Mem. Fac. Educ., Shimane Univ. (Lit. & Soc. Sci.) Vol. 13, pp. 1–11, December 1979

A Survey of American English Usage[1]

by

Masayoshi YAMADA*

0. Ever since English began to supplant Latin as a language respectably used for literature and science, some people have felt obliged to see to it that it is a fit language for such purposes. These self-appointed purifiers of the language have often been more notable for their zeal in promulgating rules and regulations than for careful and judicious attention to the actual nature of English. Naturally, most other people have gone on blithely oblivious to the purists' strainings at fleas, or they have let themselves be convinced that their natural use of language is defective, and they feel uneasy about not having learned, let alone using, all the myriad prescriptions the purists have given them.

This last group's application of those rules is quite inconsistent. Sometimes they half-learn them and misapply them (as with the rules concerning pronoun case), in other cases they ignore them (as with many "outlawed" vocabulary items), and in still others they grimly hang on to a few rules that were once current, but have now been abandoned by even the most reactionary language policemen (for example, the continued belief that "a preposition is not something to end a sentence with").

Recently, we have read a number of discussions on the English language in the United States, which seem to be unanimously advocating "linguistic cleanup."

> Vigorous efforts to rescue the battered English language are under way from the White House to classroom across the country.
>
> The campaign moved into high gear in March when President Carter ordered the federal bureaucracy to write government regulations in "plain English." The action was in line with Carter's pledge to make the government more comprehensible to the general public. Federal officials often have been accused of disguising their activities with contorted language.[2]
>
> The federal efforts and those by schools and colleges are intended to improve the use of English from kindergarten through adulthood. They come at a time when English has become the international tongue, the first language of more than 300 million people and a second means of expression for 300 million more. English is used around the world by airline personnel, financiers, diplomats and many others—far surpassing any rival, including Chinese which is spoken by 900 million people but rarely by non-Chinese.
>
> Scholars are concerned because correct English usage has been eroded by Americans who have fallen into what are widely considered sloppy habits of expression and by some foreigners with an inexact command of the language. In the United States, permissive schooling and the influence of television, which has made it less necessary to read to acquire information, are often blamed for the decline of the language.
>
> In an effort to reverse this decline, the government has instigated instruction in how to write and speak simply. The General Accounting Office, for example, is spending $82,000 a year to teach auditors how to write in terms that a nonspecialist will understand.
>
> Federal officials recognize that changing old habits will not be easy. The experience of U. S. Commissioner of Education Ernest Boyer illustrates the problem. When Boyer pointed out an unclear sentence to an underling, he was told : "Oh, yes, we'll have to laymanize it" —a tortured way of saying the thought would have to be made comprensible to everybody.
>
> Many schools, concerned about the hard times on which English has fallen, are placing renewed emphasis on grammar and spelling. The extent of the problem is shown by declining

* Department of English, Faculty of Education, Shimane University, Matsue, Japan 690.

English test scores among students entering college, ungrammatical writing of many supposedly well-educated people and the illiteracy of some highschool graduates.

Some states are instituting competency exams, with students required to pass tests in basic skills before they graduate from high school. A few colleges are also developing such exams. American University in Washington, D. C., will require students to pass tests in reading and writing before they can receive their diplomas.

Colleges are strengthening freshman composition requirements after finding that some students are barely literate. One former college English instructor cites this example of freshman writing : "The game of love is an upset because Sally and George has downset love fair." The instructor says she thinks the student was trying to say that Sally and George had broken up. . . .

Whether it is a crisis — or merely a problem — many experts agree that too many Americans do not know how to use the language properly. They are particularly worried because many parents do not read to their children and do no reading at home themselves.

Observes Jasper Neel of the Modern Language Association : "Reading and writing will continue to decline until society behaves in a way that says these skills are important."[3]

This study investigates a small group of usage items over the whole spectrum, attempting to answer three questions : 1) How aware are non-specialists that these items are disputed? 2) If they are aware, what is their attitude toward the items? and 3) How do they actually use these constructions?

