

LANGUAGE ATTITUDE STUDIES: POTENTIAL USES IN NEW ZEALAND

Janet Holmes
Victoria University of Wellington

(Received July, 1973)

In New Zealand at present a number of research projects are planned or already in progress aimed at providing information on the various linguistic codes, (languages, dialects, styles), used by different speech communities. There is obviously a great need for such research. Benton (1972) points out, for example, that the number of English-Maori bilinguals can only be estimated at present by informed guesswork: about 30% of the Maori population, (i.e. about 2.3% of the total population),¹ and declining rapidly, is Bruce Biggs' estimate (1968). Benton mentions, however, the fact that a linguistic survey is planned to provide more data on bilingualism within the next few years. Linguistic research was also recommended by Bender in a N.Z.C.E.R. Report published in 1971. His first recommendation was "that the major colloquial varieties of English and Maori be subjected to intensive scientific description and analysis." Researchers are already collecting data which will enable such descriptions and analyses to be made.

Biggs' estimate of the number of English-Maori bilinguals suggests that the majority of New Zealand Maoris speak some variety of English as their primary means of communication. In many areas, particularly for urban Maoris, English is likely to be the only language used. There is some confusion in the literature as to whether the variety of English used by many Maoris should be regarded as a distinct "Maori English"² or whether it is rather "a very restricted form of the English language" (Department of Education, 1971). The mistaken notions underlying the latter approach have been adequately refuted by Labov (1969) and need no elaboration here. Moreover it is not clear whether the "Maori English" referred to is in fact used only by Maori monolingual English speakers or whether it is used also by Pakehas of low socio-economic status. Different writers make different assumptions. (Anderson and Aitken, 1965; Hawkins, 1972; Mitcalfe, 1967). Research is obviously needed to clarify these issues and yet, in the light of the recent revival of interest in the Maori language, it seems unrealistic to search for monolingual English-speaking Maoris who have had no contact with the Maori language. A more useful approach would seem to be an attempt to describe the linguistic repertoire of any individual as a whole, eliciting the speech codes used in different social contexts without imposing an artificial distinction

between varieties of Maori and varieties of English. This is the approach used by sociolinguists like Labov in his American social dialect research (1966, 1968). We need information on how different codes are used, in which situations, to whom and when, and what degrees of proficiency individuals attain in different codes.

There has been, however, a tendency to regard overseas sociolinguistic research as a substitute for local research; and for educationalists, for example, to treat hypotheses as facts, and even to make recommendations based on the results obtained in overseas research, without any evidence that the same conditions obtain in New Zealand.³ The value of overseas sociolinguistic research in New Zealand should be clearly seen to lie in the application of sound theories and methods of investigation of the linguistic repertoire of a speech community. The results of such research cannot be taken and applied wholesale to completely different situations where basic descriptive work has not yet been completed. New Zealand English differs from American and British English; and New Zealand is unique in that Maori is a potential code in the linguistic repertoire of the inhabitants, and consequently a potential linguistic influence on all varieties of New Zealand English.⁴

With these considerations in mind I would like to discuss ways in which some of the sociolinguistic techniques described in overseas research could be applied in New Zealand. I am particularly interested in the methods used to elicit peoples' attitudes towards speech codes, and the implications of these attitudes for education. Studies which examine the function of different codes in the repertoires of members of different speech communities can often suggest areas where attitude research might be fruitful. The contexts in which certain speech codes are habitually used will generally influence attitudes towards these codes: the H(igh) variety in a diglossia situation, for example, is generally used in formal, literary or official contexts and Ferguson points out that "the speakers regard H as superior to L in a number of respects" and that "there is usually a belief that H is somehow more beautiful, more logical, better able to express important thoughts, and the like." (Ferguson, 1959) There are a number of studies, however, which have been designed specifically to discover peoples' attitudes towards different speech codes and I shall concentrate on these.

