the interviewer.

The crucial consideration was our desire to elicit speech which was as relaxed and natural as possible - what Labov (1972) labels "the vernacular". Consequently we needed an interviewer who would contribute to this goal. We were fortunate in having available Jenny Jacob, an incipient Masters student from Levin, to act as a research assistant. Levin speech was therefore selected as the focus of the study.

Jenny could be described as a walking "matched guise". She is fair-skinned and blonde haired and would appear as Pakeha to Pakeha informants (and there is convincing, if disturbing, evidence of this in comments made to her about Maori people in the interviews). However, she is a full and active member of the Maori community at Levin, with Ngāti Raukawa tribal affiliation. By basing the research in Levin Jenny was able to use her well-established social networks to select potential interviewees. The advantages

---

[2]Grammatical features will be the focus of a Masters thesis to be undertaken by the interviewer, Jenny Jacob.

[3]This decision was based on the criterion for a speaker of New Zealand English which had been agreed in preliminary discussions by the Victoria Corpus study group and included in a proposed outline discussed at the Seventh Linguistic Society Conference.

of using an "insider" for such research are well-documented (Mitchell-Kernan 1971, Labov et al. 1968, Wolfram and Christian 1976). And Lesley Milroy's "friend of a friend" technique (Milroy 1980) in accessing informants for interview is all the more effective when the first friendship has been established over years.

To avoid gender variation we decided on the basis of our interviewer's sex, and Janet Holmes' interest in women's language, to restrict the sample to women. This decision was also consistent with the goal of eliciting relaxed speech, since same-sex discussion seems likely to be less formal (cf. Coates 1984, Russell 1982). It also avoided the problems of assuming that same-sex and cross-sex interviews elicit comparable data (Cameron and Coates 1985).

The evidence from previous research suggested that we should focus on the speech of informants from a lower socio-economic group as those most likely to reveal the variation we were interested in. Though Jenny Jacob is now a university graduate, and therefore educationally better qualified than the women she was to interview, her earlier background and life experience was not so very different from theirs, and she continues to be an active member of the community.

Finally the age group of 20 - 29 was selected partly with Jenny's age in mind, but also because we wished to select women with at least one child since we expected children to be a useful topic to encourage less monitored talk.

The decisions to focus on the speech of Maori and Pakeha women, aged between 20 and 29, from lower socio-economic backgrounds, living in a provincial area, were reached therefore by a combination of theoretical and practical considerations but were also taken with a view to eliciting the kind of speech we wanted.

The interview

We decided to use an interview schedule administered by an interviewer in the interviewee's home, following the standard technique of most social dialect surveys (Labov 1966, Shuy et al. 1968, Trudgill 1974, Horvath 1985, Newbrook 1986). We aimed to elicit a range of speech styles from most formal to casual, and we discuss below the choice and organisation of the material

designed to achieve this end. Following the field method guidelines developed by the Philadelphia Project on Linguistic Change and Variation (Labov 1984), we allowed for the presence of other speech community members at an interview, with the expectation that this might encourage more relaxed interaction.

Background information: schedule 1
All the decisions about the non-linguistic variables were translated into the appended schedule 1, which was designed to be used by the interviewer to collect any background information which might turn out to be relevant to interpreting the data collected. It is reasonably consistent with the suggestions made by Donn Bayard (personal communication) about the socio-economic data to be supplied with speech samples for the corpus of New Zealand English. This section of the interview generally took about ten to fifteen minutes, although, where fruitful digressions occurred, it lasted longer. The questionnaire was filled in by the interviewer, often roughly during the actual interview, then clarified and cleaned up onto another form afterwards.

The demographic questionnaire consisted of 40 questions under five headings: residential history; gender, age and ethnic information; education, occupation and income information; information on living situation; and language history. While most of the wording in the questionnaire should be usable for other sociolinguistic surveys in this country, some was specific to this particular project - e.g. references to Levin and to the informants' gender.

Some of the questions elicited defining information, which would tell us whether a particular person qualified to be interviewed as an informant on the criteria of residence, age, socio-economic class and language history. Other questions expanded on these categories, and elicited similar although less detailed information on people who might have been important influences on the informants' language - parents and partners. The first pilot version of the questionnaire grouped all questions on the informant, followed by all those on partner, followed by all on each parent. These were re-grouped after it was found easier, and less tedious, to ask questions about all three groups at the same time.

The classifications for some questions were derived from those used in the audience survey in Bell (1977), suitably modified; others were adapted from earlier sociolinguistic surveys such as Labov (1966); and others were

22

included on the basis of our feeling for additional information we might need. In general we sought greater rather than minimal detail on the grounds that this could more easily be discarded than a second questionnaire administered to informants. Thus we asked for information on any place where an informant had lived for at least a year, and for where parents and partner had lived for more than three years.

