



1-1-2002

Adverbs and social class revisited.

Ronald Macaulay

Adverbs and social class revisited.

Adverbs and Social Class Revisited

Ronald Macaulay

1 Introduction

In the investigation of variation one of the most pressing needs is validation of the results. Most studies rely upon statistical evidence to support the analysis. One of the problems with this approach is that it is difficult to control for the number of factors that influence the production of any sample of speech. A safer approach is to replicate a previous study but few investigators wish to repeat what they have done and fewer still to repeat what other investigators have done. A third possibility is to examine the same question based on data collected in a different manner. This paper illustrates that approach by comparing the results from interview samples of speech with those collected in peer-group dyadic conversations.

In an earlier study (Macaulay 1991, 1995), based on interviews I conducted myself, I found that lower-class speakers in the Scottish town of Ayr used derived adverbs in *-ly* much less frequently than the middle-class speakers in the same sample. There were also similar differences in the frequency with which the speakers used other adverbs and also evaluative adjectives. I suggested that "the use of adverbs and adjectives by the middle-class speakers reflects a self-confident and authoritarian attitude" while "the lower-class seem to show a greater tolerance for the weakness of others in their community and a reluctance to make categorically negative judgments about them" (Macaulay 1995:56). However, I also raised the possibility that the difference between the two groups was influenced by being interviewed by an academic interviewer. Since there was no comparable information on this topic it was impossible to verify the extent to which the results were an artifact of the situation. A recent data-set of same-sex conversations between friends allows comparisons with the results of the earlier study.

2 The Data

This paper is based on materials collected for an investigation of language variation and change in Glasgow, Scotland (Stuart-Smith 1999). The study is one of several (Foulkes and Docherty 1999) carried out to discover what changes, if any, had occurred in British urban speech since the earlier studies of the 1970s (e.g., Macaulay and Trevelyan, 1973; Trudgill 1974). In the

summer of 1997, 33 Glaswegians were recorded in same-sex dyadic conversations of approximately 35 minutes long. They were digitally recorded on separate tracks and the contribution of each speaker is usually quite clear, though there are a few places where overlap or extraneous factors make some utterances difficult to transcribe.¹

The speakers were drawn from two areas of the city, representing broadly urban working-class and suburban middle-class areas. The sample consists of two age-groups: adolescents (13-14) and adults (40+), with equal numbers of males and females.² In this paper I will deal only with the adult speakers. For each session one speaker was selected and asked to choose someone they would feel comfortable talking to in the presence of a tape-recorder for about half an hour. The participants were free to talk about anything they wished. The resulting tapes provide material for an examination of age, social class, and gender differences in this particular form of discourse.

The tapes were transcribed in their entirety, both as dialogues and with the contribution of each speaker separated. The contributions of individual speakers were analyzed by means of the WordCruncher concordance program. The resulting lists were then manually searched for items directly comparable with those in the earlier study. Although there are more speakers in the Glasgow study, the total amount of speech recorded from the adults is less than in the Ayr study (Table 1). There is enough recorded speech to allow comparison of the two samples.

		# of words
Ayr	Lower-class speakers (6)	69,771
	Middle-class speakers (6)	50,898
	Total	120,669
Glasgow	Working-class speakers (10)	50,307
	Middle-class speakers (8)	34,309
	Total	84,616

Table 1. Total # of words in the Ayr interviews and Glasgow conversations

¹ My thanks obviously in the first place to Jane Stuart-Smith who organized the Glasgow project, and then to her assiduous assistants who transcribed the tapes: Cerwynn Owen, Claire Timmins, Kathryn Allen, Lesley Eadie, and Susan Bannatyne.

² For technical reasons three sessions were recorded with working-class women; one speaker was recorded twice with different interlocutors. As a result the number of participants in each social class/age/gender category is not totally consistent but since the results are presented in terms of frequencies, the difference in absolute numbers need not materially affect any conclusions.

3 Frequency Counts (Adults)

Table 2 gives the frequency of adverbs in *-ly* for the Ayr sample, from the earlier study, and Table 3 those for the Glasgow adult sample.