The most commonly used method of gathering data on language use and on attitudes is the questionnaire. Self-report data from census questionnaires, however, generally provides information on what people think they do, or what they think they ought to do or believe, rather than giving reliable information on their real behaviour and attitudes. Fishman (1968), therefore, devised a more satisfactory method of eliciting this information, by using

commitment measures aimed at discovering a respondent's willingness to perform a particular type of behaviour. He asked his informants to indicate whether they would be willing, for example, to attend a lecture or discussion group aimed at the promotion of a particular minority group language. The questionnaires were followed up by an invitation to a social event of the kind involved in the commitment items, thus enabling him to validate the commitment scores against overt behaviour. He claims to have demonstrated that commitment measures are more useful than traditional attitude questionnaires in assessing how likely it is that attitudes will affect behaviour (Agheyisa and Fishman, 1970).

Insofar as this technique provides some information on attitudes towards language maintenance or revival, or attitudes towards a particular second language, it could be used as one behavioural measure of such attitudes. We could use it, for example, to measure attitudes towards the preservation of a minority language among immigrant groups in New Zealand: or to compare the attitudes and behaviour of Maoris and Pakehas with respect to the revival of the Maori language; this information could be very useful to those involved in promoting the teaching of Maori, particularly in areas where bilingual education in Maori and English is being considered (see Benton, 1972). And it could also be used in the assessment of attitudes towards the teaching of foreign languages such as French, Chinese, Spanish, Indonesian, Russian, German etc. in New Zealand schools and tertiary institutions. It might provide a method of estimating the amount of interest among school children and their parents in the culture of the languages concerned.⁵ Their willingness to commit themselves to a "cultural evening" might indicate the extent to which they were interested in "learning more about the other cultural community" (Lambert, 1967) and this, according to Lambert, is an indication of the degree of a student's integrative motivation, which has been shown to be clearly related to successful second-language learning (Lambert et al, 1962; Spolsky 1970). This information would obviously be useful to foreign-language teachers.

One must make the point however that although Fishman's commitment measure is an improvement on questionnaires in eliciting information on attitudes and behaviour with respect to language, it is still a relatively unsophisticated technique. Although one may be prepared to commit one's time, energy, and even money, to maintaining, reviving or learning a particular language, there are many other factors involved, which Fishman's technique does not take into consideration. Immigrants, for example, may require English for social and educational advancement, to earn a living, to participate in the society they have joined and so on. And so despite their willingness to attend social and cultural activities involving their

minority language, they may nevertheless be more committed to *acquiring English in the long run*. We need techniques which will enable us to assess the relative importance of languages in the repertoire of speech community members and the ways in which their attitudes reflect this.

The second type of study I want to discuss then, is based on a social-psychological theory of the part played by attitudes in processes of language maintenance (or change). (Williams, 1971). The studies involved provide a number of interesting ideas for an investigation of attitudes towards, for example, Maori dialects of English. An approach based on attitude research may provide a means of establishing (1) whether listeners can identify the ethnic, social or occupational status of speakers on the basis of speech alone; (2) which speech varieties are popularly perceived as constituting "Maori English"; (3) to which ethnic and social groups do those who are identified as using "Maori English" belong; (4) which levels of language are significant in identifying "Maori English." Williams' theory suggests that speech provides listeners with linguistic clues that enable them to classify individuals as members of particular social and ethnic groups. To some extent then, our behaviour towards individuals will be determined by our attitudes towards the group to which they signal that they belong.

Lambert and his colleagues in Montreal derived from this theory a hypothesis which has become known as "the stereotype hypothesis." This proposes that "a listener's attitude towards members of a particular group should generalise to the language they use, and consequently his evaluational reactions to the spoken language should be similar to his reactions when actually in contact with a group member" (Anisfield and Lambert, 1964). They devised a technique "to elicit the stereotyped impressions which members of one social group hold of representative members of a contrasting group" (Lambert, 1967). This became known as the "matched guise" technique, since it involved the use of recordings of perfectly bilingual speakers reading a passage first in one language and then in the other. Groups of listeners were then asked to evaluate the personality characteristics of the speakers, using only voice cues, but the listeners were not aware that they were listening to bilingual speakers. Lambert found this technique especially useful in measuring "group biases in evaluative reactions" (1967), and it ingeniously controls for variables like voice quality, personality and topic. It reveals more private reactions to the contrasting group than direct attitude questionnaires do. The type and strength of the reactions varied with the age, sex, social class, and native language or dialect of both the listeners and the

speakers. This method of eliciting stereotypes is potentially useful in any speech community. It can provide information firstly on whether or not stereotypes of particular groups exist, and secondly on the extent to which speech alone can elicit stereotyped reactions to, or impressions of, such groups. Lambert has used the technique successfully with bidialectal as well as bilingual speakers (Lambert et al, 1965).