Addressing that third question is complicated by what William Labov has aptly termed the "Observer's Paradox" (Labov 1972, 209) : "the aim is to find out how the informants ordinarily use these items, but the very act of seeking information about them changes the use." The informants may not know how they actually use the forms, they may want to appear more correct than they really are, or they may distort the data by trying to anticipate the results the investigator is seeking (Greenbaum and Quirk 1970, 1-3). There are various ways to overcome this problem. One is to examine a corpus of some sort, with the major problem that very large amounts of material must be examined to find a significant number of examples, since the features do not all occur naturally very frequently. Another approach is to elicit the features both overtly and covertly, accepting the results as valid if they converge despite the different approaches (Labov 1972, 61-62, 209 ff.). This study employs the latter method.

Some valuable techniques of this sort have been developed by Randolph Quirk and his colleagues in the Survey of English Usage. One group of these techniques was used to study certain verb-adverb collocations, but proved readily adaptable to the usage items I wanted to examine (Greembaum and Quirk 1970 ; Quirk and Svartvik 1966 ; Greenbaum 1969 ; Greenbaum 1970). These involve a combination of performance and judgment tests. The performance tests are intended to elicit the informants' actual use of certain items ; the judgment tests to discover their attitudes toward them (Greenbaum and Quirk 1970, 3). The performance tests distract the informants' attention away from the features being tested by asking them to perform grammatical manipulations on the sentence in a short period of time, leaving intact everything not involved in the required change. Consequently, the changes the informants actually do make in the features under scrutiny are likely to be spontaneous products of their linguistic intuitions. The judgment tests, on the other hand, ask the informants directly to consider the relevant features.

Having selected this method of study, I chose the specific usage items. First was a group of five lexical items : *hopefully* used as a sentence modifier, *due to* used in place of *because of* at the beginning of an adverbial phrase, *between* rather than *among* used with more than two items, the status of two derived verbs formed with *-ize* (*sterilize* and *finalize*), and *good* used in place of the adverb *well*. Next came a group concerned with

various pronoun usages : the use, misuse, and avoidance of *who* and *whom* ; the number of a possessive pronoun whose antecedent is an indefinite pronoun, and three matters of pronoun case distinctions and verbs, and use of the objective or subjective form after the verb *be*. Finally, I included items concerned with prepositions at the ends of sentences, because the idea that these are wrong persists with many laymen. Here, I considered three cases : one with a redundant pronoun at the end, a second with a verb-particle construction, and a third with an intransitive verb plus prepositional phrase.

I will proceed first to discuss the specific experimental procedure, then to give an item-by-item discussion of the findings. After this I will present my summary of the conclusions, suggestions for further study.

1. *Experimental Design*

The test battery consisted of two parts, the performance and the judgment tests, given three to five days apart, so that the informants would forget most of the specifics of the performance test before they did the judgment test. The tests had to be short enough to take up no more than half of a 50-minute class session, and in order to avoid any problem of informant fatigue. To avoid any questions of the influence of the order of items on each other, two forms of each test were prepared, one with its order reversed from the other. In addition, the order that each informant would get on the two tests was reversed (i. e., item one on his/her part one would be item 22 on part two). Part one was prefaced by a section requesting the informant's student ID number, so that an individual's responses could be matched with one another. This section also requested five pieces of information about the informant's background.

All of the informants were enrolled in English 102, the second required English course at the University of Kansas. A total of six sections, taught by three different assistant instructors, were employed, producing 83 informants for the first part and 91 for the second. Seventy (84.3%) of those who did part one were freshmen, 11(13.3%) sophomores, and 2 (2.4%) were were juniors. Thirty-five (42.4%) of the informants were 18 years old, and another thirty-four (41.0%) were 19 years old. There were 2 (2.4%) 24-year-olds, and one each were 22, 23, 24, 25, and 28 (1.2%). Forty-six (55.4%) were males, thirty-one (37.3 %) females, and six (7.2%) failed to indicate their sex. Only one was majoring in English or linguistics. The rest were spread over a wide range of disciplines : seventeen (20.5%) in business, ten (12.0%) in engineering, eight (9.6%) in health-related fields, seven (8.4%) in the social sciences, six (7.2%) in architecture, journalism, and biology. Four (4.8%) were in fine arts, three (3.6%) in the humanities (other than English), and two each (2.4%) in education and physical sciences. That leave eleven (13.3%) who were undecided. The final demographic question asked the state or foreign country where the informants had lived most of their first 15 years. Forty-seven (56.6%) were from Kansas, ten (12.0%) from Missouri, five (6.0%) from Illinois, three (3.6%) from Texas, two each (2.4%) from New York and California. There was one representative apiece (1.2%) from Montana, Minnesota, New Jersey, Washington, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, Michigan, and Florida. Two (2.4) were from foreign countries, one from Liberia and one from West Germany. Four (4.8%) gave no response.