There was very little hesitancy and no refusals in answering the questionnaire though informants did not always know the details of their parents' residential and educational history. A few questions caused difficulty. With those concerning ethnicity (section B), it was not always clear whether the answers reflected identification as Maori (regardless of parents' ethnicity) or actual inherited ancestry. An additional question could be considered explicitly asking about ethnic identification. Most questions were framed with specific multiple choice answers, with the options refined after pilot testing. The question on educational qualifications was left more open in order not to embarrass less educated informants. The specific occupation was elicited where possible. On occasions it needed to be clarified whether informants were currently working outside the home or just giving their general occupation when previously employed. This sometimes required questioning in more detail in order to classify a job into the categories of question 23. For income earned, equivalent weekly and annual amounts were given, with the categories reflecting the lower socio-economic status of informants.

Section D was intended to give some indication of the informant's living situation - whether in an extended family, what number of children, and the level of housing. A question which should be added in future surveys would establish whether an informant's dwelling is owned or rented. Section E on language history was designed to ensure that we sampled only L1 English speakers. It was also expanded to elicit information on any use of Maori (or language other than English) by the informant or her family. The information was sought both for its possible importance in the informant's language acquisition, but also out of interest in the knowledge and use of Maori in the community.

Eliciting the linguistic variables

The formal section: schedule 2
The initial decision we made was the simple one of ensuring we elicited the

four diphthongs (ai, au, ou, ei) which had turned out to be diagnostic in previous New Zealand social dialect research (Bayard 1987, Morton and Williams 1977, Bell and Holmes 1987). We also decided in view of the fact that ethnicity was the primary focus of the research to include a number of familiar Maori words which we thought might prove diagnostic.

We then consulted our colleagues at Victoria for suggestions about additional variables which should be included[4], and drew on the standard social dialect works in the area (e.g. Labov 1966, Trudgill 1974, Labov et al. 1968). The results are encapsulated in the formal elicitation techniques, including the reading passage and word lists, in appended schedule 2, a draft version of which was circulated in the New Zealand Linguistic Society Newsletter in November 1987.

The elicitation techniques in this second section of the interview were designed to focus the speaker's attention increasingly on the pronunciation of the diagnostic sounds. In the initial phases we tried to distract attention from pronunciation by two devices: (i) focussing on lexical items and regional differences, which most people find an interesting aspect of language use; (ii) by asking informants to perform an "operation" on a sentence which would act as a distractor technique (Greenbaum and Quirk 1970). In the final stages of section 2 we focussed increasingly on eliciting specific sounds, and finally in the word list which included minimal pairs, we gave informants an opportunity to focus maximal attention on pronunciation. If informants ever make a distinction between /iə/ and /eə/ they will certainly make it under such circumstances. Correspondingly if they do not make the distinction when faced with *beer* and *bear* side by side, we can be reasonably confident this distinction has disappeared from their speech.

Lexical items/regional background

The first section of the interview, after collecting background information on the informant, asked questions about language which we considered would be easy to answer and appeal to a layperson as the kind of questions linguists ought to be interested in. We selected a small group of lexical pairs, some of which differentiate users by region, and we added a couple of questions taken

from Horvath (1985) asking if informants could tell the regional background of speakers from their speech, and if so how.

Fill the gap task

The "fill the gap" task was designed to distract attention from the pronunciation of a number of words that were embedded in the sentences. All the words selected were words we had some reason to believe might differentiate New Zealand pronunciation from other accents of English, and some were included because we suspected they might distinguish Maori and Pakeha pronunciation. Selecting an appropriate task here caused some initial problems and we settled on this particular task only after three sets of pilot interviews with revisions and refinements between each. A request to turn sentences into the negative, for instance, was rarely treated as a straightforward syntactic exercise but caused all kinds of semantic problems for informants: so, for example, the sentence:

There's a quarter of chicken on the menu for dinner tonight

became

There's no chicken on the menu for dinner tonight

which certainly negates the sentence semantically but loses the word *quarter* which we were interested in! Similarly, turning sentences into the past tense assumes a conscious and explicit understanding of tense which few native speakers have.

We concluded that it is unreasonable to expect most people to undertake such grammatical operations; they are simply too complicated for all but linguistics students. They made all but the most secure of informants feel "dumb" when they couldn't do the exercises and we most certainly wanted to avoid that. We decided finally on a "fill the gap" exercise, which worked well. It was interesting enough to serve the purpose of distracting from the words we were focussing on, but not so difficult that people gave up or felt unhappy about it. In schedule 2 below we have italicized the words whose pronunciations we were interested in. Naturally these were not italicized on the sheet which was handed to informants.

