

## Changing Norms in Canadian English Usage

H. J. Warkentyne and A. C. Brett

University of Victoria

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Assuming that intralanguage differences derive from social differences between groups within a speech community, it follows that some type of standardization of language is inevitable. Furthermore, language norms are usually based on the linguistic behaviour of the dominant or prestigious class of that community (Wolfram and Fasold 1974:17-18). In England, for example, standard usage was once based on what has been termed Received Speech; the language used by the aristocracy. However, with the changes in the structure of English society in recent history, changes in language norms in England are no longer derived solely from upper class usage. Especially in matters of pronunciation, modified regional standardized dialects have emerged to compete with, and perhaps to influence, the standard dialect centered in London. (Gimson 1961:83-84). In such circumstances standard usage no longer remains uniform. Similarly in English-speaking Canada, although there is much less regional dialect variation than in Britain, it is impossible to identify a single model upon which to base a uniform standard. The situation in Canada is perhaps unique in that, rather than dialects competing for supremacy, through the course of our short history there have been two recognized models, both external to the community itself. To varying degrees and in various aspects British and American English have both had a direct influence on the perceived standards of English language usage in Canada.

Uniformity of standard usage can be achieved by fiat. One

such instance is recorded in the history of Canada when on July 14, 1890, an order in council was issued requiring that British spelling be used in all official documents of the Government of Canada. (The order made specific reference to the letter *u* in words such as *honour*, which is omitted from American spelling conventions.) In the absence of a regulatory body, such as the Académie Française in France, the model for standard usage is often provided by educators, lexicographers, and others who are recognized as authorities in matters of language use; e.g., celebrated writers and orators. Linguists have, by and large, eschewed involvement in this matter, except to condemn attempts to prescribe correct use of language.

Standardization of language usage is unavoidably and inextricably bound up with notions of correctness and, hence, often with negative value judgments concerning nonstandard usage. It is for this reason that linguists, until recently especially in North America, not only have failed to deal constructively with normative usage, but have bitterly attacked traditional prescriptiveness in English language education. Most linguists hold the view that all varieties of language are equally adequate for communication and that it is not a question of one being better than the other, but merely that they are different from each other. This view of language differences, rather than language deficiencies, derives from the anthropological tradition of cultural relativity dating back to the turn of the century. What linguists are objecting to, of course, is the notion that nonstandard varieties are deficient in some sense; a view that would make objective investigation impossible. Although this principle is unassailable, its adherents have tended to overlook an important practical aspect of language communication. For formal expression, especially written, a uniform or common standard is essential in a large society which includes

a number of divergent dialects. In such situations members of the non-literate dialect will find themselves at some disadvantage when wishing to communicate with other groups by having to acquire a second mode of language communication. In this context only, one might venture to suggest that the non-literate dialect is inadequate for its members to function in the larger community. Be that as it may, the need and existence of standards of usage are undeniable and one of the problems facing Canadians is the lack of clearly defined norms.

With the disappearance of grammatical studies from the school curriculum there is a growing uncertainty concerning the distinction between usages appropriate to formal and informal expression. This situation, if prevalent throughout the country, could open the way to major changes in the perceived norms. This paper addresses the issue by describing an experiment to determine and measure the perception of formal and informal registers in respect of grammatical usage amongst a sample population of university students.

The aim of the experiment was two-fold. One purpose was to explore a methodology through which acceptable norms of usage might be established. Appealing directly to speakers' own perception of appropriateness of expression in formal contexts may be one way of arriving at a definition of normative usage, provided that the survey population is fully representative of those who are likely to provide an acceptable model. Our experiment falls short in that respect. Another reason for this undertaking was to investigate the status, with respect to formality, of a handful of grammatical forms that are known to be subject to variation and suspected of giving rise to changes in normative usage.