Despite the fact that claims are still made that "there is relatively little social prejudice against Maoris" in New Zealand (Sinclair, 1971), it is clear from a number of attitude studies that Maoris are, in fact, regarded as a low prestige group. Vellekoop (1966) showed, using a semantic differential scale, that the occupation with lowest prestige, machine operator, was associated, for his informants, with the adjectives "unsuccessful," "poor," "drunk" and "Maori." Studies by Vaughan (1962), Ritchie (1964), and Thomas (1969), confirm the existence of anti-Maori prejudice. To what extent is this prejudice evoked by the use of the Maori language on the one hand or "Maori English" on the other? Lambert's "matched guise" technique provides a method of finding out. It is possible to find Maoris who speak English without listeners being able to detect their ethnic background, (as I will show in a moment). Recordings of bilingual Maoris of this kind could be used to measure listener's reactions to people speaking, firstly in Maori, and then in English. I predict that, in line with previous attitude studies, reactions to the Maori language will elicit a negative stereotype of the speakers using Maori. It may also be possible to use Lambert's technique with Pakeha bilinguals who can speak fluent Maori, and thus provide further evidence for the stereotype. Another kind of experiment using the same method might involve measuring listener's reactions to Maori bilinguals who speak English with a detectable Maori accent. One might hypothesise that these Maoris would be evaluated more favourably when speaking the Maori language, than when they spoke "accented" English (cf. Anisfield et al, 1962). It seems unlikely, however, that we could use the matched guise technique to compare reactions to two different varieties of the same language since it has been suggested that it is easier to achieve perfect bilingualism than perfect bidialectalism: "we have not encountered any non-standard speakers who gained good control of a standard language, and still retained control of the non-standard vernacular." (Labov, 1970). This also has implications in the field of education which I will discuss in more detail later. For the moment it raises a problem in the application of Lambert's method of investigating attitudes in the New Zealand context.

Labov, himself, however, has provided a number of different techniques of eliciting attitudes to different varieties of a language. In his study of New York speech (1966),

concentrating only on phonological differences, he used three methods of collecting data on his informants' attitudes towards their own speech and the speech of others. Firstly he asked direct questions, such as:

"What do you think of your own speech?"

"What do you think of Southern speech as compared to New York City speech?"

This method revealed that, on the whole, New Yorkers disliked their own speech:⁶ "New Yorkers show a general hostility towards New York City speech." They preferred the speech of those from other areas.

A second method used in this study involved a test of informants' awareness of their own speech. He asked them to listen to four pronunciations of a number of words and to indicate firstly, the pronunciation they considered "correct," and then the pronunciation they considered closest to their own. This enabled Labov to discover how accurately informants could report their own usage; and to measure also what he calls "overt linguistic insecurity," by measuring in how many cases the respondent selected different forms, showing he considered his own pronunciation wrong, and accepted a pronunciation which he did not use as right. He found a general tendency for informants to perceive their own pronunciation as identical with the correct or prestige pronunciation, except among the lower middle class group who revealed a high degree of linguistic insecurity by consciously deferring to an exterior standard quite different from their own usage. Both the methods described so far involve self-report. They direct attention towards the speech forms under investigation, and responses may therefore be influenced by how informants think they ought to reply, rather than revealing what they actually do think about their own speech. Moreover the second method assumes a previous structural analysis of the speech of the community, in order to identify socially contrastive phonological features for use in the test, and to assess the accuracy of the self-report data.