The reading passage

Some effort was put into finding a reading passage with socio-culturally appropriate and interesting content, and then modifying it to make it easy to

read as well as to include the linguistic variables we were interested in. The passage finally selected was one used in an earlier piece of attitude research undertaken by Gould (1972)[5]. It was then considerably modified to ensure it included:

1. every New Zealand vowel phoneme in a stressed position before a voiceless obstruent;

2. every possible New Zealand vowel phoneme before an /l/ (/uəl/ does not occur in one syllable);

3. a list (in case list intonation turned out to be interesting for the high rise terminal);

4. possible contexts for linking /r/ and intrusive /r/.

We have included in the appended schedule 2 a version of the reading passage in which we have italicized the words and phrases whose pronunciation we were especially interested in.

The passage appeared to work well and was read quite fluently by informants. We had thought that, as a relatively infrequent activity for adults, a request to read aloud might cause problems, but there were very few.

Word lists
Each of the words incorporated into the passage for reasons 1. and 2. above was then listed separately in order to enable us to contrast reading style and word-list style in the analysis. (Word-list 1).

A second list of words was then constructed incorporating both vowel and consonant sounds identified by Bayard (1987) and Bauer (1986) as potentially diagnostic of New Zealand English. We also added some words which it seemed on the basis of the pilot interviews might turn out to be interesting: e.g. *me, go, owed, thirty.*

The second list moves from single words to near minimal pairs through

---

[5]Despite considerable effort we have not been able to trace the origins of this passage.

26

to exact minimal pairs[6], (Word-list 2). Pilot testing led to a few modifications including substitutions for words such as *enthuse* which caused people to stumble, and *dolt* which Jenny considered likely to cause people to feel uncomfortable since she judged it a word they did not know. Despite our best efforts some bugs remained. We would now eliminate ambiguous *bow* and obscure *fallow* and *cull*, replacing the minimal pair *kill/cull* with *dull/dill.*

We also learned to ask people to read more slowly (since the first interviewees tackled the list at break-neck speed), and to read across, not down, so that the phonemic contrasts we had deliberately included would not go unnoticed!

Less formal speech: schedule 3
The biggest challenge in preparing the material for the schedule was to devise ways of tipping people off the end of the formal section into more relaxed and casual speech - to minimise the "observer's paradox" (Labov 1972). We used a number of strategies to try and achieve this.

The build-up from less monitored to most monitored style was deliberately designed to engender a sense of relief and relaxation at the end of the minimal pairs reading. At this point Jenny would say something like "Good, that's the end of all the formal stuff", and she would switch off the tape, run it to the end and turn it over, thus creating a real break in the interview.

In introducing the interview, Jenny had told informants that she wanted to ask them some questions about language, and that she also was interested in their school experience. This gave her a possible lead into the less formal section. As a result of thorough pilot testing and review we decided that this was the most likely topic to get the women talking. But the crucial point was that any topic at any point which resulted in more relaxed spontaneous speech should be allowed to develop - even if it meant abandoning the more formal parts of the schedule for a considerable period. (Horvath (1985: 51) notes that her interviewers adopted a similar approach.) Relaxed speech was given top priority. So if someone began to talk about their schooling or favourite sport as a result of questions in the background section (schedule 1) then

---

[6]This particular progression was adopted on the suggestion of Graeme Kennedy who considered that minimal pairs might induce a particular "set" towards the list and thus confuse readers who were looking for them where they didn't exist. We certainly wanted to avoid readers feeling there were any hidden tricks involved.

Jenny simply encouraged and prompted them to keep talking without allowing the schedule to interrupt. This was much more difficult for her to do than one would imagine without trying it oneself. The psychological pressure to "get through the schedule" was often hard to resist, and indeed in some cases was clearly experienced by the informants too. In such cases this anxiety to complete the tasks could be used to good effect to mark the shift to a more relaxed section after completing the more obviously formal tasks.

It was correspondingly important that there should be no written schedule of questions evident once the formal section was completed. Initially we sent Jenny off with a list of possible topics, culled from other surveys as well as our own intuitions about what might get people talking, (see schedule 3). It is perhaps worth noting here that abstract questions simply did not work at all. Questions about taha Maori or what makes a successful person (cf. Labov 1966) dropped like lead balloons into the interview. Questions asking informants to recall personal experiences were uniformly more successful.

