Second Dialect Acquisition: Preliminary Results

Aaron E. Drews
University of Edinburgh
Department of Linguistics
Postgraduate Conference 1997

I can spot an Irishman or a Yorkshireman by his brogue. I can place any man within six miles. I can place him within two miles in London. Sometimes within two streets.

George Bernard Shaw, *Pygmalion*

INTRODUCTION

Professor Higgins may have fared well in placing the accent of a London flower girl, but how would he have placed a woman who spent half of her childhood in Britain and the rest of her youth in America? With all of the mobility of the modern world, a person is likely to permanently move to a region where their native dialect is not spoken. Sometimes, it may be from one region of a country to another, or the move can be from one country to another where the same language is spoken.

There is little research which specifically addresses SDA. It is for this reason that so many sub-disciplines within linguistics will be incorporated. It is hoped that, at the completion of this thesis, a sold theory of second dialect acquisition will be developed. It is hoped that this theory can apply to dialect acquisition in several languages, not just English.

There will be three main varieties of English used in the study. The first is General American (GA). GA is a descriptive term of the speech of most North Americans. This is due to the relative homogeneity of English in North America. GA is a rhotic variety of English.

The second variety used in the study is Received Pronunciation (RP). Again, this is meant to be a term descriptive of the speech of southern Britain. This includes the non-rhotic accents found in the Midlands and the south of England.

The third variety of English to be included in this study is Scottish Standard English (ScSE). The term 'standard' is a bit of a misnomer, as it is a general reference to the English spoken in Scotland, even though its accents vary between the highlands and the lowlands, and the east coast and west coast of the lowlands. There are enough similarities amongst all of the accents to derive a 'standard' underlying phonology. ScSE is a rhotic variety of English.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The phonological framework for this thesis will be based on Giegerich (1992). While Giegerich is an introductory text to English phonology, the three main reference dialects he uses as examples are the same three dialects used in this thesis.

Giegerich outlines in detail some of the phonological difference used in this study. He classifies the phonological differences between the three dialects into three groups: lexical; realisational; phonemic.

Phonemic differences are differences in the phoneme inventory. This, most importantly, includes various vowel mergers and distinctions.

Realisational differences are differences that are realised differently on the phonetic level. The underlying phonemes are the same. There may be a difference in the generative phonological rules, which would result in a different output. These differences may also just be a different phonetic realisation not due to any generative rules. In order to explain dialect acquisition more clearly, they two types of realisational differences need to be separated. Thus, simple phonetic differences will be referred to as realisational differences. Differences due to a phonological rule will be referred to as generative differences.

Lexical variations are differences in the underlying pronunciation of a word in the lexicon. The phoneme system between the two dialects may be the same, as well as the generative rules. The five pronunciation differences Chambers (1992) examines are this type of difference. Indeed, the twenty-five lexical items which he examines are also this type of difference. The acquisition process for these types of differences might be similar. However, for the time being, pronunciation differences will be referred to as lexical-distributional (or simply distributional) variants. Items which have completely different lexemes between dialects will be referred to as lexical variants.

There will be five main categories which the differences between dialects can be grouped: realisational; generative; phonemic; lexical-distributional; and lexical. Interdialects can be described using these categories. The order of acquisition can more readily be explained in these terms than what Chambers (1992) describes in his eight hypotheses.

English dialects vary mostly in their vowel systems. For that reason, the three vowel inventories are listed here. This is to make comparison and discussion of the dialects simpler.

Vowel Inventories

Standard English/ Received Pronunciation	General American	Scottish Standard English
/i/ /ɪ/ /ʊ/ /u/ /e/ /ɛ/ /ʌ/ /o/ /ɒ/ /ɔ/ /æ/ /ɑ/ diphthongs: /aɪ/, /aʊ/, /ɔɪ/ (SBrE only): /ɪə/, /ɛə/, /ʊə/	/i/ /ɪ/ /ʊ/ /u/ /e/ /ɛ/ /ʌ/ /o/ (/ɔ/) /æ/ /ɑ/ diphthongs: /aɪ/, /aʊ/, /ɔɪ/	/i/ /ɪ/ /ʉ/ /e/ /ɛ/ /ʌ/ /o/ /a/ /ɔ/ diphthongs: /aɪ/, /aʊ/, /ɔɪ/