	Lower-class		Middle-class	
	#	Freq.	#	Freq.
Manner	28	0.40	82	1.61
Time/Freq.	41	0.58	70	1.38
Degree	47	0.67	121	2.38
Sentence	76	1.08	174	3.42
<i>really</i>	55	0.79	106	2.08
Totals	247	3.52	553	10.87

[freq. = per 1,000 words]

[From Macaulay 1995: 44/1997: 124]

Table 2. Relative frequency of derivative adverbs in *-ly* in Ayr

	Working-class		Middle-class	
	#	Freq.	#	Freq.
Manner	11	0.22	32	0.93
Time/Freq.	19	0.38	33	0.96
Degree	35	0.69	42	1.22
Sentence	92	1.82	197	5.74
<i>really</i>	93	1.85	104	3.03
Totals	250	4.97	408	11.89

[freq. = per 1,000 words]

Table 3. Relative frequency of derivative adverbs in *-ly* in Glasgow (adults)

It can be seen from Tables 2 and 3 that while there are minor differences, the general pattern is remarkably similar in both, with the middle-class speakers using derived adverbs in *-ly* more than twice as frequently as the working-class speakers, so the social class differences in the use of derivative-adverbs found in the Ayr study cannot be simply an artifact of the interview situation. Nor is there any evidence in either corpus that uninflected adjectives (e.g., "I was firing that too *quick*") are used frequently by working-class speakers in place of derived adverbs.³ The

³ Except that the adolescents use *dead* and *pure* as intensifiers, e.g. *she pure does my head in* and *they're dead healthy now*.

explanation does not lie there. Table 4 shows that there is a gender difference in the middle-class speakers.

	All	Middle-class	Working-class
	Freq. #	Freq. #	Freq. #
Men	8.94 (293)	13.59 (212)	4.71 (81)
Women	6.75 (350)	9.99 (187)	4.92 (163)

[freq. = per 1,000 words]

Table 4. Social class and gender differences in derived adverbs: Glasgow adults

It can be seen in Table 4 that it is the middle-class men who are the most frequent users of derived adverbs in *-ly*. In discussing the use of derived adverbs in Ayr I suggested that "the use of adverbs and adjectives by the middle-class speakers reflects a self-confident and authoritarian attitude" (Macaulay 1995: 56). Since middle-class men are often in positions of authority, it may not be surprising that they should be the most frequent users of these adverbs.

In the Ayr study I also tabulated numbers on the adverbs *very*, *quite*, and *just* (Macaulay 1991:129-32). The figures for Ayr are given in Table 4 and the figures for the Glasgow adult sample in Table 5.

	Lower-class		Middle-class	
	#	Freq.	#	Freq.
<i>very</i>	70	1.00	178	3.49
<i>quite</i>	70	1.00	127	2.49
<i>just</i>	338	4.84	255	5.01

[freq. = per 1,000 words]

Table 5. Relative frequency of *very*, *quite*, and *just* in Ayr

	Working-class		Middle-class	
	#	Freq.	#	Freq.
<i>very</i>	16	0.32	147	4.28
<i>quite</i>	60	1.19	125	3.64
<i>just</i>	311	6.18	179	5.22

[freq. = per 1,000 words]

Table 6. Relative frequency of *very*, *quite* and *just* in Glasgow adults

Once again the similarities are obvious. In both corpora, it is only *just* that is used by the working-class speakers with the same kind of frequency as the

middle-class speakers. The difference in the use of *very* in the Glasgow sample is even more striking than that in Ayr.⁴ Half of the working-class Glasgow adults do not use *very* even once. The main gender difference is in the middle-class, as can be seen in Table 7.

	All	Middle-class	Working-class
Men	1.98	3.66	0.47
Women	1.91	4.86	0.24

[freq. per 1,000 words]

Table 7. Social class and gender differences in the use of *very*:
Glasgow adults

The middle-class women use *very* slightly more frequently than the middle-class men, but the difference is small compared with the social class difference.