In the pilot interviews Jenny tended to treat the list of possible topics as if they, like the more formal tasks, had to be "got through", and consequently some informants obviously felt they needed to "answer the question" and get on to the next one (see Wolfson 1976). But as Labov has pointed out:

> The sociolinguistic interview is considered a failure if the speaker does no more than answer questions.
> (Labov 1984:38)

Part the process of becoming a very good interviewer involved Jenny's acceptance of vernacular speech as our primary goal. She came to realize that it didn't matter when or how or on what topic she managed to elicit a more casual style[7]. That was our top priority and all else could be subordinated to it. Once she recognized this she relaxed too and abandoned her list. She kept it as a resource in her head rather than in her hand. She allowed people time, accepting that pauses might serve as thinking time and were not simply empty spaces to be filled by her as fast as possible.

She spent much more time listening carefully to reponses alert for clues as to topics of interest to the informant she could follow up. When an informant

---

[7]On the other hand topics must have face-validity and be taken seriously or informants may legitimately feel the interview is pointless.

said, for instance, that she was doing Massey University extramural papers in response to the questions on education, Jenny followed up with "how are they going?". The informant clearly treated this as an aside and gave a much more relaxed response. On another occasion an informant responded to the danger of death question in a way which suggested to Jenny she had had more than one such experience. Though the clue was subtle, Jenny picked it up and followed up with "was that the only time or was there another?" In answer to a background question about the house size "how many bedrooms?", one informant replied "Two - hopefully three". This too provided a clear opening for a follow-up "are you planning extensions?" Jenny developed considerable skills, then, in identifying promising topics from speaker's clues i.e. from what Labov (1984:37) labels "tangential shifting".

In the pilot interviews Jenny had contributed a great deal herself to the talk, believing she thus made it seem more like a conversation which helped people relax. She subsequently managed to reduce the amount of her own contributions while still achieving this effect. She developed remarkably good listening techniques and real skill in nudging people on with a well placed prompt. The informal section of the final interviews ranged from 20 minutes to about 45 minutes in length, depending on how involved informants became in the topics developed.

Two final problems relating to the interview are worth mentioning: background noise and the potential disadvantages of using an insider. One of the costs of interviewing women with young children was the background noise the children often created. We decided we would simply have to live with this if we wanted cooperation. However it was essential to get clear sound for the reading passage and word lists and Jenny became skilled at diplomatically removing any children to a distance during these sections if this proved necessary.

And it is worth noting that while insiders have many advantages in terms of local knowledge and acceptance in the community, this status may also create problems. The most obvious one relates to "loyalty". Jenny had difficulty with not identifying totally with the informants initially. While this might seem a good thing, it caused problems when informants had difficulties with the questions or tasks. Instead of justifying and explaining tasks which seemed odd to her informants, her initial instincts were to simply treat them as things which had to be done for "them", i.e. "us"! This turned out to

be counter-productive since the tasks might then be abandoned if they were troublesome. Jenny overcame this problem subsequently by identifying more strongly with and taking more responsibility for her part in the project.

Another problem related to the fact that as a community member she lacked the outsider's motive for requesting information. She often knew the answers to questions such as how many children someone had, or how long they had lived in Levin. On the other hand she sometimes thought she knew the answer (e.g. about where someone had been born or how old they were) but was surprised to find she didn't. (Reactions like "Geez are you only 24 - thought you were older than that!" obviously had to be controlled, for instance!) She therefore had to tread a careful path between asking for confirmation of questions she obviously knew the answer to, and making unwarranted assumptions about how much she knew about people's background. This related to a slightly more subtle problem which Jenny had initially with the attitudes and opinions people expressed in the less formal section. She tended to assume she knew their reasons for holding an opinion, and so did not follow up with "why?", for instance, when someone said they believed in school uniforms or that they thought Levin was a neat place to live. Being an interviewer who is also an insider means you have to develop special schizophrenic skills.

Ethics and anonymity

It is perhaps worth quoting at length from Labov at this point since the issue of surreptitiously recorded speech is a crucial one for the corpus collection.

> In general, we have set a simple and clear policy to forbid candid recordings: At all times, the speaker who is recorded must know that he (sic) is being recorded. This principle follows equally from practical and ethical considerations. It is our opinion that researchers who engage in candid recordings will eventually cause repressive legislation ....From a practical point of view such recordings have little value for linguistic research, since the quality of the data gathered is so poor that the interpretation of the words uttered is often arbitrary. To obtain good sound recording it is necessary to pay close attention to signal level and monitor equipment at many points in the process. Even when recording is done on an informed and principled basis,

> many field workers fail to achieve high quality recordings through their reluctance to pay attention to their equipment. A hidden tape recorder and a hidden microphone produce data that is as doubtful as the method itself.
> (Labov 1984:51)

On the other hand a case can be made for gaining permission after the fact to use what Labov calls "candid" recording in some circumstances (e.g. where the informants know the person doing the recording well enough to feel free to refuse permission). Indeed for some purposes it is difficult to see how one could make valid comments on natural discourse without such recordings. Derek Davy made the point at the Seventh New Zealand Linguistic Society Conference in this respect: that anyone who had simply compared the length of pauses in a conversation where participants were unaware they were being recorded, with one where they felt constrained to "feed the tape-recorder" would recognise the linguistic importance of the difference. However, we know of no formal study comparing the linguistic features of data recorded surreptitiously and data recorded openly and classified as casual by sociolinguists.