This thesis will replicate the methodology, to a certain extent, of the only longitudinal study performed thus far about second dialect acquisition. This study is summarised in Chambers (1992) (see also Chambers 1988, 1995a, 1995b). Chambers (1992) postulates eight hypotheses, six of which are listed here:

- Simple phonological rules progress faster than complex ones.
- Acquisition of complex rules and new phonemes splits the population into early acquirers and later acquirers.
- In the earliest stages of acquisition, both categorical rules and variable rules of the new dialect results in variability in the acquirer.
- Phonological innovations are articulated as pronunciation variants.
- Eliminating old rules occurs more rapidly than acquiring new ones.
- Orthographically distinct variants are acquired faster than orthographically obscure ones. (Chambers 1992: 677-700).

This paper is concerned mostly with phonology. Therefore, the two hypotheses that deal with the lexicon are not applicable to this presentation

One of the hypotheses states that the loss of a D1 feature is easier than the acquisition of a D2 feature. Chambers uses t-voicing and r-lessness to support the claim. He also uses these features to support his claim about the role of orthography. However, speakers of SBrE easily acquire the GA t-voicing rule and maintain r-lessness (Trudgill 1986: 19-20). Chambers (1995b: 248-9) concedes that t-voicing is representative of a natural, perhaps primitive, linguistic phenomenon, common to many languages. This helps explain the facility of acquisition of this feature. Phonotactic constraints, such as rhoticity, are difficult to overcome in the acquisition process (Broselow 1984). Hence, these two hypotheses of Chambers are not really supported by all of the data.

In his conclusion, Chambers admits that there is not much empirical depth in the field of second dialect acquisition. Thus, he encourages replication of the study and outlines the current theories which need to be included in any study of this topic. It is with that invitation that this study is initiated.

PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES

In total, there are nine phonological features examined. The first phonological rule examined is t-voicing. This is a rule in GA where post-tonic, pre-vocalic /t/ becomes a tap or a flap [ɾ]. This feature will be considered the acquisition of a t-voicing rule, whether it is the acquisition of flapping of the acquisition of de-voicing. Either perspective is concerned with the same phonological rule.

"In about half of the geographic United States and all of Canada" (Labov 1996), the low back vowels /ɔ/ and /ɑ/ of standard GA have merged to /ɑ/ so that *caught* and *cot* are homophonous. In ScSE, these vowels have been merged to /ɔ/. In RP, the distinction is still made, using two rounded vowels /ɔ/ and /ɒ/. Depending on the D1 and the D2, acquisition of this feature can be realisational or phonemic.

Another difference between SBrE and other varieties of English is the feature of vowel backing. Historically, Middle English ă became [ɑ] before a voiceless fricative or before a nasal and obstruent cluster. In other environments, the vowel fronted to [æ]. This is a diachronic rule that has since become lexicalised, rather than a current rule in RP phonology. However, an informant might make a generalisation based on the above environments, and acquire this feature as a phonological rule. Additionally, if both the D1 and the D2 have a *caught* versus *cot* distinction, the presence or absence of a vowel backing rule could introduce a change in an informant's phonemic inventory.

The feature that divides English dialects into two main categories is rhoticity. RP, except for in parts of the south-west of England, is non-rhotic. That is, /r/ cannot be realised as [r] before a consonant. The realisation of /r/ is governed by a phonotactic constraint which only allows it to be realised as [r] in a syllable onset (Giegerich 1992). It has been demonstrated that phonotactic constraints are difficult to overcome in SLA (Broselow 1984).

Giegerich (1992) proposes a secondary vowel system for RP. Since RP is non-rhotic, this secondary system accounts for vowels before /r/. In present-day RP, an historical rule eliminating [r] before a consonant has been lexicalised, with new phonemes as the result. The vowels of the secondary system are: "/ɪə/ in *here, beer*... /ɛə/ in *hair, bear*... /ʊə/ in *sure, cure*" (65). This analysis of vowels before /r/ helps explain the difficulty of acquiring rhoticity or lack thereof.