## 2.0 DESIGN OF THE PROJECT

### 2.1 The Instrument

The investigation reported here was part of a more comprehensive study in which several aspects of English language usage were examined. Thus, the instrument contained items measuring lexical, phonological, and morphophonemic variation, in addition to morphosyntactic variability relevant to the present discussion. The grammatical or morphosyntactic items were presented to the subjects in three sets, each of these sets consisting of the same thirty-two examples of morphosyntactic variation. Each item was followed by a scale with the more standard form at one end and with the alternative, less standard form at the other, as the following example illustrates.

It's *really/real* hot in here.

*really* / A / B / C / D / E / *real*

In the instructions preceding the first set of these items, subjects were asked to use the scale following each example to report the relative frequency with which they heard the two forms used in conversation. Points A and E indicate that the adjacent items are exclusively heard, C means that both forms are heard with equal frequency, and B and C represent intermediate points between A and C, and E and C, respectively. For the second presentation of the set of items the subjects were asked to report the relative frequency with which they used the two forms in conversation with people to whom they wished to show respect. For the third and final set the subjects were instructed to report relatively how often they used the two forms in conversation with friends. In both the second and third presentation of the set, subjects were enjoined 'to be as frank and honest as possible', and they were advised that the authors 'do not regard one form as more correct than the other'.

For present purposes the first encounter was considered to comprise a pretest familiarization with the content of the questionnaire. Since there exists considerable sensitivity regarding possible judgments on correctness of usage, we wanted to put our subjects as much as possible at their ease in order to reduce the natural tendency on their part towards reporting only what they believed to be the correct form. It was felt that, having reported on what they heard other people saying, the subjects would then be prepared to give their best performance in reporting what forms they themselves used in the formal register. Finally, in their third encounter with the same material, after having created their best impression, it was hoped that subjects would feel free to report honestly what usage they employed in informal situations. In fact, this study is interested only in the differences reported between formal and informal usage.

## 2.2 The Items

The thirty-two morphosyntactic items selected for inclusion in the survey instrument are listed in Appendix A. These particular examples were chosen on the basis of previous observations of what appeared to be indiscriminate use of alternatives. For example, it has become increasingly common to hear *between you and I* used in preference to *between you and me*, even in fairly formal situations. In order to measure the extent to which they are used and the formal versus informal distinction made, the much-discussed *who* and *whom* are included. In addition to a few examples of case confusion, examples of other common problems were included which the reader no doubt will recognize. Although the items in the Appendix are grouped according to the particular grammatical problem each exemplifies, they were randomly ordered in the questionnaire and, of course, without mention of the grammatical problems represented. Also varied at random was the order of presentation of the standard and

nonstandard forms so that, for some items the standard form was placed at the left-hand end of the scale while, for other items, it was placed at the right-hand end of the scale.

The terms standard and nonstandard are somewhat artificially used. The standard form is that which may by some still be considered the more appropriate for the most formal expression. All others are designated as nonstandard without regard to their perceived degree of acceptability for use by educated speakers, as this is precisely what the experiment is intended to measure.

### 2.3 The Subjects

The population selected for this study consisted of students in two introductory English linguistics courses taught in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Victoria. One of these courses was at the first-year level while the other was a third-year course intended for students in the language arts stream of the Faculty of Education. In fact, all but a few in both courses expressed interest in including the teaching of English as a possible career. Thus, the sample could be considered as being comprised primarily of prospective English teachers. There were approximately equal numbers of first and third year students in a sample totalling sixty-eight subjects. Having eliminated from the sample subjects who returned unusable responses, we retained a total of sixty-four subjects.

## 3.0 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### 3.1 Data Processing

The responses of the subjects, having been marked directly onto the questionnaire forms, were transcribed to optical mark-sense forms for computer data entry. Transcription of responses to computer-readable form resulted in the literal codes A through E used in the questionnaire being translated into numeric codes 0

through 4, respectively. These numerical values were then used in the calculations.

In subsequent steps in the processing of the data, attention was restricted to the results of the subjects' second and third encounter with the test items, during which they were to report their formal and informal usage. The first step consisted of transforming the response values so that the code value 0 always corresponded to exclusive use of the nonstandard form and 4 corresponded to exclusive use of the standard form. A mean and standard deviation were then computed for each of the sixty-four variables.