We have resolved therefore for our recorded interviews to follow Labov's practice and always inform people they are being recorded. We also believe, however, that the corpus as a whole will be richer if it ultimately includes some samples of surreptitiously recorded speech where permission to use it is obtained subsequently. We note also that surreptitious recording is probably less of a social and legal problem in New Zealand society than in the United States.

All subjects were assured that their identity would be protected. This means we will change names when keying transcripts into the computer (selecting a name with a similar number of syllables and stress pattern so as not to affect intonation contours). We will also ensure the material itself does not allow easy identification of informants. It is very important however that those using it for analysis in other centres respect this point and ensure that specific quotations from the material are not publicised unnecessarily. The tapes must be regarded as confidential to the researchers in the area from which it was collected. Jenny told informants that she and a small group of linguists from Victoria would be listening to the tapes for the purposes of the linguistic analysis. Any wider circulation of the tapes should involve seeking

permission from informants (which might by then prove difficult to obtain) though we would feel justified in following Labov's practice in this respect:

> Access to these materials is limited to members of the research group, in accordance with our statements to subjects.....[though] any tape recordings that form the basis of our conclusions are available to corroborate those conclusions, in the same way that any library sources are.
> (Labov 1984:52)

Equipment

After experimenting with a number of combinations of microphone (built-in, omni-directonal, directional) and tape-recorders, we selected the following from the choices we had available.
Tape recorder: SONY TCM 5000EV.
Microphone: PZM Soundgrabber Model 12 SG.
This microphone provided excellent recording quality. It is unobtrusive, sitting flat on a surface between the interviewer and informant. It is non-directional, picking up sound as the ear does, though this has the corresponding disadvantage that it picks up other noise (from children, for example) in the area. Overall however we feel we have obtained good quality clear recordings suitable for the phonetic analysis which will be necessary[8].

In conclusion, we hope the information provided in this paper will be useful and perhaps even stimulating to others planning to collect social dialect data for the Corpus of New Zealand English. We would welcome comments and feedback which might improve the elicitation material or the methods we have described.

---

[8]Labov (1984) recommends lavalier microphones for each individual and four-track tape-recorders for attempts to record group sessions.

Schedule 1: Demographic questionnaire

A. Residential history

1. Where were you born? _____

2. What places have you lived in, including Levin, for a year or more?
   When/for how long/at what age?

   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____

3. Where was your partner (spouse/husband/wife..) born?

   _____

4. What places has he lived in (for three years or more)?

   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____

5. Where was your mother born? _____

6. What places has she lived in (for three years or more)?

   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____

7. Where was your father born? _____

8. What places has he lived in (for three years or more)?

   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____
   Place: _____   Time: _____

B. Gender, Age, Ethnicity

9. Which gender is the speaker?

   F _____

   M _____

10. How old are you?
    (If possible, note exact age in years;
    if not, ask which age bracket speaker falls into)

Under 15	years	_____
15 - 19	years	_____
20 - 29	years	_____
30 - 39	years	_____
40 - 49	years	_____
50 - 59	years	_____
60 - 69	years	_____
Over 70	years	_____

11. Which ethnic group do you belong to?

    Maori _____
    Other Polynesian (please specify) _____
    Pakeha (British origin) _____
    Other Pakeha (please specify) _____
    Other (please specify) _____

12. Which ethnic group does your partner belong to?

    Maori _____
    Other Polynesian (please specify) _____
    Pakeha (British origin) _____
    Other Pakeha (please specify) _____
    Other (please specify) _____

13. Which ethnic group does your mother belong to?

    Maori _____
    Other Polynesian (please specify) _____
    Pakeha (British origin) _____
    Other Pakeha (please specify) _____
    Other (please specify) _____

14. Which ethnic group does your father belong to?

        Maori
        Other Polynesian (please specify)   _____
        Pakeha (British origin)   _____
        Other Pakeha (please specify)   _____
        Other (please specify)   _____

C. Education, Occupation, Income

15. When did you leave school?

        After primary or intermediate school   _____
        By the end of the 4th form   _____
        By the end of the 6th form   _____

16. Do you have any educational qualifications?
    (e.g. a school qualification such as School Certificate, University Entrance, Bursary;
    vocational training like apprenticeship, secretarial;
    tertiary training such as polytechnic or university)