A concomitant rule that accompanies lack of rhoticity is intrusive-r. This is a rule which inserts [r] epenthetically where no /r/ exists historically or orthographically. This feature is usually only found in non-rhotic varieties of English. Intrusive-r is highly stigmatised, particularly after the vowel /ɔ/ (see Jones 1991: xxvii,ˌ 14). However, this rule is difficult to suppress completely for a native non-rhotic speaker. This incongruity between stigmatisation and difficulty of suppression leads to intrusive-r being a variable rule. Such variable rules are difficult to acquire, comparable to hitting a moving target.

One ScSE feature worth study is high, back vowel merger. Scots and ScSE have merged the two high, back vowels. Where other English varieties have /u/ and /ʊ/, ScSE has /ʉ/, so that *pull* and *pool* are homophonous. This vowel is further forward than the two distinct vowels in other dialects. The fronting of [u] to [ʉ] or (or the backing of [ʉ] to [u]), without merging or splitting the high back vowels, can also be studied as a realisational difference as opposed to a phonemic difference.

A second feature which can be examined when comparing ScSE and GA is the acquisition or loss of the voiceless velar fricative /x/ and the voiceless labio-velar fricative /ʍ/, as in *lo<u>ch</u>* and *<u>wh</u>ich*. While this is actually two features, it will be treated as one since consonantal variation across English dialects is minimal and because of the limited distribution of these two phonemes. While /x/ is more salient than /ʍ/, it is predicted that the acquisition or loss of either phoneme is equally difficult.

A third feature to be included in this thesis is the Scottish Vowel Length Rule (SVLR) or Aitken's Law. In GA and RP, vowels are longer before voiced consonants. In ScSE, however, all tense vowels become long only before voiced fricatives, /r/ and morpheme boundaries (Giegerich 1992: 56). This is a somewhat complex generative rule, and not very salient.

In lieu of rhoticity, there is another feature specific to ScSE related to the /r/ phoneme which can be studied. GA and RP collapse all lax vowels before /r/, either to [ɚ] (GA) or [ɜ] (SBrE). In ScSE, the "phonemes /ʌ/, /ɪ/ and /ɛ/are unstable" before syllable-rhyme /r/ (Giegerich 1992: 63). Depending on the individual and the region, one, two or all three of these vowels are fully realised before syllable-rhyme /r/or are collapsed to [ɜr], which is slightly higher than the GA equivalent. The underlined words in the phrase *the <u>bird</u> sat on the <u>kerb</u> with <u>fur</u>* would be realised as [ɪr], [ɛr] and [ʌr], respectively. Some accents of ScSE may also collapse the vowels to [ɜr]. This ScSE collapsed allophone would simply be the acquisition of a new realisation of the collapsed vowel for a native GA speaker. The acquisition or loss of this feature could either be a generative or a realisational difference.

To reiterate, there are four categories into which these nine phonological differences can be classified: realisational; generative; phonemic; lexical-distributional.

Classification of Phonological Rules

Realisational	Generative	Phonemic	Lexical-Distributional
collapsed vowels before /r/ realisation of merged ɔ/a u-fronting	t-voicing SVLR lax vowels before /r/	/ɔ/ - /a/ merger /u/ - /ʊ/ merger /x/, /ʍ/ rhoticity	vowel backing intrusive-r pronunciation differences on picture cards

The categorisation of these rules is not strict in the acquisition process. All phonological differences start off as distributional differences (Chambers 1992: 693-695). Additionally, some phonemic differences may only be partially acquired as a realisational difference. For the time being, however, these classifications will suffice.

DATA COLLECTION

Elicitation exercises began with the subject reading a phrase this. This phrase list is used for testing the acquisition of specific phonological features which have been detailed. The list is based on the one Chambers' devised, with modifications taken into account for ScSE. The order of the phrases are very loosely arranged by semantic field.

After the phrase list, the subjects named items from a series of picture cards. This was to test lexical and distributional acquisition. As a distraction, the subjects read the numbers of each item as well as naming the item. Replicating Chambers' methodology, there are twenty-five pictures used to elicit lexical variants. Five items are used to elicit lexical-distributional variants. The words on this list are fairly representative of the bulk of lexical differences between the standard varieties of English. There are also ten items in the list which have no variation in the standard varieties, so as not to pique the subjects' attention as the nature of the task.