The body of part one consisted of three practice sentences followed by 22 test sentences which were read to the informants, with instructions to perform a specified simple grammatical operation on each. The operations were identical to those in Greenbaum and Quirk (1970, 8) and Quirk and Svartvik (1966, 22) except that the instructions about inversion questions with *be* or *do* were replaced with the general instruction to "change the sentence

into a yes or no question" (Greenbaum and Quirk 1970, 13-14). The order of reading the sentence or the operation to be performed first was changed with each group of three questions (Quirk and Svartvik 1966, 18-19 ; Greenbaum and Quirk 1970, 9, 26-28. Hereafter these monographs will be cited as QS and GQ, respectively.). Fifteen seconds were alloted for the responses, between the time one reading was finished and another began (GQ, 11). For the lexical usage tests, one deviant and one non-deviant sentence were included for each item. ("Deviant," here and afterwards, means "wrong according to the usage convention in question.") The same was done for the *who/whom* and indefinite pronoun items. In the pronoun case items, one, a predicate nominative "she," was non-deviant, the other two (the compounds) deviant ; and all three terminal preposition items did end in prepositions ("deviant"). Items from each group were mixed up through the series so that no two similar items came very close together.

The informants were first directed to fill in the requested information. They were then told the kinds of changes they would be required to make in the sentences, using language taken almost verbatim from QS (22). During these instructions, an overhead projector and previously prepared transparencies were used, naming tne operations and giving examples, which seemed useful to focus the informants' attention on the changes to be made. The informants usually had no questions about the operations, and the results indicate that there were no problems from misunderstanding this part of the instructions. The last part of the instructions stated "Since sentences heard in isolation often sound strange, let me emphasize that you should make only the changes that the instructions specify," which was included to discourage changes even in sentences perceived as deviant (GQ, 13, 28-29). A blank was left for sentence #23 as if it would be a regular item, but 15 seconds after sentence #22 was read, the students were advised to fill the space for #23 with their opinion of what the study was trying to discover (cf. GQ, 56-58). This did not, as I had hoped, yield a useful measure of how many informants perceived the actual purpose of the study, because most had only a vague reference to "grammar," probably conditioned by the nature of the course they were enrolled in. (The script used for giving the instructions is included as appendix).

The results were analyzed according to the model in GQ (19-25), not the earlier method of QS (37-47). The responses were classified into groups. The first was complete compliance (Group A), or production of a target sentence which would result from making only the specified changes in the original sentence (allowing for stylistic variants such as contractions). The next group was "hesitations," or indications of some sort of change or doubt in the informant's response, but also including minor matters of spelling and pronunciation errors. Hesitations were subdivided into three classes : Group B, peripheral hesitations ; Group C, central hesitations (concerned with the element being studied) which did not appear to be evading the target response in favor of an alternative relevant to the usage item ; the Group D, those which were central and evasive. The last main group included all non-compliant responses, in four subgroups : Group E, peripheral ; Group F, central but not evasive ; Group G, central and evasive ; and Group O, total omission. The responses in Groups D, G, and O are the ones of most interest in establishing the status of usage items (this adds Group D to GQ's "RNC" responses). Any one response might include more than one of these factors, and all of tne relevant ones were noted. However, for purposes of analysis, the response was classified only with the group which came last in alphabetical order (thus, a response with a B element and a G element would be reported for tallying only as a G response). The hesitations and non-compliances were further subdivided, but these subdivisions were not used in data analysis.

Part two was considerably simpler in presentation and analysis. It was a preference-type judgment test employing both rating and ranking components, based on GQ (12-13, 16-17). It does not differ somewhat in format, with several items printed on each page. In addition, there was no attempt to time responses on each item. A maximum time of 15 minutes was alloted to finish the evaluation, but all of the informants finished in less than that amount of time. Each item on part two corresponded to an item on part one, in target form, with alternatives presented that made the usage choice involved explicit.