    _____

17. When did your partner leave school?

        After primary or intermediate school   _____
        By the end of the 4th form   _____
        By the end of the 6th form   _____

18. Does he/she have any educational qualifications?

    _____

19. When did your mother leave school?

        After primary or intermediate school   _____
        By the end of the 4th form   _____
        By the end of the 6th form   _____

20. Does she have any educational qualifications?

        _____

21. When did your father leave school?

      After primary or intermediate school _____
      By the end of the 4th form _____
      By the end of the 6th form _____

22. Does he have any educational qualifications?

        _____

23. What is your present occupation?
    (If possible, note specific job;
    if not currently employed, note that and last job)

      Not working _____
      Manual labour _____
      Skilled work _____
      Office or sales work _____
      Professional/executive _____

24. What is your partner's present occupation?
    (If not currently employed, note that and last job)

      Not working _____
      Manual labour _____
      Skilled work _____
      Office or sales work _____
      Professional/executive _____

25. What was your mother's occupation (when you were growing up)?
    (If not then employed, note that and subsequent job)

      Not working _____
      Manual labour _____
      Skilled work _____
      Office or sales work _____
      Professional/executive _____

26. **What was your father's occupation (when you were growing up)?**
    (If not then employed, note that and subsequent job)

Not working	_____
Manual labour	_____
Skilled work	_____
Office or sales work	_____
Professional/executive	_____

27. **How much do you earn (gross: before tax)?**
    (Place in the income bracket. Equivalent weekly and annual earnings are shown.)

per week	per year	
Under $200	Under $10,000	
$200 - 300	$10,000 - 15,000	_____
$300 - 400	$15,000 - 20,000	_____
$400 - 500	$20,000 - 25,000	_____
$500 - 600	$25,000 - 30,000	_____
Over $600	Over $30,000	_____

28. **How much does your partner earn?**

per week	per year	
Under $200	Under $10,000	
$200 - 300	$10,000 - 15,000	_____
$300 - 400	$15,000 - 20,000	_____
$400 - 500	$20,000 - 25,000	_____
$500 - 600	$25,000 - 30,000	_____
Over $600	Over $30,000	_____

D. Living situation

29. What city/town/suburb/area do you live in?

    _____

30. How many bedrooms does the house you live in have?

    _____

31. How many people live there? _____

32. Do you have any children? How many? _____

E. Language history

33. What language did you first learn at home?

    English   _____
    Maori   _____
    Other Polynesian (please specify) _____
    Other (please specify) _____

34. Do you know any other language?

    (specify; especially Maori) _____
    Do you only understand that language? _____
    Do you speak it a little? _____
    Do you speak it well? _____

35. What language did your partner first learn at home?

    English   _____
    Maori   _____
    Other Polynesian (please specify) _____
    Other (please specify) _____

36. Does he know any other language?

    (specify; especially Maori) _____
    Does he only understand that language? _____
    Does he speak it a little? _____
    Does he speak it well? _____

37. What language did your mother first learn at home?

    English   _____
    Maori   _____
    Other Polynesian (please specify) _____
    Other (please specify) _____
    If not English: does she still speak her first language?

    _____

38. Does she know any other language?

   (specify; especially Maori) _____
   Does she only understand that language? _____
   Does she speak it a little? _____
   Does she speak it well? _____

39. What language did your father first learn at home?

   English _____
   Maori _____
   Other Polynesian (please specify) _____
   Other (please specify) _____

   If not English: does he still speak his first language?

   _____

40. Does he know any other language?

   (specify; especially Maori) _____
   Does he only understand that language? _____
   Does he speak it a little? _____
   Does he speak it well? _____

Schedule 2: Eliciting formal speech

Lexical items

1. What do you call the container that strawberries are sold in?
   If **punnet.**
   Prompt. Have you ever heard it called a chip?

2. What do you call the holiday cottages some people have at places like Hokio Beach and Waitarere?
   Have you ever heard them called anything else?
   bach/crib?

3. What do you call a woolly garment without buttons you wear over a shirt/blouse?
   Do you use **jersey** or **sweater** or **jumper?**

4. What do you call the fuel you put in your car to make it go?
   Do you call it **petrol** or **gas** or **benzine?**

5. Would you say "Let's go to the pictures" or "Let's go to the movies"?

6. Do you eat **biscuits** or **cookies?**

7. Do you think you can tell where someone comes from in New Zealand by their accent?
   Let people answer this at length if they will.
   If they dry up try as prompts
   Can you tell a person from the East Cape?
   Northland?
   the South Island?
   the West Coast?
   Taranaki?
   In any case if they say yes ask
   How can you tell?