The third method of measuring attitudes, however, distracts attention from the assessment of the pronunciation used by the informants themselves. Labov calls it the subjective reaction test. He recorded a number of speakers from different social classes reading a story; he then selected sentences produced by different speakers in the various recordings, in which the number of prestigious and non-prestigious phonological variables which occurred, varied according to the socio-economic class of the speaker. These sentences were then played to informants who were asked to assess the job potential of the speakers. They were given a

scale of seven occupations from "television personality" at the top to "factory worker" and "none of these" at the bottom; and they had to base their assessment, therefore, only on the recorded sentences of the speakers. This method provided information on the social prestige accorded to different New York accents. Since its aim is to discover how people perceive other people's speech, it need not rely on a prior structural analysis of the data. It could be used, in fact, as a way of establishing the existence of social or ethnic differences in speech styles which evoke attitudinal and evaluative responses from members of different New Zealand speech communities.

In a more detailed study of the dialect of Negro adolescents in New York (Labov et al, 1968) Labov extended this method of eliciting attitudes to speech in a number of ways. He designed two further assessment scales besides the scale of job suitability: these were a scale of "toughness" and a scale of "friendship." Respondents were asked:

- 1) "If the speaker was in a street fight, what are his chances of coming out on top?"
- 2) "If you got to know the speaker very well, what are the chances of his becoming a good friend of yours?"⁷

Labov also extended his methods further by the use of a "family background" test aimed at assessing the listener's ability to identify the ethnic group membership of a number of speakers. He recorded fourteen speakers from a variety of ethnic groups, including Jewish, Irish, and Italian, as well as Negro and white, Northern and Southern, although his main interest lay in informants' ability to identify speakers on the negro-white dimension. Correct identification of Negro versus white ranged from 30% to 60%; adults performed a little better than adolescents, and white graduate students better than other adults. When the responses were reinterpreted to refer to standard English vs non-standard Negro English, rather than ethnic background, the overall percentages of correct identifications rose to 72% - 97%. In this test Labov used recorded samples of speech from fourteen different interviews; the topic varied considerably in different samples, and the range of speech variation involved all levels of language: phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical. His respondents may, therefore, have used information provided by the topic or by any or all of these linguistic levels in identifying a particular speaker's ethnic group.

Philip Gould, an honours student at Victoria University in 1972, undertook a pilot project, aimed at investigating attitudes towards Maori and Pakeha speech, using some elements of Labov's methodology (Gould, 1972). He wanted to measure people's awareness

of differences in Maori and Pakeha speech, and he restricted his study to an examination of attitudes towards phonological variables or accent differences. He adopted Labov's "family background" test by recording sixteen people reading a passage, the language of which was rather colloquial. His speakers comprised seven Maoris and seven Pakehas (roughly matched for educational and occupational status), and two speakers with "foreign" accents (one British, one European). He played speech samples in a random order to ninety-one listeners from a variety of social and ethnic backgrounds, of different ages and both sexes, and asked them to assess the age, education, occupation and ethnic group of the speakers. A number of alternatives were given for speakers to select from in order to facilitate coding and interpretation of the replies:

e.g. Which of these groups does the speaker belong to ?

1	Pakeha New Zealander	
2	English	
3	Other European	
4	Maori New Zealander	
5	Other (please specify)	

He found that there was very little confusion over the identity of the Pakeha speakers (87% correct), but that, for the Maori speakers, judgements varied considerably (45% correct). There was no clear explanation for this: e.g. those correctly identified as Maori were not restricted to any particular educational or occupational status group, but covered the whole range. One possible factor was the degree of familiarity of the listeners with Maoris, but this was not specifically tested. Gould demonstrates then, "a distinct tendency to wrongly group Maori speakers as Pakeha (55% of judgements)," while "misclassification in the other direction (Pakeha speakers rated Maori) is quite rare," (4% of judgements). This study illustrates the importance of applying research techniques used overseas to local contexts, rather than assuming the results of overseas studies can be applied in a different cultural context without any test of their validity in that context. "The phonological stereotypes of Maori and Pakeha dialects of English are by no means as 'gross' as those demonstrated for non-standard Negro English and standard English in the United States." (Gould, 1972). And it is also worth noting that the overall ability to correctly identify Pakehas in New Zealand was much greater than the overall ability to identify whites in Labov's study.⁸ (Maximum of 66% correct responses.) And Shuy reports different results again in his Detroit social dialect survey (Shuy, 1969). The need for replication of studies in different contexts is thus very

clear. Gould's results suggest then that there may be few, if any, Pakehas who speak "Maori English" (at least at the phonological level) and that many Maoris speak English without any identifiable Maori accent.