It is perhaps worth emphasizing that the differences shown in Tables 1-4 are not differences in linguistic knowledge. Nobody could claim, for example, that the working-class speakers are unfamiliar with the word *very* or that it forms part of an esoteric register. Instead, there is a difference in the ways in which the speakers from the two social classes use the resources at their disposal.

At this point it may be helpful to point out that while the differences in adverb use are not salient and are not indexical of social class membership in Silverstein's (1996) sense, there are many obvious differences in pronunciation and morphology that distinguish the two groups. The differences between the two groups in Ayr are summarized in Macaulay (1991: 257). The differences in pronunciation in Glasgow are presented in Stuart-Smith (1999). Nobody from Ayr or Glasgow would have the slightest difficulty in assigning any of the speakers to one social class or the other on the basis of a short extract from the tapes. The two groups are clearly polarized within the local speech community.

There are also social class differences in the use of *just*. While the working-class adults use *just* slightly more frequently (6.18 per 1,000 words) than the middle-class adults (5.22 per 1,000 words), they do not use *just* in exactly the same way. In Ayr, following the analysis presented in Lee

⁴ The figures for the 34 conversations of the London-Lund corpus are *very* 4.92, *just* 3.39, and *quite* 2.30 (based on Svartvik, Eeg-Olofsson, Forsheden, Oreström, and Thavenius 1982: 44). This is consistent with the middle-class status of the London-Lund speakers.

(1987), I separated the uses of *just* into four categories. The first is with reference to time, usually the immediate past, as in examples (1a, 1b). The second use is as an intensifier with the general sense of "exactly," as in examples (2a, 2b).⁵ The third use is in the sense of "only," as in the examples (3a, 3b). Finally, there is the sense of "simply," as shown in the examples (4a, 4b).

(1) Uses of *just*

(the *a* examples are middle-class, *b* examples working-class)

'Recency'

1a. I've *just* realised something (10R)

1b. that's it *just* opened up again (13R)

'Exactly'

2a. yes that's *just* what I was thinking (12L)

2b. well *just* as it turns round the bend (15L)

'Only'

3a. but it's *just* a baby (12L)

3b. it was *just* the two of us (14L)

'Simply'

4a. I'll *just* take everything out of the dining room (10R)

4b. I'll *just* go along (13R)

The examples in (1) show that both groups use *just* in all four senses but they do not use them equally frequently as shown in Table 8.

	Recency	Exactly	Only	Simply
Middle-class adults	15%	17%	26%	42%
Working-class adults	5%	13%	26%	55%
All adults	9%	14%	26%	51%

Table 8. Uses of *just* by Glasgow adults

The working-class adults use *just* more often in the "simply" sense, while the middle-class adults make more frequent use of the "recency" and "exactly" senses than do the working-class speakers.⁶ The "exactly" use is most distinctive when employed emphatically with adjectives and verbs as in "and

⁵ Aijmer says that this is the prototypical meaning of *just* and suggests that its pragmatic function "is to identify and to clarify rather than emphasize (1985: 2).

⁶ Aijmer's analysis of the middle-class speakers of the London-Lund corpus shows that what she calls "simply" was the most frequent meaning (1985: 3).

I mean she was *just* impeccable" (16R) and the "only" use before the hedge *sort of* as in "it's really *just* a sort of buffer" (10R).

The use of *quite* can either be emphatic (what Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik 1985: 590 call "maximizers"), as in "but I think clothes-wise we're *quite* different" or a hedge (what Quirk et al. 1985: 597-578 call "downtoners"), as in "the actual wee beach is *quite* nice because it's sort of rough sand." Deciding between these two functions is sometimes difficult so any figures reflect an interpretative decision. The middle-class speakers appear to use *quite* more frequently in its emphatic function (67%) than in its hedging function (33%). For the working-class speakers the difference is less: 56% emphatic, 44% hedging.