Fill the gap

Fill in the gaps in the following sentences with any word that makes sense from those at the end. Read out the whole sentence with your word in it. There are no right and wrong answers. We are just interested in your choice.

e.g. Sun-bathing _____ becoming less common. (is/has)
    Sun-bathing is becoming less common.

1. _____ people in *New Zealand* speak *English*.
   (no/many/all)

2. Some people in *Whangarei* _____ the *Maori language*.
   (learnt/speak)

3. *Women* often get mad when their children _____ a *nuisance*.
   (are/were)

4. The bank _____ worried about the number of *withdrawals* your *secretary* made this *year*.
   (was/is)

5. There are places *here and there* in Wellington where you _____ get a decent meal.
   (can/might)

6. People _____ *Whakatane* use *Maori* on the *marae* regularly.
   (in/at)

7. There's a *quarter* of _____ on the *menu* for dinner tonight.
   (chicken/pizza)

8. We need *temporary* accommodation in *Rotorua* for _____.
   (two weeks/ a fortnight)

9. Every summer in *Ruatoria* there's an *invasion* of _____.
   (tourists/visitors)

10. This *government* has a *proven* record on _____ issues.
    (some/few)

Reading passage
(Relevant words and phrases italicized)

Last year I was *touring* around *the East* Cape area. One night I *stopped* at a pub *for a* beer and a bite *to eat*. *During* my meal this *old* guy came over. He had *bright* blue eyes, grey *curls*, and was *wearing* a baggy *suit*. He *must* have *bought* it years ago in a *sale*. He asked me for a game of cards. I *saw it* meant a lot to him so I agreed. He got *out* some *fairly tatty* cards and *pulled* up a chair. We played *till* it was *almost dark*. He didn't give me much *choice* about the game. He wanted to play *poker*.

I won a *bit* at *first* and he raised the *stakes*. After about an *hour* he owed me *four or* five dollars so he went off to his room to *get* some money. *While he* was away the pub owner came over. He had a *scowl* on his face. "*Look* here, *pal*" he said, "old *Carl* shouldn't be gambling. It's *cruel* to take his money. He's *scarcely* got enough to live on. Why don't you leave him alone and play *pool* instead?"

"Why are you trying to *spoil* his fun?" I asked. Just then the old guy came back. The owner said *nothing* and old Carl was *still* keen so we carried on playing. We finished the *whisky* and by then he owed me thirty dollars. He didn't seem at all put *out* at the *result*. He just paid up and went to bed.

The owner came over again looking *really fierce*. "Hand over that money," he said. "That's a week's rent you've taken off him. Hand it over or *else*".

I thought I couldn't be *hearing* him right. "*Or else what?*" I said. He didn't answer *so I* just got in the car and drove off.

Must go back there some time and give the old fellow a chance to *win it* back.

Word list (1)

READ ACROSS. SLOWLY.

touring	old	during
get	bite	meal
curls	wearing	suit
must	bought	nothing
out	sale	what
fairly	pulled	almost
choice	poker	dark
first	stakes	thirty
paid	dollars	meant
while	scowl	look
pal	Carl	cruel
scarcely	pool	spoil
still	whisky	result
really	fierce	hearing
that	owed	pulled
go	eat	hour
me	grey	this

Word list (2)

READ ACROSS. SCAN LINE BEFORE READING. READ SLOWLY.

tree		
student		
Paul		
tour		
water		
enthusiasm		
nuclear	nude	
dunce	dance	chance
example	transplant	
pulp	gulf	golf
peering	baring	pairing
doll	dole	colt
fire	fireman	fire engine
tower	towers	towering

43

fewer	cure	curing	
batted	battered		
sense	cents		
assume	presume		
boring	boar	board	bored
city	seedy		
rule	gruel		
fault	fort		
tune	dune		
Pete	pit	pet	pat
put	pot	putt	
baddy	daddy		
bee	bay	buy	
bough	bow	boy	
boot	boat	bout	
ferry	fairy		
bird	bard		
pull	pool	pill	
fellow	fallow		
kill	cull		
reel	real		
poor	pour	pore	paw
groan	grown		
moan	mown		
allusion	illusion		
weather	whether		
beer	bear		
here	hair		
fear	fair	ear	air
spear	spare	fare	
kea	care	shear	share
really	rarely	cheer	chair

Schedule 3: Eliciting informal speech

In this section we have simply listed the topics we used as suggestions to encourage informants to talk more freely.

Children

where were your children born? was it a good experience or did you have difficulties?

are they good kids or do they get up to mischief? how do you keep them in line? what do you do if they're naughty?

are they like you? how? are they alike? what sort of personalities do they have?

Sport/exercise

do you play any sport or get any regular exercise?

School

where did you go to school? did you like it? what was good about it? what didn't you like?

did you have to wear uniforms at your school? do you think that was a good idea?

do you remember your first day at school? who took you? what was it like?

what games did you play in school? which did you enjoy most?