There is obviously room for extending the scope of such studies using a greater number of listeners from a wider variety of social and ethnic backgrounds. One could also introduce grammatical as well as phonological variables in order to test listeners' ability to identify possible dialect differences in the speech of different ethnic groups. And ultimately one might hope to test evaluative reactions to a variety of different speech styles on a scale from spontaneous or casual styles to more formal styles, using both Maori and Pakeha speakers, and representatives of different social classes since "social strata exist in New Zealand" although there are not as many of the "symbols of stratification or the clear-cut distinctions between social strata that can be found in many other societies" (Collette, 1973). Similarly, sociological studies have indicated the existence of racial stereotypes in New Zealand. Dane and Mary Archer studied the attitudes of adolescent New Zealanders to Maoris and Pakehas (Archer and Archer, 1970) and discovered that Pakehas were perceived as "successful and well-to-do, university students, hardworking, good-looking, and good at sports," whereas Maoris were perceived as "musical, lazy, happy-go-lucky, strong, failures, unattractive and generous." It was shown that "the overall pattern and relative strengths of the stereotypes" was the same for both Maori and white adolescents (cf. Lambert et al, 1960, for similar results in his "matched guise" experiments with English and French Canadian students). And the Archers report that the degree of inter-racial contact made no significant difference to these results. It would be useful to investigate the extent to which this stereotype may be elicited by speech alone and to discover whether the social strata Collette refers to can be identified by linguistic as well as social characteristics. It may be that we shall find similar stereotypes based on social groupings, and reinforced by linguistic differences, as have been described elsewhere. But we need New Zealand research to confirm or refute these hypotheses.

The importance of such research is clear from the discussion of the consequences of stereotyping by Rosenthal and Jakobsen (1968). They describe how beliefs can function as self-fulfilling prophecies:

"one person's expectation for another person's behaviour can quite unwittingly become a more accurate prediction simply for its having been made."

They confirmed their hypothesis in a study of teacher's behaviour towards pupils, with alarming implications for "disadvantaged" children. Williams (1970) tested the extent to which teachers' attitudes to children's speech revealed stereotyping by playing tapes of Negro and white children's speech of different social status to a number of teachers, and measuring their evaluative reactions on a series of twenty-two scales, such as:

"Sentences are: fragmentary ----- complete."

He discovered that "as a child's speech was rated as non-standard, the children were rated as Negro-like and other language features were rated less favourably." The teacher's ratings of children on various scales, then, including social status and ethnicity, seemed to be based on a gross stereotype elicited by a very brief portion of the child's speech. Similar studies elsewhere confirm Williams' findings (Freder et al, 1970; Seligman, 1972). It would obviously be useful to know to what extent New Zealand teachers' attitudes are influenced by their pupils' use of non-standard dialects of English.

Finally, the implications of such studies in the field of education have been widely discussed by sociolinguists. Many American social dialect researchers have recommended the encouragement of "bidialectalism" for children who use a non-standard dialect of English: i.e. these children, it is claimed, should be taught to speak the standard dialect of the majority group. The arguments presented in support of this view are often very telling: socially "some dialects are considered more valuable than others in certain contexts;" "the exigencies of reading and writing call for standard English;" "in refusing to teach standard English to these children we cut off even further their possibility of entering the main stream of American life;" and, most revealing, "since standard English is the language of the main stream it seems clear that knowledge of the main stream system increases the likelihood of success in the main stream culture" (Baratz, 1970). It has also been pointed out that minority groups frequently reveal attitudes of self-hate, and many American blacks downgrade their dialect on subjective evaluation tests (Shuy et al, 1969).

There are, however, a number of points which should be considered before adopting a programme to teach minority groups the language of the "main stream culture." Firstly, linguistic research has shown that the distinction between what has been called Black English and standard English in the United States refers in many respects to opposite ends of a continuum. This continuum includes the speech of blacks and whites of all social classes, and overlap occurs at various points, especially when we take into consideration the variable of the social context in which the speech occurs.⁹ So advocating bidialectalism involves an oversimplified view of the linguistic and sociolinguistic competence which is to be acquired.