No information was given on the levels of usage to use in judgment unless the informants specifically asked for it. In that case, they were told to consider what would be "acceptable on a freshman theme." Thus, there was a considerable amount of ambiguity about the basis for a judgment on each item's naturalness and normality. Although the classroom setting probably encouraged a bias toward more formal/written standards as the basis of judgment, many of the informants did seem to be using an informal/spoken basis.

Analysis of the data on part two consisted of recording the number of *Yes*, *?*, and *No* responses from the rating segment of the test, and the *1*, *2*, or *3* responses on each item.

2. *Discussion*

2.1 *Lexical Items*

2.1.1 *Hopefully* as a sentence adverb

In the performance section, only one informant evaded using *hopefully* to modify the sentence — which was the same as the result on the item using *hopefully* as a regular adverb. In the judgment test, over 90% accepted this usage, as opposed to only 12% who accepted the clumsy, but "acceptable" circumlocution "it is to be hoped." *Hopefully* was overwhelmingly preferred over that one, and narrowly preferred to "I hope." Interestingly, about a third of the informants found the standard use of the adverb questionable or unacceptable. It seems that *hopefully* has become so well established in the new sense for these informants that it is driving out the old use.

2.1.2 *Due to* to replace *because of*

To be precise, the usage precept objects to this substitution only when it is used to introduce an adverbial phrase rather than an adjectival one. In the items used for this study, the relevant prepositional phrases are all adverbial, so they fit into the potentially questionable category. In the performance test, only 5% of the responses to *due to* included an "improvement" on this item, although there were another 7% of G or O responses. This contrasts slightly with the response to *because of*, where there were no D. G. or O responses, but that difference is not strong enough to be significant. In the judgment test, *because of* and *due to* were nearly equal in acceptance on the airport item (90%), and each was ranked as preferred about 60% of the time. Compare the response to "*Because of*/*Due to* the sun, I cut class," where *because of* was rated acceptable 10% more than *due to* (80% opposed to 70%), and *because of* was ranked first two-thirds of the time, *due to* only one-third. This is especially significant since the informants could have marked both choices as most preferred. I think the different response to these items can be accounted for as a stylistic perception : *due to* is perceived as more formal and quasi-official language than *because of*, so that there would be some lexical interference to using *due to* when talking about cutting class.

2.1.3 *-ize* forms of verbs

In the performance test 6% of the informants did evade using *finalize*, and none did so for *sterilize*. Thus, *finalize* is only objected to slightly more often than the fully accepted *sterilize*. The judgment test indicated that both of these direct verbs are overwhelmingly

preferred to the clumsy circumlocutions "make ... sterilize" or "make ... final." There is no convenient synonym for *sterilize*, but *complete* or *finish* would do quite well in place of *finalize*, and I did not include an item to see if the informants might choose the synonym rather than the *-ize* form.

2.1.4 *Among* and *between* with three items

About a third of the informants on the performance test did change "They are between three cities" to make it conform to the prescriptive rule (interestingly, always by changing *three* to *two*, never by using *among*), which is a significantly large response. However, the results on the judgment test show that their perceptions do not agree with their production. Nearly 80% found "*between* three cities" acceptable, compared with about half for *among*; and over two-thirds ranked *between* as most preferable, compared to only one-third for *among*. The other item in this pair used *between* with two items on the performance test, and elicited no G responses. On the judgment test, the informants overwhelmingly rejected using *among* with two items, so it is clear that they do not regard the two words as entirely interchangeable.

2.1.5 *Good* as an adverb

In the performance test, nearly 30% of the informants corrected *good* to *well* in "You did *good* on that test," while only one (1.2%) made the incorrect substitution of *good* for *well* in "He runs *well* for an old man." In the judgment section, about a third found *good* acceptable in both of these sentences, but this compare to over 90% who considered *well* correct. The results of the ranking portion are equally definite. It did seem that some informants regarded the two as stylistic variants of one another, rather than considering one right and the other wrong. This would help account for the disparity of results between the compliance and judgment tests, since many informants might not object very strongly to the non-standard usage, so they would not feel compelled to alter it, but still prefer the standard usage.