The next processing step consisted of computing for each item the difference in usage reported by each subject, this computation being accomplished by subtracting a subject's informal response value (i.e. in the context of conversation with friends) from that of his formal response (i.e. in conversation with superiors). Thus, data on thirty-two new variables were generated from the original sixty-four in two sets of thirty-two each. Finally, means and standard deviations were computed on the thirty-two difference variables. These means and standard deviations, and those calculated for the original sixty-four variables, were subsequently employed in the computation of the test statistics described in the following section.

### 3.2 Statistical Testing

The purpose of the study was to identify those morphosyntactic items for which subjects exhibit a statistically significant change in usage from that which is reported as informal to that of the more formal register. Detection of a change or shift in usage with circumstance was based on observation of departure from zero of the mean for the difference variable derived for the item. A positive mean was taken to indicate a shift towards relatively more frequent use of the standard form for the item by

subjects in the formal context; a negative mean was regarded as revealing a shift towards relatively more frequent use of the nonstandard form in the same context. A t-statistic was used to test significance of these departures from zero. Since items were identified and treated separately according to whether the mean on the associated difference variable was positive or negative, a one-tailed test of significance was applied.

The power we might expect for this test with a sample of sixty-four subjects was determined by using tables published by Cohen (1977). We considered that we would want to detect a mean shift in relative frequency of usage of approximately one-quarter of a scale unit. A scale unit might be taken as the distance between response B and C, for example, on the questionnaire response scales. In order to use the power tables, the mean shift must be converted to an effect size by dividing it by the population standard deviation. The population standard deviation was estimated by computing the mean and standard deviation of the standard deviations of the thirty-two usage difference variables. A mean and standard deviation of approximately 1.06 and 0.08, respectively, were obtained; and it was therefore concluded that a reasonable estimate of the population standard deviation was unity. Hence, the mean shift of one-quarter scale unit could be treated as the population effect size to be detected. Since the tables are for a one-sample test, the two-sample paired-comparison effect size was multiplied by the square root of two, as prescribed by Cohen, to obtain an effect size of 0.35 with which to enter the one-sample tables. Interpolation yielded a power of 62% for a significance level of 5% for a one-tailed test. Application of the 1% and 10% significance levels resulted in powers of 36% and 74%, respectively. Thus, if the shift in relative frequency of usage in the population were one quarter



of a scale unit and if we were to apply a 5% significance level, we would stand approximately two chances in three of detecting this shift in usage with a sample of sixty-four subjects, and we would run a risk of one chance in three of failing to detect this difference. The 1% and 10% levels would give us approximately one chance in three and three chances in four, respectively, of detecting the one quarter scale unit shift in usage. The 1% and 10% significance levels yield the complementary risks of two chances in three and one chance in four, respectively, of failing to detect a difference of this size. Of course, if in the population the shift in usage with circumstance were greater, then the likelihood of detecting it in our sample would increase also. For example, if the shift in the population were one half a scale unit and we were applying a 5% significance level, then the probability of our detecting this difference with a one-tailed test in a sample of 64 subjects would exceed 99%.

In the following section we report the results obtained when applying the 1, 5 and 10% significance levels to the one-tailed t-test of the significance of the departures from zero of the mean shifts in usage. For our test of the null hypothesis that the mean shift of usage in the population is zero against an alternative that the mean shift is one quarter of a scale unit (in a specified direction), these levels of significance yield ratios of the likelihood of type II error to the likelihood of type I error of approximately 44 (for the 1% level), 8 (5% level), and 3 (at the 10% level). Thus, for the small mean shift in the population usage of one quarter of a scale unit, the test is conservative in the sense that we are more likely to deny the existence of this shift in usage than to accept it. At the 5% level, for example, we are eight times more likely to conclude that there is no shift in usage. Of course, if the shift in the population were greater than one

quarter of a scale unit, then the test would become more liberal. For example, if the shift were one half a scale unit, then application of the 5% significance level would yield a type II error rate of 1%; the ratio of likelihoods of the two types of errors then would be reduced to one-fifth (1/5).