The middle-class speakers use *quite* with an overall frequency of 3.64 per thousand words compared with the working-class frequency of 1.19. The frequency with which the middle-class speakers use *quite* in its emphatic function is 2.42 per thousand words compared with the working-class frequency of 0.66. In the hedging function the frequencies are: middle-class 1.2, working-class 0.52. The middle-class thus use *quite* twice as often as the working-class speakers in a hedging function and almost four times as often in the emphatic function. The gender differences in the use of *quite* are shown in Table 9.

	All	Middle-class	Working-class
Men	2.44	4.49	0.58
Women	2.03	2.94	1.51

[freq. per 1,000 words]

Table 9. Social class and gender differences in the use of *quite*: Glasgow adults

In this case it is the middle-class men rather than the middle-class women who are the most frequent users of *quite*.

Biber and Finegan in their cluster analysis of styles of stance found that the cluster that corresponds to "involved, intense conversational style" (1989: 110) was characterized by "frequent use of emphatics, hedges, and other general evidential markers" (1989: 111). Since the London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English (Svartvik and Quirk 1980) consists mainly of middle-class speakers, Biber and Finegan's findings support the social class differences found in Glasgow.

The middle-class Glasgow adults in general use more hedges than the working-class adults. For example, the middle-class speakers use *sort of* with a frequency of 1.84 instances per thousand words. The frequency for

the working-class speakers is only 0.54 but even this is misleading because one of the working-class women uses *sort of* with a frequency of 2.3 per thousand words; the rest of the working-class speakers use *sort of* with a frequency of only 0.23. There is essentially no difference in the use of *kind off/kinda* (MC 0.49 vs. WC 0.45). The middle-class Glasgow adults are also more likely to use *you know* in hedges (see Macaulay, to appear).

The use of adverbs and hedges by middle-class speakers are illustrated in (2-5):

(2) Conversation #12, middle-class women)
(hedges in bold, adverbs in italics)

- L12: it was *quite* chatty
 R12: yes
 L12: you know it **kind of** had been programmed
 to *really* **sort of** *just* keep you in order
 and not—not work too hard
 which is *quite* good
 but it was *quite* an old-fashioned model
 I can't remember what it was
 but it was *certainly* different from
 all the PC's that we're using
 and the the Macs that are being used now
 R12: yes yes they're *quite* user-friendly
 L12: mm *very* user-friendly *really*
 R12: yes yeah
 L12: yes I'm not *really* computer-minded
 but I'm having to learn
 R12: Oh I'm sure you though—you—you are much more
 than you think *really*
 L12: well it's *quite* surprising the things I find myself doing
 or trying to do

(3) Conversation #11, middle-class men)

- 11R: and I'm *fairly* sure that if you don't speak well
 and you don't speak *properly*
 er it can mean that you're denied the— let's say a post or
 whatever
 11L: hm

I think even in this place the number of promotions there have been from the Language Department is *clearly* out of proportion *significantly* out of proportion to the number of promotions that have been available to staff *generally*

(4) (Conversation #16, middle-class men)

L16: and you come over a crest down a hill
and there's a track on the left with a gate
and you *probably* won't notice that
but you would *immediately* notice
there was very *suddenly* water on your left
which rather looks like it might be a big inlet of Loch Lomond
but it's not
it's an *entirely* self-contained little lochan called the Dhu
Lochan

(5) (Conversation #16, middle-class men)

16L: but if you *actually* know that that little bay is there
there's a *very* steep descent to it from the road
cos you're coming over one of these sort of Trossach-like
hillocks
which you then drive down that flattens out
but by that time you're past if you like the public access to this
bay
because if—if you go in via the university
it's a *very* gradual descent to the bay
I mean it's almost flat
it just goes downhill *slowly*

Biber and Finegan suggest that the certainty and emphatic forms in their conversational sample

“seem to reflect a sense of heightened emphatic excitement about the interaction, while the hedges seem to reflect a lack of concern with precise details, indicating that the focus is on involved interaction rather than precise semantic expression.” (1989: 110)

This may be true of the middle-class speakers in Glasgow too but it would be hard to say that the working-class speakers are less involved in the interaction, and yet their conversations do not display these characteristics to the same extent. Biber and Finegan were interested in different styles employed in different genres, including written materials as well as spoken, so their emphasis is not on variation within conversational styles and cannot be expected to draw distinctions of this kind. Nevertheless, their conclusions are consistent with the middle-class Glasgow conversations. The question then becomes: What is it that characterizes the working-class speakers?