2.2 *Pronoun Usage*

2.2.1 *Who/whom* distinction and use or avoidance

In the performance test, 80% of the informants altered "They are the ones *who* my mother hates," giving the highest percentage of non-compliant reponses of any items in part one. Most of them omitted the relative or substituted *that* rather than correcting *who* to *whom*. Only a little over 10% of the informants evaded the *who* in "Bill, *who* doesn't like Mary, adores Jane," indicating some significant distinction between the two cases. One possibility is that since they could not omit or replace the *who*, they just left it alone (and those who made the *who* into *whom* in the first case would probably not change this one to the wrong form). It is also possible that they have learned some feel for what situations are "dangerous" ones with respect to using *who/whom*, although the results on the judgment test would seem to indicate that they still cannot select the correct form in that situation. One further item of interest was "It was she who hit him," which had about a 30% evasion rate, and where the form of those evasions seemed to indicate as much discomfort over the relative clause as over where to use *she* or *her*.

In the judgment test, only the first two items offered a *who/whom* choice. On the first ("*who/whom* my mother hates"), the opinions on acceptability and preference were about equally divided, Although the informants had such a marked impulse to alter the performance item, it seems that it was probably not on the basis of knowing for sure the given form was incorrect, since they were as likely to accept/prefer the wrong form as the right one. But, on the other item, where few had evaded the *who* on the performance test, they were almost unanimous in choosing the correct form.

2.2.2 Pronoun case

In the performance test, fewer than 10% of the informants corrected "between you and *I*" and on the judgment test, they found both alternatives acceptable, although they gave a slight edge to the "erroneous" form. A little over a third evaded choosing between *she* and *her* as a predicate nominative on the performance test, but on the judgment test two-thirds chose the correct form as both acceptable and preferable. That still leaves a fairly large minority group which chose the wrong form, so this usage is far from securely established.

Returning to the compound object problem, with "She did not invite my wife and *I*," again fewer than 10% corrected the "incorrect" usage, and on the corresponding judgnent test about two-thirds preferred the incorrect form to the correct one. The performance test especially, but also the judgment test, indicates that the "hypercorrect" form has become the established one for this particular group. How ironic that well-meaning teachers' determined efforts to correct their charges' pronoun case errors seems to have reinforced them rather than eliminating them.

2.2.3 Number of possessive pronoun following a collective pronoun

It is clear from the performance test that these informants find the plural to be more natural after *everyone* and *each of them* than the "correct" singular form. Fewer than 10% corrected the "improper" *their* occurrences, but nearly half substituted *their* in "Everyone had *his* own car," and over three-quarters used it in "Does each of them bring *his* book?" The judgment test indicates that the singular and plural are viewed as alternate forms, perhaps with a stylistic variation possible. On all four items, *their* got more acceptable ratings than *his*, with corresponding responses on the preference section.

2.3 Prepositions at the ends of sentences

This is the one item in this study that all the usage books that I consulted agreed about. Even the most conservative declared prepositions at the ends of sentences to be acceptable English. But the injunction against doing so is still firmly entrenched in the popular idea of usage. One instance might be cited. In an advertising flyer I recently received from Radio Shack, the president (unnamed) writes, in "Flyer Side Chat #41," "In my nearly 30 years in electronics, TRS-80 is the biggest breakthrough I've ever been this close to. I know you're not supposed to end a sentence with a preposition, but when you're bursting with pride and gratitude you let it all hang out."

However, the informants in this study showed a healthy disrespect for this "rule." In the two items with nonredundant prepositions at the end of the sentence, there was only one response on the performance test that moved the preposition away from the end of the sentence. The judgment test confirmed that the informants preferred the sentence-final position for both the verb-particle and verb-preposition combinations, especially when the alternative was the pedantic-sounding "with whom" construction.

I did include one case of a redundant preposition at the end. About 15% removed the *at* from "Where was he at?" On the judgment test, the results were more marked. Slightly less than 50% marked the redundant sentence as acceptable, while on the non-redundant form, only one benighted soul thought it was questionable. The preference scores were overwhelmingly in faver of the non-redundant form.

3. *Summary and Suggestions for Furher Study*

Briefly stated, this study determined that the informants found *hopefully* as a sentence adverb, *due to* introducing an adverbial, and the verb *finalize* all acceptable. On the performance test, some of them altered the items so that *between* referred to just two items

but the judgment test indicated that they accepted it with more items, while they would not accept *among* with only two items. They did not approve of using *good* as an adverb.