The critical effect size reported in Cohen's power tables can be used to obtain approximate values for the mean shifts of usage which might be considered significant. If we assume a standard deviation of unity for all items, and if we convert the one-sample critical values to two-sample by dividing them by the square root of two, then for a one-tailed test we consider a mean shift in usage in a specified direction of 0.30 scale units significant at the 1%, a shift of 0.20 units significant at the 5%, and a shift of 0.15 units significant at the 10% level. It must be stressed that these values are very approximate since we have observed that the standard error of the mean shift varies from item to item. We cite these values here only to illustrate what magnitudes of shift in usage from that employed with peers to that used with superiors might be considered statistically significant. The results reported in the next section were obtained by applying the conventional t-test.

The objective in this experiment was to identify those items for which subjects display a significant shift in relative frequency of use of the standard and nonstandard forms with change of social circumstances. Having discovered these items, we then were interested to learn which of the two forms subjects might favour significantly in their conversation with each of the two social groups. This information was sought through additional statistical testing. Since the value "2" represents the midpoint on the five point scale from "0" to "4" on which responses were recorded, and

since the code "2" corresponds to equal frequencies of use of the standard and nonstandard forms, a t-statistic was computed to test significance of departure of the mean for the original variables from the value "2". A negative value for this test statistic could be taken to show preference for the nonstandard form while a positive value could be regarded as revealing a disposition toward the standard. Thus, having separated the items according to the sign of the associated t-statistic, we could apply a one-tailed test of significance of the identified disposition. The results of these tests are reported in the following section.

### 3.3 Results

#### 3.3.1 Negative Shift (summarized in Appendix B)

In this experiment we were interested particularly in those items for which subjects reported relatively more frequent use of the nonstandard form in the formal than in the informal context. Ten such items were identified, among the thirty-two, with mean shifts in the negative direction. In the case of seven of these items, mean shifts were significant at least at the 10% level. The two items (1) *between you and me/I*, and (17) *purser/more pure* resulted in highly significant (1% level) mean shifts in usage. (The item numbers correspond to those in Appendix A where the full text of the items is given.) A further two items (17) *in a moment/momentarily*, and (16) *I hope/Hopefully* yielded mean shifts significant at the 5% level. The remaining three items of this set of seven were (26) *behind/in back of*, (32) *visit/visit with*, and (27) *at/to home*. These yielded mean shifts of usage towards the nonstandard form from the informal to the formal context significant at the 10% level.

Results of the one-sample tests for these seven items showed that, in conversation with friends, subjects exhibit a highly statistically significant (the 1% level) preference for the standard

form; however, in conversation with people to whom they wish to show respect, subjects display a highly significant disposition toward the standard form with only five of the seven items. In the case of (17) *purser/more pure*, their preference for the standard form is significant at the 5% level while for the remaining item, (1) between you and *me/I*, although the t-value is positive, it is too small in magnitude to be considered significant at any reasonable level. Thus, it would appear that, for six of the seven items, subjects tend towards use of the standard form in conversation with both peers and superiors; but, this disposition toward the standard is more pronounced in the context of conversation with friends.

### 3.3.2 Positive Shift (summarized in Appendix B)

We were interested also in identifying those items for which shift in reported relative frequency of usage was toward more frequent use of the standard form with superiors. This shift would be in the more normal or more commonly expected direction with the nonstandard form being used relatively more often in informal situations in conversations with friends. We found twelve items yielding shifts significant at the 10% level in the positive direction; among these, we found the following eight to exhibit mean shifts significant at the 1% level: (1) *Whom/Who*, (3) *It's I/me*, (4) for you and *him/he*, (29) *as if/like*, (9) *sneaked/snuck*, (23) *wants to go/wants out*, (24) *wants to get/wants off*. Two items, (19) *do well/good* and (8) *saw/seen*, yielded mean shifts in usage in the positive direction that were significant at the 5% level. The remaining two of the twelve (30) *since/seeing as* and (31) *the reason is that/because* exhibited positive shifts significant at the 10% level.