The last of the elicitation tasks will be a reading passage. The passage was fabricated specifically for this study and will include instances of all of the phonological features outlined earlier. While this is still a highly monitored situation, various phonological and pronunciation variants can be tested in context. This will also provide another style in which dialect usage can vary.

RESULTS

Each member of the family used in this study has been exposed to at least two varieties of English. Currently, the family lives in east-central Scotland. Every member of the family was born in Britain. Permanent residence in Britain for the children did not begin until August 1992. Before moving to Scotland, they lived in the Los Angeles area for four years and prior to that, in San Francisco for four years. The two oldest children have also lived with their parents in Honk Kong and Zambia It is assumed that all of the children speak GA as their D1.

All of the children were beyond the critical age for phonology, assumed to be six years, when they arrived in Scotland five years ago. Therefore, it is assumed that the rate of acquisition, particularly for phonology was slow to begin with and most probably has stopped by now. The children speak an interdialect, with features of General American, Received Pronunciation and Scottish Standard English all contributing to their idiolects.

The parents speak relatively "pure" versions of their respective dialects. The father speaks RP and the mother speaks ScSE. For the pilot study, they served as controls – samples of the target dialects for their children. Since the parents are in an environment where their first dialects are spoken, they could not be used to examine adult dialect acquisition.

All subjects have acquired the t-voicing rule. This is a simple generative rule which can be acquired after the critical age for phonology (Trudgill 1986). Occasionally, an intervocalic /t/ was flapped. Because each subject had a de-voiced /t/ in at least ninety percent of all possible instances, it is difficult to determine if the occasional flap was ease of articulation, a remnant of GA, or accommodation towards the interviewer.

THE SUBJECTS

Peter

Peter, age 12, was exposed to ScSE towards the end of the sensitive period. It is expected that he would have had the most ScSE features in his idiolect. The more complex features, however, should have fossilised in an intermediate stage of acquisition.

Of the realisational differences Peter has acquired, the most complete is the ScSE realisation of [ɔ] in lieu of western GA [ɑ]. He also seems to have acquired the rule governing lax vowels before /r/, including the aspect of free variation.

There are eight potential realisations of a full lax vowel before /r/. Four of these eight times, Peter offered a full [ɪ], [ɛ] or [ʌ] before [r]. Two other times, he gave a collapsed vowel, but with the ScSE realisation [ɜr]. Only twice Peter gave the GA r-coloured reduced vowel [ɚ]. Whether Peter has acquired the concept of free variation or if he has only partially acquired the new realisations is difficult to determine. The end result is the same.

The Scottish Vowel Length Rule is not a very salient feature. However, Peter has acquired competence of SVLR. Out of eight SVLR long-short contrasts in the phrase list, Peter distinguished vowel quantity four times. Another two times there was a slight distinction in the length of the two vowels. Peter also distinguishes the length of diphthongs according to this rule.

The voiceless velar fricative [x] is a special feature in Peter's idiolect. For almost every occurrence of <ch> in the phrase list, Peter produced a fricative. The name *Michael* he pronounced with a stop, but, in the same phrase, he pronounced a fricative in *ar<u>ch</u>angel*, which is not anticipated. Upon his first glance of the phrase *monar<u>chy</u> and anar<u>chy</u>*, he produced a fricative for both words, although he realised that *anar<u>chy</u>* should have a plosive and corrected himself. When he came across the word *paro<u>ch</u>ial*, he tried guessing the pronunciation from the spelling, the word being difficult for him. Apparently, he has learned that the graphs <ch> always corresponds to the distinctive ScSE sound [x] and he hypercorrects based on this knowledge.

Since Peter is the youngest, it is expected that he would have acquired the most ScSE features of all the subjects. He produced all ScSE variants in at least seventy-five percent of all possible instances. The remaining twenty-five percent or so could be due to fossilisation of the rules or because he was accommodating towards the interviewer. So, Peter has acquired the range of phonological differences: a simple generative rule; realisational differences; a complex generative rule; and one phonemic difference.

Richard

The next youngest subject is Richard. He is fifteen years old. When first exposed to an ScSE speaking community, he was past the critical period for phonology. However, he seems to have acquired some features of ScSE, as well as some from SBrE.