The informants avoided using *who* or *whom* in one item, and could not choose the correct form on the judgment test. On another item, though, *who* was not changed, and the judgment test from that showed a clear preference for the correct form. They preferred the subjective cases of pronouns as parts of complex objects of prepositions and verbs. The informants evaded choosing any case form for the predicate nominative by rewriting the sentence, which also let them avoid using a *who*-clause. They preferred the plural forms for pronouns whose antecedents were collective (indefinite) pronouns. And, finally, the informants showed no objection to prepositions at the ends of sentences unless they were redundant.

The results of this study could be extended in several ways. First, it would be useful to compare results with other subject populations, varied by age, region, and occupation, to see if the responses would differ in significant ways. There is also the potential for more analysis of the data already taken.

NOTES

1. My special thanks go to John E. Bush. This study was finished during my stay at the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas in 1978.

2. See Elgin's discussion on "Political Language and Its Structure." (Elgin 1975, 75-119). Also, Kilpatrick, James J., "Political phrases distort meanings." *Topeka Capitol Journal*, October 22, 1978, p. 28.

3. *U. S. News & World Report*, April 24, 1978, p. 75. See the following articles : Schmuhl, Bob, "Linguistic cleanup campaign." *Indiana Alumni Magazine*, Vol. 4, No. 7 (April 1979), pp. 18-19 ; Mitchell, John, "What a language we develop ... " *University Daily Kansan*, April 19, 1978, p. 2 ; Feather, Leonard, "A Plea for Good English." *Los Angeles Times*, May 18, 1979 ; Mosk, Stanley, "And Its Grammatical Sniping Is Sic, Sic, Sic." *Los Angeles Times*, July 12, 1978 ; Safire, William, "How do you do — when it's a matter of language?" *Lawrence Daily Journal-World*, February 18, 1979, p. 5A.

Is a certain word you are thinking about using hyphenated or not hyphenated? Do you want to say "affect" instead of "effect"? Is your grammar straight, your punctuation correct? Are you in fact saying what you think you are saying?

The writer's hotline at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock is a telephone service to answer such questions.

"We're handling up to 75 calls a week from all over the country with even some from Canada," said Dr. Stuart Peterfreund, assistant professor of English and creater of Writer's Hotline. ... Peterfreund said English department faculty members man the hotline on a volunteer basis. ... He said the English faculty was especially well-equipped to provide the service because at least half of each professor's teaching load is composition classes.

When Peterfreund launched the project, brief stories were carried nationally and that set the Writer's Hotline phone ringing from areas outside Arkansas, although the majority of calls are local.

Most queries come from people writing business letters, government agencies doing reports, and students doing term papers and the like.

Dr. Margie Burns, an English faculty member who volunteers on the hotline, said she had fielded one or two calls that "were kind of strange."

A lady mayor of a small town wanted to know whether she should sign her name "Mrs. So-And-So or Mayoress So-And-So." So I suggested "Mrs. So-And-So, Mayor."

Some questions don't end in clear-cut solutions. A man addressing a business letter doesn't know whether the recipient was male or female. "It didn't sound right to say, 'Dear Person' so I suggested 'Dear Sir or Madam' but he thought that was a little stiff and I agreed." — Carey, Robert, "University offers hotline on problems of writers." *Los Angeles Times*, September 19, 1978, Part I, p. 20.

Bibliography

Bryant, Margaret M. (1962), *Current American Usage*. New York : Funk and Wagnalls.
Crews, Frederick. (1977), *The Random House Handbook*. 2nd ed. New York : Random House.
Elgin, Suzette Haden (1975), *Pouring Down Words*. Englewood Cliff, New Jersey : Prentice-Hall.
Evans, Bergen and Cornelia Evans (1957), *A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage*. New York : Random House.
Fowler, H. W. (1965), *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. 2nd ed. rev. by Sir Earnest Gowers. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
Greenbaum, Sidney (1969), *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*. London : Longman.
_____ (1970), *Verb-Intensifier Collocations in English : An Experimental Approach*. The Hague : Mouton.
_____ (ed.) (1977), *Acceptability in Language*. The Hague : Mouton.
_____ and Randolph Quirk (1970), *Elicitation Experiments in English : Linguistic Studies in Use and Attitude*. London : Longman.
Hodges, John C. and Mary E. Whitten (1977), *Harbrace College Handbook*. 8th ed. New York : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
Lamberts, J. J. (1972), *A Short Introduction to English Usage*. New York : McGraw-Hill.
Labov, William (1972), *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press.
Morris, William and Mary Morris (1975), *Harper Dictionary of Contemporary Usage*. New York: Harper and Row.
Pooley, Robert C. (1974), *The Teaching of English Usage*. Urbana, Illinois : NCTE.
Quirk, Randolph and Jan Svartvik (1966), *Investigating Linguistic Acceptability*. The Hague : Mouton.