On applying the one-sample tests to these twelve items, a

highly significant (at the 1% level) preference was discovered for the nonstandard forms in conversation with both peers and superiors for the three examples (2) *whom/who*, (3) *It's I/me*, and (31) the reason is *that/because*. For the items (29) *as if/like*, (13) *If he were/was*, and (9) *sneaked/snuck*, although the test statistic was positive in sign for the formal register, the magnitude was not sufficiently large to be regarded as significant at any reasonable level. For the informal register the statistic was negative in all the above six instances. For the item (29) *as if/like*, the disposition towards use of the nonstandard form was significant at the 1% level; for (13) *If he were/was*, this disposition was significant at the 5% level; however, for the item (9) *sneaked/snuck*, the tendency towards the nonstandard could not be regarded as significant. For the remaining six of the twelve items, the one-sample t-test showed a highly significant (at the 1% level) preference for use of the standard form by subjects in conversation with superiors. In conversation with friends, however, subjects displayed a highly significant preference for the nonstandard forms in the two items (23) *wants to go/wants out*, and (4) *for you and him/he*, while with the item (24) *wants to get/wants off*, although the statistic is positive, it is not large enough to be significant. With the remaining three items, namely, (30) *since/seeing as*, (19) *do well/good*, and (8) *He saw/seen*, subjects show a highly significant preference for the standard form in conversation with friends.

### 3.3.3 General Disposition (summarized in Appendix C)

Although it was not the major concern in this experiment, we were interested peripherally in discovering in which of the thirty-two items subjects demonstrated preference for the nonstandard form in both registers. On applying the one-sample t-test, we found five such items. In the case of three of these, namely, (2) *whom/who*,

(3) It's *I/me*, and (31) the reason is *that/because*, we discovered that subjects exhibited a highly significant (1% level) tendency toward use of the nonstandard form with superiors, while with the items (28) different *from/than* and (21) Everybody gets *his/their*, subjects showed tendencies towards the nonstandard which were significant at the 5 and 10% levels, respectively. For the four items (1) between you and *me/I*, (29) It looks *as if/like*, (13) If he *were/was* and (9) *sneaked/snuck*, although the test statistic was positive in sign, it was not large enough to allow us to conclude that subjects exhibited a statistically significant preference for the standard form; however, for the two items (12) He *lent/loaned* me money and (17) *purser/more pure*, the tendency toward use of the standard form with superiors was significant at the 10% level. Subjects exhibited a highly significant preference for use of the standard form with superiors for all other items.

The one-sample test was also applied to responses by subjects in the context of the informal register. This yielded ten items for which a negative value for the test statistic (i.e. a tendency towards nonstandard usage) was observed. In the following six cases this tendency was highly significant (at the 1% level): (2) *whom/who*, (23) *wants to go/wants* out, (29) It looks *as if/like*, (3) It's *I/me*, (31) the reason is *that/because*, and (4) for you and *him/he*. In the two cases (13) If he *were/was*, and (28) different *from/than* the tendency towards the nonstandard form was significant at the 5% level while in the remaining two cases, namely, (21) Everybody gets *his/their*, and (9) *sneaked/snuck*, this tendency was not sufficiently large to be construed as significant. Among the twenty-two items for which the test statistic was observed to be positive, in all except two cases the disposition toward use of the standard form with peers was found to be highly significant (1% level); in

the case of the item (12) He *lent/loaned*, this disposition was discovered to be significant at the 5% level, and only for the item (24) *wants to get off/wants off*, did we observe the magnitude of the statistic to be too small for us to conclude subjects exhibited as significant preference for the standard form.

#### 4.0 DISCUSSION

Eliciting formal register by appealing to respectful style raises a problem. By specifying the interlocuters as people to whom respect is due, the questionnaire may be suggesting a focus on parents and older members of the community rather than formal situations in general. Therefore the responses, on occasion, appear to reflect an accommodation to the linguistic behaviour of the respondents' elders by indicating nonstandard or dialect forms as preferred in respectful usage. Examples of these in the present corpus are (26) *in back of*, (27) *to home*, and (32) *visit with*. A possible way of avoiding such an outcome might be to appeal directly to the respondents' perception of correctness of usage, even at the risk of offending our philosophical sensibilities.