Holidays/festivals

tell me about a really good holiday you had

what was the best holiday you can remember?

have you been to any good dos lately - a wedding, 21st? what was it like?

Personal relations

how do you get on with your mum and dad? do you see much of them?

do they help out when you need it?

how did you get on with your mum/dad when you were little?

do you remember your first boyfriend? what was he like?

how did you meet your partner?

did you ever get the blame for something you didn't do?

Driving

what do you think of the standard of driving in Levin?

are there any dangerous spots you'd warn people about?

Danger of death/fear

have you ever been in a situation when you thought you had had it /that you were going to be killed/ this is it............

have you ever been in a bad accident?

have you ever seen a bad accident?

did you ever have a dream that scared you?

Maori issues

what do you think about teaching Maori in schools? do you think it should be compulsory? how about taha Maori?

how do you think the kohanga is getting on? what does it need to improve it?

Local topics

what do you feel about the problem of sewage disposal in Levin?

are there any roads which are particularly dangerous in this area?

Explanation

could you describe to me how to make a _____.

could you describe how to play _____.

(Fill in something the interviewer might plausibly not know: hangi, pavlova, pool, card game)

References

Bauer, L. 1986. 'Notes on New Zealand English phonetics and phonology', *English World Wide* 7,2:225-258.

Bayard, D. 1987. 'Class and change in New Zealand English: a summary report', *Te Reo* 30:3-36.

Bell, A. 1977. *The language of radio news in Auckland: a sociolinguistic study of style, audience and sub-editing variation.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Auckland: University of Auckland.

Bell, A. and J. Holmes 1987. 'Sociolinguistic research on New Zealand English'. To appear in *English Around the World: Sociolinguistic Perspectives* ed. by J. Cheshire. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benton, R.A. 1987. 'Maori English: a New Zealand myth?' To appear in *English Around the World: Sociolinguistic Perspectives* ed. by J. Cheshire. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, D. and J. Coates 1985. 'Some problems in the sociolinguistic explanation of sex differences', *Language and Communication* 5,3:143-51.

Coates, J. 1984. 'Language and sexism', *C.L.I.E. Working Paper no.5.* BAAL /LAGB Committee for Linguistics in Education.

Cheshire, J. 1982. *Variation in an English Dialect: a Sociolinguistic Study.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gould, P. 1972. 'Assessment of status by accent: an aspect of sociolinguistic competence'. Unpublished terms paper. Wellington: Victoria University.

Greenbaum, S. and R. Quirk 1970. *Elicitation Experiments in English: Linguistic Studies in Use and Attitude.* London: Longman.

Hall, M . 1976. *An Acoustic Analysis of New Zealand Vowels.* Unpublished M.A. dissertation. Auckland: University of Auckland.

Horvath, B. 1985. *Variation in Australian English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, W. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, W. 1972. 'Some principles of linguistic methodology', *Language in Society*. 1,1:97-120.

Labov, W. 1984. 'Field methods of the project on linguistic change and variation'. *Language in Use: Readings in Sociolinguistics* ed by J. Baugh and J. Sherzer, 28-53. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Labov, W., P. Cohen, C. Robins and J. Lewis 1968. *A Study of the Non-standard English of Negro and Puerto-Rican Speakers in New York City*. Report on Co-operative Research Project 3288. Washington DC: Office of Education.

McCallum, J. 1978. 'In search of a dialect: an exploratory study of the formal speech of some Maori and Pakeha children', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 13,2:133-143

Milroy, L. 1980. *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mitchell-Kernan, C. 1971. *Language Behaviour in a Black Urban Community*. Monographs of the Language-Behaviour Research Laboratory, No. 2. Berkeley: University of California.

Morton, R. and L. Williams 1977. 'An investigation into the diphthongs of New Zealand English'. Unpublished manuscript. Auckland: University of Auckland.

Newbrook, M. 1986. *Sociolinguistic Reflexes of Dialect Interference in West Wirral*. Berlin: Verlag PeterLang.

Russell, J. 1982. 'Networks and sociolinguistic variation in an African urban setting'. *Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities* ed. by S. Romaine, 125-140. London: Edward Arnold.

Shuy, R.W., W. A. Wolfram and W.K. Riley 1968. *Field Techniques in an Urban Language Study.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Trudgill, P. 1974. *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfram W. A. and D. Christian 1976. *Appalachian Speech.* Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wolfram, W. A. and R.W. Fasold 1974. *The Study of Social Dialects in American English.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Wolfson, N. 1976. 'Speech events and natural speech: some implications for sociolinguistic methodology', *Language in Society* 5,2:189-209.