Secondly, there is Labov's point that bidialectalism is even more difficult to achieve than bilingualism, and that non-standard speakers who gain "good control of a standard language" generally lose control of the non-standard dialect. One might ask why a speaker of a non-standard dialect should be required to abandon this vernacular dialect. He may not want to adopt "main stream" values, and, if this is so, Lambert's evidence of the importance of motivation suggests that teaching the standard dialect in school is a literal waste of time. His studies of second-language learning suggest that successful learning depends, in part at least, on a student's willingness "to adopt certain aspects of behaviour including verbal behaviour, which characterise members of the other linguistic-cultural group" (Lambert, 1967). In order to successfully acquire standard English, then, the child may need to adopt the predominantly white upper middle class as a reference group. The psychological dangers of developing feelings of loss of identity or anomie, as a result of such behaviour have been discussed by Lambert and his colleagues (Lambert et al, 1963) and one might also mention the undesirability of encouraging the kind of linguistic insecurity which Labov reports in the behaviour of upwardly mobile members of the lower middle class in New York, who adopt the upper middle class as their reference group (Labov, 1966).

The assumption that speakers of non-standard dialects want to adopt the values of those who speak standard English is in fact refuted in many of the studies of their attitudes. Labov found that although people recognised the prestige value of the upper middle class accent in New York, many of them, especially the men, indicated that they valued the less prestigious speech of the working class which they all used in the most informal speech situations and which they associated with "cultural norms of masculinity" (Labov, 1966). Similarly in his later study of Negro adolescents (1968), Labov found that, although these boys recognised the value of standard English in relation to securing a good job, they ranked those who used it very low as potential friends; on the other hand non-standard English speakers were rated as likely to get low status jobs, but also likely to win a fight. And it was these speakers who were considered desirable friends on the "friendship" scale. So masculinity, toughness and group solidarity are values clearly symbolised by the use of the non-standard dialect, and reinforced by the peer group. The importance of the peer group in influencing speech behaviour has also been pointed out by Gardner (1968). In Bristol (Britain) Giles reports that "all regional accents have significantly less prestige than R.P." (1970) and he advocates an "accent-extension programme," despite the fact that only 13% of the teachers in his attitude study "gave any indication of an awareness of the social stigma of regional accented speech" (Giles, 1971). Trudgill, (1972) however, reports in his study of social dialects in

Norwich, "evidence of the 'covert prestige' associated with non-standard varieties" and claims that for Norwich men, and young people of both sexes, "working-class speech is statusful and prestigious."

It is clear that research, using some or all of the methods I have described, is needed, if we want to discover, for example, whether non-standard dialects of English exist in New Zealand, and, if so, to examine the attitudes of non-standard English speakers towards those who speak the standard dialect in New Zealand, and particularly towards their teachers' speech. Labov points out that it is women who are most negative about New York speech, and it is women who show the greatest linguistic insecurity (1966). And it is women who make up most of our teaching force. As Spolsky remarks, "The decision made by most modern societies to recruit primary school teachers from the very group that is most unsure about its own variety of language produces a major strain . . . Their tendency to choose as a reference group the speakers of another language or variety has a serious effect on their attitude to language, and consequently on the attitude they pass on to their pupils" (Spolsky, 1971).

Since those who speak a non-standard dialect do not seem to experience any difficulty comprehending the standard dialect (see Labov, 1969; Wenner, 1967), it would seem advisable, at the very least, to restrict educational aims to the more realistic aim of one style of standard English for use in formal contexts. Spolsky points out that, "It is possible to learn enough of a language to use in a restricted domain" without changing one's membership group or switching one's allegiances to another group (Spolsky, 1969). In the long run, however, we should surely be aiming at changing the main stream attitudes towards non-standard speech rather than at "bidialectalism" or "accent extension" for non-standard dialect speakers. "The basic assumption of bidialectalism" as Sledd has said so forcefully, "is that the prejudices of middle-class whites cannot be changed, but must be accepted and indeed enforced on lesser breeds" (Sledd, 1969). "Any attempt to teach the minority group child standard English is in part an attack on the child himself and his family background" since "the child is being told indirectly that the language he speaks at home with his family is not good enough for school" (Kennedy, 1972). Linguistic change is, however, the effect rather than the cause of social change. Changes in middle-class attitudes towards the dialects and accents of minority ethnic or social groups will depend in the final analysis, on the development of respect for the values and culture of these groups. In New Zealand one small first step might be an adequate description and analysis of the speech codes of such groups.