Richard does not realise lax vowels fully before /r/ in stressed syllables. However, he has acquired the ScSE collapsed vowel [ɜr] and used it six out of eight times. One allophone, [ɜr], has been acquired in place of another, [ɚ]. The other three allophones have not been acquired, so this ScSE feature has not fully been acquired.

Like Peter, Richard demonstrate use of SVLR. Five times, out of a possible eight, Richard distinguishes vowel length in paired contrasts. He also makes the distinction once in the reading passage. Not only does he distinguish the length of the vowels, he produces diphthongs with different vowel quality in long and short contexts, which is reported to be a feature of SVLR (Giegerich 1992). Competence of this rule has been acquired. Performance of the rule might depend on the social situation.

Richard also demonstrated partial acquisition of two phonemic features. First is the acquisition of the /u/-/ʊ/ merger. There are four occasions on the phrase list where /u/ and /ʊ/ are in paired contrasts. One on occasion, Richard pronounced the vowels with the same fronted realisation [ʉ]. Out of twelve occurrences of /u/ in the phrase list, Richard realised a fronted vowel six times. This includes the three instances in the phrase *pull your brother through the pull* just mentioned. In Richard's idiolect, the phoneme /u/ has two allophones: [u] and [ʉ]. This is possibly an intermediate stage in the acquisition of the merger.

Richard also distinguished between the low, back vowels. The distinction is not as great as RP [ɔ] and [ɒ] or GA [ɔ] and [ɑ]. But nine out of eleven times in the phrase list, Richard produced slightly different vowels in paired contrast. He also maintained the contrast in the reading passage. This may be the realisational acquisition of [ɒ] for [ɑ], assuming he had the distinction in his D1. It is possible that Richard was in the process of acquiring the ScSE merged vowel, having made the distinction in his D1. Now, the GA phoneme /ɑ/ is losing lexical distribution and becoming merged with the ScSE phoneme /ɔ/, which would explain the auditory similarities in the two vowels he produced.

Chris

Chris, the second eldest child is seventeen years old. He is demonstrating little acquisition of ScSE.

Chris merged the two low, back vowels. He has acquired the ScSE realisation [ɔ] in the place of western GA [ɑ]. He also pronounced diphthongs with raised onsets, another realisational feature of ScSE. He produced one full lax vowel before /r/, but in all other instances he offered the ScSE collapsed allophone [ɜr]. Three times Chris produced a fronted [ʉ] for /u/.

There are no instances of merging the two high back vowels. There is only one instance of SVLR, which may have been due to list intonation. He uses [x] for all occurrences of *loch*, but given the nature of this lexeme, acquisition of the voiceless velar fricative is not likely.

Clearly we see one of the affects of age on the acquisition of phonology. Chris has only acquired one simple generative rule (t-voicing) and simple realisational differences. But he has not acquired anything more complicated than these two types of phonological features.

Elizabeth

Since Elizabeth is the eldest child at age 23, it is expected that she will not have acquired a D2 at all. It is true that she has not acquired all of RP or ScSE. However, her interdialect phonology seems to be more diverse than those of her brothers.

In addition to having lived in the previously listed locations, she has also lived in Manchester during summer holidays, and in Wales briefly about one year prior to moving to Scotland. During her sojourn in Wales, a very prescriptive family member convinced Elizabeth to speak "properly" (i.e. RP). According to her, she was once again speaking GA before returning to Scotland.

The only feature Elizabeth has categorically acquired is t-voicing. She still utters an occasional flap, which is probably a remnant of GA encouraged by accommodation towards the interviewer.

Occasionally, Elizabeth demonstrates the SBrE diphthongal realisation of [-low] vowels, such as [həʊm] for *home* or [dʊu] for *do*. This was mostly noted in the reading passage.

Elizabeth distinguishes between /ɔ/ and /ɑ/. Because of the completeness of the distinction, and considering her age with respect to the critical period, it should be assumed that the distinction is part of her D1.