*

Eskey, David E. (1976), "Standard/nonstandard English : Toward a balanced view." *English Journal*, Vol. 65, No. 9, pp. 28-31.
Hiejima, Ichiro (1974), "A historical study of American English usage (1)." *ΣΙΛΦΗ*, No. 13, pp. 32-43.
_____ (1975), "A historical study of American English usage (2)." *ΣΙΛΦΗ*, No. 14, pp. 28-41.
Lance, Donald M. (1973), "*Whoever* and *whomever*." *Language Sciences*, No. 25, pp. 31-35.
Paper, Herbert H. (1971), "An experiment in 'whoever'and 'whomever'." *Language Sciences*, No. 16, p. 55.
Poteet, Lewis J. (1969), "Minnesota freshmen and ten controversial linguistic forms." *Research in the Teaching of English*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 62-69.
Yamada, Masayoshi (1977), "Notes on personal pronouns in present-day English." *Memoirs of the Faculty of Education, Shimane University*, Vol. 11, pp. 1-12.

Appendix (1)

SCRIPT FOR PART ONE :

First, fill in the blanks at the top of the sheet. This information will be used only for analyzing the results of this study. The ID number will be used for matching your responses on this part of the study to the second part, which you will do next week. [Stop tape until all the subjects are finished with the part.]

In a minute, I will be reading a series of sentences with instructions to you for making changes in them. In the pause between each of them, you should write down the changed form, NOT the original, as speedily as possible. [Turn on the overhead projector if it is being used.] These are the kinds of changes you will be asked to make :

First, to change the verb of the sentence into present tense. For example, *they ran* will be changed to *they run*.

Second, to change the verb of the sentence into past tense. For example, *they are coming* will become *they were coming*.

Third, to make the sentence negative in the usual way. For example, *they ran* will become *they didn't run*, and *they're enjoying it* will become *they aren't enjoying it*.

Fourth, to turn the sentence from negative to positive. For example, *I don't like it* will become *I like it*.

Fifth, to replace a given singular subject pronoun by a given plural subject pronoun. For

example, if I say "Replace *he* with *they* in *he likes it*," the correct result will be *they like it*.

Sixth, to replace a given plural subject pronoun by a given singular subject pronoun. If the instruction is "Replace *we* with *I* in *we are going*," the correct result will be *I am going*.

Seventh, to turn the sentence into a yes or no question. If the sentence is *you are tired*, the correct result will be *are you tired?*, and if the sentence is *he likes it*, the correct result will be *does he like it?*

Are there any questions about these operations? [Stop tape and answer any questions. Turn off overhead projector.]

You will be asked to make only one change in each sentence. The sentence and instruction will be read only once, so listen carefully. Sometimes the sentence will be given first; sometimes the operation to be done will be given first. If you cannot finish writing before the next sentence starts, leave it and start the next one. Since sentences heard in isolation often sound strange, let me emphasize that you should make only the changes that the instructions specify.

We will begin with three practice sentences.

Practice #1 : *The car over there is red.* Change the sentence into a yes or no question. [15 sec.]

Practice #2 : Change the verb of the sentence to the present tense. *They all went to the discount store.* [15 sec.]

Practice #3 : *He will go to Colorado soon.* Replace *he* with *they.* [15 sec.]

Now the regular series starts : [for form B, the sentences will be in reverse order.]