Amongst the items involving grammatical case it will be observed that, except for (1) between you and *me/I*, the standard form is still being recognized by respondents as being more formal. The tendency to replace the accusative by the nominative form may be related, by way of analogy, to the change from *it is me* to *it is I* which has been foisted on the English-speaking world by the school grammars. Halliday (1967:67-71) argues that, in a four-way classification, the verb *be* has the status of being a transitive (lexical) verb, thus making the expression *it is me* perfectly grammatical. Halliday observes that the replacement of Middle English *it am I* by *it is me* represents a shift in subject function from *I* to *it*. The two forms, *it is me* and *it is I*, existed side by side in the sixteenth century. Halliday suggests that *it is I* may have been a transitional blend,

analogous to *he hits I* with *he* as subject, and to *him hits I* when the subject is *I*. In view of this, one might speculate that the form *it is I* would not have survived had it not been for the insistence of the school grammars that this was the grammatically correct form. Presumably *it is I* was preferred to *it is me* because of nominative complements in Latin which provided the model.

The occurrence of the accusative *whom* in interrogatives appears to be rare in Canada, judging by the results of The Survey of Canadian English (Scargill and Warkentyne 1972:74). Of the total survey population, 23% adults and 11% students reported the regular use of *whom did you see*. Professor Scargill (1974:27) draws the reader's attention to the pronouncement of Edward Sapir (1921:156-164) on this form. Sapir predicts the demise of the accusative in this context within a century. Among the reasons cited for this change are that sentence initial position is strongly associated with the nominative case in English, and the fact that the other interrogatives, *which*, *what*, *where*, *when*, *how*, are invariable in form influences speakers also to treat *who* as invariable. Whilst indulging in speculations as to the causes for the disappearance of the accusative pronoun in formal expression, one might also suggest that a contributing factor is the reaction against its over-use which is regarded as substandard.

Some items in our corpus designated as nonstandard have already received wide acceptance in the United States as appropriate to formal use. *Momentarily* meaning 'in a moment' is included by *The American Heritage Dictionary* (1969) without comment as to its acceptability. For *hopefully*, meaning 'let us hope' *Heritage* informs the reader that it is unacceptable for formal use to 56% of its usage panel. Fowler's *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (1965 edition) does not comment on *hopefully*, but condemns the use



of *momentarily* to mean 'immediately' as 'foolish novelty-hunting'. The use of analytically constructed comparison for inflectional adjectives, as in *more pure*, is permissible in formal English in certain contexts; e.g. where *more* is to contrast with *less* as in *This item is more pure but less interesting than the other*. However, disyllabic inflectional adjectives collocate with *more* more readily than do the monosyllabic ones.

The experiment reported in this paper in no way claims to have provided firm answers to questions on standards of English usage in Canada. Any serious attempt to do so would entail a survey on a much larger scale, perhaps similar to the Survey of English Usage directed by Randolph Quirk at the University College London.

#### APPENDIX A

Test items (with a tentative classification)

##### Case erosion

1. It's between you and *me/I*.
2. *Whom/Who* did you see.
3. It's *I/me*.
4. This letter is for you and *him/he*.

##### Preterite/participial confusion

5. He has *drunk/drank* the water.
6. I'm *worn/wore* out.
7. I've *gone/went* there often.
8. He *saw/seen* it happen.

##### Strong/weak verb formation

9. He *sneaked/snuck* by when my back was turned.
10. He *sought/seeked* political asylum in Canada.
11. Look what the cat *dragged/drug* in.
12. He *lent/loaned* me some money.

Subjunctive of *be*

13. If he *were/was* here, things would improve.

## Semantic shift

14. It was *lying/laying* on the floor.

15. Don't go away, I'll be back *in a moment/momentarily*.

16. *I hope/Hopefully* we will have nice weather tomorrow.

## Loss of adjective inflection

17. 24K gold is *purser/more pure* than 18K gold.