FOOTNOTES

1. Maoris constitute about 8% of the total population.
2. "Maori(fied Colloquial) English" (Bender, 1971).
3. See Hawkins (1972) for a discussion of the ways in which Bernstein's work in Britain has been misinterpreted in New Zealand.
4. This influence may well increase if the Maori pronunciations of place-names introduced by the N.Z.B.C. are more generally adopted.
5. For the importance of parents' attitudes towards the second language see Carroll (1967); Gardner (1960, 1968) and Spolsky (1970).
6. Some qualifications of this statement are discussed later. (Page 141).
7. The results of these tests and their implications are discussed below.
8. The sample of listeners in Gould's study was, however, rather restricted in range, and there was some bias in favour of those with above average education.
9. See Labov (1966) for the relationship between social class variation and stylistic variation.

REFERENCES

- Agheysi, R. and Fishman, J.A. (1970). "Language Attitude Studies." Anthropological Linguistics, Vol. 12, No. 5.
- Anderson, L. and Aitken, R. (1965). A Study of the Speech and Idiom of Maori Children. Mount Maunganui College/Auckland Secondary Teachers College (unpublished).
- Anisfield, E. and Lambert, W.E. (1944). "Evaluational reactions of bilingual and monolingual children to spoken language." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 69.
- Anisfield, M., Bogo, N., and Lambert W.E. (1962). "Evaluational Reactions to Accented English Speech." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 65, No. 4.
- Archer, D. and Archer, M. (1970). "Race, Identity and the Maori People." The Journal of the Polynesian Society, Vol. 79.
- Baratz, J.C. (1970). "Educational Considerations for Teaching Standard English to Negro Children," in Fasold, R.W. and Shuy R.W. (eds). Teaching Standard English in the Inner City. Centre for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
- Bender, B.W. (1971). Linguistic Factors in Maori Education. N.Z.C.E.R., Wellington.
- Benton, R.A. (1972). "Should Bilingual Schooling be Fostered in New Zealand?" Paper read at a general meeting of the Wellington Teachers' Language Association.
- Biggs, B. (1968). "The Maori Language Past and Present," in Schwimmer, E. (ed). The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties. Blackwood and Janet Paul, Auckland.
- Carroll, J.B. (1967). "Foreign Language Proficiency Levels Attained by Language Majors Near Graduation from College." Foreign Language Annals, Vol. 1, No. 2.

- Collette, J. (1973). "Social Stratification in New Zealand," in Webb, S. and Collette, J. (eds). New Zealand Society: Contemporary Perspectives. John Wiley and Sons Australasia Pty Ltd, Sydney.
- Department of Education. (1971). Maori Children and the Teacher. Government Printer, Wellington.
- Ferguson, C.A. (1959). "Diglossia." Word, Vol. 15.
- Fishman, J.A. (1968). "Bilingual Attitudes and Behaviour," in Fishman, J.A., Cooper R.L., Roxana Ma, et al. (1968). Bilingualism in the Barrio. Yeshiva University, New York.
- Freder, R., Brown, B., and Lambert, W.E. (1970). "The Role of Speech Characteristics in Scholastic Success." Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, Vol. 2.
- Gardner, R.C. (1960). "Motivational Variables in Second-Language Acquisition." Dissertation, McGill University.
- Gardner, R.C. (1968). "Attitudes and Motivation: Their Role in Second-Language Acquisition." TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 2.
- Giles, H. (1970). "Evaluative Reactions to Accents." Educational Review, Vol. 22, No. 3.
- Giles, H. (1971). "Teachers' Attitudes Towards Accent Usage and Change." Educational Review, Vol. 24, No. 1.
- Gould, P. (1972). "Assessment of Status by Accent: An Aspect of Sociolinguistic Competence." Unpublished M.A. Honours Project. V.U.W.
- Hawkins, P. (1972). "Restricted Codes and Maori English." New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. 7, No. 1.
- Kennedy, G.D. (1972). "Non-standard English Among Minority Group Children." Unpublished paper.
- Labov, W. (1966). The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Centre for Applied Linguistics, Washington.
- Labov, W. (1969). "The Logic of Non-Standard English." Georgetown Monographs on Languages and Linguistics, No. 22.
- Labov, W. (1970). "The Study of Language in its Social Context." Studium Generale, Vol. 23.
- Labov, W., Cohen, P., Robins, C., and Lewis, J. (1968). A Study of the Non-Standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City. Final Report. Cooperative Research Project 3288, Office of Education, Washington.
- Lambert, W.E. (1967). "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism." Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 23, No. 2.
- Lambert, W.E., Hodgson, R.C., Gardner, R.C. and Fillenbaum, S. (1960). "Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 60.
- Lambert, W.E., Gardner, R.C., Olton, R., and Tunstall, K. (1962). "A Study of the Roles of Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning." Mimeo, McGill University.