1 [22] : *Hopefully, we will see the play.* Make the sentence negative. [15 sec.]
2 [21] : *Because of the sun, we cut class.* Replace *we* with *they.* [15 sec.]
3 [20] : *You didn't do good on that test.* Make the sentence positive. [15 sec.]
4 [19] : Make the sentence negative. *It was she who hit him.* [15 sec.]
5 [18] : Make the sentence a yes or no question. *Everyone brought their book.* [15 sec.]
6 [17] : Make the sentence negative. *The nurse sterilized the scalpel.* [15 sec.]
7 [16] : *He is the one who my mother hates.* Replace *he* with *they.* [15 sec.]
8 [15] : *Each of them brings his book.* Make the sentence a yes or no question. [15 sec.]
9 [14] : *Where is he at?* Change the verb of the sentence to past tense. [15 sec.]
#10 [13] : Make the sentence positive. *Mary was not between Ron and Bill.* [15 sec.]
#11 [12] : Make the sentence a yes or no question. *The airport was closed due to snow.* [15 sec.]
#12 [11] : Change the verb of the sentence to present tense. *Bill, who didn't like Mary, adored Jane.* [15 sec.]
#13 [10] : *Each of them have their own car.* Change the verb of the sentence to past tense. [15 sec.]
#14 [9] : *He searched hopefully for Louise.* Replace *he* with *they.* [15 sec.]
#15 [8] : *The committee was finalizing the plans.* Change the verb of the sentence to present tense. [15 sec.]
#16 [7] : Make the sentence positive. *He was not someone I could work with.* [15 sec]
#17 [6] : Replace *he* with *they. Between you and I, he is a coward.* [15 sec.]
#18 [5] : Change the verb of the sentence to past tense. *Everyone has his own car.* [15 sec.]
#19 [4] : *They run well for old men.* Replace *they* with *he.* [15 sec.]
#20 [3] : *They were between three cities.* Change the verb of the sentence to present tense. [15 sec.]
#21 [2] : *They don't put the mail up.* Replace *they* with *he.* [15 sec.]
#22 [1] : Make the sentence negative. *She invited my wife and I.* [15 sec.]

Appendix (2)

INSTRUCTION PAGE FOR PART TWO :

In this part of the study, you are to evaluate related sentences, then to rank them in your order of preference. You will see an arrangement like this for each group :

	Put *Yes*, *No*, or *?*	Order of Preference. Put *1*, *2*, *3*.
a) *He doesn't have a car.*	_____	_____
b) *He hasn't a car.*	_____	_____
c) *He hasn't got a car.*	_____	_____

For the *evaluation part* : *Yes* = Perfectly natural and normal, *No* = Wholly unnatural and

abnormal, *?* = Somewhere between. For the *ranking part* : *1* = Most preferred, *2* = Second most preferred, *3* = Least preferred. If you have no preference, you may repeat numbers.

	Put *Yes*, *No*, or *?*	Order of Preference. Put *1*, *2*, *3*.
1. a) Hopefully, we will not see the play.		
b) I hope we will not see the play.		
c) It is to be hoped we will not see the play.		
2. a) Because of the sun, I cut class.		
b) Due to the sun, I cut class.		
3. a) You did well on that test.		
b) You did good on that test.		
4. a) It was not her who hit him.		
b) It was not she who hit him.		
5. a) Did everyone bring their book?		
b) Did everyone bring his book?		
6. a) The nurse did not sterilize the scalpel.		
b) The nurse did not sterilize the scalpel.		
7. a) They are the ones whom my mother hates.		
b) They are the ones who my mother hates.		
8. a) Does each of them bring his book?		
b) Do each of them bring their book?		
9. a) Where was he at?		
b) Where was he?		
10. a) Mary was among Ron and Bill.		
b) Mary was between Ron and Bill.		
11. a) Was the airport closed due to snow?		
b) Was the airport closed because of snow		
12. a) Bill, who doesn't like Mary, adores Jane.		
b) Bill, whom doesn't like Mary, adores Jane.		
13. a) Each of them had his own car.		
b) Each of them had their own car.		
14. a) They searched hopefully for Louise.		
b) They searched in hope for Louise.		
15. a) The committee is making the plans final.		
b) The committee is finalizing the plans.		
16. a) He was someone I could work with.		
d) He was someone with whom I could work.		
17. a) Between you and I, they are cowards.		
b) Between you and me, they are cowards.		
18. a) Everyone had their own car.		
b) Everyone had his own car.		
19. a) He runs well for an old man.		
b) He runs good for an old man.		
20. a) They are among three cities.		
b) They are between three cities.		
21. a) He doesn't put up the mail.		
b) He doesn't put the mail up.		
22. a) She didn't invite my wife and I.		
b) She didn't invite my wife and me.		