## Adjective/adverb confusion

18. It's *very/some* hot out there.

19. I hope you do *well/good* on your exam.

20. It's *really/real* hot in here.

## Number agreement

21. Everybody gets *his/their* reward.

Collocation of *less* with count nouns

22. He's taking *fewer/less* courses than he should.

## Unusual ellipsis

23. The dog *wants to go/wants* out.

24. He *wants to get/wants* off the bus.

Loss of negative agreement with *anymore*.

25. A lot of people are away *at present/anymore*.

## Prepositional variation

26. It's *behind/in back of* the house.

27. He's *at/to* home.

28. My book is different *from/than* yours.

## Clause conjunctives

29. It looks *as if/like* he will go.

30. *Since/seeing as* he's gone, we'll leave.

31. The reason I can't go is *that/because* the road is washed out.

## Verb reclassification

32. I am going to *visit/visit with* my friend.

## APPENDIX B

Summary of items exhibiting statistically significant shifts in usage between formal and informal registers. The significance levels of the shifts are given in percent, and the t-values for each register are given only as plus or minus indicating a disposition towards standard and nonstandard usage, respectively. Where the signs of formal and informal are the same, one is duplicated to indicate the direction of the shift. In cases where the t-value is not statistically significant, it is shown as (+) or (-).

	Sig. Level	t-value	
		Neg. Shift	Informal    Formal
(1) between you and <i>me/I</i>	1%	+	(+)
(15) <i>in a moment/momentarily</i>	1%	++	+
(16) <i>I hope/hopefully</i>	5%	++	+
(17) <i>purser/more pure</i>	1%	++	+
(26) <i>behind/in back of</i>	10%	++	+
(27) <i>at/to home</i>	10%	++	+
Positive Shift			
(2) <i>Who/whom did you see</i>	1%	--	-
(3) <i>it's I/me</i>	1%	--	-
(4) <i>for you and him/he</i>	1%	-	+
(8) <i>he saw/seen</i>	5%	+	++
(9) <i>sneaked/snuck</i>	1%	-	(+)
(13) <i>if he were/was here</i>	1%	-	(+)
(19) <i>do well/good</i>	5%	+	++
(23) <i>wants to go/wants out</i>	1%	-	+

(24) <i>wants to get/wants off</i>	1%	(+)	+
(29) <i>it looks as if/like</i>	1%	-	(+)
(30) <i>since/seeing as he's gone</i>	10%	+	++
(31) <i>the reason is that/because</i>	10%	- -	-

## APPENDIX C

Summary of items showing a tendency towards nonstandard usage and only a marginal tendency towards standard usage in either register.

Item	t-value	
	Informal	Formal
(2) <i>who/whom</i>	-	-
(3) <i>it's I/me</i>	-	-
(21) <i>everybody gets his/their</i>	(-)	-
(28) <i>different from/than</i>	-	-
(31) <i>the reason is that/because</i>	-	-
(13) <i>if he were/was</i>	-	(+)
(29) <i>it looks as if/like</i>	-	(+)
(9) <i>sneaked/snuck</i>	(-)	(+)
(1) <i>between you and me/I</i>	+	(+)
(4) <i>for you and him/he</i>	-	+
(23) <i>wants to go/wants out</i>	-	+
(24) <i>wants to get/wants off</i>	(+)	+

(The remainder of the items from the total set of 32 items had a statistically significant positive t-value in both registers.)

## REFERENCES

- Cohen, Jacob. 1977. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Rev. ed., New York: Academic Press.

- Gimson, A. C. 1962. *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gowers, E. (ed.) 1965. *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, by H. W. Fowler. Rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English. *Journal of Linguistics*, 3.37-81.
- Morris, William (ed.) 1969. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. New York: American Heritage Publishing Co.
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company.
- Scargill, M. H. 1974. *Modern Canadian English Usage*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Scargill, M. H. and H. J. Warkentyne. 1972. The Survey of Canadian English. *English Quarterly*, 5.47-104.
- Wolfram, Walt and Ralph W. Fasold. 1974. *The Study of Social Dialects in American English*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.