One clue may lie in the phrase "a lack of concern with precise details" (Biber and Finegan 1989:110) with reference to hedges. It was apparent in the Ayr interviews that the working-class speakers were concerned about details. The Glasgow working-class speakers also include many details.

(6) (Conversation #13, working-class women)

- R13: and eh that's what happened there
everybody was aw watching their bottles going doon you know
doon and doon and doon
the next thing oor table—
it was like a half bottle of vodka and a half bottle of whisky and
six cans of Pils
and th—there was near enough another carry-oot was getting
ordered
- L13: do you know you know that's what I would have ha—had with
me
I wouldn't have had the vodka
I'd have had like that my Pils maybe
- R13: aye
- L13: but I thought "Oh to hell
I'm going—I'm going to drink vodka tonight for a change"
- R13: aye but see that last one?
The Times were gieing a can of Pils oot free in the Coop at the
time
can you mind o that?
- L13: oh right
- R13: so everybody was aw on Pils
everybody that came in aw had aw these Pils
they must have all been buying *TheTimes*
and g—giving—giving aw these Pi—cans of Pils

- L13: you were get—you were getting—you—
 R13: cause their tables were full of them
 everybody
 you could guarantee there was about six at each table aw
 drinking Pils
 and aw these cans were up
 and a big black bag at the—the bottom of the hall
 aw the cans were getting put into
 cause that's what I was on an aw
 and then as I say we ended up going on to Haddows and getting
 mair

This is a narrative about a night's drinking but nothing much happens in the story. Yet the details are important: the vodka, the whisky, the cans of Pils (beer). The evaluation comes in the line "there was near enough another carry-oot was getting ordered." This means that despite the amount of drink on the table they were thinking of getting more from the off-licence (liquor store), and in the end they did: "we ended up going on to Haddows and getting mair." It was clearly a night of prodigious drinking and the way it is communicated is through the details.

Here is another example, this time from a conversation between two working-class men.

(7) (Conversation #18, working-class men)

- L18: because I used to remember em trying to copy them
 because we had Beatle suits
 R18: mhm
 L18: there were four of us
 R18: this is Ruchill
 when you were a boy
 L18: this is in Ruch—
 R18: in the sixties aye
 L18: oh this was in oh well my goodness
 well aye
 they had all em black with no collar
 remember thae suits right
 R18: aye aye
 L18: the Beatles when they first started the—the no collar
 R18: the collarless suits aye

- L18: I could only get—
I couldnae get a black one.
I had a grey one
- R18: mhm mhm
- L18: you know all my pals had a black one
and I had a grey one
- R18: aye

Once again the details do not play any role in the subsequent story but they are clearly important for the speaker. Johnstone, in her study of Fort Wayne narratives points out the importance of details in storytelling (1990: 91):

“Many Fort Wayne personal experience stories include far more detail than should, from the point of view of strict relevance, be necessary, detail which turns out to have no bearing on the narrative core at all.”

Johnstone refers to this as “extrathematic detail” and explains its prevalence in Fort Wayne stories (1990:107):

“Since audiences do not break into stories with requests for clarification, tellers cannot expect to be told when settings are unclear. It is thus to a teller’s advantage to err on the side of too much orientation, at the risk of including some irrelevant material, rather than on the side of too little, at the greater risk of not being understood at all.”