In the phrase list, there are nine potential instances of vowel backing. Elizabeth produced a back vowel in seven of these nine environments, as well as for both possible occurrences in the reading passage. Considering the completeness of the acquisition, it is possible that this feature was acquired as a generative rule instead of as individual distributional differences. Elizabeth has acquired vowel backing and she maintains a GA /ɔ/-/ɑ/ distinction. However, she has not acquired a new phoneme. While vowel backing and a low back vowel distinction have three vowel phonemes in RP (/ɑ/ and /ɔ/-/ɒ/, respectively), Elizabeth uses one of the *cot-caught* vowels for vowel backing, thus acquiring a generative rule (possibly) without acquiring a new phoneme. Acoustical analysis on computer needs to be done in order to determine if there are two or three vowels, however.

The /r/ phoneme is peculiar is Elizabeth's interdialect phonology. According to the data from the phrase list and the reading passage, an underlying /r/ following a surface [ə] is obligatorily realised as [ɚ] in word-final position. The lexeme *water* is an exception to this rule. Elizabeth's brothers remarked how she usually says a very RP-like [wɒtʰɜ]. This is probably a distributional acquisition, acquired in the same way as *tomato*, for example. An underlying /ər/ (in GA) in word-final position is present seventeen times in the phrase list and reading passage. Fourteen of those times, Elizabeth realised the [r].

Because of this close association of /ə/ and /r/ in word-final position, intrusive-r is also present. There are three instances in the phrase list and three in the reading passage of an underlying /ə/ in word-final position, followed by a vowel. Five instances were realised as [ɚ] by Elizabeth.

In a medial environment, /ə/+/r/ occurs six times in the phrase list and eight times in the reading passage. There were four non-rhotic realisations from the phrase list and two from the passage. Less than half of the /ə/+/r/ realisations were non-rhotic, but this was dependent on the elicitation exercise.

The realisation of /r/ is slightly different after full vowels. Elizabeth does not realise an underlying /r/ (in GA) after the vowels /ɑ/ and /ɔ/. These segments might have been acquired as realisational differences of /ɑr/ and /ɔr/ This generalisation also includes instances of intrusive-r, which was never pronounced in this environment. Elizabeth has not acquired the SBrE phonemes /ɪə/, /ɛə/ or /ʊə/. Instead, she still maintains rhoticity in these environments as a remnant of GA.

Unlike her brothers, Elizabeth's target dialect is SBrE. She demonstrates no instances of ScSE features except for the occasional Scots lexeme. Thus, her interdialect phonology differs considerably from that of her brothers. However, some generalisations about SDA can be made using all four subjects.

CONCLUSION

With regards to the critical age, we see the youngest informant, Peter, demonstrating the most use of ScSE phonology. ScSE features were produced correctly in at least seventy-five percent of the time. Peter did not demonstrate complete use of some features, particularly the acquisition of a new phoneme /ʉ/.

This could be due to the fact that he was just slightly beyond the critical age when he was exposed to ScSE.

At the opposite extreme is Chris, who demonstrates very little use of ScSE phonology. This is clearly due to the fact that he was exposed to ScSE after the critical age for phonology. Even if he were not accommodating towards the interviewer, it is likely that he would not have produced any ScSE feature, except t-voicing, more than twenty percent of the time.

Despite being the oldest, Elizabeth has partially acquired what seems to be the most difficult feature used in this study: rhoticity. The only part of rhoticity Elizabeth has not acquired at all is the secondary phoneme system. The reason she has acquired some SBrE features may be due to her varying exposure to SBrE before permanently moving to Scotland.

A critical age of six is most pertinent to the acquisition of phonemic differences. Those features which can be acquired in the later stages of the critical period are simpler, and probably acquired first by all dialect learners. Complex features which seem to be acquired later, have an earlier critical age. This inverted effect of the critical age suggests a distinct order in the acquisition process.

Realisational differences are acquired early in the acquisition process. For example, many of the informants have acquired ScSE [ɜr] in place of GA [ɚ], or ScSE [ʉ] in place of GA [u]. Acquisition of these realisational differences seems to be the first step in acquiring phonological rules.