- Lambert, W.E., Gardner, R.C., Barik, H.C., and Tunstall, K. (1963). "Attitudinal and Cognitive Aspects of Intensive Study of a Second Language." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 66.
- Lambert, W.E., Anisfield, M., and Yeni-Komshian, G. (1965). "Evaluational Reactions of Jewish and Arab Adolescents to Dialect and Language Variations." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 2.
- Mitcalfe, V. (1967). "Survivals of Maori in English." Education, Vol. 16, Part 8.
- Ritchie, J.E. (1964). "The Evidence of Anti-Maori Prejudice," in Ritchie J.E. (ed) Race Relations: Six New Zealand Studies. V.U.W., Wellington.
- Rosenthal, R. and Jakobsen, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the Classroom. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York.
- Seligman, C.R., Tucker, G.R., and Lambert, W.E. (1972). "The Effects of Speech Style and Other Attributes on Teachers' Attitudes Towards Pupils." Language in Society, Vol. 1, No. 1.
- Shuy, R.W. (1969). "Subjective Judgements in Sociolinguistic Analysis." Georgetown Monographs on Languages and Linguistics, No. 22.
- Shuy, R.W., Baratz, J.C., and Wolfram, W.A. (1969). Sociolinguistic Factors in Speech Identification. Final Report, MH 15048-01. National Institute of Mental Health Research.
- Sinclair, K. (1971). "Why Are Race-Relations in New Zealand Better Than in South Africa, South Australia or South Dakota?" The New Zealand Journal of History, Vol. 5.
- Sledd, J. (1969). "Bidialectalism: The Linguistics of White Supremacy." English Journal, Vol. 58, No. 9.
- Spolsky, B. (1969). "Linguistics and Language Pedagogy - Applications or Implications?" Georgetown Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, No. 22.
- Spolsky, B. (1970). "Attitudinal Aspects of Second Language Learning." Language Learning, Vol. 19, No. 3 and 4.
- Spolsky, B. (1971). "The Language Barrier to Education," in Perren G.E. (ed) Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language. CILT Reports and Papers, No. 6.
- Thomas, D.R. (1969). "An Analysis of Ethnic Prejudice," unpublished M.A. Thesis, V.U.W., Wellington.
- Trudgill, P. (1972). "Sex, Covert Prestige and Linguistic Change in the Urban British English of Norwich." Language in Society, Vol. 1, No. 2.
- Vaughan, G.M. (1962). "The Social Distance Attitudes of New Zealand Students Towards Maoris and Fifteen Other National Groups." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 57.
- Vellekoop, C. (1966). "The Meanings of Occupational Prestige and the Semantic Differential." Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, Vol. 2.
- Wenner, P.D. (1967). "The Influence of Dialect Differences on the Immediate Recall of Verbal Messages." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Michigan (unpublished).

- Williams, F. (1970). "Psychological Correlates of Speech Characteristics: On Sounding 'Disadvantage'." *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, Vol. 13, No. 3.
- Williams, F. (1971). "Language, Attitude, and Social Change," in Williams, F. (ed). (1971). Language and Poverty. Markham.
-