How does this relate to the difference in the use of adverbs? In the earlier paper (Macaulay 1995: 51-53), I argued that the working-class use of quoted dialogue allowed the hearer more freedom to interpret the situation than the use of evaluative adverbs and adjectives, which impose the speaker’s interpretation. In the same way, the kind of details provided in examples such as (6) and (7) provide the hearer with the information necessary to understand the situation. In contrast, the middle-class examples in (2-5) not only give details but an interpretation, as in

- R12: yes yes they’re *quite* user-friendly
- L12: mm *very* user-friendly *really*

6 Conclusion

Thus, similar to the findings from the Ayr interviews, the working-class speakers in the Glasgow conversations appear not to want to impose their views on their hearers but rather to let the hearers make up their own minds. One of the ways in which they do this is by rarely employing the adverbs that the middle-class speakers use more frequently. Powell (1992) observes that certain adverbs can "act preemptively to inform and to persuade a hearer of the nature and importance of the speaker's evaluation" (1992:76). The evidence of the Ayr and Glasgow studies suggests that the working-class speakers are much less anxious than the middle-class speakers to inform and persuade the hearer of their evaluation. This is not an idiosyncratic difference, since it is consistent across a wide range of speakers from both social classes. Nor is it a matter of register that might be related to level of education since it extends to the use of words that are part of everybody's vocabulary, such as *very*, *just* and *quite*. We are, in fact, confronted with the question that Bernstein (1962) wished to investigate. The unfortunate political fall-out from his categorization of restricted and elaborated codes has led to an avoidance of such questions in sociolinguistic research but perhaps it may soon be possible again to set goals for the field that go beyond charting change in progress.

Given the different ways in which the data for the two studies were collected, the results cannot simply be the effect of the methodology. The consistency of the social class differences is remarkable since there is nothing in the choice of topics that might affect the use of adverbs. Nor can the patterns of use be the result of interviewer bias, since there were no interviewers in the Glasgow sessions. Since quantitative studies of discourse variation are not yet common it would be unwise to place too much significance on the results of two small-scale studies, but the fact that the social class differences show up so strongly in two quite different kinds of sample suggests that there is something fundamental that affects speech style in the two social class groups in western Scotland.

References

- Aijmer, Karin. 1985. Just. In Sven Bäckman and Göran Kjellmer (eds.), *Papers on language and literature presented to Alvar Ellegård and Erik Frykman*. 1-10. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

- Bernstein, Basil. 1962. "Social class, linguistic codes and grammatical elements." *Language and Speech* 5: 221-40.
- Biber, Douglas and Edward Finegan. 1989. Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text* 9: 93-124.
- Foulkes, Paul and Gerry Docherty (eds.) 1999. *Urban voices: Variation and change in British accents*. London: Arnold.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 1990. *Stories, community, and place: Narratives from Middle America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Macaulay, Ronald K.S. 1991. *Locating Dialect in Discourse: The Language of Honest Men and Bonnie Lasses in Ayr*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Macaulay, Ronald K.S. 1995. The adverbs of authority. *English World-Wide* 16: 37-60. [Reprinted in Macaulay 1997.]
- Macaulay, Ronald K.S. 1997. *Standards and variation in urban speech: Examples from lowland Scots*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Macaulay, Ronald K.S. To appear. You know, it depends. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Macaulay, Ronald K.S. and Gavin D.Trevelyan. 1973. *Language, education and employment in Glasgow*. (Final report to the Social Science Research Council). Edinburgh: The Scottish Council for Research in Education.
- Powell, Mava Jo. 1992. The systematic development of correlated interpersonal and metalinguistic uses in stance adverbs. *Cognitive Linguistics* 3: 75-110.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1996. Monoglot "Standard" in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In Donald Brenneis and Ronald Macaulay (eds.), *The Matrix of language*. 284-306. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Stuart-Smith, Jane. 1999. Glasgow. In Paul Foulkes and Gerry Docherty (eds.) *Urban voices: Variation and change in British accents*. 203-222. London: Arnold
- Svartvik, Jan and Randolph Quirk (eds.). 1980. *A corpus of English conversation*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.
- Svartvik, Jan, Mats Eeg-Olofsson, Oscar Forsheden, Bengt Oreström, and Cecilia Thavenius. 1982. *Survey of spoken English*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1974. *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pitzer College
 Claremont, CA 91711-6101
 ronald_macaulay@pitzer.edu