These "intermediate" rules are acquired more completely than more complex phonological rules, such as vowel backing or SVLR. In turn, complex rules seem to be more completely acquired than new phonemes. This would explain why Elizabeth has only partially acquired r-lessness. She has not acquired the phonemic differences that are part of the lack of rhoticity. In addition, the consonant phoneme /ʍ/ is not used at all by any of the subjects, and /x/ is only uttered in the token *loch*. The ScSE phoneme /ʉ/ is not being acquired by any of the informants, either.

Elizabeth's rhoticity is a clear example of interdialect phonology. It is possible that definable, "incomplete" phonological rules are common to all speakers of an interdialect. It is also possible that this "semi-rhoticity" and similar features are only part of one person's idiolect. More data would be able to determine which possibility is true.

Acquisition of ScSE Features

	Simple	Realisational			Generative		Phonemic	
	[t]/[ɾ]	[ɜr]	[ɔ]	[ʉ]	SVLR	ɛr,ɪr,ʌr	u/ʊ	ɔ/ɑ
Peter								n/a
Richard								
Chris								n/a

Acquisition of SBrE Features

	Simple	Realisational		Generative		Phonemic	
	[t]/[ɾ]	[əʊ]/[eɪ]	[ɔr]→ [ɔ] [ɑr] → [ɑ]	ă-backing	rhoticity ə/ɚ	rhoticity ɪə,ɛə,ʊə	(ɒ-ɔ, ɑ) ɒ
Elizabeth							

white: uttered in at least 75% of all possible instances
grey: uttered between 25% and 75% of all possible instances
black: uttered in less than 25% of all possible instances

There is some semblance of an order of acquisition. However, more data may enlighten us as to which environments – linguistic and social – acquisition is most likely to occur. No firm conclusions or rules can be made about the features that are only partially acquired.

It is hoped that with more data and with more scrupulous analysis of the data, the hypotheses established for this thesis will be confirmed or denied. This suggests, then, that the pilot study and the experiment design were a success. Some of the hypotheses were addressed, but no solid conclusions can be drawn because of lack of data. This implies that a more solid theory can be formed using the experimental techniques used in this study and with more subjects to provide data.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Broselow, Ellen. 1984. Transfer Effects in the Acquisition of Second Language Phonology. IRAL, 22. Pp. 253-269

Chambers, J.K. 1988. Acquisition of Phonological Variants. In Alan R, Thomas (Ed.) Methods in Dialectology. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Pp 650-665.

Chambers, J.K. 1992. Dialect Acquisition. Language, 68. Pp 673-705.

Chambers, J.K. 1995a. Acquisition of Lexical and Pronunciation Variants. In Wolfgang Viereck (Ed.), pp 3-19.

Chambers, J.K. 1995b. Sociolinguistic Theory. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

David, Shanta. 1985. The Acquisition of the Phonological Features of a Second Dialect. Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Giegerich, Heinz J. 1992. English Phonology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giles, Howard and Philip Smith. 1979. Accommodation Theory: Optimal Levels of Convergence. In: Howard Giles and Robert St. Claire (eds.) Language and Social Psychology. Oxford: Blackwell. Pp 45-65.

Jones, Daniel. 1991. English Pronouncing Dictionary. Eds. A.C. Gimson and Susan Ramsaran. 14th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (1917).

Labov, William. 1994. Principles of Linguistic Change. Vol. I: Internal Factors. Oxford: Blackwell.

Labov, William. 1996. The Organization of Dialect Diversity in North America. Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference of Spoken Language Processing at Philadelphia at http://www.ling.upenn.edu/phono-atlas/ICSLP4.html.

Ladefoged, Peter. 1993. A Course in Phonetics. 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. (1975).

Payne, Arvilla C. 1980. Factors Controlling the Acquisition of the Philadelphia Dialect by Out-of-State Children. In W. Labov (Ed.), Locating Language in Time and Space. New York: Academic. Pp. 143-178.

Trudgill, Peter. 1986. Dialects in Contact. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Viereck, Wolfgang (Ed.). 1995. Proceedings of the International Congress of Dialectologists: Bamburg 29.7.-4.8.1990. Volume 4: Sociolinguistic Variation. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Vousten, Rob and Theo Bongaerts. Acquiring a Dialect as L2: The Case of the Dialect of Venray in the Dutch Province of Limburg. In Wolfgang Viereck (Ed.) pp 299-313.